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THREE NORTH DELTA NOMES.

[Plate 1.]

BEING desirous, after the revelation of intimacy between prehistoric Crete and Egypt which the Cretaceous excavations had made, to know if there were indeed no "Aegean" remains in the Lower Delta, I searched the authorities for an account of the extant antiquities of its north central region—north, that is, of the 'Borari' railway, which links Dassuk on the Rosetta Nile with Sherbin on the Damietta arm. But in vain. Nor, for that matter, could I find any description of the scenery of the region itself, more detailed and recent than the romantic sketch of the marshes with which Heliodorus opened his Aristonous. I had myself visited the extreme south-west corner of it in 1896, following in the steps of Messrs. Poiret and Griffith to Tell al-Faraun; and the last named scholar had gone on thence a few miles north to the district of Tida. Nor did east of that point stretched unknown land. So I was forced to undertake an exploration of the region for myself. The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies generously gave a grant in aid; and almost every kind of assistance was furnished on the spot by the Société Anonyme de Babylon, through the great goodwill of its Managing Director Mr. E. W. P. Foster, C.M.G. I should have fared badly in the marshes without the use of the Inspection Houses, men, animals, and boats, of that Society, and the unique local knowledge of its officers, among whom (after Mr. Foster) I must thank especially Mr. Smith, the Agricultural Director at Constantinia, M. Monnerat, the Assistant Manager in chief, and Messieurs Boutros and Pessalides, the local Directors at Sidi Salem and Kum Wahal respectively. If I did not find anything "Aegean" in this North Delta district, I hope this article will show that its exploration was not made wholly in vain.

The coastal belt of the Delta is divided by Ptolemy into five Nomoi: (1) the Mutilic, capital, Metelis; (2) the Patheneic, capital, Buto; (3) the Schamaticus Inferior, capital, Pachnemounis; (4) the Mendanu, capital, Thmuis; (5) the Nestic, capital, Panophys. But a sixth coastal Nome,

---

1 See Poiret, Naukratis, p. 93, and compare his remarks on our ignorance of the Delta.
known from the local coinage of Hadrian's reign, that of Diospolis Inferior, was certainly in existence just before Ptolemy's day.

My exploration, however, extended over only some of these Nomoi. Parts of the Pithonic, and the Lower Sebennytic and Diospolite Nomoi form the subject of this paper. I found the second of these (assuming for the moment the lines of division between the three nomoi to fall on or about the existing Bahr Nashart and Bahr Tirah) to be studded with large mounds; the third to contain only one site of importance, and not many minor mounds. No one of these mounds was identified before my visit with any known ancient town; and, that being the case, no probable courses could be assigned to the branches of the Nile, which, according to Ptolemy and others, divided or traversed the Nomoi, whereon the known towns lay; nor could the Nomoi themselves be placed precisely on the map.

Thanks to various authorities, principally lists of Coptic bishoprics, certain town-names can be relegated generally to that area of the North Delta which I visited. As the precise situations of some of these towns depend on the situations of others, I shall take the names in groups; and then discuss the question which their identification with certain sites raises as to the courses of the ancient Nile arms.

A.—Buto (Pteteto); Phragonis; Pachnemounis; Diospolis Inferior.

The last three names (the first two as Φραγωνις and Παχνμονις) are in the order in which they occur in Hierocles' Synopsis, the trio being enumerated between Ζαχυς (Xois) and Σεβαντος (Sebennytus), whose sites are certainly identified with the mounds of Sakha and Samaund. In the same order they precede Sebennytus, but succeed KáBara (modern Shaab), in the earliest Notitia. 6

Hierocles' order is always most intelligible if related to main avenues of communication. In enumerating the towns in the Lower Deltaic Eparohy, he first ascends the western Nile from Alexandria to the southern limit of the province at Nikin, mentioning every town within easy reach on either hand, e.g., on the east, Buto and Kabasa (Shaab), the latter of which towns was certainly not on the stream itself. Thence he passes to Xois in the north-western interior; takes next the three towns, of which we know this at least, from other sources, that they all lay in the north of the province; and next

---

6 The variations in the Nomoi lists, as given by diverse authorities, present an insoluble puzzle. See e.g. the discrepancies between Strabo's list and the lists in the Roman Papyri of Ptolemy Philadelphus (cols. 51, 56, ed. B. P. Grenfell). No one of Ptolemy's five coastal Nomoi, except the Mendesiac, appears in that Papyrus: but it is not impossible that Nomos No. 7, in col. 51, Delta, included one or more of them. Evidently there were frequent changes made in the distribution and nomenclature of Nomoi, especially in the Delta, perhaps owing to gradual changes which took place in natural conditions by processes of reclamation. It is impossible to regard any list as final, but it is equally impossible not to regard certain lists, e.g. this in the Roman Papyri, as authoritative and comprehensive for the moments at which they were compiled.
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again. Sobennytos on its extreme eastern limit. Thereafter he makes a circuit westward through a series of towns, known to have lain in the south interior, and swings round east again to Bubria. And finally he adds three towns, of which one, Paralos, is known to have lain on the coastal sand-belt, north of the marshes, and another to have been also in the extreme north. It is probable, therefore, that all these three last were cut off by the lagoons from the interior, and lay in a district reckoned apart. In the early Arab period at any rate, when the province of Gharbieh did not include the province of Nosteraweh, the central coast-belt was certainly so divided administratively from what lay to south.

In our ignorance, however, of the ancient lines of communication in the central Delta, we need independent evidence for the precise position of certain towns in Hierocles’ list.

(1) Phragonias, besides its occurrence in the town-list of Hierocles, in bishopric-lists, Greek and Coptic, a, appears in the Athanasian Tract to the Antiochenes a as the see of a bishop, who signed Φραγωνιαν και μέρος Ἑλαφριας τῆς Ἀλβίου. This was in 362 A.D. In a Greek, Coptic, and Arabic list of famous bishoprics, of which de Rögné and Amelinaeus have made great use, and the latter has published two MS. versions as the fourth appendix to his geographical work, b this bishopric is cited as ΦΡΑΓΩΝΙΝΟΝ ᾔγευς = Τοῦ = Tida and al-Furain. Tida and al-Furain are found similarly conjoined in several Coptic scales, which equate ΒΟΙΤΕ ΦΡΑΓΩΝΙΝΟΝ (or ΠΕΡΩΝΙΝΟΝ ΤΟΙΝ) or similar corruptions) with the same pair of Arabic place-names, connected by the copulative. The latter appear also in connection, both in the work of Calcashandi c and in the valuable list of provincial assessments, made in 1376, and first printed by Sylvestre de Sacy. Now Tida exists still as a village territory some fifteen miles N.N.E. of Sakha (Xois). About seven miles on a bee-line west of it and beyond the Bahr Nashart are the great mounds known as Tell al-Furain. The latter name, occurring just in the locality where the relation of Phragonias to Xois in Hierocles’ list, and to Kabasa in Notitia L, would incline us to put that bishopric, can hardly but be a survival. The form in Hierocles, Φραγωνιων, pronounced probably Frwnis, is very close.d

Must Tell al-Furain, then, be identified with the site of Phragonias? It has been claimed by Mr. Petrie for no less a city than Buto; and after much

---

c. De Rögné published it first, as app. to his De episcopis Aegyptiis. He had got his copy from Revillout.

e. At the end of his edition of Abdallatif’s Relation de l’Égypte, pp. 393, 47.
f. The signature of a bishop at the Council of Ephesus. Φραγωνιων, is interpreted by an ancient gloss as Φραγωνιων Αλβιον (in the Copitc Acts ed. by Y. Bouriant in Miss. Fr. en Copts v. 1, the reading is [hannes]). So perhaps there was some phonoetic uncertainty about the sound, variously rendered by ἡ, ο, and ε. In the Arabic form (if one may trust de Rögné and Amelinaeus for exact solution of MSS.) this sound appears variously as ἡ and ε, and in local pronunciation to-day there seems to me to be the trace either of a soft η or an ος in this place.
doubt, I incline to accept his identification still, on the double ground that (1) these mounds are so large and have so important a temple-area in their midst, that if they do not represent the one Pharaonic city of the first rank in this corner of Egypt, one does not know where else to look for a site which will satisfy the geographical data concerning Buto: (2) the little hamlet at their foot is still called Ḫent, which seems a survival of the old name. Nothing has been found in the mounds in question, I believe, of Pharaonic date; but they have never been excavated except by sekhkhe. The site lies about ten miles on a bee-line from the east bank of the Rosetta Nile, and therefore comes as appropriately into Hierocles’ enumeration, as Kahasa (Shabes).

To justify, however, the consequent hypothesis that the site of Buto bears now a survival of the name of Phragonis which Hierocles shows to have been a town distinct from Buto up to the sixth century at any rate,¹⁰ I must call attention to two points. (1) In what I will call henceforth for convenience the ‘Equivalents List,’ published by de Rouge, the name ΘΕΝΕΥ is associated with ΦΡΑΣΟΥΝ, That can hardly be anything but a slight corruption of ΘΕΝΕΟΥ, inscribed on the Hadrianic coinage of the Ptolemaic or Bumanic Nome. (2) Buto does not appear as a bishopric either in the Equivalents List, or any of the specie. But its name does occur in the first named list coupled with that of Pachnenousis, apparently as descriptive of the locality of the latter (see below p. 5). It seems fair, therefore, to infer that the old name clung to the district and even the town. Buto perhaps still existed as Phtheneos, after the Arab invasion; but the town was utterly decayed, while a neighbouring place, Phragonis or Faragin, had taken its place as the local centre.¹¹ But the old and the new centres were so close together, that the name of the old may have been still in use as an explanatory title of the new—Phragonis of Phtheneos, in Copio Thebae; and when both had fallen equally into the ruin and oblivion in which they now lie, the name which was last of importance, Faragin, possibly attached itself in Arab tradition to the more extensive of the two desolate sites.

Where, then, is the lesser site, that of Phragonis? Obviously near Tida. There are two mounds near the locality (for the village has come to be split up into two or three small groups of huts, widely separated). One is a small mound, Kwm ed-Duba, very near the northernmost group. It is probably an older Tida. The other is a much more important site, situated about two miles further to E.N.E., and now called Kwm al-Hamadiq. Nearly a mile in circumference and some thirty to forty feet high, it is the third mound in point of size in the western half of the north-central Delta. It yields the best Roman brick found in the district, and an exceptional amount

¹⁰ Cf. also the occurrence of both names in the signatures to the Council of Ephesus.
¹¹ V. e. ΠΤΕΝΕΤΟΧ, also occurs both in the Equivalents List and the specie.; and Ammianus (p. 100) is probably right in locating it beyond Shabas and near the river. But its name must also be a survival of the old Neme title Phragonis of Pliny; and doubtless the place was a successor to Buto on the western side, as Phragonis on the eastern.
of worked stone. I noticed two Byzantine capitals of good workmanship lying on the surface. Here I suggest was the site of the western Marshes, Phragonis—Thoth.

(2) Pachnemounis. The position of Phragonis being narrowed in any case to the immediate neighbourhood of Tida, Pachnemounis is to be looked for east or north-east of that point. Its bishop signed the Athanasian Tract, quoted already, as Παχνημούνιος καὶ τῶν Χοιρίων μέρους τῆς Ἐλευσίας; which distinction leads one to expect to find its marshes divided from those of Phragonis by some considerable interval. The Equivalents List cites it as ΠΑΧΝΟΜΕΝΟΣ—ΚΒΟΥΣΟ ὉΕΡΟΣ (see above), but unfortunately omits to add an Arabic identification; and there is no other literary authority but Ptolemy’s for the location of a place important enough to have been the capital of the Lower Soemmlytic Nome.¹²

In the course of my journey, however, I came across a piece of epigraphic evidence. At the Behéra Society’s Inspection House near Kum Wahal are preserved three inscribed slabs, found by diggers for brick in the large mound of Khassiri, about ten miles due north. Two of these bear parts, not consecutive, of a single text, and it is probable they were once facing slabs of a pedestal. A head was found near them; but this well preserved life-size portrait in Parian marble, (also at Kum Wahal) cannot be that of Marcus Aurelius, and, though not unlike both Trajan and Domitian, represents probably neither one nor the other, but a private individual. The inscription, so far as recovered, is as follows:

(1) Two slabs of coarseish white marble with rough backs, displaying parts of one inscription. The longer (right-hand) fragment measures 845 × 413 × 044. The letters are slender and of very varying height and disposition; they are without apices. The right-hand slab is the most worn, and appears to have been used at some period in a pavement or threshold. Copy and squeeze of the most worn parts. Complete except at bottom.

¹² The name probably occurs also in the Aenae. does not help us to locate it.

References (diagram as Hesiodius; but this
A. T. NEI... NCEBACTON
TONETERGETHNCARICICWHRATHCOALHSOIKOTMEHNC
IC
CIAPXOUYPWTOYUTWNAPAIWNOCEKTOT
OUTAPOL................. ROYTOT
OMOTKAIE... H..... K..... C... PXOT
NOYNEWKOOPOTOTE... AXNEMOYNI
HHTOYKAIYTANACIAPXOUYKALIDATLOY
KAIYTANACIAPXOUYYINOTHEWNOCDIO
WNETYATPIDOTICIDWROUTGEPOMENOTAGO
OYWPREINOSPRUTOUTWNAPAIWNO
NOMENUTAPOROMOYKALIEEZHHTOT
CIPHOUTAPZANTOCTACATTACAPXR
SKORUYAPZANTOCTACATTACAPXR
SAYTACAPR... CANYIOTDIATMOTDIAT
ARZANTOCTACATTAC.. AC.. NEYOT
NTACATTACAPR........ ICIDWP
OUTAPRZANT............ AYT........ ANETIADOT
CTACATTAC........... WNPROMAN
WNTACAYTA... XACANEYI...... PIALOT

[ἡ Πόλεις]

The slab on the right is a little longer than that on the left. Beside the narrow slab which is wanting between these two, others doubtless are missing from below, which continued the catalogue of honours to even remoter relatives. The date of this inscription must fall later than 186 A.D. when the titles here enumerated were first assumed by Marcus Aurelius.

Ll. 4, 5, πρῶτον κ.τ.λ. As this phrase, so common in inscriptions of Asia Minor, refers invariably to the office which follows it (cf. ll. 10, 11), we can hardly translate εκτοι . . . 'Απάλλονος as it would most naturally be translated '26th to be designated high priest, etc.' but must suppose the office to have been annual and translate the whole phrase 'first of men in all ages to be designated for the 26th time high priest, etc.'

Beyond its general revelation of the complete civic organization of the town on Khunzir, this text contains nothing else worthy of special remark except its mention of Pachyhennomis. At first sight, this specification of the locality of the Neocorate might seem to argue that Pachymomis was a foreign place, not the πόλις in which all the other offices were held. Some will probably take this view, and be inclined, therefore, to look elsewhere for Pachymomis. But the superior size of the site itself and the full civic organization, shown by the inscription to have been enjoyed by the πόλις on Khunziri, strongly suggest that on this mound stood Pachymomis itself; and its situation suits best with Ptolemy's position for the Nome capital, due north of Xois and far down towards the sea. I therefore propose definitely to place Pachymomis at Khanziri, and to suppose the particular mention of the city-name in connection with the Serapeum to imply that, had the latter stood without qualification, there was danger of its confusion with some more famous Serapeum, e.g., that in Alexandria, with which town the two other inscriptions showed the πόλις on Khanziri to have had intimate relations.

I spent two days on Khanziri, and, by the kindness of M. Passalides, the local Director of the Beha Society, had the disposal of four labourers, who probed the site to the basal mud at several points. The mound has also been deeply and extensively cut into by diggers for brick. I found a contractor employing there some forty hands and a Decauville railway, and from his men learned the exact spot at which the head and slabs, now at Kum Wala, were found. It is in the south-western part of the hollow, which divides the high western mound from the lower eastern. Many Delta and Fayum mounds show this sort of division; and the hollow in them probably represents the ancient market-place with surrounding temple-enclosures, in which the rise of level by accumulation was naturally much

---

13 I took this view myself at first, and still feel a difficulty in rejecting it. But there is not another unassigned site in the whole N. central Delta of sufficient obvious importance to be that of a Nome capital, except Tell al-Balatun close to the Daniutta Nile (see below p. 11); and to place the capital of Solenites Inferior as far east is to introduce great difficulty into the understanding of Ptolemy's geographical arrangement of Names and Siles.

14 See infra.
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slower than in residential quarters. Neither here nor in any part of the Mound did I find the accumulation so deep as I had expected. The core of the site is a mound of solid Nile mud, no doubt artificially heaped to raise the settlement, at its foundation, well above flood-level. The buildings, architectural fragments, pottery, and coins, which I saw on the site were none of them older than the Roman period. Nor, I am convinced, does anything earlier lie under the surface. If the site of Paunemoonis was indeed here, then the place must have owed its existence as a Nome-capital to some late re-arrangement of the provincial division.

The town was connected with a water-course passing to south-west, by a canal, whose bed and embankments are still visible. This can hardly be other than the stream of which the Bahr Kassed is the modern representative. This canal now runs out into the swampy tracts west of Khanziri. Except in late spring and summer, Khanziri is now surrounded by water. I append a photograph showing the Mounds at the head of the ancient canal.

Kum Khanziri and its ancient Canal, from the S.

The other inscriptions found on this site, and now preserved at Kum Wahal, are as follows:—

2. Slab of coarse marble 885 × 720 × 0.25. Inscribed on both faces. The obverse is broken top left and much worn below. Long ornate letters with apices, varying from 0.60 to 0.40 in height.

\\\\\\\1111111IONIEPAKA> TONKA.
\\\\\\\ANTONINON> KAIWCEPHMATIZI
KAIFORANOM\\
BOYEYTHTHCAMPROTATHCPALEOE\C
\ANALAEANAPLEWNYOINANAPAMEIWNOC
\OMONICEPFPROONWNEYGENH
The name in 1.1 is restored at a venture from C.I.G. 4888, an Alexandrian inscription of about the same time. Four letters seem lost before 'Ἀρτονείνου', of which the last is Λ and the second probably Σ. Read ΤΟΥΛΑΣ! 1.5 = noble consistently with his ancestry. 'Ἀργυριών' fits the epigraphic indications. The end is rather syntactical, but the readings, so far as given, are fairly certain. Soteris and Anr. Isidora were daughters of the person honoured. Hierax, son of Soteris, and therefore grandson of L. Licinius Hierax, added his name in the nominative regardless of the ἀντι clause. In 1.2 ὁς χειματίζει would have been more according to common usage.
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THREE NORTH DELTA NOMES.

Aur. Dioscorus and several granddaughters dedicate to their native town. I took squeezes of the most difficult parts of this inscription, which (as well as my copy) establish that there is no τ at the beginning of line 1, so we must read as above—a nominativus pendens. For the name Dioscoenus see Oxyr. Pap. I. 43 v° iii. 23 (Διοσκουρίαν). For Besodora see Berlin Pap. No. 34. In l. 6, 7 the reading is certain so far as I give it; for Στολη see C.I.A. III (1) No. 2375. Κρατιστή I have not found elsewhere as a name, but Κράτιστος occurs. Ακορείτης in l. 3 means evidently a native of the town Aeolis in the Nome of Cynopolis on the east bank of the Nile (Ptol. Geogr. iv. 5. 59).

(3) Diospolis Inferior is omniue consensu the town indicated by coins of Hadrinius's time bearing legend ΔΙΟΠΙΚ (|=ΔΙΟΠΙΚΟΙ) κ(ο)τ(ωσ) τ(ων) Μεθυςιάτων; and according to a fragment of Hermippus, it was the burial place of Demetrius of Phalerum. In the Equivalents List it is cited as ΔΙΟΠΙΛΟΙΚ ΚΑΤΩ=ΠΟΥΝΕΜΟΥ=Al-Falwan. The site proposed by de Rougé, namely Kafr al-Baramon, east of the Damietta Nile and north of Mansura, seems not to be ancient. But it is possible he was confusing it with a mound which does indeed exist on the west of the Damietta Nile north of Sherbin. This, the only one which in height and extent is a rival in the north Delta to Khaznari and Famin, is that now known as Tell el-Balamun, about three miles west of Ras al-Khalig railway-station.

I visited this site on May 23. I had noticed the mounds as a conspicuous landmark on the horizon, when staying at the Beheira Society's Inspection House at Constantimia, near Bessoudila; but having found no mention of them in any modern book, nor even heard much rumour of them in the

---

19 See B.M. Col. Cat. Alexandria, p. 312. The lower Sebennytic Nome had coins with distinct cult type, stamped ΣΕΒΕΚ, a fact, which, even had Hierocles and the Notitia left any doubt, would serve to negative the proposal of Brugsch and de Rougé to identify Paichammoum and Diospolis Inferior.

19 P. 862.
neighbourhood, I was amazed on reaching the spot, at their size and importance. Their circumference must be nearly two miles; their summit fifty feet above the plain. The western part is low; the eastern high and steep, so that the site is very conspicuous from the Damietta railway. The soil being very salt (wherefore the mounds are sometimes known as Tell Matha), it has not been much disturbed by diggers for either sēbakh or brick; nor has it ever been probed by an archaeologist. The Department of Antiquities has no information at all about the site. The skin of the mounds is of course made up of late stuff, but among the sherds of glass occurs more perishable blue faience than is usual on north Delta sites.

The coincidence of the name, Balamun, with the form in which Pachnemousas might well have survived on Arab lips is tempting; but Balamun may equally well represent the Coptic Pōwemous (perhaps the Pōwemous of Stephen of Byzantium). In any case it is almost impossible, in the face of Ptolemy’s scheme of Nomos to place Pachnemous as far east; nor would the latter’s name identified with a site in this position agree nearly so well either with the order which the Equivalents List seems to follow in descending to Tamiatth (Damiatta), or with that of the Synecdemus and Notitia I. For Hierocles obviously describes a curve from Xois through the north of the province to Sebennytus (possibly the line of a road or main canal), just as after Sebennytus he describes a curve through the south to Busiris. We therefore expect to find Phragonis, Pachnemous and Diospolis lying in order on this northern curve, the latter farthest to eastward. On this account and relying especially on the hint in Strabo, who resided some time in Egypt, I have no hesitation in proposing Tell al-Balamun as the site of Diospolis Inferior. I reserve till later some remarks about its Name.

B.—Oases; Helechoia; Paralos.

There are three names remaining in the list of Hierocles which seem to belong to the northernmost Delta. They are grouped apart (c. p. 3, supra) and are all to be looked for with probability in the sandy region north of the marshes.

(1) Paralos may be taken first, since its general position is practically certain. It was the town on the sands N.E. of the central Lake, whose name (Paralos in the Coptic lists) has survived as Burlos (in native pronunciation Burallos) and given a title to the Lake. Under this name, Abulfeda mentions it as a station on the east track from Damiatta to Rosetta, and the Assessment of 1876 puts it in the province of Nesterawel.

Its bishop, Athanasus, signed at Ephesus. In the Equivalents List it is cited as ΠΕΡΑΛΟΥ = ΝΕΚΕΔΟΥΛΟΥ ΠΑΡΑΛΟΙ = al-Burlos. Nowadays the name Burlos is given to a district of scattered houses, unusually rich by reason of fisheries, palm-plantations, and gardens, and extending from Borg...
on the "Boghaz" or outlet of the Lake south-eastward along its shores to Baltim (Balkhi). I found Roman glass and sherds lying on the sandhills in three places in this belt; but where dunes shift so constantly, the exact site of an ancient town is probably not to be found.

(2) Helearchia.—As the lists of Hierocles and the Notitia pass to this group from the south-east of the Province, one would naturally expect the enumeration of the three towns in question to proceed from south or east to north or west; and would look for Helearchia either in the sand-belt east of Burlos or on the south-east margin of the Lake. As we have seen, the Athanassian Tract mentions Helearchia as the name of a large district, divided between the Sees of Phragonis and Pachnemoumous. But Hierocles and the Notitia have it as a town distinct from either of these last, and the Coptic lists know it as a bishopric apart. In the Equivalents List the citation ΗΑΙΑΙΛΙΑΜΩΝ ΜΗΡΑΤΟΥ = Al-Sharut, no doubt refers to ΕΑΙΑΛΡΑΙΑ. One may suppose it a settlement which grew up as an administrative centre for a part of the newly reclaimed marshes, at a distance from Phragonis, Pachnemoumous, or Dihopolis. I noticed glass and sherds strewn over a wide area of dunes just east of Abu Madi and some fifteen miles south-east of Baltim; and Mr. Totten- ham, the Inspector of the Second Circle of Irrigation (Gharibieh), marks in a map, with which (among other benefits) he mostly kindly furnished me, two Kurnas immediately north-west of the same Abu Madi. I was not able to visit these, but in a district of such constant superficial change, should in all likelihood have been little wiser if I had. Hereabouts one would be most inclined to place Helearchia.

(3) Oases.—Nothing further is known of this place (or these places) which neither the Notitia nor the Coptic lists mention, and Wesseling (ad Hieroclem s.v.) wished to transfer to the Mariut region. In any case it is uncertain whether the name (occurring in the relation it does) ought to be reckoned with the coast group at all, or not rather to be located near Buqiris. The name suggests, however, palm tracts such as occur in the northern sand-belt, and therefore I group it with Helearchia and Paralos, and propose a situation for it nearer Damietta than either one or the other.

C.—AGNOU; NIERTOU.

These two towns are not in the list of Hierocles; but Agoum occurs in the Notitia, and both are in the lists of Coptic bishoprics. The Equivalents List cites them thus:

AGNOU = ΑΓΝΟΥ = Nostaraweb.
NIERTOU = ΝΙΕΡΤΟΥ = Singar.

Both these places are mentioned under their Arabic names in the Assessment of 1376 where the second is reckoned in the province of the first, which was distinct from that of Gharibieh, and evidently included all the sand-belt between the Rosetta and the Damietta months.

Athanassius in Pastoral Letter xii probably indicates this bishopric as Rosetta. Cf. his Life of St. Antony 49.
(1) Nestaraweh occurs in the Itinerary, given by Abulfeda, between Burlos and Rosetta. In his time it and not Burlos gave a name to the Lake (so also according to Caleashandi). Its wealth was in fish, and its contribution is given in the Assessment of 1376 without mention of lands,—as is the case also with all the other places in its province, which included Rashid (Rosetta). On the "Domains" map of the Delta (revised in 1897), a "Kum Mostorn" is marked in the sand-belt some distance west of the Boghaz; and the similarity of name (in Caleashandi the town appears as Nestorn) renders the identification of that mound with Agmon-Nestaraweh probable.

(2) Singar. From the order in which the names occur in the Coptic lists, this place would seem to have been in the west of the Nestaraweh province; and it should be looked for north-west of the Lake rather than on the desert islet at the east end, still called Singar. The only other Kum marked on the Domains Map west of the Boghaz is al-Alkhal; but this is probably the mound of that name, distinguished from Singar in the Assessment under the name al-Rus.

D.—Banaban.

Mentioned only in the best of the ordinary Coptic select, and not in the Equivalents List. I include it in the north Delta because of the existence of a Bahr Banawan, a branch of the Bahr Bellas, which turns north above Biela, and runs past two small kums (Agfar and Nas) and a considerable one (Kum Kebir) which is a conspicuous object due N.E. from the Behere Society's Inspection House at Dar es-Saura near Salafia. Owing to the flooded state of the marshes I was unable to visit Kum Kebir, which is probably the site of Banaban. In the Assessment List of 1376 I note an entry al-Banawanin, which points to two villages near together having borne the same name.

I cannot with confidence place any other ancient name in the district that I visited north of the railway line; but at least three towns which occur in Notitia I between Parales and Xois, may have been there. These are Παναλλον and Θεάματος occur later between Agram and Temiatthi (Damietta). The important monastery of Gemiana (or Damiana), north of Belkas, has a small ancient mound hard by it. Is this the Damelianae of Amelinia's authorities? 21

There are, however, a score of mounds south of the Lake awaiting identification. I have shown their position on the accompanying map, which is traced from the land-chart of the Irrigation Service. For their general characteristics the following notes will suffice. The superficial remains upon one and all are late Roman, Byzantine, and early Arab.

---

21 Mr. W. E. Crum has referred me to various authorities concerning this monastery, which are mentioned by him in Egyt Esc. Pud. Arch. Report 1899-1900 p. 91, also to Wansleben, who visited the place in 1672 (Hist. de l'Eglise d'Alexandrie p. 100).
THREE NORTH DELTA NOMES.

Bohra Nasbort District.

(1) Siid Salem: oval, about 500 paces by 200. All bricks baked, late painted 'Coptic' sherds in abundance. Very little stone, and moderate depth. Has been much dug for brick and sebaah.

(2) Daba: about the same size as the foregoing, but some earlier sherds, e.g., moulded Samian, and many fragments of worked syenite occur. To judge by the abundance of slag, it must have yielded much stone. Dug out almost to the basal mud by natives.

(3) Mesk: about half as big, but higher and hardly dug at all. No sherds of the better class, but necks and bases of 'kitchen' vessels common. No sign of stone.

(4) Bundak: in size between Daba and Mesk, shews many stone fragments on the surface and good baked brick. Painted sherds and fragments of good glass. The bed of a broad ancient water-course is apparent west of the mound. Very little dug.

(5) Haddadi: larger than any of the foregoing, but so completely untouched (owing to salinity) that its contents are not apparent. A village called al-Haddadi appears in this region in the Assessment of 1376.

(6) Ahmar: very small but shewing bits of syenite. Site of a farmstead?

(7) Khulezu: unusually prolific in large drums of syenite used as millstones, and in good glass, painted 'Coptic' sherds, and copper coins. But in size less than Haddadi, though larger than Bundak. The line of a large dyke is seen running from S.W. to N.E. to north of the mound, which may be the old limit of the Lake. I picked up an Alexandrian billet coin of Diocletian.

(8) Honazia (or Nasheem): about the same size as Haddadi, divided into two parts, north and south, by a deep and narrow depression, looking like the line of a canal. Prolific in brick, and shews more unbaked bricks than the foregoing Kusa. Looks like a slightly older site than they.

(9) Khirbeh: a circular mound of about 250 paces diameter. Fragments of rather good character, e.g., of marble paving and ribbed glass, and painted 'Coptic' ware. Much dug.

(10) Sheikh Ibrahim on the west of the Bahr, like Miyetein, whose twin mounds lie on both banks, is apparently almost wholly a cemetery, now rifled. But like all the other mounds it has a large red brick vaulted building at one corner, which was probably a tank-house fed from a canal.

(11) Husalid has been described on p. 4. It has about three times the area of any of the foregoing. The only legible coin picked up was a Roman minimus of the fifth century.

Kassed Canal District.

(12) Wâhal: about the size of Haddadi, very much dug, and showing traces of having contained much stone. A small limestone 'Horus' shrine from it is preserved in the Inspection House. I picked up an Alexandrian bronze coin of Hadrian.
(13) Shalamah (or Misri?): so completely dug that even its area is uncertain.
(14) Daba: larger than any of the foregoing except Hanalid, which is about the double of it. A double mound. Fragments of brick, ware, glass, and stone of the better class.
(15) Makhen: I did not see this, but it is very small.
(16) Um el Sin: has a village on it and there is almost nothing left of the mound.
(17) Khunzir: See above p. 8. I picked up or bought from brick-diggers fifteen legible bronze coins. Two (of Tiberius and Caligula) proceed Hadrian. The rest are later; the last is of Heraclius. The only coin of numismatic interest is thus described for me by Mr. J. G. Milne.

ANTONINUS PIUS.
Æ. 34 mm. Obv. legend effaced; head r. laur. rev. bust of Helios i. rad., wearing chlamys; in field [L] 2. (Cf. Dattari, Num. Alm. 3288 of Faustina sen. for rev. type.)

(18) Asfar: very small.

BAHR TIRAH DISTRICT.

(19) Khareef: about the size of Sidi Salem, but very low; of no importance. Picked up an Alexandrian follis probably of Constantine IV.
(20) Nimra: unimportant, about the same as Meak.
(21) Mansik: about the area of Haddadi, but very shallow. Double divided by a wide depression, apparently the old course of the Bahr. Superficial remains of poor quality.
(22) Nus: both high and large, being about equal to Daba. Remains of stone and syenite frequent. The bed of the Bahr passing W. is very clearly marked.
(23) Ti'is: I never reached this mound, but to judge by its appearance at five miles' range it should be as big as Nus.
(24) Shugreena: very small.

BAHR SHALAI DISTRICT.

26. Ahmar: very small = a farmstead only.
27. Gemalna: ditto, ditto.
28. Naghlia: small, not so large as Mesk, and very shallow.
29. Tersi: not visited, but through the glass it seemed not bigger or higher than Naghlia.
31. Basho: see p. 11.
THE NILES.

All the considerable mounds of the northern Delta are disposed in three chains running north and south. The first chain (reckoned from the east), is that which aligns the old channel of the Bahr Tirah. The second lies along the line of the Kassed canal, and continues the mound of Sakha in Kums Wahat, Dabaq, and Khobziri. The third is a double chain: the eastern part of it runs north from Tida through Daba—Hawazid—Khudhe—Hauzin to Khobza and the Lake; the western from Tell al-Fara in through Gir—Sidi Salem—Mesk—Bunduk to Haddadi. I do not propose to place a Nome boundary at the Kassed canal, for that does not divide the space at all equally. But the important Bahr Nashart, which now sweeps north partly through, partly to west of, the double third chain of mounds must represent both a considerable main channel of antiquity and the western limit of the Lower Sebennytic Nome. Beyond it began the Nome of Phtheneto or Buto, continued up to the Great River (or Agathodaemon) and the Taly stream which are now represented respectively by the upper and lower courses of the Rosetta Nile.

The Bahr Nashart then must represent the Theumuthiae (Pharumuthiae) Nile which issued at the Sebennytic estuary, i.e. traversed all the length of the Lake Burlos to the Bohniz. Its earlier course to south of the Lake lay, I believe, somewhat to east of its present course, and close under the Sidi Salem—Mesk—Bunduk—Haddadi chain of mounds. It probably passed close to Tida.

The Athribitic Nile, which bounded the Lower Sebennytic Nome on the east, cannot well be the Bahr Shibin—at least not the lower course of that stream, despite its present independent estuary; for no mounds rise on its banks. We must identify the Athribitic arm rather with the upper Shibin, continued by the Bahr Tirah past the eastern end of the Lake to an artificial estuary (ψευδώτομον) now blocked. The actual channel, in which the Athribitic Nile flowed in its lower course, may still be seen, dry, but with dykes well preserved, sweeping past the mounds of Nimra, Mansur, and Nos in succession. To come on this conspicuous ancient channel was a complete surprise, since neither maps nor local authority had given me any warning of it. I paced it at several points in the five mile stretch which I followed, and found its average breadth to be about 350 feet.

Ptolemy places so much ground between the Athribitic and Busiric Niles, and in particular the Nome and City of Mendes, that I cannot see how to regard the lower part of the existing Damietta Nile as the Busiric, or its mouth as the Pathmetic. Unless Ptolemy's authority is to be rejected in a matter of broad division, on which it is hard to see how a resident in the country could perhaps the Sebennytic estuary was so called after the Lower Sebennytic Nome.

Ptolemy makes it clear that Sebennytic itself was not on this Nile, in spite of the name of the estuary; but was on the Athribitic.
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go wrong, it seems inevitable that the Busiric arm and the Pathmetic estuary should be placed in the region of Lake Menzala: and the Mendesian, Tanitic, and Pelusiac estuaries be located still further east. Overflowing of the Eastern Delta with Nile arms need not result if it be remembered that the Mendesian and Tanitic (Sanitic?) were rather estuaries than arms, according to all accounts, and probably branched off low down.

The only ancient channel that the lower reaches of the actual Damietta Nile can therefore represent is the artificial Diolkos, which Ptolemy places between the Pineptimis and Pathmetic (Pathmetic) estuaries.

**THE NOMES.**

Enough has been said to shew how I propose to arrange the three Nomos on the map:—(1) The Pathmetic between the lower course of the Rosetta Nile (ancient Taly) and the Bahr Nashart. (2) The Lower Sebennytos (temp. Hadrian) between the Bahr Nashart and the Bahr Tirah. (3) The Lower Diospolite (temp. Hadrian) between the Bahr Tirah, and the Damietta Nile, the old Diolkos. The southern limits must be left uncertain. On the north was the sea. For the last named Nome and its limits there is of course no authority in Ptolemy. It is necessary to add a few remarks on this omission.

The authority for the separate existence of an Inferior Diospolite Nome, in the time of Hadrian at any rate, is the Nome coinage: for the existence of Diospolis, the town, apart from Pachnemouis, we can point to the conclusive evidence of Hierocles. Therefore the contention of de Rougé (and H. Brugsch), that there was not more than one Nome in question, and that Pachnemouis and Diospolis are two forms of the name of only a single town, is untenable. But there is probably this much basis for it. (1) In Pharaonic times there was but one Nome covering all the area in question, that of Pi-Khen-amen, the seventh in the hieroglyphic lists (de Rougé op. cit. p. 115 ff.), which lay north of the twelfth Nome (Sebennytus), and extended to the sea. Of the full name of this Nome, Pachnemouis is a Graecized rendering; and Diospolis is an exact translation of its abbreviated name, Pi-Amen. (2) If we follow Ptolemy's authority implicitly, we must assume that there was but one Nome again in the time of the Antonines, that of Sebennytus Inferior with Pachnemouis for capital. That is to say, a more complicated arrangement, made perhaps only in the time of Hadrian, had again been simplified, and the Inferior Diospolite Nome had ceased to have a separate existence. (3) Under the Hadrianic arrangement two Nome capitals were needed and the two seem to have borne names of equivalent meaning, derived alike from the old Nome-name.

Which of these two, then, was the original capital of Pharaonic times?
If either, the present indications are clearly in favour of the city which stood on Tell al-Balamun, i.e., in my view, the Diospolis of later times. The city on Kun Khanziri is beyond doubt of later foundation. Indeed it may well be not earlier than Roman Imperial time, to judge by the remains on the level of its basal mud. I suggest, therefore, that when the old Lower Sebennyptic Nome was divided, a new capital was constituted on Khanziri, on which the old Pharaonic name was conferred in the Graecized form, Pachnernous. The earlier capital, now the centre of the eastern half only, the original Pi-khen-amen or Pi-amen, had come to be best known under the Greek translated form, Diospolis. When the earlier Nome arrangement was restored by the Antonines, the more central Pachnernous was found the more convenient capital and it remained, after all, capital of the reunited Només. It was perhaps the remote position of the old capital close to the eastern border that led in the first instance to the division of the Lower Sebennyptic Nome. When a new capital had come into existence on Khanziri, it was probably found central enough for both Només, and the maintenance of the separation, which necessarily involved extra expense and complication of the administrative machine, was seen to be superfluous.

D. G. HOGARTH.

[I greatly regret that, until the above was in its final proof, I did not know of M. G. Daressy’s article in Rev. Arch. iii, Série, 25, p. 195; and I must offer all apology to a scholar better fitted than myself to discuss these Coptic questions. M. Daressy has covered much of my ground and anticipated me in many points, especially in the identification of Phragonis, Agnon, and the two mid-Delta Niles. I would gladly accept his general situation for Pachnernous and place it precisely at Hassaid; were his reading of the Equivalents List in this connection open to less objection. I believe he is right in identifying the Leonta of that List with Buto, and so supplying a see, which is well known to have existed till Arab times: but the further equation with Dantana is less convincing, entailing as it does a MS. correction and the elevation of a little mound of no obvious importance to the honours of Buto. So much does M. Daressy feel this last objection that he suggests that the Butoic oracle was nevertheless at Farain, and so anticipates me in the confusion of Buto with Phragonis, though on other grounds. His low estimate of Ptolemys’s authority will perhaps lead him to suggest Diospolis for Khanziri. I own to too much respect for the Alexandrian geographer to admit this. Space does not allow me to add more than that, had I known of M. Daressy’s article in time, I should have confined myself to points on which I differ from it, and to an account of the actual mounds.—D. G. H.]
UNPUBLISHED INSCRIPTIONS FROM THE CYZICUS NEIGHBOURHOOD.

1. At Robert College, Bebek, Constantinople, a small stele 0·36 x 0·69 (letters 0·015) with relief of sacrifice to Apollo Citharoedus by a number of worshippers arranged in rows above each other: the inscription is much worn:

\[ \text{ΙΟΔΩ} \cdot \text{Ο} \]
\[ \text{ΛΗΙΝΟ} \cdot \text{ΟΥΔΙΟΦ} \]
\[ \text{ΝΙΜΕΚΑΣΤΗΝΩΕ} \]

\[ \text{Μηρόδωρος} \]
\[ \text{υπέρ?} \]
\[ \text{Απόλλωνις ου τοῦ Διοφάντου?} \]

The epithet may be connected with the river name Macestus, Mecistus, with which again we may compare the Lesbian mountain Macestum, and the name Macestis in Le Bas 1127. The Macestis valley is possibly the provenance of both the Bebek stelai. A long series of votives dedicated to Apollo Crimeus (Arch. Zeit. 1875, 162), is said to come from a spot three hours from Manyas and nine from Balukiser. It was told also by Mr. Bunning of Susurlu that many of the Van Branteghem antiquities were found at a spot near Omarekeu.

2. Panterma, in private house: funeral banquet stele, letters 0·03.

\[ \text{ἈΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΩΕΙΟΓΕΝΟΥΣ ΧΑΙΡΕ} \]

3. 1b. Very late banquet stele of degraded style.

\[ \text{ΥΠΟΜΝΗΜΑΒΙΒΙΟΥΕΤΥΧΑΟΕ} \]
\[ \text{ΗΣΕΝΑΥΤΟΤΟΙΟΒΙΟΣΓΑΛΑΤΗΣ} \]
\[ \text{Τυράουμα Βαϊσίου Εὐνύχα α ἐ ποι-} \]
\[ \text{ησαι αὐτῷ ο νίκος Βαϊσίων Γαλάτης.} \]

In line 1 ΜΝΗΜ are ligatured, in line 2 ΘΗ in monogram. All but the first word is written on a rough tooled surface, which suggests that the stele has been used before.

\[ ^{1} \text{See J.H.S. xxii. 57 (33). That inscription should read χαριστήμα.} \]
Pandroma, in private possession, stele 0.62 x 0.82, with high relief (Fig. 1) of good work representing Zeus with eagle, standing by altar and sacred tree, and approached by a worshipper; the altar is adorned with a relief representing the sacrifice of a bull.

**Fig. 1.—Stole at Pandroma.**

Inscribed (letters 0.03).

(a) (above relief)

ΖΕΥΣΧΑΛΑΖΙΟΣΩΣΟΣ
ΓΠΑΙΩΝ ΌΥ
Ζεὺς Χαλάζιος Σώζων
Ἐπὶ Διοὶνος

(b) (below)

ὈΡΑΚΙΟΚΩΜΗΤΑΙΩΘΕΩΤΗΛΗΝΗΚΑΘΙ
ἘΡΩΣΑΝΥΠΕΡΕΥΚΑΡΠΙΑΣΚΑΙΑΒΛΑΒΙΑΣΤΩΝΚΑΡΠΩΝ
ΚΑΙΥΠΕΡΓΙΕΙΑΣΚΑΙΣΩΤΗΡΙΑΣΤΩΝΕΙΚΟΣΙΩΝΚΑΙ
ΤΩΝΣΥΝΕΡΧΟΜΕΝΩΝΕΠΙΠΟΘΝΕΟΝΚΑΙΚΑΤΟΙΚΟΥΝΩΝ
ΘΡΑΚΙΑΝΚΩΜΗΝ
ΜΕΙ∆ΙΑΣΣΤΡΑΤΩΝΟΣΘΕΟΚΑΙΟΙΣΚΩΜΗΤΑΙΣ
ΔΙΟΙΚΗΣΑΣΠΡΩΤΟΣΤΗΛΗΝΗΝΕΚΤΟΝΙΩΝΕΠΑΝ
ΓΕΙΛΑΜΕΝΟΣΑΠΟΚΑΤΕΣΤΗΣΕΝ

* I am indebted to Mr. Henderson for this photograph.
Zeus Chalazios (χάλαζος), obviously a brother of Hysios, Brontaion, is elsewhere unknown, though Apollo bore the title at Thebes (Phileus, p. 321, Bekker). The epithet Sozon, here used in a deprecatory sense after Chalazios, to imply the (sender of and) protector from hail, is common further south (cf. Ramsay, C. B. Phrygia, I 262).

The 'Thracian village' is known from Plutarch's account of the Mithradatic siege as the site of Lucullus' camp (Vit. Lucull. 10); as the camp was within sight of the besieged and cut off Mithradates' communications with Asia, the site may perhaps be placed on the high ground east of the isthmus, at or near Mahmunkeu. The stone has been for some years in Pandera, and I could get nothing but vague answers as to its provenance.

**FIG. 2.—STELA AT KAZAKKEU.**

A broken stele of Zeus found by Mr. Henderson at Kazakkeui on the lake of Manyas shows the same type slightly modified: it is common all over the district. In this example the bull and sacrificer are actual figures.

---

2. The θεία σέλαξ is described (with a bibliography) in B.C.H., xxvi. 229.

4. Cf. also the 'Thracian harbour' at Cyzicus (Apoll. Rhod. i. 1118), but the 'Thracian gate' of Pliny N.H. xxxvi. 38 is to be referred to Byzantium; cf. Xiph. lxxiv. 16.
INSCRIPTIONS FROM THE CYZICUS NEIGHBOURHOOD. 23

For the terms of the first dedication we may compare C.I.G. 2054: ὑπὲρ τῆς ἱεροῦ συνελείας καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν ὑμέτερος; Dumont, Issor. de la Thrace, p. 456, 1116, 42; ὑπὲρ ἱερᾶς συνελείας καὶ τῶν θεῶν; and Brit. Mus. Excavations in Cyprus, p. 97, No. 7: ὑπὲρ τῆς συνελείας τοῦ Ἀρμαθου- σίου δήμου καὶ τῶν καρπῶν.

γεωκτονεῖς are also mentioned in C.I.G. 3695 B. (Gonen), where they are distinguished in the same way from the villagers. They have may have leased lands from the Cyzicene government in the neighbourhood of the village.

The 'assembly of the god' is paralleled by the τοῦ θεοῦ συνελεία of Conza, Lesbos, pl. xviii, and still more closely by Luders 45, συμπαρενομενοι πάο Δια Τέτιον.

The original of this inscription was probably set up by the κοιμαρχία (cf. Dumont, 316, C.I.G. 3420, 3461 b.*) in the hipparchate of Dionysia, who is elsewhere unknown; the more ambitious dedications of the Cyzicene are frequently dated in this way. Of this old inscription only the first two lines remain, the lower mutilated by the sinking for the relief, which, with the re-engraving of the dedication, represents the restoration by Meidias.

His own inscription designates him as first dióketes, so we may infer that in the interval the Tirakia Kome had been raised from a simple village to a borough (δυσοικησις, cf. Str. 669); the corporation of such a δυσοικησις, including δυσοικησις, δημαρχείος, five διάκονοι, and the inevitable οἰκοφυλακία, dedicate a stele found at Dubëki near Panderma, and published in Ath. Mitth. x. 203 (9): we may compare also the development of the χώροι at Laodicea (Ramsay C. B. Phrygia i. 1, 36). There were both χώροι and κόμα in the neighbourhood of Cyzicus, cf. Berlin Cat. Sculp. 835 (A.-E.M. xx. 73).

The curious association of the god and the villagers in the dedication is met with again in B.C.H. xvii. 520 (1) Διὶ υφίστο καὶ τῷ χώρῳ. It is characteristic of a village population worshipping an ancestral hero or earth god.

5. Aidinjik, at the Armenian church: fragment 0·42×0·32, letters irregular, about 0·04.

ΔΩΦΕ
ΟΜΕΤΙΟΥ
ΚΑΙΤΩΝ
ΝΩΝΑΤ

6. Ib. Marble step 1·29×0·40 in mezarlik, east of the road to Panderma, letters 0·03.

ΜΗΤΡΟΔΩΡΙΟΥ ΜΗΤΡΟΔΩΡΙΟΥ
ΧΑΙΡΕ
ΕΛΕΝΗ ΠΟΣΕΙΔΙΝΠΟΥ
ΧΑΙΡΕ

* Cf. παρακολούθησε J.H.S. xvii. 292. (70) Kokoul. The word is discussed at some length in J.H.S. xxii. 259.
7. Mihallitch, Tumbekii Djami: slab forming lintel of doorway, letters irregular, about 0.04 and of late form.

HAI
ONAN
OCH
EENTO
MEION
OLOC
HOCMH
Σ

8. In mosque wall: fragment, letters irregular, about 0.04.

ENΘΑΚ
ΘΕΟ
ONI

9. Mihallitch, garden of Hoshkadem Djamisi: funeral banquet stele, 0.61 × 0.50, letters 0.15.

ΠΟΤΑΜΟΝ
ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΑΤΑ
ΧΑΙΡΕ

Ποτάμον
᾽Ασκληπιάτα
χαίρε.

Near it is an uninscribed (I) stele with reliefs of (1) banquet, (2) horseman, and the milestone published by Perrot, Galatie, 1, 99 (62) from Tchamandra.

10. Near Hoshkadem Djamisi: base 0.58 × 0.49, letters 0.02, with relief of tripod.

ΦΙΑΣΒΑ
ΗΡΩΚΡΑΤΟΥΣ

Φιάσβα
'Ηρωκράτος.

11. In private house: worn banquet stele, 0.50 × 0.37, letters 0.015; (the reading is very doubtful.)

ΑΡΤΕΜΩΝΕΡΜΑ
ΕΡΜΑΣΥ ΡΕΓ

[Ἀρτέμων Ἑρμᾶς(ι)]
'Ἑρμᾶς(ι)...

My reading of the inscription in the wall of the Ulu Djami agrees in every respect with Muaro's (J.H.S. xvii, 271) except in the first word, which I read ΕΠΗ (with Cichorius, Ath. Misc. xiv. 247, 15). The Dindymus referred to can hardly be the Cyzocene.

Perrot’s inscription 61 (Galatie 1, p. 98) lies in the Greek churchyard: it is possibly to be restored:

εἰ δὲ τις ἑστῶ γὰρ τὸ μὴμα τοῦτο ... ἀποτείσει ἔργα μν. ὅτι κληρονόμαι δοκεῖ.
12. Ulubad, outside Circassian house: marble slab, much worn, 0'83 x 0'51, letters 0'9.

\[ \text{NOTOIEGAII} \]
\[ \text{CIEIPEOKATAGE} \]
\[ \text{FEINECTWIIA} \]
\[ \text{YRΦAUYCTEINOCALINON} \]
\[ \text{AIOINOYEL} \]
\[ \text{ONOMOC} \]

κληρονόμος τε ραμύνιοι; 'Δαμθή; μέρων ει δε τις
tολή;ς; ει έτερον καταθήκης
η μεταγενεστέρων πας[ευλή]ς αι υπόν
Αδρ. Φαουστίνου εαυτόφ ζων (?) δ|[ποίησεν
λειβίνου]

κληρονόμος

A. M. Aur. Faustinus is hypesebarch in C.I.G. 3665, which probably dates from Severus Alexander, since the Asiarch there mentioned appears as strategos on an unpublished medallion of that emperor in my collection.

13. ib. Round pedestal 0'50 high, 0'51 diam., letters 0'65.

\[ \text{OΣIEIOINELΝΟΣ} \]
\[ \text{ΕΚΤΩΝΙΔΙΩΝ} \]

14. Ulubad, outside Circassian house: large fragment of stele, with moulding, much worn, apparently a psephisma of Imperial date.

The heading probably read:

'Δαμθή; Τέχνη [έσεχεν το δήμο], etc.] είσερχεν [ησαμένων τῶν ἀρχόντων
πάντων, γραμματείαντος, etc., cf. Ditt. Syll. 365, time of Caligula.

16. Issiz Han, left of entrance: in well-cut letters 0.06 high.

17. Abouliound, pavement of street: fragment, letters 0.03.

ΜΑΡΕ
ΓΑΚΑΙΩΙ
ΚΑΠΟΥΣΤ
ΑΝΣΥΝΠΑ
ΕΥΧΕΚΤΩ
ΝΕΣΤ

Μαρίεντος Ἔρμο-
γάκαι οἱ καὶ - - [Δε-
καποῦς τὸν στο-
ἂν σὺν πυρα-
σεῖον εἰκ τὸν
ἰδὼν αὐτὸτη

18. Ibid. Small base in wall on the southern shore of the island.

ΑΓΑΘΗΤΥΧΗ
ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑΤΟΡΙΚΑΙ
ΣΑΡΙΑΔΙΑΝΩΙ
ΟΛΥΜΠΙΩΝΣΩΤΗ
ΡΙΚΑΙΚΤΙΣΘ

Ἀγαθῆς Τύχη
Αὐτοκράτορι Καὶ-
ΣαρίαΔιάνωι
Ὀλυμπίων Σωτῆ-
και κτήτη.

In line 4 ΤΗ in monogram.

A similar inscription from Abouliound is published in J.H.S. xvii, 270 (11). The formula is common all over the district, which is rich in Hadrianic associations.

19. Tchamandra Cliffik, on the left bank of the Maeastus above Mibal-
ilitch: banquet stele 0.34 x 0.64, letters 0.02.

ΜΕΝΕΚΡΑΤΗ
ΑΓΙΟΥ ΧΑΙΡΕ

Μενεκράτη
Ἀγίου χαίρε.

Before the house stand two large Corinthian capitals of fairly good style, which were found, like the stele, on the spot. The milestone found here by Perrot (Galatie, i, 60, (62)), suggests that the road from Cyzius to Lopadum crossed the river at this point; there is still a road from Tchamandra by Top-hissar, (where the northern tributary of the Tanis is crossed by a Byzantine or early Turkish bridge) and Akehebunar to Panderma; but there is no ford at Tchamandra: the site may represent the Mandral of Hierocles.

Ergileh, near the south-east corner of Lake Maiyas: the following stelai, all found just above the village, are interesting evidence of the state of Greek culture in the Cyziene: the work is quite equal to that of the average stelai from Cyzius, and the names without exception Greek. The name Ergileh suggests Heraclion (cf. Ereghi).

20. Broken banquet stele 0.45 x 0.55, letters 0.03.

ΦΕΣΗΙΔΟΣΤΗΣΕΦΕΙΟΥ

Ἐφεσηίδος τῆς Ἑφεσίου
21. Do. 0.47 x 0.40, letters 0.02.

**ἈΡΤΕΜΙΩΝΜΕΝΕΚΡΑΤΟΥ**
**ΧΑΙΡΕ**

22. Do. 0.75 x 0.57, letters 0.03.

**ΜΟΣΣΧΙΟΝ**
**ΔΙΟΔΩΡΟΥ**
**ΧΑΙΡΕ**

23. Do. 0.61 x 0.48, letters 0.02.

**ΠΟΛΛΩΔΙΟΥΣΙΕΘΕΩΝΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΥ**
**ΘΕΟΣΟΜΕΒΙΔΙΟΥ**
**ΧΑΙΡΕ**

24. Stele with two reliefs (broken on both sides) 0.75 x 0.29, letters 0.015.

(relief of banquet scene)

**ΣΚΛΗΡΗ**
**ΕΝΑΝΑ**

(relief of two persons seated facing a stele between them)

**ΣΚΛΗΡΙΟΝΔΗΜ**
**ΑΙΡΕΚΑΙΣ**
**ΓΕΩ**
**ΑΡΗΣΟΤΙΤΟΥ**
**ΣΕΜΟΙΧΑΙΡΕΙΝ**
**ΣΕΒΙΗΣ**

25. Eski Manyas castle: built into the wall, slab, left of entrance, letters 0.02.

**ΟΦΟΥΣΑΚΟΛΟ*...N**
**ΤΗΚΛΑΔΙΟΥΣΕΝΟΦΩΝ**

In line 3 ἩΝ, ἉΚ are ligatures, Υ placed inside Ο. ΤΗ perhaps represents a lapidary’s confusion of ΤΗ ΤΙ.

Philosophers are mentioned also at Apollonia (J.H.S. xvii, 268, 5) and in another inscription from Eski Manyas (Rev. Arch. N.S. xxxiv, 102, 7). The latter stone is now built into the wall of the mosque. My copy supplies Ν

26. Hodja Bunar, west wall of church: funeral banquet stele, 0.67 x 0.47, letters 0.02.

ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΞΕΝΩΝΟΣ
ΑΙΡ

27. 1b. Wall of chapel of Panagia: broken cippus, about 0.55 diam., letters 0.03.

ΥΠΟΝΗΜΑ
Τ. ΠΩΥΑΜΑΡΑΝ
Ο. ΟΚΑΤΕΣΚΕΥΑ
ΣΕΝΕ...ΣΩΣΙΑ, Θ

Τ. ΠΩΥΑΜΜΑ
Ο. [Χ.ΠΙΝΟΥ 'ΑΑΡΑΝ[Τ-
ΘΙ] ΘΑ ΚΑΤΕΣΚΕΥΑ-
ΣΕΝ Ε[Α]ΤΩ ΧΩΝ.

28. 1b. Garden of private house: stele 0.80 x 0.30, broken on both sides and below, said to have been found on the spot: in the pediment is carved a female bust in relief: below relief of (L.) tree with eagle (r.) Zeus in himation, holding haste with left hand, and extending patera over altar with right.

ΣΟΥΚΛΑΙΣΑΡΟΣΙΠ
ΟΥΕΠΗΞΕΙ..Τ
ΙΚΑΙΤΟ

ἐπὶ Δροῦ[νον Κα]ίσαρος ἵππ[παρ-
χον ἐπηγγεῖλατο
Δι] καὶ τοῖς καμήταις?

The form ἵππαρχον is without precedent at Cyzicus, but traces of a possible ἔχον remain in 1.2.

The hipparch is probably the son of Germanicus, of whose official career we have no record (cf. Dessau, Prosopographia, ii, 177). He seems to have held some office in Asia from C.I.G. 3452, 3612 C.I.L. iii, 380. At the date of his father’s tour in Asia (a.d. 18) he cannot have been more than ten years old, so that the hipparchate probably falls rather between 25, when he was appointed praefectus urbis, and 33, when he was murdered by Tiberius: his brother Caligula held the same office at Cyzicus in 37 (Ditt., Syll. 1: 365).

29. Sari-Keni (Zeleia) in a café: cippus 0.75 high, 0.58 diam., letters 0.04.

ΥΠΟΝΗΜΑ
ΚΑΛΛΙΣΘΕΝΟΣ
ΟΥ ΚΑΛΛΙΣΘΕΝΟΥΣ
ΤΕΕΚΕΥΑΣΕΝ
ΕΑΥΤΩ

Τ. ΠΩΥΑΜΜΑ
ΚΑΛΛΙΣΘΕΝΟΥΣ
Τ. ΠΩΥΑΜΜΑ
ΘΙ ΤΕΕΚΕΥΑΣΕΝ
ΕΑΥΤΩ.
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Here also I saw a native copy of a stone reading Θεως Ὀλυν πλοῦ.

At Gonen I was shown by M. Spirakis a copy of a sepulchral inscription from the neighbourhood beginning Ττόμημα Νωκεφόρου τοῦ Μοσχίον, which is now on its way to the Imperial Museum via Brusa. I note it here for the sake of recording its provenance.

30. Hammamli (above Cyzicus), house of Sali: cippus 0.85 high, 0.47 diam., letters 0.02.

ΟΜΗΜΑ
ΜΗ ΟΔΩΡΟΥΤΟΥ
ΜΗΝΟΔΩΡΟΥ
ΚΑΙΤΗΣΜΗΤΡΟΣΑΥΟΥ
ΤΟΥ ΜΟΣ. ΙΟΥ
ΤΗΣ ΜΗΝΟΔΩΡΟΥ
ΧΑΙΡΕΤΕ

Ττόμημα
Μηνοδωρου τοῦ
Της Μηνοδωρου
χαιρετε.

31. Harakhi (Kapu Dagh), about an hour above the village on a spur of Klapsi: rough boulder, inscribed in large letters (the P is 0.27 high).

ΟΡΟΣ
Α Θ

ὁρος
Ἀθηνᾶς

I saw no marble or worked blocks of any sort, so the stone may mark the boundary of a person unknown.

Other evidence points to a small ancient site at Harakhi. I was shown in a café a fragment of a poor stele of Artemis with torch (a dedication to the θεά, φωςφόροι from Porto Palio is published in Ath. Mitt. ix. 65) and a small relief of Zeus is built into the wall of the school. I was told also that a marble statuette of Pan and slab graves had been found: slight remains of a Byzantine castle crown the headland above the village. The name suggests Ἀράκιν, though De Rustafjaell calls the place Heraceia (J.H.S. xxiii. 175); this is probably on the authority of local antiquaries, who attribute the settlement to Cretans from Heracleum; there is, so far as I know, no other evidence for the supposition.

32. Katatopo * (Kapu Dagh). Built into belfry of church (S. Basil), relief of three Graces, flanked by youthful Erotes holding drapery; the composition is gracefully balanced and the work good: below (letters about 0.04)

ΟΔΟΝΚΑΛΗΝΒΑΔΙΖΕΚΑΙΜΕΝΗΣΟΜΟΥ
οδόν καλήν βαδίζε καὶ μέμησό μου.

ΜΕ and ΜΝΗ are ligatured.

* Katatopo is the Sierra.! of Kiepert's map. Similarly Langa.de=Kodja Burgez and Divavathy Shalin Burgez.
33. *Ib.* Ch. of the Panagia Decapedistria: fragment built into W. wall, letters 0'04.

\[\text{WYW\_WIMWC} \quad \text{Τ[φ[φ Zω[σ]μωφ}\]

Μω are ligatured; a ligatured Τ after W may have escaped me.

A worn slab in the same church bears fragments of two lines of letters 0'10 high apparently NVSVO | ASIAT.

*Ib.* Fragments of door jambs inscribed with columns of letters 0'04 high, twice published by Dr. Mordtmann from copies by Dr. Limnios *Ath. Milth.* ix. 27, (31). The letters are now free from plaster, which I imagine to have been Limnios' difficulty, and easily legible,

(a) . . . ου μεν δπαφ\(\)ς ε\(\)ύρα . . .

(b) ε\(\)των αι\(\)\(\)τ\(\)\(\)ι το\(\)υ . . .

34. Monastery of S. George, Egri-dere, (Kapu Dagh): marble slab 0'82 \(\times\) 0'50, with irregular Byzantine lettering.

\[\text{+ΘΕΙΓΙΑΡΙΣΤΕ} \quad \text{ΤΕΥΣ} \quad \text{ΚΑΙΘΗΚΟΜΝΙΟΥΑ} \quad \text{ΓΥΡΙΙΩΝ} \quad \text{ΘΕΙΣΙΑΒΡΟΣΑ} \quad \text{ΣΤΙΣΣΝΙΟΙΑΤΗΣ} \quad \text{ΣΤΟΝΚΑΙΡΟΝ} \]

\[\text{+ΘΙΣΙΣ ΛΩΡ(η). ΤΕ[\_ΧΡΟΥ} \]

καὶ τὴν σ(υ)μβιον αἰτί(ο)ν.  

θείς διαφερονσα Σ(φ)υρ(ίδω)ρ(ος) \(\]

καὶ τη\(\)\(\)ς συνβιον α\(\)υτο\(\)υ \(\]

καὶ τ\(\)δ\(\)\(\)υ κ\(\)λη\(\)ρο\(\)μο\(\)λον 

The church is probably that mentioned in *Acta Patriarchatus* II. 110: a dedication of a well-head dated 1721 shows that the building has only lately been allowed to fall into its present dilapidated state.

35. Langada (Kapu Dagh), church of Coemesi: fragment 0'36 \(\times\) 0'43, letters 0'03 \(\sim\) 0'025.

\[\text{ΙΖΗΟ} \quad \text{ΕΤΗΝΟΥΜΩΒΑ} \quad \text{ΣΑΘΑΝΑΤΟΙ} \quad \text{ΕΣΑΡΚΟΒΟΡΟΝΚ} \quad \text{ΩΜΑΤΟΛΑΙΝΕΩΝ} \quad \text{ΛΑΟΝΤΛΑΙΤΙΣΕΜ} \quad \text{ΠΑΛΗΝΠΑΥΛΗΣΙΠΗ} \quad \text{ΔΕΤΣΑΝΤΙΑΡΕΣΗΑΚ} \quad \text{ΚΑΙΤΕΙΣΕΠΑΤΡΗ} \]

\[\text{αρ[φ]γη} \quad \text{ετηρ} \text{θύμω βα} \quad \text{σ(ε)θαμάτως} \quad \text{α} \text{σαρκοβόρος} \quad \text{π[φ]ομα} \text{το} \text{λαίνεω} \quad \text{μοι} \text{δε} \text{δ\(\)θ\(\)λ\(\)ο} \text{τ} \text{λα\(\)ε} \text{\(\)τ\(\)ις} \text{ε\(\)ρ\(\)ο} \text{χωρ\(\)ς} \text{κατα\(\)θε\(\)θαι} \quad \text{πληρ} \text{Παύλων} \quad \text{ειβε} \text{τις} \text{δ\(\)οι} \text{β\(\)ε\(\)γ\(\)} \text{ι} \text{να} \quad \text{καὶ} \text{τελωι} \text{πατρ(ι)ων} \text{τακεισ} \]

...
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Ligatures ТΨΗ in 1. 2, ΝΕ in 1. 5, ΝΤ in 1. 7, ΗΨ in 1. 8. The lower half of the last line has been broken away; for the threat in verse, cf. Ramsay C.B. Phrygia No. 657.

36. Ιβ. Block in floor 0·37 × 0·23, letters 0·03.

АБΑΣΚΑΝΤΣ
'Αβάσκαντς

37. Ιβ. Outside in wall.

+ СΥΜΕ
+ Συμέ[ω]

38. Ιβ. House opposite church: banquet stele 0·52 × 0·53, letters 0·02.

ΚΛΕΩΝΟΣ.... ΛΕΜΟ
ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΑΣΤΗΣΑΡΧΟΝΤΟΣ

Κλέωνος [τοι] Τηρητο[υ] λέμο[υ]
Διονυσίας τῆς Ἀρχοντος.

Ιβ. Ch. of St. Athanasius: sarcophagus fragments.

39. Letters 0·04.

ΛΛΙΔΙ
ΣΙΜΙΤ
ΧΡΥΣΟ
ΥΙΣΑΙΜ

1 Φύ[λιδι
'Ομη[σιμη]
Χρυσο[θεμά]
υιό[Δ(η)μη[γρήφ

1 is fragmentary.

40. Letters 0·04.

ΥΠΟΙ
ΑΥΙΣΟΥ
ΑΡΤΟΙ

Τσάρ[υμα
Λό[ρο] Ου....
αρτοπ[ώλου

41. Letters 0·07.

ΝΒΛΗ
ΣΚ
ΠΡΕΤΗΣΕ

'έτερο[υ βλη[θήμε[πλή
.... ο[κ[ε[ι]
υπηρέτη[Σε[βήμα]

ΠΗ and ΗΣ are ligatured.

Monastery of Panagia Galatiane,7 Calami (Kapo-Dagh): sarcophagus fragments.

7 The title of the Virgin is derived from the "rolikatone," which forms the chief attraction of the church. The ancient magnificence of the latter is attested by remains of a marble tessellated pavement.
ΣΥΝΑΙΚΟΣΑΥΤΟΥ
ΚΩΝΑΥΤΩΝΑΛΑΝΤΩΝΙ
ΠΟΥΚΑΛΑΝΤΩΝΙΟΥ
ΟΞΩΛΑΝΤΩΝΙΟΣ

Τοῦ δεινὸς καὶ τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ...
καὶ τοῦ τὲ ἔνων αὐτὸν Ἀ. Ἀπωνίου [ον]
καὶ τοὺς ἀντίγραφον ἀπαγορεύοντο [...]
καὶ] αἰς Ἀ. Ἀπωνίου [ἐπιτρέψει
tοῖς δὲ ἄλλος ἀπαγορεύοντο εἰς δὲ τὰς, ἄτοκα.

In line 3 ΝΤ is ligatured; l. 6 is restored from very distinct remains of the tops of the letters.

ζωνα
ΚΑΤΙΜΟΧΡ
ΥΨΕΙΔΕΤΟΛΜ
ΕΙΣΙΔΙΩΡΟΤ
ΩΝΑΛΕΟΝΗ
ΕΤΥΜΒΩΡ

Besides the fishers, guilds of fullers (Ath. Mittl. vii. 251 (19)), weighhouse porters (Ath. Mittl. xi. 125, 8), and harbour porters (Syl. vii. 164, 4) are known at Cyzicus.

44. Ib. 0.52 x 0.31, letters 0.07.

(a) άιν
ΚΕΥΛΕΝΕ
ΤΙΣΤΟΛΗΣ
(ΜΗΣ ligatured)

(b) ΑΙΛΗ
ΕΙΝΕΙΑ

45. Ib. Letters 0.10.

ΗΣΥΜΒ
ΔΙΟ

46. Ib. Outside church; slab 0.80 x 0.50, letters 0.06.

ΠΟΜΗΜΑ
ΛΟΥΟΙ
ΟΥΣΙΟΣ
ΣΚΑΙΤΩ
ΟΙΔΕΛΥΠΟ

Παῦλου καὶ ἀπαγορεύοντο εἰς δὲ τὰς, ἄτοκα.
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47. Divanathy (Kapu Dagh), in church (S. George): Fragment, 0.45 x 0.60, letters 0.05.

ΑΥΚ. ΛΑ
ΚΠΒΑΛΙΑΝΑΙ
ΕΥΩΕΙΔΕΤΙΣ
ΕΡΟΥΣΙΑΧΑ
ΤΟΥΝΩΣΕ

σ(ε) Παλλιμανφ κ[αί τοίς
λοιποῖς ἀγορ[άνω εἰ δὲ τις [τολμήσει, ἐτε.
δόσει τῇ ἡρουσίᾳ (ἡρ. Λ. [καὶ
ἐπιθέθηκος δ[οιοί, ἐτε.

The gerousia at Cyzicus is elsewhere only known from the gravestone of a gerousiast: C.I.G. 3687.

48. ib. Large slab forming step to sanctuary, letters 0.035.

ΗΙΝΕ...·[Σ] Ἰ ΟΙΟΙΠ
ΕΠΟΥΡΑΝ...ΝΚΑΙΤΩΝΚ
ΝΙΩΝΘΕΩΝ...ΕΧΟΛΩ
ΧΟΙΤΟΚΑΙΕΠΑΡΑΤΟΣ
ΤΟΣΤΕΚΑΙΓΕΝΟΣΤΟΕΣΑΥΤΟΥ

ἐποιηρα[μίω] καὶ τῶν καταχθονιῶν θεόν [κ]εχολο[μένον τό-
χοτο καὶ ἐπάρατος [ἐστω αὐ-
tός τε καὶ γίνως τὸ δὲ αὐτοῦ.

For the formula cf. Pomea Anax, Sch. Π. 31 (28), 32 (29, 30), 237 (216); Ramsay C.B. Phrygia, 1, 157 (67). It varies between θεῶν... ἔχοντες and θεῶν... τούχοι αἱ τούχοιτον.

49. Mihaniona, by S. Nicholas Molas: broken banquet stele, letters 0.15 in (a), 0.25 in (b).

(a) ΔΙΟΔ. ΡΕ
ΔΑΟΥ ΧΙΡΕ

(b) ΕΜΒΙΑΕ
ΔΑΟΥ ΧΑΙΡ
Μ...ΑΝΔΡΟΣ
ΜΕΝΑΝΔΡΟΥ

(a) Διόδ[ω]ς
Δαού χαιρε.

(b) Ἐμβίαη
Διοῦ χαϊρε
Μ[ε]νανδροῦ
Μενανδροῦ.

Daos is a common Phrygian name, and an epithet of Zeus in Ramsay C.B. Phrygia, 1, 2, 566 (468): Suidas says that it was the Phrygian for wolf, of Apollo Lycius, etc.

For Emblos cf. the river god Ἐμβεῖλος mentioned in C.I.G. 3700: which was found at Panderma; so the river is not likely to be the Tuzla Chai (as Ramsay and Tomaschek on Anna Comana, xiv. 5. Ἐμπτλος), but more probably the Aesopus, which is personified on Cyziene coins, and had a cultus; Aesopus also occurs as a name in Michiel, 532 (Cyzicus).
50. Perame, at the Greek school: banquet stele 0.67 x 0.75, letters 0.02

ΑΙΑΘΑΡΧΟΥ
ΤΟΥ ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΔΟΥ

'Αγαθάρχου
toù 'Hrakleídou.

51. Ib. Large stele 0.85 x 0.40, showing

five worshippers
leading victim
to altar.

Artemis in
short chiton
holding patera
r. and torch l.

Apollo
Citharodes
holding
lyre l. and
patera r.

below, letters 0.012.

ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΗΡΩΔΟΤΟΥ
ΙΣΟΣ ΑΡΜΕΝΟΣ ΠΡΩΘΥΜΟΥ
ΕΜΑ ΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΙΔΕΙΑΝΗ
ΕΥΧΗΝ

Διονύσιος Ηρώδοτος,
μεσσαράς Πρωθύμον
'Αρτέμιδα, 'Αρτέμιδι Πεδίανη
εὐχή.

This stele was said to be from the monastery of S. Theodore (between Peramo and Koun-liman) where we found the upper half of a similar stele. A votive stele of Artemis from Ermeni Keni is published in Ath. Mitth. x. 200 (31). Artemis monuments from Cyzicus are collected in J.H.S. xxiii. 86 (38).

52. Ib. Lower half of pytany list (I) with moulding 0.38 x 0.43, the upper part erased and used for later gravestone, letters 0.015.

Τ
ΤΕΣΣΑΡΩΛΕΙΩ
ΜΗΛΗΧΧΧΩΠΙΝ

ΛΛΟΚ. ΗΙΟ. ΝΕΙΚΙ. ΦΟΙΟΣ
ΖΗΛΑ. ΒΟΧΑΙΖΙΑΙΟΣ
ΜΙΟΔΩΡΟΣ &
ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΜΕΝΕΜΑΧΟΥ
ΔΙΩΚΛΗΣ &
ΜΟΥΛΑΝΤΩΝΙΟΣΘΑΛΑΙΟΣ
ΓΙΟΥΛΙΟΣ ΔΑΡΔΑΝΟΣ
ΜΟΥΛΑΙΟΣ ΟΜΙΣΙΜΟΣ

L. Σ. ΟΥ
ΓΙΟΥΛΙΟΣΙΟΥΛΙΑΝΟ
ΦΙΛΟΕΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ
ΜΗΛΗΤΟΣ ΤΡΟΦΙΜΟΣ
ΕΥΗΕΠΙΣΤΟΣ ΤΡΟΦΙΜΟ
ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣΑΡΣ
ΕΜΙΔΩΡΟΥ
Inscriptions from the Cyzicus Neighbourhood.

53. Monastery of S. George, Koun Liman: slab 0.80 x 0.52, rude letters about 0.05 high.

54. Kurshunlu (Kara Dagh). Monastery of Panagia tou Megálon Agero. Fragment of sarcophagus 0.37 x 0.86, letters 0.045.

The monastery was important in Byzantine times, as the massive precinct wall with its fortified gateway, and the remains of a marble pavement in the church attest. Fragments of two marble lions which I saw on the spot suggest that it was the seat of the Mátrh Máxaru (C.I.G. 3457, Arch. Mitt. vii. 132), though the town of Plaka can hardly have stood here. The Kara Dagh slopes at this point right down to the sea, leaving no room for tillage, and Kurshunlu ekes out a living by the export of charcoal to Constantinople. The tradition that the miraculous picture of Kurshunlu was removed to the monastery of the Panagia Phaneroménas of Kapu Dagh is a pretty parallel for the transfusion of Plakán to Cyzicus.
55. *Ib.* By the door: sarcophagus slab 1.75 x 0.83, letters about 0.07.

\[\text{ὙΠΟΜΗΝΗΜΑ} \quad \text{ΠΑΥΛΟΥΡΑΧΣ} \]

\[\text{ὑπόμηνημα} \quad \text{Παύλου Ραξ} \]

56. *Ib.* Fragment letters 0.03.

\[\text{ΑΥΡ-ΜΑΙΓ} \quad \text{Αύρ. Μαλόρος} \]

57. Yenije Kurshunlu, in church: marble block 0.52 high x 0.50 x 0.50, supporting the holy table; fine letters of early fourth century, 0.025 high and widely spaced.

\[\text{ΚΤΗΣΙΑΣ} \quad \text{Βιανορίδα} \quad \text{Αθηράος} \]

58. Monastery of St. Anna, east of Yenije: stole in two fragments, (letters 0.02):

a. (inside the church) 0.56 x 0.65: reliefs, (above) banquet scene, (between II. 2-3) three pipers seated.

\[\text{ΑΙΩΜΕΓΑΛ} \quad \text{Θιασείται αι μετά 'Ασκληπιάδου} \quad \text{τοι Μητρόδωρο} \]
\[\text{ΠΑΡΜΕΝΙΣΚΟΠΩΡ} \quad \text{Παρμενίσκου Παρμενίσκου} \]
\[\text{ΜΕΝΑΝΔΡΟΣΑΗΜΗ} \quad \text{Μενανδρός Δημήτριο} \]
\[\text{ΠΟΤΑΜΩΝΑΣΧΗ} \quad \text{Ποτάμων 'Ασκληπιάδου} \]
\[\text{ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΑΔΗΣ} \quad \text{'Ασκληπιάδης Μ} \]
\[\text{ΕΝΕΚ} \quad \text{'Ηγίας Μ]ένεκ[ρ]ατος} \]

b. (built into wall, right of door): 0.37 x 0.25.

\[\text{ΗΙΙ} \quad \text{'Ηγίας} \]
\[\text{ΜΕΝΕ} \quad \text{Μενε[κρήτης]} \]
\[\text{ΜΗΤΡΟ} \quad \text{Μητρόδωρος} \]
\[\text{ΜΗΝΟΦΑΝΗ...ΙΘ} \quad \text{Μηνοφάνης...ιτη} \]
\[\text{ΜΕΛΑΓ. ΟΣΑΣΚΑ} \quad \text{Μελαγ[ρ]ος 'Ασκλήπητα} \]
\[\text{ΜΗΝΟΦΙΛΟΣΑΙΚΛΕΙ} \quad \text{Μηνόφιλος Δαικλείους} \]
\[\text{ΜΗΝΟΦΑΝΗΣΑΙΚΛΗΠ} \quad \text{Μηνοφάνης 'Δαικληπ[ά]} \]
\[\text{ΕΥΒΟΥΛΟΣΜΗΝΟΦΑΝΟ} \quad \text{Ευβούλος Μηνοφάνο[ν]} \]
\[\text{ΜΗΝΟΦΙΛΟΣΠΑΡΜ} \quad \text{Μηνόφιλος Παρμενίσκου} \]

Similar stelai with reliefs representing the banquet of a religious society are to be found in the British Museum (*B.M. Sculpt.* i, 817,
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B.C.H. xvii. 520 (1) = 48. xiii. pl. iv.) where a lower register shows banqueters, pipers, and dancers. B.C.H. xvii. 545, 32 (Trigilia) Conze Lesbos, pl. xix. The pediment of C.I.G. 3899 (Pandera) contains a much mutilated relief of similar character, and an inscription from Sarikou (Rev. Arch. 1891, 10) commemorates the contributions of the members: they are variously called τιμωται (Conze Lesbos, pl. xvii. xix., B.C.H. xvii. 545 (32), Latyschev, 355) θεοπετεται (Syll. 164, 6, Rev. Arch., N.S. xxxvi., 257, both Senapis monuments from Cyzicus) θυσιασται (Dumont Inscr. de Thrace, p. 442, 110b 4) . επαί αι μετά B.C.H. xii. 195 (5) (Hammanmili by Manyas).

59. 1b. Two fragments, letters 0:0225, breadth 0:024 with moulding.

(a) 0:051 high.

Above—cross on orb, in angles of cross Φ Χ Φ Π (φειδου Χριστε, φειδου Παναγις)

διπλαθα την | χων και το θυ[η]σκον

σαρκιον

(b) 0:048 high.

ΝΕΙ
ΛΟΥΣΑΠΕΜΠΙ
ΕΒΔΟΜΑΣΤΙΝ
ΗΜΕΡΑΝ
ΕΚΙΧΧΙΛΙΑΣ
ΕΚΑΤΟΝΤΑΣ
ΗΝΕΜΙΘ

60. 1b. Fragment letters 0:093.

ΤΟΣ
ΤΟΝΘ
ΕΓΕΝΕΤ
ΕΓΕΝΤΟΘ
ΕΘΑΚ
ΞΑΝΔΡΙΑΠΙ
ΑΝΝΟΥΕΠΙ

εγεντο
θ
εθα και τακεται Αλε-
ξανδρια πιστη γυνη Ιω-

ιονου επι[στολαρ-

io|u ]
61. Slab with fillet in relief.

Σιλικιχισιον

χαίρε.

Inscriptions discovered by Mr. Henderson during the continuance of the survey of Cyzicus in 1903.²⁸

62. Yeni Keui: fragment of Proxenia stele 0·30 x 0·20 x 0·06, with head of Persephone and tunny in medallion, below.

The design of the medallion is already well known from the coins of Cyzicus (cp. Fig. 4 from the Ward Collection No. 608). The later arms (the altar of Persephone, cf. Ath. Mitt. xviii 355 ff., C.I.G. 2158, and a sketch from Cynos in Rubensohn, Mysterienheiligtümer p. 163) correspond to the torch substituted for the tunny as mintmark on the coins (cf. Müller Monn. d’Alex. p. 223).

Many other examples of Proxenia stelai with heraldic headings, all dating from the 4th-3rd century B.C., are quoted in Ath. Mitt. xviii. 355.

²⁸ Published from photographs and impressions communicated to me by the finder, who very kindly undertook on my behalf a short journey into the Manyas plain. No. 62, by the courteous permission of the Director of the Imperial Museum, remains in Mr. Henderson’s possession.
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B.C.H. xiii. 515, pl. xx. 540. See also A. E. M. vi. 38, pl. III. Our closest parallel is the Panticapaean stele from Cyzicus (B.C.H. xiii. 515, pl. IX. = Ath. Mitt. vi. 121 = Thinly Knobs Cat. Sculpt. 114).

For the terms of the decree we may compare the simple formula of the Cyzicene Michel 532. Πόλεωι (Μαριὰ τόιοι) Μηδίκεω καὶ τοῖς Αἰσθητοισιν καὶ τοῖς ἀγώνισιν ἀτελεῖν ἐτς.

63. Cyzicus, lower road: 0.46 × 0.25 × 0.13, letters 0.02.

ΑΜΙΣΟΛΣΑΣΑΤΟΕΟΔΟ ος
ΗΓΗΣΑΝΔΡΟΤΟΥΤ ΧΟΥΤ
ΝΟΥ ΡΓΥΑΣΚΟΤΛΕΣ ΤΗ
ΕΚΑΤΩ ΠΕΝΤΗΚΟΝΤΑΕΙΜΙ
ΥΧΟΙΡΛΟΣΠΟΝ Ν ΊΟΡ
ΩΚΛΕΙΕΝ

μυρός Θαργηλίων ἐκ
θασοῦ καὶ τοῦ τιχον τινὸς
κατὰ τις ἔκατον εἰκοσι
τριάκοντα καὶ τοιαύτα ἐκ
τριάκοντα θείῳ χοίρῳ θεοῖ
ὁ Θεός ἄναλώθη θεοῖ.

μ in μυρός and θεοῖ in ἐκατόν are plainly visible in Mr. Henderson's photograph.

This inscription is couched in similar terms to those of Bœc. Arch. N. S. xix. p. 93 = Michel 596.

δασμαθάτοτε Ταύκρως Διούκατος τῷ πύργῳ οἰκοδομήσαι στατήρων τετρακοσίαν τεσσαράκοστα έτηνυς επτακοσίως:

which was found clamped to the eastern wall of the city, and dates, like the present record, from the first half of the fourth century B.C. The τοίχος, considering the price and formulae, must surely be that of some public building. I can find no example of τοίχος = τείχος, which would otherwise be a tempting solution.

64. On the Panderma-Erdeik road: slab 0.94 × 0.36, with large irregular letters, 0.04—0.05 high.

ΝΑΥΚΛΗΡΟΕ
ΕΠΑΦΡΩΔΕΙ
ΤΟΤΕΡΜΙΩΝ

ναύκληρος(ξ)
Ἐπαφρώδεις-
τεσὶ Ερμιων-

11 The Cyzicene inscription restored as a proximia decree in favour of Pan Agrion (Michel 533) has been shown (Num. Chron. 1899, p. 11) to belong rather to the class of statues with memorial bearings; the god, formerly associated with Pan, is the arms of Antandros.
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65. Haji Pavlioti (near Manyas) built into church wall: banquet stele 0'62 x 0'50, letters 0'015.

TEMIDWPE
RTEMI OPOY
XAIPE

66. Ib. Do. 0'66 x 0'34, letters 0'015.

MENANDRE
MELEAGRE
ROTOPAXOY MENANDROY
XAIPE
XAIPE

67. Hammamli by Manyas: block 0'36 x 0'19, letters 0'035.

VNM
UKAP
PAS

"Adjji Buzar" in Kiepert's large map: I heard Bagouli, Pogouli, which is the name given to the place by Nicodemus, metropolitan of

F. W. Hasluck.
AMONG the many genuine works of Greek Sculptors in the Museums of Athens there are three colossal heads and a piece of richly sculptured drapery, more striking perhaps in their originality than any others to be found there. Shortly after their discovery they were published with photographs by the Director of Antiquities, M. Carvadias, under the title *Fonilles de Lycostra*, Athènes 1833, and carefully described and appreciated. My excuse in venturing to bring them again to notice is the undeserved neglect with which works of such fine and unexpected quality have been treated.

That the group and the temple in which these fragments were found are those mentioned by Pausanias viii. 37 cannot reasonably be doubted. Equally reasonable, too, was the inference, drawn by the late Prof. Brunn from the various notices by Pausanias, that the author of these works, Damophon of Messene, lived in the first half of the fourth century B.C. But an examination of the fragments themselves has led Carl Robert* to attribute them to Imperial times, and in this attribution he has been followed by Overbeck (ii. 4 p. 420) and others.

The works, it is true, remain the same; whatever date is attributed to them and to their author. But the difference between Damophon, a successor of Phidias and Polycleitus, and a contemporary of Scopas and Praxiteles, and Damophon, a fellow sculptor with those unnamed workers who carved sarcophagi and made busts of Antinous, is too great not to disturb the judgment of those who examine the works of the latter; it threatens even to suspend all interest in him. Yet the individuality of these fragments discovered at Lycostra is undeniable and they deserve a place in any careful survey of the extant monuments of Greek sculpture.

In examining these fragments we are struck mainly, I think, by three distinctive qualities, viz. by the subtle play of surface due to the sculptor's feeling for texture, by an element in the design which I would venture to call baroque, and by thorough discrimination of character without portmiture. One glance at the drapery fragment (Fig. 1) with its pile-like surface and rich heavy folds is enough to prove Damophon's feeling for texture. The ease with which the members of the decoration are spaced and cut on the rise and fall of the folds is striking, and the mastery with which each element obtains enough of its own texture, without destroying the appearance of the whole as an

* Herman, 1894 p. 420.
embroidered stuff, is in strong contrast with the anxious particularization in such works as the Poseidon frieze in Munich or the Nereid frieze from Thermopylae.

In the heads, also, wherever the surface is preserved, a corresponding qual-

ity is evident. Unfortunately, for good preservation we are confined to the Artemis head (Fig. 2) and in that to the mouth, the chin, and portions of the cheeks. Yet from these alone we can gather what charm the supple and almost, velvety skin added to the modelling, full almost to plumpness, but firm and decided in its transitions from plane to plane.

But the extent of Damophon’s capacity in handling is shown even better in the hair of the three heads. The habit of the hair in each is distinctive.
and appropriate to the age, sex, and nature of each. The surface of the rolls which form the forepart of the 'melon-frisur' of the Artemis is chiselled into crisply broken waving lines, suggesting the polygonal facets of cut stones. The hair of the Demeter (Fig. 3), drawn back from the forehead in a welling mass on either side, has a fine interrupted striation comparable to that of the hair of the Aphrodite head found on the southern slope of the Acropolis.

Fig. 2.—Head of Artemis. [Nat. Mus. Athens.]

and like that in aiming at the look of hair rather than at the accurate rendering of its structure.

Finally, the irregular locks into which the starchy hair of the Anytus head (Fig. 4) is cut present another contrast, mainly determined perhaps with a view to light and shade. The locks, though separate, cluster closely to one another and to the frame of the head and face without any of that sharp undercutting and that rope-like texture so characteristic of hair of this type as treated in the Pergamene school (the Alexander head from Pergamum, in the Constantinople Museum) or in the later Attic and Alexandrian schools.
Asklepios head from the Piraeus, and the Poseidon from Melos, both in the Athens Museum. The element in the design suggested above as baroque appears mainly in the drawing of the lines of the brow, the eyelids, and the lips. These lines project sharply and have a free firm curve, a curve or a series of curves, as strong and as decided as the structures which they render will allow without distortion. In fact, one might say that in the mind of the sculptor there was a conflict between the claims of the features and the claims of his feeling for design; the former, from their supreme importance in the scheme of a head, demanding a cautious and, so to speak, a literal rendering, the latter urging the sculptor to a rapid stroke and to lines interesting by contrast.

Thus, the outer third of the margin of the upper lid curves rapidly backwards and downwards and, in full face, appears to meet the lower lid almost at right angles. The lower lids are in the main horizontal and, together with the frontal ridge which breaks away from its usual parallelism to the upper lid, contrast sharply with the line of the latter.
The mouth of the Artemis, by the flattening of the 'mucous' area of both lips and by the emphasizing of the line of junction of this with the skin, is defined by a sharp edge, which, made strongly convex in the lower lip and in

Fig. 4.—Head of AYTUS. (Nat. Mus. Athens.)

the upper almost tortuous in its changes of direction, satisfies the sculptor's love for strangeness of design.

It is hardly necessary to do more than point to the AYTUS mouth, with the line of the upper lip and moustache and the contrasting curve formed by the edge of the lower lip. This quality of line, the basis of the design of much of the work of the Pergamene and other Asia Minor Schools, is present
slightly in the two heads from the temple of Athena Alea at Tegae. It is the
dominant element in the Asklepios head before-mentioned.

But I am far from suggesting that these Lycosura heads are 'Scopasia'
Damophon, certainly, had had no such training as those ateliers provided
which were engaged in the making of nude male statues for dedication as
memorials of victories at the great games. The sculptor of the Tegean
heads, transcending indeed the mere athletic statue, however fine, had been
through that training. The bony substructure is too well felt and lies
too deeply at the root of his conception of form to allow of doubt on this
point.

The sculptor of the Lycosura heads had indeed sufficient knowledge to
build up a figure simply and strongly and on this he proceeds to follow out his
conception in the line and with the texture that delight him. An exami-
nation of the other fragments of this group, which the kindness of Mr.
Castriota allowed me to make, strengthens this inference.

These remains suggest a man whose practice, whether by choice or
necessity, had been mainly confined to the making of temple statues in set
pose and of silent dignity.

The elaborate designs on the drapery fragment,—to be found also on
other fragments not exhibited,—the statements of Pausanias that several
of his statues were acroliths and that he was commissioned to repair the Zeus at
Olympia, and possibly also his habit, as shown in these, of putting together
his marble statues out of innumerable pieces, will bear this out.

The third distinguishing quality of Damophon’s work arises from his
thorough discrimination of character.

Each head bears the stamp of a definite character, a character consistent
in form, in age, and in temperament, and to each is given his appropriate mood
of the moment. Yet this intimacy, this personality, is obtained without de-
pendence on the model, or rather, without the introduction of such accidents
of form and expression as distinguish persons from one another and give
portratiasts, in paint or stone, their opportunity.

The Artemis has the form and fashion of a young girl, and with head
slightly bent she is watching with a lively look and the trace of a smile on her
lips.

The Demeter, a matron and carrying the burden of many legends, has a
garve thoughtful countenance. Without frown or smile, she sits, enthroned
as a queen, and in the absence of Despoina appears as the central object of
worship there.

The Anytus, somewhat wild and dishevelled, country born and country
bred, has something of the openness and alertness of expression
that mark the Artemis, but with less meaning and more naïveté. If he
were to stand as Damophon’s conception of Pluton Epimachos or Kronos, as
two scholars have severally suggested, the artist misread his instructions.
The local custodian’s reading of the figure is nearer to the mark.

A clear impression of the general effect and style of the whole group
would solve many difficulties. Unfortunately, though the extant fragments
are numerous, they are still dispersed in the magazines of the Athens Museum and at Lycosura. In detail, it is true, we may recognize the same qualities that characterize the pieces exhibited in Athens. A fragment in the small museum on the site, the upper portion of a female torso, shows the same breadth of modelling, the same fine quality of surface and the same easy fall and fullness of the drapery folds.

Of the Despoina it is difficult to form a clear image. But from her attributes, the cista mystica and sceptre, from the peculiar richness of her robes and from her position of dignity, as the mistress of the temple, it is natural to infer that she was worshipped there, not as the youthful Kora, nor as the bride of Pluto, but as the greater of the twin goddesses. In fact, the whole interpretation of Damophon issues from the Arcadian cult untouched by the distinguishing marks of the Eleusinian legend.

It is needless, however, to urge the exceptional originality of Damophon and his mastery in execution. The fragments themselves are a sufficient proof. It is on the question of his date that the great difficulty arises and some discussion of this vexed problem is inevitable. It is the necessary complement to a discussion on his character as artist.

On this point evidence drawn from the architectural remains is of the first importance, and fortunately we have not only the notices of Cavvadias, who was assisted in his excavation by Cawerau, the architect, but also two statements by Dörpfeld in the Athenische Mitteilungen (1890, p. 230 ff. and 1893 p. 219 ff.). In the former Dörpfeld places the date of the building in Roman times, in the latter he places it in the second or first century B.C. and affirms that both the temple and the temple group were made at one and the same time.

A comparison of the basis of the statue group with the remains of the cella wall will confirm, I think, this latter judgment. The two, in the material (a local limestone), in the dressing and filling, and in their general arrangement (an upper and a lower sill course, separated by fine upright slabs) are strikingly similar. The blocks in both were secured by similar, narrow, \( \square \) shaped clamps. Dörpfeld notes also the correspondence in the use of marble. Both the statues placed upon the basis and the more decorative parts of the temple, viz. the fore-columns and antae, the entablature and imas, are cut from the same marble, quarried in Dolmata.

In his 1892 notice Dörpfeld withdraws the opinion, put forward rather hesitatingly in 1890, that the temple was of Roman construction, and certainly such buildings as the Exedra of Herodes Atticus (ca. 156 A.D.) at Olympia, the “Chamber” of Antoninus at Delphi, and the small Odeum at Epidaurus, also made in the second century A.D., exhibit a quite distinct style of construction.

The cella walls of the Lyceosura temple, above the limestone socle, were, it is true, built of baked bricks. Many of these are still to be seen on this site. But they are very different in form from the bricks used in undoubted Roman buildings and show no trace of the strongly binding mortar, which the former buildings have in common with Imperial buildings in Rome.
This seems at once to dispose of Carl Robert's contention that the whole, temple and temple group, is of Hadrianic times.

It should be noted that the situation of the sanctuary, on a narrow shelf directly below a steep banked-up slope, makes frequent damage likely. A mosaic on the fore part of the cella floor suggests one restoration; an inscription of the time of Hadrian found in 1895 and published by Leonardo² records the same or another. It may even be that the brick courses were a later addition, in place perhaps of sun-dried blocks, and that the marble entablature was added then or later. In any case, there was, from some uncertain date up to the final dismemberment of the sanctuary, a marble entablature carried on baked brick walls, however exceptional such a combination may be. In no case does it seem possible that the brick courses were placed there in Hadrianic times. Their difference of form and of bonding is too pronounced.

But a comparison of Damophon's work, the temple statues themselves, with their true correlates, according to this theory, viz. with statues of Imperial date found on Greek soil, is equally unfavourable to Robert's hypothesis.

If we had little or no material for comparison, it would be attractive to assume that just as the stimulus to poets and artists in earlier times had come mainly from Greece, so Greece was the centre of invention in the last artistic movement of pagan Rome. The Greek Museums, however, now contain many works of the first and second centuries A.D. It is enough to enumerate only the Imperial statues from the Metoos at Olympia, the statues of the Elean ladies also found there, in the Heraion, the series of Kosmetal busts in Athens and the Antinous busts and statues from Patras, Olympia, and Delphi. Not one of these is strictly parallel to a cultus-image within its own shrine, such as is the group from Lyososura; but the first and last are, at least, of the nature of temple statues. Further, many of those from Olympia are inscribed with the names of Athenian sculptors, and the marked similarity in form and treatment suggests the prevalence throughout Greece of one school tradition, that of Athens probably, during the entire period.

From these, then, we can derive a definite idea of the special tendencies in sculpture during that age; an idea, on the one hand, of the kind of form, if there is a distinct form, in which those sculptors conceived their objects; on the other hand, an idea of the treatment preferred by them, if they had a special manner or technique in carrying out their designs. For it is on these primarily, and not on the degree of excellence in conception and execution, when each person's private test of beauty and ugliness intervenes, that decisions on a sculptor's school and period depend. And in comparing together the Lyososura fragments and the statues enumerated above, the difference of form and treatment seems to me to amount to this difference in kind.

The full modelling of the nude, in the Lyososura fragments, its fleshiness

and its grain, the massed drapery and its simple folds, the freedom of line and breadth of cutting contrast strongly with the brilliant surface of the statues of the first and second century after Christ, their fine drapery with its many folds and sharp shadows, and the rendering in them by incision and drilling of detail in hair, eye-brows, and eyes. If during this period Damophon had visited Olympia to readjust the ivory plates on the Zeus of Phidias, he would hardly have understood his fellow-sculptors' work, nor they his aims.

With one other argument for the Roman date I will deal as shortly as possible. This rests upon the Hadrian inscription already mentioned, from which Robert draws some brilliant conjectures as to that Emperor's movements in the Peloponnesse, and even as to his presence in Lycothora itself. This inscription occupies the front slab of a base, once carrying a statue of Hadrian. The statue was dedicated by the Megalopolitans and the inscription is in very laudatory terms. The lettering is large, irregular, and badly spaced, the face of the stone is rough and unfinished and the final chisel marks remain unobliterated.

With this slab was found a second slab, with a well finished face, carrying an earlier pre-Christian inscription.  

The Greek excavators consider that the base, some time after the destruction or loss of the earlier statue, that of Aristo, was turned with its face to the wall and used to carry the statue of the Emperor. Such parsimonious treatment, an old base and a hasty inscription, was hardly consonant with that gratitude which, on Robert's theory, the dedicators should have felt towards the Imperial founder and builder of the temple. Thus, we must conclude, neither the sculpture of Lycothora nor the main portion of the architecture will allow of the attribution to them of a date within the period of the Roman ascendency.

We are left, then, with Dörpfeld's revised date of the second or first century B.C., and Collignon and Helbig accept this attribution for the sculpture supporting it on the ground of the character of the fragments themselves.

But on this view, to my mind, the style of the Lycothora heads still presents great difficulties and this, too, is the opinion of many writers of great judgment on Greek sculpture. In searching through the mass of Greek and Graeco-Roman remains for correlatives to the Lycothora heads, it is impossible not to find oneself turning again and again to works admittedly of the fourth century and even earlier. So inevitably do those works appear to have been born in the period of experiment and invention and not in the period of selection and repetition.

Just that kind of line, we feel, in the lips and eyes had not been done before. It is too free, too careless, one might say. The sculptor was inventing as he worked and felt himself bound by no previous model in the same kind. The contrast between the three heads in the chiselling of the hair is almost as great as hair, rendered in stone, can show. Place, then, side by side the head of the Hermes at Olympia, the Euboules head, the
Aphrodite head from the southern slope of the Acropolis, and the Petworth head. The striving for variety, for originality in the rendering of the hair is unmistakable. In later times, the treatment of hair becomes of a type; there was a recognised handling for hair, which all sculptors followed, whatever differences in arrangement and design might be required. The experiment had been worked out and interest in hair treatment was dead. I might venture, even, to find a parallel for the drapery fragment, in its substance and close rendering of material, from the mantle of the Hermes of Praxiteles. This is Attic, the Lycosura piece is not, but the claim that drapery problems then made on sculptors shows itself in the two answers as one and the same.

In later times, however brilliant in design and line the results may be—and the Nike of Samothrace and the Chiaramonti Niobid are proof enough of this—the aim was different. The drapery is abstract; there is no interest in texture and substance; it frames the figure, enriches the design, expresses movement, but as material and for itself, it is of quite secondary interest.

In general, so far as the remains in our Museums justify a definition in disjunctive form, we are led to conclude that sculpture in Hellenic centres, after the death of the leading sculptors of the fourth century and before the formation of a definite school in Rome, tended in one of two directions. For one direction, we may quote such works as the Demeter from Cnidus, the 'Venus of Milo,' the Asklepios head from Melos, even the Zeus of Otricoli, in its origin.

These and their like represent a development in direct line of the forms and technique first perfected in the fourth century. In making them, their sculptors had before their minds works of that earlier age. They framed their conceptions on these, emphasising here and there those qualities which most appealed to them. Thus, their works are repetitions with a difference; with just enough personal motive in each, to make the sculptor an artist while making it. But these men glozed, while the earlier men contended; these accepted ready-made what the earlier invented and worked out in pain.

The other direction is displayed in such various styles as the Pergamene, Rhodian, Alexandrian. The works of these schools are alike in avoiding, on the whole, this traditional style. To sculptors of wide knowledge in art and of strong character, that style seemed worked out. To such, what has been done should not be re-attempted. They must invent afresh; they should emulate the great schools, but in other fields. The drama, painting, still-life, and life itself are called in and, out of that very emulation, the material from these is often strained, to fit a form too great for it.

Neither of these two groups will admit, to my mind, the Lycosura fragments; and if we place them within that period, but outside of the two groups, we shall find it hard to bring up precedents for them as a whole, to support the attribution.

And it is this difficulty, perhaps, which first led Robert to attribute them to Imperial times. Then, much was changing; a new race was domi-
nant, and a new taste was requiring expression. Artists might then have conceived afresh and have found out new methods of interpretation. It was so in Holland, after the revolt of the Netherlands. Early in the seventeenth century Rembrandt and the petits maîtres ousted finally the Haarlem leaders, Heemskerck, Goltzius, Cornelis.

But as I have argued above, neither the sculpture nor the architecture at Lycosura will accept this date; nor does the sculpture fit readily the tendencies prevailing in Hellenistic times. Rather, our fragments impress themselves on the mind as being in the main current of the earlier style, as being part of the movement which produced the prototypes, though they are distinct from the main source of these, the later Attic School.

In the Capitoline Museum there is a well-preserved head of a goddess (Helbig, 2453) which has been attributed to Damophon (Fig. 5). In the full modelling of the cheeks and in the drawing of the lids and lips, this head is strikingly like the Damophon heads in Athens. The peculiar treatment of the upper lid—its outer half lying close to the full fold of the orbit, its inner half standing free, owing to the setting-back there of the eye-socket filling—is almost a diagnostic.

It is of interest moreover to note that B. Gräf 1 has referred this head to the 'Scopaic' group, while Furtwängler 2 considers it a later 'Hellenistic' work under that influence. Still, both elements, that of Damophon and that of the Scopaic, are recognised to be there. What differentiates it from the Lycosura heads, whether this head be by him or not, is a certain formalism in the hair treatment and a greater closeness in the drawing and the design of the contour and features. There is, in fact, a lack of the characteristic freedom and verve in the chiselling. Further, it is colossal, in the less favourable sense of the term, in the sense in which it is meant that such works as these are too big. This quality can be better seen in more marked instances, in the Ludovisi Hera or in the Demeter or Hygieia of the same collection. In these, if I may so put it, the original design would not bear enlargement. However fine the main lines may be, the intervening spaces, unnoticed in the smaller work, appear, in the larger, unmeaning, empty, motiveless. Of such a passage in a picture, we should say, in terms of painters' criticism, 'il fait trou.'

There is something of this in the Capitoline head, as there is in many works, later than the fourth century, but repeating fifth and fourth century types. There is nothing of it in the Lycosura heads.

These are over life-size and in this sense colossal, it is true. But the modelling everywhere is lively; it is felt and it is meant. Where the space is large, the texture and handling come in to supply the interest. In spite of this difference, however, and though the Capitoline head should probably be judged to be later, yet the evidence it brings in regard to the Damophon fragments is of great value. In it we have, at the least, a most striking
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1 Boll. Ital. iv., p. 218. 2 Meintem, p. 644, Note 3.
witness to the close connection of Damophon's work with the standard styles of the fourth century.

To this evidence we may join that of Pausanias. For, though his evidence, since the discoveries at Lykosura, has been unaccountably neglected, yet the data from which the late Prof. Brunn 6 drew his inferences are still valid and must be estimated at their fair value.

According to Pausanias' notices (iv. 31, vii. 23, viii. 31, viii. 37, and vii. 31), Damophon worked in Messene, Megalopolis, and Aegium as well as at Lykosura. In the most important of the Megalopolis temples, the principal cult images, apart from xoana brought there at the foundation of the city, were by his hand. We must except, however, the image of Zeus Philios by Polycletus the younger, placed in a temple within the great sanctuary, that of the great goddesses, containing the Damophon statues. The only other sculptors named by Pausanias in his description of Megalopolis are Cephasodectus the elder and Xenophon, who made statues on either side of the figure of Zeus Soter in the temple dedicated to him. While the greatest number of Damophon's works seem to have been in Megalopolis, Messene, and Aegium, not far from the Messenian centre of exile in Greece itself, contained statues by him and, among them, one of Thebes.

Prof. Brunn inferred, and naturally inferred, that Damophon was living in the 102nd Olympiad; at the moment, that is, when Megalopolis was founded and Messene rebuilt and this inference is still valid.

Just in so far as the conclusions based on other grounds, on the architecture or the sculpture, for instance, show themselves uncertain and insecure, in just that degree does the evidence of the documents gain weight. The conflicting hypotheses thrown out by different writers since the discoveries of the Lykosura remains prove the extreme uncertainty of the conclusions from the main groups of data. Among these, therefore, that from the literary notices is entitled to a place, and by itself it is of considerable force. Prof. Brunn's inferences were universally accepted from their first publication. Since the discoveries, they have merely dropped into oblivion, but their force has never been disproved.

It would be wise, perhaps, at this stage to sum up the arguments which tell in favour of a fourth century attribution for Damophon and his work.

One argument, and to any mind a strong argument, is the character of the Lykosura sculpture. Many acute judges have, indeed, interpreted its character in a different sense, but they themselves have by no means reached that consensus of expert opinion which is often the sole decision possible in this sort of question. Each can but lay down his opinion with as careful an exposition of the grounds for that opinion as lies in his power.

The Capitoline head forms another. With this the character of the Lykosura heads and a well recognized fourth century school tradition meet in unity. The relation is complex. But Damophon at least preceded in time the author of this undoubtedly Greek head, if he did not directly form its sculptor's

style. The head itself strongly suggests fourth century types and the judgment, that Damophon was of the fourth century, follows directly and at once.

![Colonial Head of a Goddess](Capitoline Mus. Rome)

We have, in the third place, the notices of Pausanias, and their evidence tells strongly in the same direction. It would be easy to add that it is irrefutable except on the production of some specific proof of date.
These three together put forward a strong claim for the verdict. More than this I would not urge: nor is it necessary to urge more. For, these apart, the evidence for a later date rests solely on the architectural proof and in this there is nothing of the nature of demonstrable fact.

Some discussion of the architectural remains, however, must be attempted; and fortunately, can be more easily made in that Dörpfeld has in his notices laid bare the main difficulties of the problem.

One statement we are, I think, entitled to make at the outset: viz. that in Greece generally, apart from such centres as Delphi and Olympia, building construction undertaken by Attic architects and masons was far superior and more orderly in development than that undertaken elsewhere. The temple of Phigaleia at Bassae, even, will provide a proof. Exquisite though the general design is—and it may well be so from the proved ability of its architect—the palmette decoration on the sima crowning the raking cornice is markedly inferior to similar forms on the Erechtheum, or on the Parthenon so far as the reconstruction of the late Penrose and Michaelis is valid. There is a well preserved piece of the Bassae sima in the British Museum and other fragments are lying on the site. The cutting is shallow, the drawing is without life and the palmette forms have become almost linear designs, without growth or accent. Just such a change, and a worse change, has befallen the more florid sima at Lycosura, when it is compared with fourth century forms from Epidaurus, or Delos, or Halicarnassus.

Allowance, too, must be made for the greater liability of the Dolian marble to disintegration by weathering. The Damophon heads and the heads from the Athena temple at Tegae are unfortunate proofs of this.

In contrast with the marble members of the temple, the limestone portions, viz. the socle of the cella wall and the face of the statue-group basis, are well preserved. The large upright slabs are well made and well dressed. Their effect is massive and of good proportion. Further, they bear a close likeness, in dressing, in form, and in the draft margin, to the similar lower courses of the earlier portion of the Thersaleion at Megalopolis.

The Thersaleion, like other portions, e.g. the town walls of the city, is not of the best construction. The necessity of a hasty construction, the paucity of thoroughly trained masons, and the need of building so much in so short a time will readily explain this. Even later, the construction was worse rather than better. If Dörpfeld is right in attributing to the latter half of the fourth century the alterations to the southern portico of the Thersaleion, viz. the walling up of its northern front and the additional steps down to the orchestra level from the southern front, the building construction in that period was less considered and less careful even than in the first half.

It is, however, the lower courses of the main wall of the Thersaleion, still to be seen more or less in position along the eastern portion of the south wall, which form the exact parallel. These courses, as at Lycosura, consist of an upper and lower sill-course, running through the width of the wall, and an intermediate series of large upright slabs, in pairs and of even size. Their material is the same, a native limestone. The proportions and the dressing
and facing are quite similar. In both there is a draft margin, round two sides of the Thersileion orthostates, round the four sides of the Lycothorium.

One important difference there is, and this lies in the shape of the clamps used to hold the blocks together. The clamp form in the Thersileion blocks is \([\text{shape}]\) shaped, in the blocks of the other \([\text{shape}]\) shaped. That the latter form was readily adopted and at once approved of is shown by its appearance in such important buildings as the Miansaleum at Halicarnassus (see the block of the basis for the Chariot group in the British Museum) and the Philippeion at Olympia. That it was rapidly diffused is shown also by its use in the alterations to the southern portico of the Thersileion. These, according to Dr. Dörpfeld, were made later on in the fourth century, when the present stone theatre was constructed and the orchestra floor lowered to its final level. Both the lower courses for the walling-up of the northern colonnade and the blocks of the steps down to the orchestra on the southern front have the \([\text{shape}]\) shaped clamps. These facts suggest that while the fashion of building was Megalopolitan, the actual date of the building of the Lycothorium temple was in the latter half of the fourth century and not in the first half.

And a notice of Pausanias (vii. 26) gives a reason. Like the Trapezuntians, the inhabitants of Lycothorium refused to leave their village and to migrate to Megalopolis. The Megalopolitans, who were undoubtedly the best patrons of the sanctuary, would not at once overlook this disloyalty. All their energies, too, would for some time be required for the decoration and completion of their own city. Nor does the style of the Lycothorium sculpture conflict with this later date. They are, in their freedom and easy mastery, the work of an experienced sculptor rather than of a young man or even of a man still learning, while the claims of Messene and Megalopolis would precede the less important commissions at Lycothorium.

There still remains one problem which cannot be left unnoticed, viz. the fragment of marble drapery in the Athens Museum. The surface of this is decorated with friezes and panels in low relief. The fragment of a torso in the magazines of the same museum and other fragments at Lycothorium carry the same designs. It is evident that one of the two seated goddesses, the Despoina in all probability, appeared covered from head to foot in a richly decorated robe. The determination of the date of the sculpture from the style of these designs forms the problem yet to be considered.

Robert finds their parallel in the mattresses on which lie the figures of the dead in certain Graeco-Roman sarcophagi. Collignon, on the other hand, attributes their origin to 'Hellenistic influences' working on the sculptor. In general effect, the whole design is undoubtedly 'Hellenistic,' in that it is full of grace and fancy and made up of heterogeneous elements. But in the definitive sense of the term, as a name for works distinct in style from Hellenic work proper, the design is not Hellenistic. The strange band of draped animals, dancing and playing on musical instruments, is provincial, Arcadian one might say, and suggests vividly the mythic at the basis of the ritual of such cults as the Laconian Κορυθαῖα.
A. M. DANIEL

The motive of the alternate eagles with outspread wings and the winged thunderbolts is proper to the western Peloponnesse, as the coins of Elis prove. Both designs are redolent of the soil. In Hellenistic times artists took their motives, so to speak, from a common pattern book. Thus the cuirass-designers of the Empire used the Nike motive again and again, and a Nike forms the centre of one of the main designs on our drapery. But when was this motive not used? It appears in various actions on innumerable red-figured vases of good period. The exact motive used in the drapery, a Nike carrying a thymateria, appears, according to Kekule, in the series of Nike-figures on the well-known balustrade in Athens. Nor is the thymateria in the hands of the figures on the drapery panels Augustan only, as Robert implies. A gem from Melos and a mirror case in the British Museum point to a much earlier date of origin. Furtwängler gives in outline in vol. iii., p. 138, of his work a gem with the design of a winged Nike strewing incense on a thymateria of this very form. According to him the gem was cut in the first half of the fourth century. Similarly, the development of the other motive used in the drapery, Nereids seated on hippocamps and accompanied by Tritons, can be traced in the Munich frieze of the marriage of Poseidon and Amphitrite and in a smaller frieze found near Thermopylae. The Thermopylae relief (Fig. 6, Athens Museum, No. 221, 222) is attributed by Cavvadias to the later decades of the fourth century and he compares it in style to the frieze on the monument of Lyaiocrates. In movement, in its subtle contrasts, well shown in the different modelling of the torsos, and in the delicacy of the chiselling, it far surpasses the Munich frieze. But, compared with the design on the Lycosura drapery, it is Hellenistic in the sense in which the latter is not.

Wherever it was possible, the designer of the Thermopylae relief has introduced accessories, Erotes with bird-like wings, fruit baskets, a whip, an urn: here the sea-monster has a lion's head with lion's claws, the next has a carefully elaborated horse's head with horse's hoofs; below the figures, the scene is closed with the surface ripples of the sea waves. The form of
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2 Bronze Room, Table Case A, from Corinth (no number).
expression is, if I may use the term, anecdotal. The main lines of each motive being laid down, subsequent sculptors, in adopting any one of them, confine their efforts to supplying subordinate and novel motives within the general scheme. In the earlier Hellenistic period, this could be done with success and with delight: the method was new, and the accessory motives innumerable. In later times, this method, too, became worn out and banal. Such works as the Munich frieze show the failure of interest and the consequent fatigue.

The Lykourgeion drapery, in this as in the other elements of the decoration, is as freshly conceived as the design of the Thermopylae relief; it is also without its accessories and without the research in detail. If design has principles of orderly development, the Nereid design of Damophon cannot be later. It must be an earlier form and its prototype must be looked for elsewhere.

If, finally, we regard the drapery in its place as part of the whole group by Damophon, and if, at the same time, we admit, in the evidence of the written notices and of the sculpture, a preponderant weight in favour of a fourth century date, the designs on it will not oppose this date. Rather will they support it. Nor does the architectural evidence oppose a fourth century attribution, unless, perhaps, we hold strictly to the theory that the whole building from akroterion to foundation stone is of one date and contemporaneous with its temple-images.

All that must, at present, be accepted, is the contemporaneity of the socket of the cella wall and of the statue basis (and, with that, the statue-group itself); and for that Megalopolis provides independent evidence. That the upper courses of the temple walls and the marble entablature and prostyle were built at the time, is a valid supposition, but it is by no means necessary in fact.

The whole question of the Lykourgeion remains and of Damophon's date, so inextricably bound up with them, is a problem of the greatest complexity, and no one, who has examined the question, will venture to decide dogmatically. At present it is a problem of the weight of evidence and the weight seems to me to tell on the side of the fourth century.

A. M. Daniel.
THE TARSIAN ORATIONS OF DIO CHrysostom.

The town of Prusa, of which Dio was a native, stood in a fertile valley in Western Bithynia near Mt. Olympus. To this day the country round Prusa is remarkably rich and beautiful and here were situated the vineyards and farms which belonged to Dio’s family. 1 His grandfather was a distinguished sophist, τὸν γὰρ οὐσίαν ἐν ἔχει πατριώτων καὶ παππίων ὑπασαν εἰς φιλοσοφίαν ἀναλάθαε, διότι μιθέον ἐχει λοιπὸν, ἑτέραν εκτίσεω ἀπὸ παιδείας καὶ παρὰ τῶν αὐτοκρατόρων: 2 and the sophistical or rhetorical bias of Dio’s education is clearly reflected in his earlier speeches. It mattered little that the study of the classics formed part of the average education: his reading everywhere would be directed by teachers who held the ordinary sophistical view that exact thinking and deep study unfit a man for practical life and that success is achieved by those who have acquired the art of making a skilful and impressive use of ideas which do not differ materially from those of the ordinary citizen. In the view of this school philosophical epideixis was only a small part of sophistic, and Stoics, Cynics, Epicureans, Platonists, and Peripatetics were only dry-as-dust schoolmasters and pedants who, differing in everything else, united in disparaging the universal culture of the Sophists.

No education was considered complete without visiting several of the chief centres of learning, and Dio doubtless began at an early age 3 those travels which sooner or later must take him to Rome. Apart from other attractions, the Philhellenic leanings of the capital made it an exception to the general separation in culture of the Greek-speaking East from the Latin West. Its literary coteries offered a tempting field to a talented Greek and Dio could not fail to obtain recognition. As a result of his intimacy with Flavius Sabinus, one of the victims of Domitian, he was ordered to quit Rome shortly after that Emperor assumed the purple. The date of his banishment, on the showing of Emperor, is determined by Dio’s own words 4 as 82 A.D. and accordingly he remained for fourteen years excluded

---

1 In a bad season, says Dio, ἐιρή ποι ἡ τινα ἄναμα ἐφανερότερα καὶ οἰκείαι καὶ Σαμαραία (Or. 48 p. 120 § 9) but compared with other cities corn is always cheap at Prusa (Or. 48 § 10). 2 The environs are of great beauty; the mountain, with its marshy zone of vegetation rises up from the town, and there are many charming drives and walks in the chestnut, oak, and other woods. 3 Sir Charles Wilson, in Murray’s Handbook to Constantinople, &c. p. 123. 4 Or. 48 p. 125 § 2. 5 Cf. the tradition that Dio met Vespasian in Egypt in 69 A.D. not as a youth but as a man with a reputation. 6 Exp. Or. 13.
from Italy and Bithynia. During this period visits to Delphi, Olympia, Borythynian, Cyzicus, and Viminacium are recorded more or less distinctly.

For the chronology of Dio's speeches there is no external authority and internal evidence of date is scanty. The earliest speech which appears to fix its own date within limits is Or. 46 in which his son is called παιδίον and the joint rule of Vespasian and Titus is faintly indicated — οὐ γὰρ λαυθύνει τὸν ἐν ταῖς πόλεις αὐτῶν τῶν ἡγεμόνας ἄλγος δὲ τοὺς μείζονοι ἡγεμόνας τῶν ἐφθάσε (p. 129; § 14). The whole speech is that of a man who has been quite recently struggling to meet the obligations imposed on him by his father's extravagance and his own public spirit but has to contend against the erroneous idea that he is rich and parsimonious. It may be assigned to the years 71–81 A.D. Or. 31 Rhodiae is also to be placed before the reign of Domitian. The reign of Nero and particularly the visit to Olympia are still fresh in the minds of his audience, τοιούτοις ἔγγυτα ἐφ' ἡμῖν, οὐ διπλωτάτα, τῶν αὐτοκρατόρων τῶν ἐντὸς σφάδα τῇ ἐπίθεσι τῆς πράγματος καὶ ἐπεθύμησι τῆς ἐκεί νίκης δότε καὶ ἄρνηθησαθίναι παρ' Ἡλεως. Two speeches, κατὰ τῶν συνεργῶν and τῶν Μυκόνων, are mentioned by Synesius and may have been delivered about 71 A.D. when the philosophers were in disgrace and Dio's enthusiasm for Rhetoric was fresh. The Melankomenas speeches Or. 28 and Or. 29 have been connected by von Arnim (op. cit. p. 145) with a favourite of Titus and attributed to this period.

A marked change comes over Dio's thought during his exile. Comfortable acquiescence in the status quo is replaced by a genuine interest in ethical-political problems. Almost involuntarily he was driven during his wanderings to reconsider his earlier opinions: στολὴν τε ταπεινὴν ἀναλαβὼν καὶ τᾶλα κολάσας ἔμαυτον ἡλικίαν πανταγωγό, οἱ δὲ ἐντυχεῖσαν ἄνθρωποι οἵν μὲν ἀλήθης, οἱ δὲ πωλῶν έξολος, οἱ δὲ τινες καὶ φιλόσοφοι τινὶ οὖν δὲ τι καὶ ἀπολύσας τής φύσις συνεξήμοι. τόλλοι γὰρ ἡμῶν προεισε δι' μου φανερῶν ὡς κακῶν δότε ἰμακελάζων φρονεῖσθαι ὑπὲρ τούτων, ἔκρυμες αὐτοκρίνεσθαι τοὺς ἐρωτῶν (Or. 13 p. 243; § 11). Here we have a description of Dio's life between 82 and 96. It was necessary to avoid notoriety, πωλήσεως ἑκεῖθεν τὸν μὲ καὶ ἁμένον ἐπὶ συνεξερχόμενος προσδοκήσεις (Or. 45, p. 122; § 11), but this did not prevent him from giving free utterance to his speculations on questions not directly political. Like Socrates he came to see that wise men were scarce, ἔδοκοι δὲ μοι πάντες ἄφρονες, ὡς ἦσαν εἰσεῖν (Or. 13, loc. cit.), and went so far in the direction of Cynicism as to be charged with detracting from the worth of human affairs, διασώριζα ταύτων ἐνθρωπον (Or. 21, p. 300; § 10). A similar departure from the sophistical standpoint

---

6 The invective against Athens is incompatible with a post-exile date: after 86 many scattered allusions and the whole of Or. 13 show quite a different feeling.
7 Or. 21 p. 182 § 13; the phrase ἔγγυτα ἐφ' ἡμῖν indicates that Dio was no longer a youth in 86 A.D., and presupposes for the year of his birth a date not later than 50.
is apparent in his recognition of an affinity between Homer and Socrates, the great enemy of the sophists:—τα μὲν πρῶτα καὶ μέγατα κατὰ τὸ ἱδρός, οὐδὲτεροῦν γὰρ αὐτῶν ἀλαξών ἴν αὐτοὶ ἀκούση, ὅπερ οἱ ισαλεκτανοὶ τῶν σοφιστῶν (Or. 55, p. 55; § 7). In the speeches in which Diogenes is the prominent interlocutor (Orat. 6, 8, 9, and 10) we meet with the Cynic principles of αὐτάρκεια and αὐτοποιία, and these may appropriately, along with most of the dissertations on abstractions like ἄντι, πλωτεξία, εὐδαιμονία, δόξα, ἀρετή, and μονοκνέασθαι, be ascribed to these years of exile.

On the removal of the tyrant and the restoration of exiles by Nerva, Dio returned to Prusa, where he received an invitation to proceed to Rome. In a speech delivered at Prusa (Or. 44) after this event he refers to Nerva's summons, his own reply in which he put forward certain claims on behalf of his native city, and Nerva's flattering answer: ἀνεγραφόμεθα μὲν ἐπιστολὴν ἤτο τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἐπίστευτον τῷ αὐτοκράτῳ, ὅτι ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐκείνους παρεκκλών ἀφεθήμεν πρὸς ἱμάς, καὶ ἦκεν ἐκείνος ἀντιγράφη. The Emperor expressed himself as favourably disposed to Prusa: καὶ τῶν δημῶν ἡμῶν ἀξία, ὧν ἐστιν παρὰ τῶν κρατοῦντων, ταῦτα ἔστειλεν ὡς ἐσφυγμένα, καὶ ἐγκέφαλοι συμβαίνειν τῷ τιμῷ θείῳ δῷξαι ἐπιτροπῇ χρησίμων, and conferred some distinction on Dio which evoked embassies of thanks from Prusa and neighbouring towns: πολλῶν ἡμῶν πολλαχῆ παρακλώνων μὲ καὶ μένειν καὶ προσπαθήσαν τῶν κοινῶν οὐν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρότερον, ὅτι τὴν φυγήν, καὶ ψυχίσματα ἐπηρεάζετι πρὸς τοὺς αὐτοκράτορας χάριν εἰδότες τῆς εἰς ἐμε τιμῆς (Or. 44, p. 115 § 6). In the summer of 97 Dio was compelled by illness to remain in Asia; τελευτῶντος δὲ εἴκοσι καὶ τῆς μεταβολῆς γενομένης αὐγείν μὲν πρὸς τὸν Βελτιστόν Νέρβαν, ὅτι ἐπὶ τῶν ἑσφυγμένων κατασχεθεὶς ἄλοκτι εἴκοσιν ἐξιμιώθην τὸν καιρόν, ἀφαιρεθεὶς αὐτοκράτορος φιλανθρώπου καὶ ἄγαποτος καὶ πάλιν φιλόκατο (Or. 45, p. 118; § 2), and it was not till the reign of Trajan that he was able to appear at court. The embassy on which he served probably was carried out in the summer of 100 A.D., and it was on this occasion that he procured for Prusa the desired concessions.

After the Embassy he returned to Asia with the intention of recruiting his health and repairing his fortune. εἰσόμενοι γὰρ, ὃς ἄνδρας πολιτικῶς τού ἐσχάτου, εἴ καὶ μὴ πρότερον, ἄξειν τὴν ἐπιτάξιν ἀνθρώπων, διόρθωσιν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ μὴ προσ- ῳεσθήσῃ μὴ τῇ ἐκατον ἐκατον καὶ δύσκολον καὶ περιγραμμένον (Or. 40, p. 88 § 1), but he had a few bitter opponents who contrived to make his life extremely unpleasant. His fābolōn τριβάνοντος, his dilapidated house and his feeble

8 Or. 44, p. 117; § 12.
9 Perhaps the same Coccianus (cf. Hilary, Ad Tract. 81, 1).
10 Until the year 89 A.D., Trajan was in Germany and in 101 he was preparing for the first Dacian war. In this latter year may have occurred the second embassy sent by discontented Prussians and boldly received by the Emperor.
11 In striking contrast is his treatment elsewhere, ἔφησι συνέχεια σήμερα μετὰ τῆς αὐτοκράτορα καὶ πρὸς ἄλλησε πολλοῖς τοῖς δικαιο-

[Or. 47 p. 136; § 23]
health did not protect him from malicious accusations: νῦν γὰρ εὰν ἀπτωμαί τοῦ πρῶματος καὶ ὑποβάζω γέγονεται τὸ ἔργον,12 τυραννίζεται μὲ φασὶ τινος καὶ κατασκάπτει τὴν τόλμη καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ πνεύμα (Or. 47, p. 155; § 18). Some were jealous of his influence, μαρωνεῖται τινας ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ περιττόν, and some quivered at his mounty καλὸς μὲ τὴν ἀγάλματος ἑαυτοῦ σφαίρας, λαοδηγός (Or. 47, p. 134; § 18). The conclusion arrived at is that for philosophers ἐλατεῖον ἐν τῇ πάτρῳ, ὁ βλός, and at the end of the first Dacian War, when Trajan expressed a wish to see him at court, Dio was ready to comply, καὶ νῦν δὲ μὲ αὐτῶν, νῦν ὁ στροφὸς κλάμῳ, πάντως μὲ ὁποτέσπερ καὶ ἑτομοκτόνως, ἕλλα μὲ ὑψίφρασι τινος (Or. 48, p. 111; § 8).

It was at some point subsequent to this visit that Dio undertook the journeys in the East which produced the most important of his orations, namely, delivered at Tarsus, Alexandria, and Cæsarea in Phrygia. That those journeys had a serious purpose is evident from the speeches themselves and from the circumstances which attended them. In the early Empire, for a Greek who looked beyond the narrow circle of the πόλεις, there was only one sentiment which appealed strongly to his imagination, the Panhellenia. To the last Greek πατρίς maintained itself against Latin culture, and at this epoch political loyalty to Caesar went hand in hand with keen partiality for Hellenism.13 In the Republic of Letters formed by the Greek cities and literary Romans the educated Greek gained reputation and sometimes wealth and so satisfied his ambition. But with Dio after his exile, when he had abandoned his sophist ideals of sophistic epideixis, the desire for further rhetorical successes was not a moving force. Motives of pleasure or curiosity are equally inappropriate to a man of Dio’s years and health. What led Dio to the East was his wish to assist the government in its work by helping to promote order and good conduct in public and in private life among the provincials.14 Conversely he insists emphatically on the political advantages

---

12 In the interval between his restoration and the emprise 96-100 A.D. Dio had been actively engaged in improving the city. He would gladly have emulated Theenas and EpanOMeneus but prudently limited himself to a stoa and an apse (Or. 45, p. 125; § 12) and even these were not completed without immense trouble. The ἅγες took up the scheme readily and after thorough discussion contributions were promised and the work of building begun: but a group of malcontents attempted to frustrate his plans, διότι μὴ ὤντος καὶ τοὺς ἅγες ἀπεδώκαν γνώριον, ἀφετέρους δὲ διότι δόξας ἄνει δόλων φύτης ἦν ἐπιφροσυναίης, and thus after weathering the storms of exile only caused him to make a ridiculous shipwreck in harbour (Or. 49, p. 92; § 12).

13 Dio replies with dignity, διὸ τί ποῦ τι εἶναι ἡττον; εἶ δὲ τὸν σταυρὸν ἀπεδώκατο, ἐκλεῖσεν τὸν πόλιν τε ὀλίγον, δὲ τὴν τάφωρα αὐτῷ ἀδιάφορα, ἐκλεῖσεν τὸν παλαιὸν πατρίς, ἐκλεῖσεν τῇ εἰρήνῃ κτίσει; τὸσ τό δὲ ένας τὸν πατριότητα ἔσται ἄλλας. 

14 Thus while Dio assures the Rhodians that the Romans have no desire to rule over slaves (Or. 31) and holds that a good citizen will even lay down his life παρὰ τὸν βασιλέα—i.e., for Cæsar (Or. 32), he is revolted by gladiatorial exhibitions, a Romanising institution, in the Athenian theatre. At Berytus, remains as it is, καὶ τάλλα εἰκέντα σαφῶς ἀλληλογίζεται διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὰς ἀνάροις ἦν τὴν γε. Εἰμὶ δολοφονίας τοιαύτης ἀνεότητις, and a man was accused of servility to the Romans because he shaved his beard! (Or. 58 p. 58 §§ 9, 17).

15 In Or. 3, deemread perhaps before Trajan, we may see a direct reference to Dio’s commission in the words ὡς ἂν ὃν εἰς τόπον δομήσων ἀλληλομεταξὺ τῶν ποὺτατοί εἰσάξας ἥν αὐτὸς ἐκεῖνη ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ, ἀκακοσμί νυν ἐν χαρίς ἑαυτοῦ ἡμῶν οἷαν ἐν αὐτῷ καταγεγραμμένον αὐτῷ ἔδωκεν Χριστός τῷ αὐτῶ καταγγελτικόν τὸ μὴ
to be gained by decency and moderation. The intimacy of his connection with the Emperor was too well known to permit of his being received simply as an irresponsible private person. When he asks the Alexandrians πώς κρείταν μικρείνα ταύ τόν ἄρχοντα παίδευ εκλόγη προσυνεχοντα; (Or. 32, p. 421; § 60), or holds out the prospect of a visit from Trajan, assuring them that their lively interest in Caesar is reciprocated by him, they recognize that he is not talking at random. He speaks always in this group of orations as one having authority. Apart from this the special value of these speeches rests in the fact that they emanate from a representative of the best class of Greek provincials at the point at which the Principate reached its highest development, and form an authentic account of life in public in the Greek East as it appeared to a Greek of decided ability and large experience.

Tarsus, the provincial capital of Cilicia, was situated on the Cydnus in a fertile country which stretched from the Taurus to the sea. It was customary to compliment the Tarsians on their fine river and famous hills, but Dio is candid enough to observe that nature has not been superlatively kind to them, εἰ γαρ ταύτα δύναται τοιαύτις ἀνθρώπως μακρὰς ν ουτάμεν ἡ κραίσις ἄρος, οὐ κτισμένη ἡ καλάκτης ἡ λιμνὴ ἡ τύχος, οὐκ ἐκεῖν ἐστὶς ὅσον λείπειθε.13 Clear as the Cydnus runs yet it is somewhat muddy in its lower reaches, οὐκ αἰτὸν ὁ Κόδος ἄνω καθαρότερος; For then, as now, its waters, which from its source in Taurus till it reaches the plain a mile or two above Tarsus are transparent, began at that point to lose their purity, especially in flood. On these occasions the river was apt to overflow its banks: at a point near the centre of the city, where the channel made a sharp turn to the west, just as at Rome the Tiber, when it ran high, had a trick of running straight across the Campus instead of taking the bend to the right. To obviate this nuisance Justinian dug a channel to carry off surplus water to the east, a channel which eventually emptied the older stream.14 In the first century the river was navigable up to the city, through the centre of which it made its way till it reached a lake to the south called the Rhegma. This lake, says Strabo, formed the harbour (Strabo xiv. 5). Near the river stood the gymnasion for the young men to which Dio alludes in his mention of the chief places of resort. These include also more than one agora and a theatre, while the Stoa of Tarsus is (Or. 47, p. 135; § 17) classed with the most famous in the Empire, with that of Antioch, the Poikile at Athens, the Persike at Sparta, and the Golden Stoa of Rome. Unlike the majority of Greek towns Tarsus possessed no proper acropolis: εἰ συνέβαλεν ὅμως ἡφαίστης τινα ἕχειν ἑκαταρακτικον κ.τ.λ. p. 13 § 39.

The origin of the city is involved in obscurity. In the first Tarsian speech a few of the conflicting foundation-legends are suggested. The Tarsians certainly profess to be Hellenes or more definitely Argives,
THE TARSIAN ORATIONS OF DIO CHRYSOSTOM.

Professor Ramsay dates the transformation of Tarsus from an oriental town to a Greek πόλις to Seleucid times. The reputed founder, Δαρείος ο Ζυμίος, and chief god is Heraclès, and the abundance of coins (e.g. Fig. 1) with the type of the pyre to which Dio alludes (πυρός, ἡ τοιαύτη καπνος αὐτὸ παράλλης p. 16 § 47) is ample evidence of the local importance of this cult. The deity in whose honour the Tarsians were wont to erect this pyre and whose image (a god standing upon a lion) was represented without intermission on coins from Seleucid times to the middle of the third century A.D., was formerly identified with Sandan, the Asiatic Heraclès. M. Imhoof-Blumer is of the opinion that the god is certainly a local divinity of immemorial antiquity, and that on the Babylonian cylinders and the rock-reliefs of Boghaz-koï the nearest analogues to

![Fig. 1.—Pyre of Sandan.](image1)
(Tetradrachm of Demetrius II. struck at Tarsus. Brit. Mus.)

![Fig. 2.—Perseus and the Fisherman.](image2)
(Bronze Coin of Gordian III. struck at Tarsus. Berlin.)

this figure are to be found. No title more precise than 'Asiatic God' therefore is strictly appropriate. The other principal deities named by Dio, Perseus, Apollo with the trident, and the Titans are mostly suggestive of Eastern influence though the nomenclature is Greek. The trident in local legend is associated with Apollo, and the novelty of the attribute here has added significance when considered along with the strange association of the figure of Perseus holding the statuette of Apollo and the fisherman on the coinage of Tarsus (cf. Fig. 2). The Apollo who led the Greek settlers to Cilicia by the agency of his servants Mopsus and Amphilochoi evidently assumed through contact with oriental cults a new character in this region and was invested with some of the qualities of a god of the sea. The cults in which these heroes figure contain reminiscences of the enterprise of Greek settlers in Cilicia and their importance is illustrated by the place-names Mopsustia and Mopsukrene and by the heroon erected in Mallia to Amphilochoi the reputed founder of that city. Perseus, who frequently appears on the same coins with Apollo, is fundamentally an Oriental god widely worshipped in Eastern Asia Minor. As a sign of his

---

20 Tattas ad Lyophron, 881. Amphilochoi and Mopsus are 'dogs of Apollo.'
character at Tarsus it is noteworthy that Dio names him with Minos as the ideal of a just ruler. The Titans, too, who according to one version are the real founders of the city, are perhaps Hellenised forms of primitive oriental deities. 80

Dio was clearly struck with the prevailing atmosphere of Orientalism. In a speech to the Rhodians he contrasts such a city with the true Hellenic type. It is not so much, he observes, harbours, docks, and walls that constitute the real glory of Rhodes, but rather its preservation of the ancient Hellenic spirit, which teaches even a barbarian visitor the moment he steps ashore to recognise that, he has entered no city of Syria or Cilicia but one truly Greek (Or. 31 p. 389; § 103). The Tarsians, on the other hand, reminded him of the East. πάσηρ εκλήρως ἤ Φωκίκου τὸν ὧσει λεγετότους; (Or. 33 p. 14; § 14). Such is their laxity of manners that there is only one distinctively Tarsian custom which he pronounces really good. He notes with surprise and pleasure the modesty of Tarsian women, who veil their faces out of doors: τὸ σώφρον καὶ τὸ αὐστηρόν τῆς τῶτε ἀγνης, διὶ ἐστὶ τὸ πέρι τῆς εὔσητα των γυναικῶν, τὸ τούτων τῶν τρόπων κατεστάθη καὶ βασίλειον ὡστε μὲν ἐν ἑαυτῶν ἕνεκεν ἕντεκα τῶν πρῶτων μῦτη τοῦ λοιποῦ σώματος, μηδὲ αὐτάν ὀφθαλμοῦ ἔχω τῆς ὀδοῦ μῆκος (Or. 33 p. 17; § 48). Yet excellent as the custom is, of itself it avails but little against the growing demoralisation: ἢ γὰρ ἄσελγεια καὶ ὡς ὄντων καὶ ὡς ὄφθαλμων πανταχῶς εἰσόδεται, ὡστε τὰ μὲν πρόσωπα κεκαλυμμένα βασίλειον, τῇ ψυχῇ δὲ ὑκαλύπτω καὶ σφόδρα ἀναπεπταμένη, τουτοροθὲν ὦτε των ἄσημων ἐν τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν, ὡστε ὅι ἀγαμέται (ib.). Syrian and Phoenician styles of music are supreme, and sympathising as Dio does with the view that Greece was ruined in her theatres, ὡς διαβδημόρια ἐν τοῖς θεατροῖς τῆς Ἑλλάδος, the intrusion of these dissolute modes was ominous enough. But more bitter still is his criticism of an

---

80 Traces of Titans are found elsewhere in Cilicia. Adamus the founder of Adamas is a Titan, son of Ouranos and Gaia (Steph. Byz. s.v. 'Adamas'). The Sarus was formerly called Κοινής (cf. the Titan Κατε) and Anchialus, which lay between Mersina and the Cydnus, and was said to have been built along with Tarsus in one day by Sarthampalus, (Strabo xiv, 6, 72) is reminiscent of the Numerous Anchiale, mother of the Titans, Titias and Kyllene (Apollon. Rh. i. 1129-31, quoted by Keilh. Gatt. Nachr. 1901 p. 489). Thus it is scarcely correct to say: von Dakeley, Tithans, Kretens, Korybanten finden sich in Asien ausserhalb der gyräßischen Spätzeit keine Spuren, während die Grieche Mutter weit über Thyrsgis hinaus nach Osten und Westen hin herrschte (Kaihel, Lc. p. 496). A special connection between Cilicia and the 'Thyrssian sphere' is indicated by the existence of Kilikes in Tithes and Lyrakus in the Troad (Hom. H. vi. 415). Arrian speaks of an island in the Tithis Karrēs called ἡ Κάλλιας νῆσος (Peripl. p. Post. Eux. 18, 23). Further in historical times a district in central Cappadocia was called Klaisis, while in the fifth century B.C. the Cilicians extended up to the Ialybs (Herod. v. 28, L. 28, 72). To a certain extent there is no evidence to support the primitive inhabitants of Cilicia as of Phrygia, that since the Darytis and Titan-edli are found both in Asia Minor and in Greece independently (not 'imported') in either case it belongs to kindred peoples who pushed from the north, on the one hand into the Greek peninsula, and on the other hand, after sojournin in Thrace, over the Beoprus into Asia (Gatt. Nachr. 1901 p. 490). Or we may understand by Titans merely primitive Oriental deities whose worship was adopted and Hellenised by Greek settlers about the third century B.C.
indescribable peculiarity about the Tarsian voice: φημὶ δὴ θαυμαστὸν τι πάθος ἐν τῇ πόλει ταυτρὶ πεπονθέντα πολλοὺς, ἐν ταρᾷ ἄλλοις τισὶ πρῶτερον ἂκον μᾶλλον ἢ ταρὰ ἄλλων γγυρισμένον (Or. 33 p. 11; § 31). This extraordinary affection, τὸ τῶν μνών, which is neither κλασμος οὔτε ποταμός, ovis σφυγμὸς, described by Photius as φονῆς ἀπίργησις, (Bibliothec. Cod. cc. ix.) seems to have been a nasal kind of singing which excited the ridicule of their neighbours, ἀλλὰ πόλεως τὰς κρέατας ὑμῖν ἐπιβουλεῖ; but was not less prevalent elsewhere, if of better quality. 23 Dio recommends the most drastic remedy, καὶ υἱὲς, ἀνδρὲς Ταρσεῖς, μυρίσασθε τὸν Λακεδαιμονίους, ἐκτέμετε τὸν πετριτοῦ φθοράς (Or. 33 p. 20; § 57).

For a century previous to the advent of Dio, Tarsus had been well governed, ἐπὶ εὐτάξει καὶ σωφροσύνῃ διαβόητος, but now he found nothing but confusion. Philosophy had fallen into disrepute owing to the self-seeking of a band of pseudo-philosophers, τὰς παρθὲνα κλασμάτων καὶ συνιστάμενων κατὰ τῶν πολιτῶν. An inferior class had come to the front, and the best men were disregarded. Honours went to men who treated municipal affairs as a simple means to their own advancement. Their sole concern was to acquire the magisterial insignia and then wash their hands of public business. 24 The privileged class of full citizens despised the menfranchised crowd, and these in turn were discontented. The various corporate bodies Demoi, Boule, Gerousia were at variance, and in the quarrel with the governor, who had imposed a certain unanimity on the rest, the Gerousia had stood selfishly aloof. Scarcely any two Tarsians were agreed on anything.

A partial explanation of this dissension was discovered by Dio in the policy which existed at Tarsus. This was the work of the philosopher Athenodorus, δὲ πρὸν γενεμέας ὑμῖν ἔδειξε ὁ Σκύθης. Quitting the society of his pupil Augustus Athenodorus had returned to his native Tarsus, to carry out a complete reorganisation of affairs with the emperor's assistance. The Tarsians were divided into two classes, those who possessed the name Ταρσεῖς, implying full citizenship, and those who from inability to

23 Cf. Or. 33 at Alexandria πάστες δὴ δοξοῦσι, καὶ δόξες καὶ πορείας καὶ πάλαι περιποτηνὸς καὶ φθορὰς κ.τ.λ. (p. 423; § 48) and Petronius Tiberianus pp. 21, 22 Bücheler: ταῦτα κρατούν ποιεῖ ἡ Ἀλεξανδρεία γενομένη καὶ τοὺς Παρθιανοὺς καὶ τὰς πολιτικὰς ἀφής ὑπολαμάζεται ἀνεύρετα καὶ τὴν ἐκτέμειν χρήματα καλεῖ, τίνες δὲ καὶ τὰς λαοὺς θεραπεύει, διὰ τὴν ἐπιστροφήν, διὰ τὴν ἐπιστροφήν, διὰ τὴν ἐπιστροφήν. Evidently the name would apply to the landi-winds which blow off the coast of Cilicia for some part of almost every day and which enabled the trading-vessels of Alexandria once they reached the coast of Syria (in the event of their failing to make Myra direct past the west end of Cyprus) to work their way, aided by the current which sets steadily westwards along the Kanannian coast past Myra to Cilicia at the extreme south-western corner of Asia Minor (Rambu, St. Paul the Traveller, p. 299).
pay a premium of 500 drachmas. They were omitted from the register at the making up of theburgers' roll (πολιτιγοραφούσετο τινος, αο μεταλειφεν τον όνομαν) and were thus practically outside the state. In Pogla and in Sillym also, there was a distinction between ἐκκλησιασταὶ and ἰπολίτας. Here too the ἐκκλησιασταὶ are the citizens with a vote: the ἰπολίτας are the Tarsian λαομεροί, who by Dio are called "not citizens really, though in a sense citizens." So Rostowzew in Jahresh., 1901, Bechtold 45; but he errs when he considers this as peculiarity of Pogla, due to the extreme poverty of its citizens. The examples of Sillym and Tarsus show that it was a widespread fact of imperial times due to a deliberate restricting of the number of full burghees and the general introduction of a timocratic qualification. The progress of Roman methods of government in the East is a process by which Caesar comes to relieve the populace of all responsibility in matters of administration. Against the Tarsian arrangement Dio argues that most of the excluded Tarsians have no other city. They and their forefathers have in many cases been born at Tarsus, a fact which is a better title to citizenship than a mere monetary qualification. So long as poverty is a bar to citizenship large numbers of the people remain alienated and unable to regard the city with due filial affection. The logical course is either to expel them from the city altogether or grant them equal rights with the rest. How far Athenodorus had gone in the direction of timocracy is not clear. There are traces in these speeches of popular election of magistrates and perhaps also of dikasteries. The rights of the full burghees were no doubt preserved intact by Augustus, who was not averse at one time even in Italy to a measure of representative government.

If the Tarsians were prone to intestine dissensions, they were equally unfortunate in their dealings with neighbouring towns. Shortly before Dio's visit the people of Aegae had contested some point in connection with the record office, but the decision had been adverse. No details are given but it may be surmised that the Aegaeans appealed against the necessity of having to deposit the official copy of legal and business documents in the Tarsian arsenals instead of in their own city. The record office, a regular adjunct to
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23 Or. 34 p. 29; § 33 οἰκεῖοις is used also in the sense of 'depositing' (documenta, etc.), but more frequently of payment, which is the more suitable meaning here (honosurium).
24 The name Αμεροείς (wrongly changed by Dimof to Αμεροείς) 'linen-workers,' which is contemptuously applied to these 'outsiders,' is the name of a guild at Thasos (M. Curs. de rob. Thasos Plasser p. 92).
25 For this note and much other help I am indebted to Professor Ramsay.
26 On Tarsian coins from Septimius Severus to Gallienus and Valerian the letters ΠΔ are frequently inscribed and from Valerian these are replaced by ΠΔ. If the interpretations Περιγράφοντας (or Περιγράμματα), Βελήν, Περιτρις respectively are correct (Hill B. M. C., Ιέρουσαλημ p. 209), one may be permitted to see in the supersession of the Boule an illustration of the idea of things to paternal despisition. The Δικαιοσύνη in Tarsus as at Hierapolis (cf. Ramsey C. and B. P. Smyrl., p. 110) was a social institution like a club and only of indirect political significance and such a transference of privilege marks a stage in the decay of local government.
27 Of the ancient philosophers ἤστησαν ἐπωσὶκλῆσις ἐπί τοῦτο τῷ κεραυνῷ ἐξισορροπῆσαι ἁμαρτώσεις κ.τ.λ. (Or. 31 p. 22; § 10).
THE TARSIAN ORATIONS OF DIO CHrysostom.

provincial administration, must have been continually resorted to in the ordinary course of business, and the hardship of going all the way to the head of the conventus, to lodge or consult documents, must have been severely felt. The present action against Mallus arose from the claim of that city to a strip of sandy ground along the sea coast and the margin of the lake. At the present day there are two lagoons between the mouth of the Selim (Sarus) and Karatasch, where formerly there seems to have been this larger lake, which is thought by Professor Ramsay to have received the waters of the Sarus directly at its western end, discharging the same into the sea by an outlet partly choked with sand banks. Mallotis accordingly extended considerably to the West of the Pyramus, where it marched with land of Tarsus. The Mallotae are the aggressors, but yet the Tarsians are advised to put up with a trifling loss rather than run the risk of seeming to oppress the weaker party. Mallus, says Dio, is a poor place; and the Tarsians can afford to be magnanimous. A special reason for displaying a spirit of conciliation is found in the sinister movement which is already afoot at Soli and Adana to obtain another metropolis. After all the influx of neighbouring towns-people to join in a religious service or for purposes of litigation, which are the principal privileges of a metropolis, are of small account compared with the goodwill of the emperor.

In its relations with the Imperial Government Tarsus had been on the whole fortunate. Embracing the Caesarian cause in the struggle against the Republicans, it had stood a siege and was taken by the party of the Liberators. Antony made amends for this disaster by abolishing import and export duties at Tarsus and giving it the use of its own laws, the status of a libera civitas; and Augustus had confirmed it in its possession of these privileges. Thus it had quickly effaced the traces of the disastrous capture by Cassius. Of late the good understanding had broken down. Dio speaks of a dispute between the Tarsians and their governor the ἀρχηγός; a term which misses the question of the administration of Cilicia in the first century. Mommsen’s view (Provinciae, p. 323) is that Syria and Cilicia were governed jointly at this period. Cilicia was a non-military command but not necessarily governed from Antioch. The prosecutions against Capito and Numitor (Juvenal’s 'pirasæ Cilicium' Sat. viii. 94, Tac. Ann. xiii. 33) do not give the impression that the accused were merely procurators. Cilicia, at least since 73-4 A.D., when Vespasian united its two divisions, Rough and Smooth, probably formed the province of an Imperial procurator of praetorian rank. In the present case Dio anticipates that the intractable temper of the Tarsians will in the long run deprive them of the very right to retaliate which they think to preserve: ἐκεῖνα μὴ τελέσω ἀποβιβάλλετε τὴν παρηγορίαν; and holds up as an example the resolution of the Ionian cities which forbids this appeal to the senate or to Caesar against official misgovernment: ὅρατε ἐκ τούτων περὶ τὴν Ἰωνίαν, ἄτι κατηχομένων κατηγορεῖν ἐνθριβεστατο. (Or. 34 p. 34; § 30). It is true that certain imperial governors had been prosecuted and punished, thanks to the efforts of a Tarsian citizen, but frequent complaints are apt to be construed as evidence of disloyalty, and since
the accused are also the judges, any charge is liable to be dismissed as merely vexatious.

At this point it may be noted that the magistrate who has rashly precipitated matters in the quarrel with the governor, instead of waiting at least till the ekklesia had ordered a prosecution, is the Prytanis and apparently chief magistrate of Tarsus. Elsewhere we have evidence of Roman Emperors holding the office of Demiurgos at Tarsus and Anazarbus, and this must mean nothing less than the highest honour in the gift of these cities. The Prytanis and the Demiurgos in Tarsus may be however probably understood to be respectively the eponymous and the chief magistrate. Compare the case of Poglia: δρ κατα την ἐπώνυμον ἄρχην καὶ δημιουργῆσαντα. (Ramsay in *Ath. Mitt.* 1885. p. 336, Rostowzew in *Jahresb.* 1901, *Beiblatt*, 45.) The eponymous magistrate was Archon or Prytanis, the chief magistrate was Demiurgos.**

In other respects Tarsus was typical of a multitude of wealthy, bustling Greek cities which flourished throughout the East in Imperial times. What we know of the material prosperity of Asiatic cities contrasts powerfully with the decay recorded by Dio in European Greece, with the depopulation of Arcadia, the desolation of Thessaly and Euboea. In Macedonia the very race of Macedonians was extinct and already Pella was a mere heap of broken pottery. In literature likewise, Asia Minor held the foremost place. Rhetoric and philosophy were cultivated with great assiduity and every city of importance contained a proportion of men accustomed to listen enthusiastically in the market-places and in the schools to their fluent professors of universal knowledge. What Dio condemns in this culture is its emptiness and lack of serious purpose. His first speech at Tarsus is from one point of view an example of sophist epideixis, just as he himself was for many of his contemporaries a sophist and indeed the ‘nightingale of the sophists.’ None the less it is an ethical discourse on Tarsian ἀκολογία, with a serious practical aim which distinguishes it plainly from Sophistic. Similarly in the second speech, which belongs to another class and is directly political, συμβουλευτικός, the subject is treated from the standpoint of a philosophical preacher. In the attitude of individuals to the community, of class to class, in the relations of Tarsus to its neighbours and of Tarsian magistrates to the Imperial service the mischiefs noted are all traced to moral weakness and the remedy implied is always the same, παιδεία καὶ λόγος directed to higher ideals. And yet appearances were against philosophy, which was to supply this training. It was a common charge against philosophy that it tended to the dissolution of society by discouraging interest in public affairs. In particular the pattern
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**Communicated by Professor Ramsay.

N.B. It may be suggested that the unexplained inscriptions on Tarsian coins *TH, THB* (cf. *Hill R.M.C., Lycurgus*, etc., p. 121.) may stand for *Tēgōν Προ̣δεσία, Tēgōν Προ̣δεσία Βουλῆς.* Both at Tarsus and Anazarbus the Boulê had certain rights of coinage (cf. coin types *Hill* p. xvii.) and when it was necessary to authorize an issue it would naturally act on the motion (πρόθεσις) of the Prytanis. At Anazarbus, which imitated Tarsus closely, these letters are not found, nor is there any trace of a Prytanis.
held up for imitation by the Stoics in the ideal Sage appealed to all who were out of sympathy with the times and inevitably was often made a pretext for selfish neglect of public duties. With his eye on the best age of Greek history, Dio was too sensible of the decline in public life to reject the consolation afforded by this ideal of self-sufficing virtue. The question whether, in a society where all were slaves but one, there was anything left to strive after was for him a real one, but here again Stoicism came to the rescue. The principle of the all-sufficiency of inward virtue was supplemented by the doctrine of natural function, which insisted on the energetic performance by every man of the work that lay nearest to his hand, an inconsistency which enabled Stoicism to find a home in Roman official circles and notably in the house of Caesar itself, while yet it was the natural refuge of the discontented litterateurs and aristocrats who formed the opposition. The second speech to the Tarsians breaks off short in the midst of a discussion of this inconsistency, but enough is said to show that Dio had arrived at a theoretical as well as a practical solution of the difficulty. While admitting that philosophy represses certain activities like the incontinent pursuit of gain, he believes that it acts as a stimulus to the higher interests and motives. He in short succeeded, where so many failed, in reconciling his speculative principles with the requirements of a high conception of public and private conduct; and it is this, along with his missionary enthusiasm, moral and religious—for he claims to speak under divine inspiration—that makes him one of the finest products of Hellenism in Asia Minor under the Empire, that Hellenism of which it has been said, in the words of the poet, 'The sun even in setting is ever the same.'

T. Callander.
PHAYLLUS AND HIS RECORD JUMP.

Πέντ’ ἐπὶ πεντήκοντα πόδας πήδησε Φάυλλος
dισεκατέρον ο’ ἕκατον πέντε’ ἀπολειπτομένον.  

The marvellous jump recorded in this epigram has naturally given rise to much controversy. Intimately connected with it is the equally disputed question of the meaning of the terms σκάμμα, τὰ ἐσκαμμένα, and βατηρ ἐς applied to the long jump.

I.—The σκάμμα.

Most of the discussion on this point might have been avoided if scholars had considered the whole of the evidence and not confined their attention to one or two passages. The discussion has mostly turned upon the words of Piudar (Nem. v. 19, 20) μακρὰ ροι ὑπείρων ἐξίσοις ἐπισκέπτω τις, and upon the scholiast’s note on this passage. In J.H.S. vol. i. 213 Prof. Percy Gardner gave the following explanation: ‘After every leap a fork was drawn across to mark the length, so that he who leaps beyond all marks distances his rivals.’ In J.H.S. vol. ii. p. 218 Mr. Myres suggested that the σκάμμα might be a line drawn for the jumper to jump at like the handkerchief or piece of paper sometimes used in the present day. He further suggested that the three lines seen on the B.M. vase B 48 represented the ἐσκαμμένα. Both these gentlemen have I believe since altered their views, but as statements bearing the authority of their names are always liable to be repeated without further investigation, the errors still persist. For example, in Liddell and Scott the σκάμμα is described as ‘the place dug out and sanded where the athletes jump’ and distinguished from τὰ ἐσκαμμένα or ‘scores to mark the leaps of the πάνταθλοι.’ Prof. Bury in his edition of the Nemean Odes reverses this explanation. ‘The ground’ he says, ‘dug up for the long jump was called τὰ ἐσκαμμένα, the distances of individual jumps were marked by smaller trenches called βόθροι or σκάμματα.’

A review of the evidence will, I believe, prove beyond doubt that there is no distinction between τὰ ἐσκαμμένα and the σκάμμα, and that both denote the ‘garden’ or ground dug up and sanded on which the jumpers
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alighted. To the passage from Pindar we may add the following passages in which the proverb ὑπὲρ τὰ ἐσκαμμένα occurs.

1. Πλατ. Cratyl. 413 A.

ὅταν ἦδη μακρότερα τὸν προσήκοντος ἔρωταν καὶ ὑπὲρ τὰ ἐσκαμμένα ἀλλεσθαί.

2. Λυκ. Suda, & Gall. 6.

βευνό τινα τὸν ἐρωτα ψῆς τοῦ ἐνυπνίου, εἰ γε πτημο ήν, ὡς φασί, καὶ ὕρων ἔχω τὴν πτήσεως τὸν ὑποτον ὑπὲρ τὰ ἐσκαμμένα ἦδη πηδα καὶ ἐνυπνίμησε ἀνεφράτη τὸν ἐφθαλμόν.

3. Λιβανίου ὑπὲρ τῶν ὄρχηστρων. 373 (Reiske).

καὶ ἡ μὲν παροιμία φησιν ὑπὲρ τὸ σκάμμα βαθμόζουσα τοῦ τοῦ ἕποδα τοῦ μέτρου παρειστά.

In these passages we may observe how the proverb from denoting merely the extraordinary and marvellous comes to denote that which exceeds what is right. Even in athletics there must be some measure, and to go too far involves Nemesus; so a tradition recorded by Suidas states that Phayllus in breaking the record broke his leg. This twofold meaning of the proverb is further illustrated by the passages in the scholiasts and paraphrizers referring to it. It will be convenient to present these passages in a tabular form. The three passages from Suidas are numbered in the order in which he gives them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>παροιμία, ὑπὲρ τὰ ἐσκαμμένα τάξια, ἦν τὸ ἐνυπνίμον καὶ τὸν ἀνεφράτη ἐνυπνίον, εἰ γε τὸν προσήκοντος ἔρωταν καὶ ὑπὲρ τὰ ἐσκαμμένα ἀλλεσθαί.</td>
<td>ἦ δὲ μεταφορὰ ἀπὸ τῶν ποιητῶν ὅτι σκαμμάτως ὑπερήφανον ὁδοῖς ἐκκόψω ταύτα, ἀλλοὶ πρὸς τὸν ἐρωταν νῦν ἐνυπνίων καὶ χρηστοὶ χρηστὸν ἐνυπνίων καὶ ἀνεφράτη τῷ ἐρωταν ἀλλεσθαί.</td>
<td>Φάθαλος τε τῆς ἀγάπης, ἔστε τὴν τᾶς ταίγης, τὸν ἄλαυσι σκαμμάτως ὁ τῆς τῆς αὐτοῦ προκαταλείποντος, καὶ τῇ τῇ τῇ καταλείποντος, καὶ τῇ τῇ τῇ ὑπερήφανον ὁδοῖς ἐκκόψω ταύτα, ἀλλοὶ πρὸς τὸν ἐρωταν νῦν ἐνυπνίων καὶ χρηστοὶ χρηστὸν ἐνυπνίων καὶ ἀνεφράτη τῷ ἐρωταν ἀλλεσθαί.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To these may be added the much disputed passage in Pollux III, 151, καὶ ὃν θέλει ἀλλεία: βατηρ, ἂδικον καὶ τὸν βατηρα κέρκοικεν; τὸ δὲ μέτρον τοῦ πετήλους καϊκὶν, οὐδὲ ὅτι τὰ ἐσκαμένα ὄδει ἐπὶ τῶν ὅρων ἱπτεράρων τῶν παροιμιώτοτων λέγοντο πόδαν ὑπὲρ τὰ ἐσκαμένα. Similarly Suidas describes the βατηρ as ἀρχὴ τοῦ τῶν πετήλων σκάμματος and Hesychius as ἀκρον τοῦ σκάμματος.

First as to the relation of these passages to one another. Zenobius, Suidas, Codid. B. V., and consequently Apostolius and Eustathius agree so closely in substance and language, that they must obviously be derived from one common source, probably from a note by some paronomiographer on the proverb, and from the epigram on Phayllus. Of these authorities the earliest is Zenobius. The collection of proverbs which bears his name and the collection contained in Codid. A. B. V. are derived from the original collection made by Zenobius in the reign of Hadrian.6 Zenobius is known to have epitomised the proverbs of Didymus and of Lucullus of Tarra, who themselves drew upon earlier collections, one of which was ascribed to Aristotle. Lucullus has further been identified with the Lucullus who in the reign of Nero wrote two books of epigrams, many of which are athletic. It is tempting to conjecture that both the epigram and the interpretation of the proverb were derived from Lucullus. But without going so far as this we may surely infer that Zenobius or the earlier paronomiographer on whom he drew is the sole authority for all the passages mentioned. To these we may add the scholiast to Lucian, the meaning of which is now clear. The words τῶν πρὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐκπληκτῶν τοῦ πόδαν ἐπὶ τῶν πρότερον τῶν σκαμμάτων of Suidas, and both expressions merely explain the ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐκπληκτοῦ τοῦ πόδας of Zenobius.

1 =Suidas (2) who reads ἀλλίθων instead of ἀλλέων.
2 =Apostolius, xvi. 62, who reads πρῶτον for πρῶτερον and τῶν ἐκπληκτῶν for τῶν σκαμμάτων. Also =Eustathius Od. viii. 1581, with verbal differences.
3 =Op. J.H.S. xxiii. pp. 19 sq. where Mr. Bernard Cook clearly shows the relations of these paronomiographers.
4 =J.H.S. xxiii. p. 57, I misinterpreted this passage.
The scholia to Plato and Pindar seem at first sight to belong to a different source. But a closer examination shows that this is not so. The scholiast to Plato who is referred to by Suidas is a rhetorician, but when we strip him of his verbiage we find nothing more than the facts with which we are already familiar: that Phayllus was a record jumper and that there was an epigram on him. We may note the elaborate paraphrases for ἐδοκεῖ μέγιστα ἄλλαχθα and for ἐίσ ὑπὸ ἐπεκθυραπτο. The σκάμματα become ὑφόρματα τάφων, the ὄρος or μέτρον becomes τὸ τῆς ἀγωνίας ἀκρότατον, ἦλεος ὑπὲρ becomes the unusual ύπερπαθείας. One phrase reminds us of the words already quoted from Libanius. We have then merely a rhetorical expansion of the passage in Zenobius, or his authority. Lastly we come to the scholiast to Pindar. The last words are difficult. They should certainly denote the scores marking each individual’s jump. But what a hopelessly inappropriate word βόθρος is for such a mark! I cannot help thinking that we have here a short paraphrase of the scholiwm to Plato by another scholiast who did not really understand the words. Ὄρομα τάφων becomes βόθρος and ἐκάστου τοῦ ἀκρα δειπνός is an inaccurate reminiscence of τὸ τῆς ἀγωνίας ἀκρότατου ἐπεκθυραπτο. Such a view will offer no difficulty to anyone who realises how inaccurate the scholiasts often are on matters athletic. If this argument is correct we may trace these two scholia to the same source as the passages previously discussed, i.e. to the explanation of the proverb given by Zenobius, or by some earlier paroemiographer, whom he copied.

The first point which becomes clear when we bring all these passages together is that there is no difference between τὰ ἐκαμμένα and σκάμμα. Libanius quotes the proverb as ὑπὲρ τὸ σκάμμα, other writers as ὑπὲρ τὰ ἐκαμμένα. The scholiasts to Pindar and Eustathius use σκάμμα only. Apostolius and Pollux τὰ ἐσκαμμένα. Suidas uses both phrases indifferently. Lastly Suidas Zenobius and Coll. B. V. also use the phrase τῶν ἐσκαμμένων πεντήκοντα πτῶσις. This last phrase, with which the scholiasts to Pindar and Lucian agree, leaves no possible doubt that what is meant is the ground dug up and soared for the jumpers, i.e. the garden. The tradition that Phayllus landing on the hard ground beyond broke his leg shows that the σκάμμα itself was soft. This is confirmed by the words of Philostratus: ὁ γὰρ συνχωροῦσι οἱ νόμοι διαμετρεῖν τὸ πτήμα ἦν μὴ ἅρπις ἢ χρὶ τῶν ἵππων, words which would be meaningless unless the ground was soft but which are perfectly intelligible to anyone who has witnessed a modern long jump. Again the σκάμμα is described as the ὄρος by Pollux and according to the scholiast to Plato it showed the furthest limit beyond which it was considered impossible to jump. Similarly the βαθύρ or take off’ is the ἀφρῆς οὐ ἄκρου τοῦ σκάμματος.

In later times at all events the term σκάμμα was also used of the place where the wrestlers practised. The reason is obvious. Wrestlers required soft ground. When the remainder of the Ten Thousand were holding their sports at Trapezes some of the men objected to wrestling ἐν σκληρῷ καὶ
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δασίς σώτος. So Lucian describes the wrestlers exercising in the ὄργεια. The exercise of digging was also utilised as a means of training especially for the heavier contests, and so the σκάμματι is one of the most frequent symbols of the Palæstra in vase paintings, and is spoken of as the special attribute of the boxer or wrestler. Still later we find skamma used of the arena itself, or even of the racecourse, and used metaphorically for any form of contest.

II.—The βατίρι and the Theory of a Triple Jump.

From the passages already quoted it is clear that the βατίρι is merely the end of the σκάμμα from which the jumpers took off. There is no evidence that it was anything in the nature of a spring board; on the other hand the proverb κέφερενι τῶν βατίρων suggests that, as might have been expected, it was hard. On a vase painting shown by Krause we see a youth about to jump standing on a small raised platform, which seems to represent the βατίρι. There would be no further difficulty about the point were it not for the theory put forward by Fedde to explain Phayllus' jump. He adopts the view first suggested by Wasmannsdorff that the Greek jump was a triple jump consisting of three consecutive jumps or rather two steps (Sprungschritte) and a jump. This view he supports by a passage in Bekker's Anecdota, 224. The λέξεις ῥητορικαὶ in which this passage occurs are part of the Leucos Segueriana contained in the Codex Coislinianus 345, a manuscript of the tenth or eleventh century. It is as follows—βατίρι τὸ ἀκρον τῶν πεντάθλων σκάμματος, ἄφ' ὃν ἥλιον τὸ πρῶτον. Σέλενικος Ἰώμασης ἀτὸ τὸ μέσον, ὧν ὁ Ἀράμενος πάντως ἤδη ἔλλογε. Ἰμένων ὁ Σέλενικος: σημαίνει δὲ καὶ τὸν τῆς θύρας ὑπὸν, ὡς ὁ λόγος θηλὼν, ὁ ὁ δὲ πραγματικώς ἄνδρος.

The words τὸ πρῶτον and τίον, says Fedde, are direct evidence that the jump consisted of more than one jump, probably of three, or rather two steps and a jump. Now in the Palæstra at Olympia a little way from the north wall there is a curious tiled pavement. It consists of two belts of ribbed tiles 1·60 metre broad, separated by two rows of smooth tiles. The length of the pavement is 24·20 metres, and between the end of it and the wall is a further space of 5 metres. Graf suggested that this pavement was the wrestling-ground, a truly murderous arrangement, to which Xenophon's fellow-soldiers might have well objected. Fedde explains this pavement as a double jumping-track. The paved tiling, he says, was the σκάμμα and served for the run and the two 'Sprungschritte,' the ground beyond was the ἑσκαμμάτων proper, and perhaps the whole might be described as the σκαμμά.
The βατόρ he describes as a sort of movable jumping board, placed somewhere about the middle of the paved run, and the fifty feet was measured from the βατόρ partly by means of the paved tiles which are 60 cm. square = 1 ποδός, partly by the κανών or measuring rod.

This theory is certainly ingenious, but it is open to many objections. In the first place there is no evidence of any distinction between the σκίμμα and τὰ ἔσκοπτα, which both denote the place dug out. Secondly it would be hard to find a more inappropriate word to describe a tiled course than σκίμμα; for it is impossible to dissociate it from the cognate words so common in athletics, ὑποσκίμμα, σκύψις, σκαφείαν, σκαπαθής, and from synonyms used for it, ὑποκάμμα, βαθρός, τιθρός. Again the palaestra is not the place where you would expect to find an elaborate jumping-track, especially at Olympia where there was a gymnasion close by with its δρίματα. The palaestra was essentially the wrestling school. Finally from a practical point of view, even when we make allowance for the hardness of a Greek athlete’s feet, ribbed tiles can hardly have been comfortable to run on, much less to jump on. This pavement therefore cannot possibly have been a jumping-track; from its position it is more likely to have been a place for the spectators, or for the officials of the palaestra.

The next difficulty in this theory is the two "Sprunghschritte." These were according to Fedde reckoned in the jump, and the jumper must therefore have tried to make them as big as possible. This is easy enough: without halteres, but with them is so clumsy and awkward a performance as to render a good jump almost impossible. The fact is that with weights the run, or the few steps taken before the jump are rather of the short springy character which we associate with the high jump, whereas big strides and jumping weights counteract each other. This will be obvious to anyone who experiments with a pair of dumb-bells, especially if he swings them in the manner depicted on the vases which according to Fedde represent the Sprunghschritte. The type is fairly common; it represents a youth swinging the weights not on different sides of his body but both on the same side. A slight pause is necessary between each movement to allow the swing of the weights to be utilised, far before each forward swing they must be swung back again. Now when the pause is made on one leg, it is almost impossible to preserve the balance during the double swing. Martin Faber, who adopts the same view, sees the Sprunghschritte depicted on a vase published in Arch. Zeit, 1881. Unfortunately the jumper here depicted has no halteres!

But if we abandon Fedde’s theory and with it the hop, skip, and jump theory which is open to the same objections, is it not possible that the Greek long jump was a series of three jumps? A series of jumps with weights is a familiar exercise in our own gymnasia, it is said to be practised to-day in parts of Greece, and it would explain Phayllus’ jump. Unfortunately, the only evidence for it is the passage from Bekker’s Anecdota already quoted. The
unknown writer quotes two authorities, Seleucus, and Symmachus. Seleucus was an Alexandrian grammarian who taught at Rome and is quoted by Suidas. Symmachus edited a collection of scholia on Aristophanes and other authors which was also used by Suidas. Seleucus defines the βατήρ as τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ τῶν τεντάλων σκάμματος, ὁμοίως ὑποθέτου τὸ πρῶτον. Suidas defines it as τὸ ἄρχη τοῦ σκάμματος, Hesychius as τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ σκάμματος. These three writers then agree. The author of the passage in Bekker prefers Seleucus to Symmachus; so evidently does Suidas, who quotes the definition of Seleucus, and though he elsewhere uses Symmachus, ignores his definition of the βατήρ. The presumption is that Symmachus made a mistake. But can we infer from the words τὸ πρῶτον καὶ τὸ ἄρχον that the Greek long jump was a succession of jumps? At the most the passage can only prove two jumps, but I confess to being doubtful if it proves even that. To begin with there is a practical difficulty. If we are right in concluding that the whole of the σκάμμα was dug up and that the ground was soft, it would be most difficult to take off for a second or third jump from the loose soil. If on the other hand the βατήρ was some sort of jumping-board placed in the middle of the σκάμμα, the distance of the first jump would be unfairly limited. Moreover there are certain verbal difficulties: τὰχω is not the natural word for a second time, it rather means back. What again is the force of ἐξ αὐτῶν, and why is the aorist ἠλώθη used? But if we refuse to accept Fédde's interpretation, how can we explain the passage? In discussing the σκάμμα we found that nearly all our information was derived from the explanation of a proverb given by some paroemiographer. I believe that this is also the case with the βατήρ. Pollux and Eustathius quote the proverb κέρκονε τὸν βατήρα. Let us suppose that Symmachus and Seleucus were both explaining this proverb. The word βατήρ merely means the treading place, and so is used of the threshold of the door; but the treading place need not be the take off, it may also be the place where the jumpers land. Indeed Pollux speaking of the racecourse says ἣν παράτινης, τέλος καὶ τέρμα καὶ βατήρ. Now the proverb κέρκονε τὸν βατήρα is a sporting expression used to describe some decisive step, equivalent to 'the die is cast.' Seleucus derives it from the jumper who has taken off—he has jumped! Symmachus supposed the βατήρ to be the place where he lands—he has landed in the σκάμμα, and now must jump out again! This appears to be a possible explanation of the working of the grammarian's mind; but apart from this the passage is too difficult of interpretation to warrant us in founding upon it a theory which is opposed to all the other evidence as to the σκάμμα.

We may conclude therefore that there is no evidence for the triple jump, that the Greeks jumped very much as we do, that they took off from the hard βατήρ and landed in the soft σκάμμα. Each jump was marked by a line drawn in the sand, or by a peg. Pegs were certainly used to mark the throw of the diskos. The lines which we see on the R.M. vase B 48 might

**S. v. Σκάμμα.**
**S. v. βατήρας καὶ παράτινης.**
**ili. 147.**
be either lines in the sand or pegs; so too the σήματα referred to by Quintus Smyrnaeus. The jump was measured by the κανον, or measuring rod which Palliri describes as τὸ μέτρον τοῦ πυκνόματος, and which occurs constantly in vase paintings. It has been usual to speak of measuring ropes and compasses as used to measure the jump, but Dr. Dithner has shown conclusively that the objects so described are rather the ιματιν or boxing thong, and the short ἀγκόλη or amentum used in throwing the spear.

III.—Phayllus.

The fifty-five foot jump of Phayllus is the real cause of all our difficulties. Now we may admit that the use of halteres adds considerably to the length of a jump. We may admit that the Greeks probably did excel modern athletes in jumping. There is hardly any form of exercise in which practice produces greater improvement, and whereas in the present day jumping is practised by comparatively few athletes, in Greece it formed an essential part of every man's and every boy's physical training and was systematically taught. We know from a recently discovered papyrus of the second century A.D. that each movement in wrestling was systematically taught. The numerous vases where we see pairs of jumpers on either side of a trainer practising with halteres suggest a similar method of practice for jumping. Moreover the feet of the Greek being uncramped by shoes and stockings had probably far greater elasticity. But making allowance for all these facts, we cannot explain the discrepancy between the modern record of 24 ft. 11½ ins. and Phayllus' performance. Even with a spring board and a raised platform such a jump would be impossible, and there is no evidence for any such aids.

We have seen the objections to the theory of a triple jump. The only alternative is to suppose some mistake in the Greek record. It has been the fashion to state that this record is attested by considerable weight of evidence. I propose to examine this evidence, taking first the evidence of classical authors, secondly that of lexicographers and scholiasts.

Herodotus vii. 48 tells us that the people of Croton were the only Greeks beyond the sea who sent help to the Greeks at Salamis. They sent a single ship commanded by Phayllus. Plutarch tells us that Phayllus fitted out the ship at his own expense and that Alexander in recognition of his spirit and courage sent a portion of his Asiatic spoils to the Crotoniates. Pausanias saw his statue at Delphi. He adds that Phayllus won no victory at Olympia but was victorious once in the stadium race and twice in the pentathlon at Delphi. Aristophanes twice alludes to one Phayllus as a noted runner (Ach. 213, Vesp. 1203) and as Dicaeopolis in the Acharnians is alluding to the days of his youth, the Persian wars, it seems certain that he

---

28 Quintus Smyrnaeus, IV. 440.
29 ιματιν to τὸ μέτρον τοῦ πυκνόματος
30 Aesch. Tyrannophilo, p. 40, 89.
31 Granfield and Hunt, Caryophyllos Papyri;
is referring to Phayllus of Croton, though the identification of the Phayllus in the *Waggs* is not so certain. This is all we know of Phayllus at first hand. He was evidently a popular hero, popular partly for his patriotism, partly for his athletics, one of those men about whose exploits all sorts of stories arise. He was noted more as a runner than as a pentathlete, or at least as much. We hear nothing of his jump, or of the epigram, an omission which is certainly remarkable in the case of Pausanias. It seems unlikely that Pausanias could have failed to notice the epigram had it been inscribed on the statue at Delphi.

We come now to the evidence of scholiasts and lexicographers. I have collected most of this evidence in connection with the *σκάμμα*. I tried to show that all the passages quoted might be derived from the epigram on Phayllus and from some commentator's explanation of the proverb *ὑπὲρ τὰ ἑσκαμμένα*, the earliest explanation known to us being that of Zenobius. With regard to Phayllus these writers tell us no more than we could have learnt from the epigram. Zenobius tells us that he ἔβαλε ρέμαστα δακτυλιοῦ καὶ ἀλεθέα, and jumped *ὑπὲρ τοὺς πεντήκοντα πόδας εἰς τὸ στέρνον*. Codd. B.V. add the words ἔτέρων εἴ and quote the first line of the epigram. One passage in Suidas pointing the moral of excess tells us that he broke his leg; an accident which cannot surprise us. The rhetorical scholiast to Plato tells us that the epigram was composed by his fellow-competitors, and Suidas tells us that it was the inscription τῆς εξοικον αὐτοῦ. These are precisely the details which would naturally be added to the epigram, and we cannot attach any importance to them, especially when we remember that Phayllus lived a century before Plato, we do not know how many centuries before the scholiast, and fifteen centuries before Eustathius and Suidas. The only detail of importance in which these writers differ is the nationality of Phayllus. Zenobius and Suidas in the passage borrowed from Zenobius describe him as ὁ Ποντίος, Eustathius, Apostolius, and Suidas in another passage as Κροτανίτης. Others describe him simply as πένταθλος. Now this is precisely the point on which the epigram is silent, a silence which is very unusual in athletic epigrams, and the fact of the doubt as to the nationality of the hero is an additional proof that the sole authority of all these writers was the epigram.

There are still two passages left to which I have not referred, or rather one, for they are identical. The scholiast to Aristophanes *Aithra*, 213 says:

ο Φάιλλος δρομοῦς ἀριστος (Ολυμπιονίκης, ὀπλιτοδρόμος περιπόμοσ, ὡν ἐκάλεν ὄδομεν ὥν ἐν καὶ πένταθλος) ἐφ' αὐ καὶ ἐπιγράμματο τοιοῦτον πεντ'. ἐπὶ πεντήκοντα κ.τ.λ.

(τεύντον ὡς καὶ ἐτερος ἀθλητῆς, ὡγοῖον ὀλυμπιάδα μυκῆα καὶ τρίτος λωτοθύτης.)

The words in brackets do not occur in the Ravena MS. The same passage is quoted by Suidas s.v. Φάιλλος with the addition of the lines from Aristophanes. If we are to identify the Phayllus of the epigram with Phayllus of Croton, as our other authorities do, this passage is manifestly
wrong. For Herodotus implies and Pausanias expressly states that Phayllus of Croton was not an Olympic victor. Apart from this we learn nothing new except that there was more than one athlete named Phayllus; for the epigram is common to all our authorities, and Aristophanes tells us that he was a runner.

The result of our investigation is that all we learn from scholiasts and lexicographers about Phayllus and his jump, and therefore about the fifty foot στάδιον, rests solely on the authority of an epigram of which we first hear in the time of Zenobius, some six centuries after the event. What is the authority of the epigram? I believe it is absolutely worthless, and such as no historian would think of recognising. The silence of Herodotus and Pausanias, the style of the epigram itself, so different from that of actual inscriptions, make it improbable that it was written till centuries after the incident recorded. Certainly it is not a contemporary commemorative epigram. For in such an epigram the winner's father, and city, and the name of the meeting would have been mentioned. Now no records are so liable to exaggeration as athletic records, especially when based not on written evidence but on report and tradition. For example we often hear it said of some old skater of the last generation that he could cut his name on the ice. Every figure skater knows the impossibility of the feat: even in the present state of skating, much more so fifty years ago when only the simplest turns were known; and yet the myth survives. Sporting records and sporting stories are notorious all over the world and especially when connected with the names of famous men. Phayllus was just such a popular hero, whose exploits the hero-worship of later ages would love to exaggerate. Equally marvellous tales are told of Milo, Ladas, and other famous athletes, not to mention the feats of Heracles and such heroes. Moreover in this case the tradition is put into an epigram. Now if we always regard the sporting story with suspicion, what shall we say of the sporting epigram? The pages of the Anthology bear abundant evidence to the imaginative power of the later epigrammatist. When we come to examine this particular epigram our scepticism is confirmed. It is artificial from beginning to end. Mark the alliteration, the constant repetition of the number five, the symmetrical contrast between 50 feet + 5 and 100 feet - 5! The artificiality in itself is no proof of a late date. Had such a jump ever been made, Simonides who enjoyed using tricks of metre in a humorous way might well have written such an epigram. But the artificiality is an argument against such a record ever having been made. For it is most unlikely that actual records should assume so symmetrical a form. A point which I have never seem noticed is that for any competitor to outjump all his rivals by more than five feet is quite as marvellous as for him to jump fifty feet. Moreover whatever was the usual length of the akamma, we may feel sure that it allowed a liberal margin even for the best jumpers just as the garden in the present day is several feet longer than any possible jump. For a jumper who landed on the edge would certainly injure himself seriously. As the scholiast to Plato says, it marked το τῆς ἀγωνίας ἁκρότατον. Therefore
Phayllus must have outjumped his fellows by much more than five feet. The epigrammatists do not often venture on giving numbers, but the exaggeration of this epigram is no greater than that of many another epigram in the Anthology. Milo we are told picked up a four year old heifer at Olympia, and after carrying it about killed it and ate the whole of it. No one has yet elaborated a theory to account for this extraordinary gastronomic feat, and yet it rests upon as good evidence as Phayllus' jump. The proverbial use of the number five would sufficiently explain why a poet wishing to describe a prodigious jump should select such a number as fifty-five. Such obvious exaggeration though impossible to the poet of an athletic age like the fifth century would be in perfect accord with the persiflage of the later epigrammatist in an age when serious athletics were left to professionals, and the public interest in them was purely spectacular.

Besides the epigram on Phayllus one more piece of evidence must be noticed. In Sextus Julius Africanus we read

'Ολ. κθ'. Χίνος λάκνας στάδιον ὁδὸν τὸ ἀλμα κβ’ ποδιῶν.

Little credit can be placed in these early Olympic records; but apart from this it is probable that the reading is wrong, and that we should read κβ’ instead of κβ’γ. For the Armenian Latin text reads 'duos et viginti cubitus,' which gives quite a reasonable record, especially when we are told that 'cubitus' is often used in Armenian writings for 'pes.'

A rhetorical epigram and a doubtful reading in Africanus are then our only authorities for the statement that Phayllus jumped fifty-five feet, and that fifty feet was a common performance. I have tried to show that the various attempts to explain such a jump are unsupported by any evidence. I have tried to show the untrustworthiness of the epigram. Surely it is simpler to reject its evidence than to build up artificial theories on so unstable a foundation.

E. Norman Gardiner.
SOME GREEK PORTRAITS.

[Plates II.—IV.]

I.—Aeschylus (Pl. II.).

Since the Capitoline Aeschylus was discredited as a portrait of the tragedian there has been a curious blank in our knowledge of Greek iconography; yet his portraits in antiquity were famous and it seems certain that they must, like those of Sophocles and Euripides, have been widely reproduced. Those known to us from literary evidence are that in the Στοῖς Ποικίλης, where he appeared as one of the warriors of Marathon, that erected by Lycurgos in 340, and (probably) another of earlier date, inferred from the words of Diogenes Laertius that the Athenians Αστυδάματα πρότερον τῶν περὶ Αἰσχύλου στῆματα εἰκόνι χαλκῆι; now Astydamas, nephew of Aeschylus, won the prize in Ol. 95, 2, and Bernoulli suggests that if a statue were erected at that date to one of his followers, one of the great tragedian was probably in existence, i.e., one erected before the end of the fifth century. That set up by Lycurgos was, however, by far the most famous, and of its style we get clear evidence from the Sophocles of the Lateran.

A problem has recently come to the front with regard to the Lycurgean Aeschylus. It has long been a puzzle to archaeologists that Pausanias, in describing the statues of the three dramatists in the theatre, should have mentioned that of Aeschylus apart from the other two, adding, τὴν ὅ ἐκείνην τὴν Δικαίου πολύτο τῷ ὑπερτέρᾳ τῆς τελευταίης δοκοῦ ποιηθέντι, καὶ τῆς γραφῆς ἢ τῷ ἐργῷ ἔχει το Μαραθῶν. Since this paper was first written light has been thrown on the subject by Herr von Prott, who has published the base of a statue from the Theatre at Athens inscribed [ΑΙΣ]ΥΛΟΣ, in letters of Roman date. The inference is that, when Pausanias wrote, the original statue had been destroyed or carried off, and was replaced by another which struck him as later in style, and which he therefore did not couple with the Lycurgean Sophocles and Euripides. Any attempt then to identify portraits of Aeschylus derived from this statue will have to reckon with the question
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of their being copies of the original or of the later statue which filled its place.

Studniczka suggests that in the 'grandiose poet-statue' of the Vatican, holding a scroll and mask, we have a copy of the Lycurgan Aeschylus, in favour of which view there is much to be said. The right arm is a restoration, its action meaningless as the torso is undraped, so that the similarity of the pose to that of the Lateran Sophocles counts for nothing; but in the case of the legs the position is almost identical, save that here the left leg is advanced. Again, the drapery from the thigh to the knee is much alike in both, though the folds here converge and are gathered up under the left arm, hanging in a straight mass away from the free leg and down from the arm; herein the scheme of course differs, but where similarity is possible we get it, in the details mentioned above, in the deeply incised folds, even in the sinuses that run from hip to hip. The Euripidean head does not belong to, and is too small for, the statue, but if this be a copy from the Lycurgus group the choice lies between Euripides and Aeschylus, and all things point to the latter—the extraordinarily broad shoulders, the nudity of the upper part of the body, pointing to the warrior of Marathon, the tragic mask. The last is perhaps the strongest argument, for we know from the Vita Anonyma, Pausanias, and Pollux how deeply the poet’s development of stage properties affected the course of the drama as well as his startled audiences. There was moreover a tradition that Aeschylus was the inventor of masks, and this may well have been emphasised in an honorary statue as a means of distinguishing the poet from the rest set up in the theatre with him.

Even though this identification be accepted, it gives us no clue to the poet’s features, and of the two heads hitherto proposed as portraits one is now universally discredited, the other has never been accepted.

There exists, scattered over various museums of Europe, a series of heads published together by Arndt-Bruckmann (Gesch. u. Röm. Portraits, 401–10) as portraits of an unidentified person, known to be a poet from the fillet appearing in the Naples head, traces of which are found in three more. Their astonishing general likeness to the Lateran Sophocles is commented on by Furtwängler, by Arndt, and by Bernoulli, while the Naples example (Fig. 1) is even described (incorrectly, as Bernoulli points out) in the Museum as a Sophocles. It is noteworthy that the Florentine replica (Pl. II.), incomparably the best, was found with three other bronze poet heads, including a fine Sophocles, in the sea off Livorno, and probably formed part of the decoration of some Roman villa in the neighbourhood. All archaeologists consider the series of heads under discussion to represent a poet of the fifth century whose statue was erected in the fourth, Arndt so
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far defining the date as to say 'the second quarter of the fourth century.' Their character must now be considered in detail, and here the first important point is the startling variation in excellence. The bronze replica is very fine, with much of the character of marble treatment in hair and modelling, as a comparison with the Naples bust shows; the latter is of very careful and elegant workmanship, but the remaining three are bad, two

![Fig. 1.—Aeschylus: Bust at Naples](image)

utterably so. With all this variation in style, the five replicas correspond almost line for line, almost the only difference being the introduction of hairy eyebrows in the worst replicas, so that there is little need to consider, as one usually must, what elements belong to the original and what to the copyist. The following description therefore applies to all the replicas; a special feature of the Naples herm will be noted later.
The head is long in proportion to its breadth, the upper part predominating; the skull is not highly developed behind, nor is the breadth across the temples remarkable, though the depth from crown to brow is very great. The hair lies in short thick locks over the head, with no trace of thinness, and its growth over the forehead is peculiar, with a marked trend to the left, the front locks running almost parallel with the forehead, leaving the whole length of the temples bare. In the best copies the brow is traversed by two furrows, toward which smaller lines run up from the root of the nose. The eyebrows are very straight save at the outer corners, where the sharp angle formed by the juncture of the plane of the temple with the forehead causes a similar angle in them. The eyes are decidedly small, with prominent lids, the upper projecting in fourth century fashion beyond the lower, while the opening is narrow, the inner line of the upper lid being given in all the replicas. The nose is very straight, with no depression at the roots, by no means ideal in shape, with deep lines running down from the nostrils. On the thin cheeks the whiskers grow almost in a straight line from close by the ear to the end of the moustache, and on the inner side down to the neck; the moustache parts over the middle of the upper lip in a fashion closely resembling that of Sophocles, but mingles with the beard instead of drooping in locks from the corners of the mouth, which is somewhat small, the upper lip projecting, and the lower having but little depression between it and the chin. Along the lower lip grows a thin straight line of hair, immediately below which the beard proper appears, made up of short clustering locks like those of the hair and whiskers. It is a curious point that on the upper part of the chin, where these locks begin, they show the same trend to the left as appears in the hair on the forehead, so that the two here run almost parallel, while elsewhere on the chin, as in the hair above the brow, the growth is in the usual downward direction. All the copies give this peculiarity, but their faithfulness is perhaps most apparent in the rendering of the ears, usually a merely stylistic matter, but in this series reproduced with almost exact uniformity. In two of the copies the head is not broken off from the neck, and in each case is bent forward, though the inclination is more marked in the bronze.

In attempting an attribution there is certain definite evidence to go upon: the bearded head crowned by a fillet can only belong to a poet, and the many strongly individual points prevent the assigning it to a merely ideal subject of an earlier period than the middle of the fifth century, when portraits in the strict sense began to be made. The fillet gives the other limit of date as the fourth century to which the style points, so that the date of the person represented lies between the Periclean period and the rise of Macedon. Clearly, moreover, we have here copies of a famous original, famous enough to be copied in Greek times, as the Florentine bronze shows.

On stylistic evidence the original must have been set up in the fourth century—the second quarter, according to some authorities—while it admittedly has a close resemblance to the Lateran, or Lycurgoan, Sophocles, and, though there is nothing to warrant their identification as portraits of the
same man, the identity of spirit and hand is undeniable. It is therefore perhaps not too presumptuous to suppose them taken from a statue of the Lycurgoes group, and if so, from the Aeschylus. Strongly in favour of this identification; as the unique character of the Capitoline head was against it, is the number and accuracy of the replicas, which is such as to suggest their being taken from the same statue, and this is more than possible, had the original, as suggested by Herr v. Prott, been carried off to Rome and there copied by men who, if their skill was in certain cases beneath contempt, at least had the merit of faithfulness to their model. On the other hand it is possible, though distinctly less probable, that they merely reproduced other copies in existence in Rome.

One superficial difficulty there is in assigning the Braccio Nuovo statue and these heads to the same original: the statue has no drapery over the left shoulder, whereas in the Naples herm we find it. Arnolt, however, comments on the peculiar form of the herm, and even suggests that the artist of this, the finest of our marble replicas, may, in his striving after elegance and fineness, have introduced features not belonging to the original. That this is so in the case of the drapery is highly probable; a bare herm of this form would be ugly and ungraceful, and the introduction of the highly conventional drapery would be a convenient way of meeting the difficulty; indeed the poverty of the folds is such as to suggest a merely decorative treatment contrasting with the exceeding care bestowed on face and hair. Further, there is no trace of it in the bronze head, nor yet in the others, the beards of which would, as in the Naples herm, have shown some contact marks; and marks there are none. We may therefore assume that, like the statue which is probably a copy of the same figure, the original had no drapery over the left shoulder.

In the absence of any direct allusion to the poet’s personal appearance we are thrown back on subjective impressions. These are more usual than usual as we have the Lateran Sophocles for comparison, in which impressions drawn from the poet’s work are satisfied just because the sculptor’s aim was highly subjective—the creation of an ideal portrait of the ideal poet to preside over the theatre of ideal tragedy, with the individual present indeed, but in a much modified and elevated form.

The original of this portrait was not an amiable or easy-going man; the knit brow, the eager eyes, the irascible mouth, the general unrest, proclaim it: the ideal calm of the Sophocles has no place here. Nor is the sum total of our impressions that of a man of letters, rather of a man of action with a fiery soul—aphi is one of the characteristics of Aeschylus in the Frougs—and mighty brain, noble indeed, but ever fretting against things as they are. The contrast appears even in the pose of the head. Sophocles gazes gently upwards, with slightly parted lips; this poet gazes downwards, with bent head and compressed lips, as in the line in the Frougs.

\[\text{εξελεψε σ' οδο ταυρηδον ψυχην κατω.}\]

---

Of the impressions of the man drawn by the next generation from his plays we have a vivid picture in the *Frogs*, and they are similar in kind to ours. The story that he wrote while drunk,¹⁷ thus accounting for the frenzied energy of his plays, was current in his lifetime (as we see from Sophocles' comment,¹⁸ *καὶ γὰρ τὸ δείωντα ποιεῖ, φησίν, ἄλλ' οὐκ εἰδώς γε*) and is merely an expression of the same feeling in popular terms. That the *Agyx* of his early life did not forsake him we see from his epitaph on himself, which speaks not of his tragedies, but only of his slaying the long-haired Medes at Marathon.²⁰

Inferences drawn from his plays would lead us to expect a head of this character, and, as we have seen, the sculptor of the Lycurgos group, approaching his task in this spirit, produced a Sophocles adequate to the conception formed by the student of his plays. Even so is this head adequate, and for the same reason, that the artist's standpoint was largely subjective, and his statue a portrait not of the man only but of the writer of the *Oresteia* as one would imagine him. In one particular the sculptor has seen deeper than the brilliant critic of the *Frogs*: this face suggests the intensity of feeling pervading his plays, of which no hint is given by Aristophanes.

In conclusion then, the evidence may be thus summed up: we have numerous replicas of a famous fourth century original representing a tragic poet, so much akin to the Lateran Sophocles in character and handling as to have led to the inclusion of the best copies among portraits of that poet.

Incorrect as this attribution is, there is much in the close relationship of the two that can only be accounted for by supposing the original to have belonged to the same group, and therefore, of necessity, to represent Aeschylus.

The question remains: are these heads copied from the statue erected by Lycurgos or from that which took its place and was seen by Pausanias? All the evidence is in favour of the former. The bronze head is certainly pre-Roman, and the spirit of the portrait is impossible in a work of late date—the greatness of conception, the simplicity of treatment in cheeks and forehead, the large and lofty character. Further, the minute accuracy of even the poorest replica shows that all were taken from the same original, not, in all probability, copies of a copy, and the date of the bronze makes it almost certain that the prototype was the statue of 840.

We may therefore fairly hope that this inexplicable blank in our series of Greek portraits is now filled, and that we know Aeschylus in person as in reputation, the one not unworthy of the other.

II.—Agathon (Pl. III.).

The literary evidence for the character and appearance of the poet Agathon is unusually full, and is mainly drawn from the works of men

¹⁸ Pint. Frogs, xxii. 2.
²⁰ Anth. Pol. ii. 17.
intimately acquainted with him, a fact which gives it a value far beyond that of most other personalia. It is remarkable also that the tone of these references is so uniformly kindly. Considering that one of the most important witnesses is Aristophanes this may seem a strong expression, but his position must not be judged from the *Themophoriazusa*, where the abuse is purely comic, with no trace of personal feeling, but from the reference in the *Frogs*. Dionysos, complaining that all the good poets are gone, is asked, "But where is Agathon?" and replies

\[ \text{ἀπολείπτων μεν ἁποίχεται,} \\
\text{ἀγαθὸς ποιήτης, καὶ ποθεῖνος τοῖς φίλοις.} \]

We may even suggest that the words put into Agathon's mouth as a defence of Phrynichos are applicable to himself

\[ \text{αὐτὸς τε καλὸς ἢν καὶ καλὸς ἡμπίσχετο} \\
\text{διὰ τούτῳ ἀρ αὐτοί καὶ τὰ δράματα ἢν καλαί} \\
\text{δομοὶ γὰρ ποιεῖν ἄνεγκε τῇ φύσει.} \]

Both these passages tend to prove that Aristophanes' feelings towards the poet himself did not greatly differ from those of the rest of his age, though against his innovations in music and drama he felt bound to protest. This view is confirmed by the entire absence of such praise in Aristophanes' attacks on the other innovator Euripides, who receives no such tribute when dead, but even in Hades is represented as the corrupter of souls.

In Plato we have an interesting juxtaposition. Aristophanes appears as a privileged guest, at the *Symposium* held in honour of Agathon's first tragic victory, at which both poets make long and characteristic speeches. But the earliest Platonian portrait of Agathon is that in the *Protagoras*, where he is referred to as 'the fair and modest youth whose name, I think, is Agathon,' and the later portrait in the *Symposium* is worthy of this gracious beauty. Plato also addressed an epigram to him full of ardent passion, and Aelian speaks of Euripides' love for him, a proof that antiquity in general, as well as his contemporary in the *Themophoriazusa*, recognised the close kinship, mental as well as literary, between them. The long speech on the genesis of love uttered by Agathon in the *Symposium*, smooth and flowing, flowery and antithetical—the very qualities ascribed to his style by antiquity—is eminently characteristic, to judge from the fragments that have come down to us, of which the following is a fair specimen, in thought and expression strongly coloured by Euripides.

\[ \text{εἰ μὲν φράσω τάληθες, οὐχὶ σε εὐφρανό.} \\
\text{εἰ δ' εὐφρανό, τί σε οὐχὶ τάληθες φράσω.} \]

---

21 *Rhet. 84.*  
22 *Them. 105.*  
23 *Rhet. 758 extg.*  
24 *Pyg. 174 B.*  
25 *Prot. 315 B.*  
26 *op. Dig. Laert. iii. 22.*  
27 *Ael. V. H. xiii. 4.*  
28 *Sympos. 1944.*  
29 *Athen. 1820; f. V. H. xiv. 19.*  
30 *Athen. 211 E.*
Admiration of his dramas indeed, as of his character and person, is the keynote of the opening of the Symposium. Lucian again charges him with nothing worse than effeminacy in gait, attitude, voice, and glance, and takes away from the force of the charge by adding, after giving a list of fops, ἡ αὐτῶν Ἀγάθονα τῶν τῆς προφορίας ἐπίραστων ποιητήν. Of his good natured banter over his own effeminacy we hear in Plutarch, by whom the tradition of his exceeding beauty is thrice recorded. But these are little more than generalities, and we must turn to Aristophanes for a more exact portrait.

In Theaet. 191 ff. we find Euripides contrasting himself with Agathon in the following words,

πολίος εἰμι καὶ πώγων ἔχω,
σὺ δ᾽ εὐπρόσωπων, λευκός, ἐξερευμένος,
γυμνακόφωνος, ἀπαλός, εὐπρεπὴς ἰδέαν.

Again in l. 218, asking him for a razor to shave Mnesilochos,

Ἄγαθων, σὺ μέντοι ξυροφορεῖς ἐκάστοτε,
χρήσον τι νῦν ἢμέν ξυρόν.

This question of shaving is of no small importance in the attempt to identify a portrait of Agathon, as it has hitherto been assumed, on the strength of the above passages and of two in Athenaeus, that he was close-shaven, and the sweeping assertion is made (e.g. by the writers in Smith’s Dictionary of Antiquities, in the new Darenberg and Saglio, art. Barba, Cuma, and in Becker’s Choricles) that fops habitually shaved in the late fifth century. Both passages in Athenaeus refer to personages of the later fourth century, and immediately before the second come the words, λέγει δὲ αὐτῶς ὁ φιλόσοφος (i.e. Chrysippus), τὸ ξυρεῖται τῶν πώγων κατ’ Ἀλέξανδρον προῆκται, τῶν προτέρων οὐ χρωμένων αὐτῷ, which sufficiently disposes of the assertion that these passages support the theory of clean-shaving in pre-Macedonian times. We are therefore reduced to the two quotations from Aristophanes, which occur within a few lines of each other, in reference to the same person, in a particularly libellous comedy. Further, the speaker is Euripides, whose hairiness is most unusual: his slaggish beard and whiskers almost conceal the lower part of his face, and, like his hair, are worn longer than the fashion of the day warranted, as a comparison with any contemporary portrait will at once make clear. This would make the antithesis between him and a fashionable close-clipped dandy obvious without supposing that Agathon was actually clean-shaven. Moreover, if he wore his hair shorter than usual, it would be quite legitimate for comedy to represent him as beardless, which would be sufficiently near the truth to be a genuine caricature, especially in contrast with Euripides, whose hairiness would be equally exaggerated. No one has, from the Aristophanic portrait,
drawn the conclusion that Agathon habitually went about in woman’s dress, and the question of clean-shaving is on a precisely similar footing. Moreover, no monumental evidence gives the slightest confirmation to the theory that clean shaving was practised in the fifth century; rather it proves the entire truth of Chrysippos’ assertion quoted above, that the practice was unknown before the days of Alexander. As a young man Agathon wore a beard, and as an elderly top would very likely continue to do so, in imitation of ‘the time when youth is fairest.’

We may then fairly conclude that Agathon, noted for extreme beauty and gentleness, wore a slight beard like that which earned for him Euripides’ famous compliment. No portrait of the poet has hitherto been identified, for that in the Capitol bearing the Latin inscription Agathos has long been discredited—‘Ein in romischer Zeit lebender Agathon,’ as Bernoulli calls it—but the occurrence of one among our fifth and fourth century heads is more than a possibility. Statues were erected to much less distinguished dramatists, e.g. Astydamas, nephew of Aeschylus, and it is highly probable that Agathon would be similarly honoured. No identification, however, has since been made, and the following attempt is based upon the supposition that Agathon was bearded, a view not hitherto suggested, and certainly not held by the earlier believers in the ‘Agathos’ of the Capitol.

In the museum at Bonn there is a double herm representing two poets, Euripides and another, usually called Sophocles, but most certainly a different person (Pl. iii).

The shape of head, eyes, mouth, differs completely from both Lateran and Farnese types, and even more different is the expression, with the almost appealing gaze of the eyes and gentle mouth, from the calm self-satisfaction of the Sophoclean type. The head is remarkably long, and the distance from the crown to the eyes great; the hair, surrounded by the poetic fillet, is thin and lies in long locks close to the head, fuller above the ears and falling on to the neck behind them in a heavy curl. The forehead is high and bare, with a slight depression almost in the middle, but with no bar above the eyes. The eyebrows are singular, slanting towards the nose for about half their length and curving rapidly up at the outer corners, leaving marked bony ridges above the eyes, larger on the right side than the left. The eyes themselves are deep-set, far apart, long and narrow, with a very gentle expression, and the same slight asymmetry as in the brows. The cheeks are smooth and rounded, curiously bare of hair, the line of whisker in front of the ear being of the slightest, and the beard not beginning till below the level of the mouth. The nose is a restoration, but

---

enough remains to prove that it was straight, continuing the line of the forehead; the distance between it and the mouth is rather unusual. The latter is very small, with a thin upper lip bowed at the outer corners, and a lower lip, somewhat thicker and with little bend in the middle, but curving up at the ends. The expression is kindly but somewhat weak, even under the carefully trimmed moustache, which mingles on either side with the scanty beard; the latter leaves the lower lip free of hair and is cut close to the skin till it reaches the spring of the chin, when it falls in thick locks growing to the neck.

The most noticeable point about the face is its softness; the skin is absolutely smooth, and the treatment of the hair suggests fineness, silkiness almost, while the refined gentleness of mouth and eyes has already dwelt upon. In all these points it differs from the Sophocles type, but those even who admit this have suggested no attribution to take its place.

The data for the head are as follows: it represents a poet, from the fillet in the hair; it is neither Aeschylus, Sophocles, nor Euripides, yet of sufficient likeness to the latter in character or production for it to be placed with him on a double herm; the date of the original was the end of the fifth century or the beginning of the fourth. All this suits the identification as Agathon, whose affectionate relations with Euripides were recognised by all antiquity, as do the beauty, amiability, almost womanish gentleness, and comparative absence of hair on the face, the points insisted on in the literary references. In the carefully trimmed hair and beard there is an element of foppishness, and the cut of the latter certainly suggests that it is meant to imitate the growth in early youth, when, according to Homer, youth is fairest.

πρώτευν ὑπηρρύφη, τοῦτερ χαριστάτη ἔβη.

The copy is a singularly poor one, how poor a comparison of the Euripides with such a portrait as the Naples or Mantua herm will show; yet even here Agathon's beauty is apparent, and the head is so far satisfactory in that it shows us the kindliness of the man, confirming and explaining the love antiquity bore him, when even his caricaturist and bitter literary opponent could write at his death,

ἀγαθὸς ποιητής, καὶ πολεμός τοῖς φίλοις.

III.—Aeschines.

In spite of the numerous replicas known to us, portraits of Aeschines are among the most unsatisfactory we possess: a series of lifeless and mechanical reproductions chiefly, by the irony of fate, in superb preservation. The best examples are the inscribed herms in the British Museum.\(^6\)

\(^6\) H. xxiv. 348.
\(^a\) Bern, Gr. Icon. ii. p. 60.
\(^6\) Am. Marbles of Brit. Mus. xi. 13, full face only.
and Vatican, derived from different originals, but almost equally soulless, complacent, and uninteresting. The statue in Naples, found in the villa of the Pisos, is inferior to these, because in it the characteristic features which they at least preserve are softened into an empty smoothness which for sheer weakness it would be hard to parallel. The herm in the Capitol, though in a ruined state, has far more character.

The British Museum herm, brought from Greece early last century, and presented to the Museum by Col. Leake, is reproduced here (Fig. 2) in profile for the first time, not for its intrinsic merit but as actually the best example known. The type is an unmistakable one, and the portrait so familiar that it is needless to do more than recapitulate its main features: the high bald forehead with scanty locks struggling to the middle, the straight brows with converging wrinkles above the nose, the upward glance of the eye, the broad nose with deep lines running down from the nostrils, the projecting lower lip, the breadth of cheek and jaw, and the curiously recumbent ear. All the known replicas represent him as a man entering on middle life, with a vacant self-satisfied face and an absence of the lines of thought, usually contrasted with the worn and wrinkled face of Demosthenes, greatly to the advantage of the latter. I hope to show, however, that another portrait exists, hitherto strangely overlooked, which represents him not as the complacent bourgeois but in face as in writings as the not unworthy opponent of Demosthenes.

Among the marbles found in the villa of the Pisos is a herm (Fig. 3) in a marvellous state of preservation representing a bearded man with wrinkled

---

*Born, t. c. and Pl. IX.*  
*Arndt, Br. Gr. u. f. Führer, Portraits, 118-8.*  
*Iv. 118-20.*
forehead; knit brows, and concentrated upward glance, the "Supposto
Zenone" of Comparetti and Petra. The locks of hair are short and dis-
arranged, growing low on the neck and treated with a care and fulness that
point, like the hard outlines of brow and lips, to a bronze original; the fore-
head is high and bare, with a few scanty locks straggling to a point in the
middle; the straight brows on which the hair is marked are knit so that the

Fig. 3.—Aeschines: Bust at Naples.

wrinkles at their roots run up triangularly above the nose to the lowest of
the four furrows on the forehead; the eyes have arched upper lids and
crow's feet at the outer corners; the nose is broad and strong, with deep
lines running from the nostrils to the outer corners of the mouth, whose
upper lip is arched, the lower straight, full and projecting. The whiskers

* Villa Ercolano, p. 276, no. 72.
grow low on the face, in short locks, like the close-cut beard, which appears beneath a straight fringe of hair on the lower lip, a peculiarity nowhere so clearly marked as here, though indicated on every example, again pointing to a bronze original for our herm. The jaw is very broad; and the ear in a line with it, a feature conspicuous in every case save the characterless Naples statue. In short, we have here a portrait of Aeschines, but one far superior in artistic merit to any hitherto identified, and differing from all others in representing the orator later in life, when care and thought had left their mark on him; as he died at an advanced age, it is only natural that such a portrait should exist, and indeed the almost youthful appearance of the rest is a curious and unexplained point. Whether or not this herm has any relation to the statue described by Christodoros, it is, of course, impossible to say, but it at least suits the orator as he appears and the character of the man as shown in his writings and those of his contemporaries. Indeed,

\[\text{καιρής δὲ συνείρειν κόκλα παρεύον, οὔ πολυτροχολοίσιν ἄθλενων ἡγομένων, στεινατο γὰρ πυκνήσα μελημόνιν}\]

reads like a description of this very portrait, while it has little or no meaning in connection with other examples, from whose expressionless smoothness ἄθλενων and μελημόνιν seem equally remote.

IV.—Demetrios Phalerus (Pl. IV.).

The son of a freed slave of the household of Konon, by sheer force of genius Demetrios rose to be the foremost man in Athens, whose rule of ten years (317-307) οὐ μόνον οὐκ ἐπερχότας τὴν δημοκρατίαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐγγυώθησε. He entered on public life in 325, before the age of twenty, and was supreme in Athens until 307, when he was forced to fly before the approach of Demetrios Poliorcetes and betake himself to Thebes, and thence to Alexandria. There he lived on the best of terms with Ptolemy, son of Lagos, who is said to have entrusted him with the revision of the laws of the kingdom, and seems to have set him over the Library. The latter story is improbable, but his devotion to literature during his exile may certainly have influenced the king in its foundation. During his rule in Athens also he had given proof of his interest in literature by causing the Homeric poems to be recited in the theatre by rhapsodists called Homerists, because tragedy produced with its old splendour was no longer possible in the impoverished city.

Of his personal appearance we hear a good deal. He disputed with
Alcibiades the palm of beauty among all the Greeks; he was called Ἀριστοβλέφαρος and Λαμπετώ; σφόδρα ἦν εὔπρεπής; but his vanity caused him to indulge in the use of dye and unguents to add to his radiant appearance, τὴν τε τρίχα τὴν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλής ξανθισομένος, καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον ἐπιλειφόμενος; finally, in the Dionysiac procession a chorus chanted the poems of Seiron of Soli, in which he was addressed as ἢλιομορφός. He was, however, accused of every kind of riotous living, and his flight from Athens was signalised by the destruction of all the honorary statues save that on the Akropolis, set up by order of Demetrios Poliorketes. Of these statues there are said to have been 300, many of them equestrian, or set up in bigas and quadrigas, such that "the utmost diligence could not complete them in more than 300 days." Other accounts give three hundred as the number; either version is probably much exaggerated.

As orator, statesman, and philosopher he would seem to have been equally distinguished. His speeches are highly praised by Cicero and Quintilian, but the latter calls his oratory too richly dressed and coloured for the dust of the lawcourts. The praise of his statesmanship rests on the condition of Athens under his rule, while his philosophy was so important as to be the first thing mentioned by Suidas after his name—περιπατητικός. He was a distinguished disciple of Theophrastus and the friend of Demarchos and Menander, the latter of whom was in serious danger from the friendship at the time of Demetrios' expulsion from Athens. That he took philosophic views of life in the modern sense is plain from the sayings attributed to him by Diogenes. His philosophical writings were numerous, including works on history, politics, rhetoric, public speaking, and embassies, so that Diogenes says of him, πλήθει δὲ βιβλίων καὶ ἄριστοι στίχοι σχεδόν ἀπαντὰς παρελθάκε τοὺς καὶ αὐτὸν περιπατητικοὺς.

He was then a man of great personal beauty, radiant to look on, with wonderful eyes, unless χαριστοβλέφαρος be a meaningless epithet, with golden hair and (almost certainly) a slight beard. There is reason to believe this, though it is nowhere expressly stated. Alike as philosopher, orator, and strategist he would wear one, and the words of Athenaeus about the hair ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς seem distinctly to imply a beard.

Famous as he was, and numerous as his portraits were in antiquity, we
should expect to find a portrait of him among those we possess, yet, curiously enough, none has as yet been even attributed to him.

Among the portraits attributed to Alcibiades is a gem (Fig. 4) figured in Faber and also in Visconti, representing the profile of a young man with slight beard running from ear to chin, eye deeply recessed, and powerful brows. The hair grows in thick lionine locks, the growth from the crown being clearly marked; the forehead is high, but much covered by the hair, which stands out beyond it in a mass. There is a very powerful bar above the eyes, but for which forehead and nose would be in a straight line. The mouth is small, the lips parted, the lower being far less prominent than the upper, with a deep indentation between it and the small round chin. The most striking thing about the head is its power; even in an engraving this can be traced, in the brows, eyes, and cheeks, where the modelling is of great force. The shape is peculiar, round on the top, straight behind, with the upper part immensely predominating, the distance between nose and chin being seven millimetres, as against eighteen from the crown to the bottom of the nose. The person represented is quite young, as Bemoulli says, and clearly belongs at earliest to the later fourth century, as the treatment of the hair, brow, and eyes sufficiently shows. The gem was called Alcibiades by Faber on the ground of an inscribed gem which has since disappeared, bearing the heads of Alcibiades and Socrates. It is, of course, possible that the latter was genuine, but it by no means follows that it represented the same man as our present one, as sixteenth century antiquaries were no great judges of style; but we can most emphatically say that, if this is Alcibiades, it is not a contemporary portrait, but a translation into late fourth century forms. It is, however, much more probable that this is not Alcibiades at all, but a much later personage, and it is certainly incompatible with the Heilig Alcibiades of the Vatican.

\[\text{Fig. 4.—Demetrius Phalereus.}
\]

\[\text{From Visconti, Gr. Gr. tab. 16. 3.}\]
gem too has disappeared, but M. Houssaye stated in 1873 that one of the Italian ministers sent him a wax reproduction, recently taken from the gem itself, so that there is no reason to doubt its existence at the present day.

In connection with this I would take a head (Pl. IV.) in the Uffizi, sometimes called Alcibiades from its likeness to the gem, which is unmistakable. It is a superb portrait, excellent in modelling and vigour alike, with massed Lysippic locks, heavy bar above the eyes, and extraordinary intensity of expression. Beautiful as the side face is, the full face is yet more so; it is that of a man in extreme youth, not much above twenty, and instantly suggests a number of problems. The first of these is the beard; the head dates certainly from Macedonian times, the person represented is a man of astonishing beauty, and yet he is bearded. The next is his extreme youth; portraits of distinguished men were, as a rule, set up in their old age, of young men not of royal blood not at all, save on funeral stele. Among our many hundred Greek portraits of the non-athletic class, it is doubtful if any can be pointed out before the second century of men so young, and after that date we only get boys and older men, so that this head is unique. The third problem is the relation between gem and marble: there can be no question of their representing the same person; the shape of the head, the hair projecting beyond the forehead, the treatment of brow, eyes, nose, and mouth, all make this point certain. The marble head has rather more hair than the gem, but it is the same first beard, soft and curly, and its growth is precisely the same. The proportions are similar, the distance from nose to chin being \( \frac{1}{4} \) of the whole in the gem, \( \frac{1}{4} \) in the head. In short, the two correspond almost exactly, and their identity is unquestionable.

The identification I propose does away with all difficulties: Demetrios, as we have seen, probably wore a beard as a philosopher, and as a Peripatetic it would be cut close to his face, after the example of Aristotle and Theophrastos. He entered on public life before he was twenty, being even more precocious than Alcibiades, and is the only other young statesman of whom we hear at all. The parted lips, the straining eyes suggest the orator; the correspondence with the gem a famous man. Moreover there are such differences between the two as to make it almost certain that they were not copied from each other. The beard has already been touched on, while there are decided differences in the hair; the locks do not exactly correspond, and there is a sort of parting from the crown towards the left ear, from which the locks fall on either side, which does not appear on the gem at all. Again, the hairs covers the tip of the ear in the gem, but leaves it free in the head.

The portrait exactly suits what we know of Demetrios, his wonderful beauty, his radiant eyes, his richly clustering hair; and it is no idle question in this case to ask: If it does not represent Demetrios, whom can it represent? What other of all the Greeks of the late fourth century was famous enough to be represented at this age? Who else would be bearded like philosopher

---

or statesman, and of such personal beauty? Unless we take it as Demetrios, the head presents a mass of contradictions, of irreconcilable elements; this identification explains and harmonises all, and agrees with the literary evidence in every particular.

Is it possible to name a school? Amelung speaks of it as "excellent portrait of the second Attic school"; Arnit says, "with Scopas' pathos but forms more Lysippic," a perfectly just judgment. Lysippus is now no longer judged from the Apoxyomenos, and recent evidence has shown more and more distinctly that recessed eyes, powerful brows, and tense expression are not the characteristics of Scopas exclusively, as indeed the description of Lysippus' portraits of Alexander might have taught us. A comparison of this head with the Lysippic Alexander of the British Museum is very instructive, and confirms the assignment of this head to the school of Lysippus.

It may even be possible to name a sculptor, not of course with any degree of certainty but as a suggestion at least not at variance with the evidence. Tissikrates, a son and pupil of Lysippus, whose work was so like the master's as to be scarcely distinguishable from it, made a portrait of Demetrios Poliorcetes, one of the works especially named as like those of Lysippus. Now we know that Demetrios Poliorcetes ordered the Athenians to erect a statue to Demetrios Phalerus on the Akropolis, the only one not destroyed at the time of his disgrace. It is extremely probable that Tissikrates would have other commissions from Demetrios Poliorcetes, and that this portrait of the Athenian statesman would be of the number.

The closest parallel, both in forms and expression, is to be found in the Munich replica of the Diomede of Kresilas (Furtwängler Masterpieces, p. 150), which has decidedly fourth century characteristics. The problem involved is too large to be entered upon here, and must be reserved for future discussion; but it may be remarked en passant that a work of Kresilas was to be seen at Hermione (Lowy 45) and it is to the Peloponnesian school of the later fourth century that the Demetrios must, as we have seen, be assigned.

In the absence of any certain monumental evidence the identification can only be tentative, but it at least corresponds with literary and internal evidence, and is even the only satisfactory explanation of the head before us, so that it may not be unreasonable to hope that we have now a worthy portrait of one of the most striking figures in the history of the fourth century, Demetrios Phalerus. If this is so, we may say of Tissikrates as was said of Kresilas "mirumque in hac arte est quod nobilissi viros nobilissori fecit."

Through the courtesy of Herr Fr. Bruckmann and Dr. Amelung the heads on Pls. II. and IV. are reproduced from Griez. u. röm. Portraits. I have to thank Dr. Loeeschke for the photograph of the Bohn Agathon on
Pl. III., Mr. A. S. Murray for allowing me to publish the British Museum Aeschines, and Mr. Arthur Sidgwick for many useful suggestions. To Professor Percy Gardner, at whose suggestion these studies in Greek Portraiture were undertaken, for constant and generous help as teacher, critic, and friend, I desire above all to express my gratitude.

Katharine A. McDowall.
ANDROMEDA.

[Plate V.]

I.

The romantic tale of the beautiful princess Andromeda, and how Perseus freed her from the dragon, has been treated by two of the great tragedians, Sophocles and Euripides. Here, if anywhere, Sophocles is thrown into the shade by his rival, so much so that the most important elements of Sophocles' version have been given to the drama of Euripides. Therefore if we wish to restore to Sophocles what justly belongs to him, we must first define as clearly as possible what belongs to Euripides. For although a great deal has been written about this brilliant achievement of Euripides, yet conclusions that seemed settled are constantly being called in question or denied, while questionable or erroneous views are once more put forward as correct. Only after the genuine remains of Euripides' play have been separated out can we hope to form any conception of the Andromeda of Sophocles, or to give any reasoned answer to the question which is the earlier, Euripides' play, which was performed with the Helen in 412 B.C., or Sophocles' play, the date of the first performance of which has not come down to us. The poetry of Euripides was Latinised by Ennius, but the fragments of the Latin tragedy do not give substantial help towards the reconstruction of the Greek one.

The Andromeda of Euripides lacked the narrative prologue with which the poet usually prefaced his plays for the sake of some special dramatic effect. Here it suited his purpose better to leave it out. The only person who could have spoken it was Andromeda herself, because she was on the stage from the beginning. In accordance with the idea of the drama, Andromeda, as the bride of death, had been led forth to the sea-shore.


Robert, loc. cit. p. 18, tries to prove, on very insufficient evidence, the existence of a prologue in the customary form, and, strangely enough, supposes it spoken by Echo.

The solution which refers to the beginning of Andromeda's lament, Fr. 114, as τίς ορφάλον τις Ἀδη, ὦ θεία, tells against and not in favour of Robert's theory, as Wecklein demonstrates, p. 87, ff. Engelmann's use of the British Museum Hydria, E 760, as evidence for a prologue of this kind, which S. Reinach (Bibl. Crit. 1900, p. 109) thought ingenious but Betha (Deutsche Literaturzeitung 1900, p. 2982) rejected, falls to the ground along with the accompanying interpretation of the vase.

H. 2
during the night, and just before daybreak, when the action of the piece begins, she was standing chained to the rock and ready for sacrifice. With no set narrative, but with heart-breaking lament, she begins to speak, calling on holy night, who delays her departure. It would be difficult to imagine what information a prologue could have given, that could not be better made clear as the action unfolds itself. The device (ridiculed by Aristophanes) of making Echo always repeat the last word of the lament not only is a startling stage effect, but in an admirable way brings home to the spectator the absolute loneliness of the victim abandoned to a cruel death (Fr. 114–116, Nauck 5). Then when the Chorus of Andromeda’s companions arrives on the scene Echo obeys the maiden’s behest and is silent. This is far from being unnatural, for the character of the lament alters, and instead of resounding in deserted space it is addressed to friends who are standing close by (Fr. 117–122). Now follows the dialogue with Perseus, who comes through the air, and this informs the spectator of everything he requires to know concerning the persons of the action, except what has already been communicated by Andromeda or the Chorus (Fr. 123–131; 135 spoken (1) by Perseus, (2) by Andromeda 6). To them enter Andromeda’s parents, who come to learn their daughter’s fate. Cassiopeia perhaps appearing as κακάς πρόσθεν, bowed with grief. 4 In any case the conversation here is chiefly between Cepheus and the stranger, who induces Cepheus to promise him his daughter as the prize of his help. 5 Apollodorus ii. 44, and Ovid, Metam. iv., 704, give this incident, though this does not prove its occurrence in Euripides. Fragment 143, spoken by Cepheus to Perseus, is the only one which can with certainty be assigned to this conversation, but the objections raised by Cepheus later on prove that he had given the promise. This scene, as we shall soon see, had a special attraction for the vase-painter.

With the well-known invocation of Eros, Fr. 136, Perseus then walks or flies away.

The successful issue of the fight is announced, probably not by Perseus himself, because the narrative would not seem natural in his mouth, either before or after the rescue of Andromeda, but by a messenger. From his report the grammarians and rhetors preserved what Frs. 145, 146 give, and perhaps also the obscure line 147, with 148 and 155, while the elder Philostratus used it as the source of his fictitious picture (i. 29). It is not likely that anyone except Andromeda heard the messenger’s tale, for when Perseus appears again to loose Andromeda’s chains, the Chorus only are present on the scene. It is not until everything seems to be turning out

---

5 Wecklein very rightly separated them, but gives the second verse to Cepheus.

6 In support of this view note that in Ennius (assuming that Eibbeck, p. 167, was right when he gave Fr. xvi of the Litra to Andromeda; Perseus addresses his question as to who she is not to the mother herself but to the daughter.

---

* Robert considers such a promise inconsistent with the later refusal by Cepheus, and he does not believe that Perseus spoke with Cepheus at all, previous to the death of the monster. This view is related by the vase-painters, the fragments, and the action of the piece.

* Several fragments of Ennius belonging to this part are preserved, v. Eibbeck, p. 168 f.
well that the lover's happiness is threatened by the re-entrance of Cepheus. It is a touch characteristic of Euripides that Cepheus, at once monarch and barbarian, having made a promise in the stress of difficulty, refuses to keep his word now that the difficulty is over, and will not give his daughter to the stranger without father or lands. Out of the dispute arising from this situation a number of verses of transparent meaning have been preserved. Of these we may with sufficient certainty assign Fr. 141, 142, 1–3, 144 to Cepheus, Fr. 139, 140, 142, 4, to Perseus, and Fr. 137, 138, 151–153 to the Chorus. Andromeda must have been present, and the words of Cepheus, Fr. 141, could have been addressed only to her. If in addition the mother appeared and tried to dissuade Andromeda, she could only have done so after the exit of Cepheus, unless there was a fourth actor. Evidently the words of Eratosthenes, Cat. 17, σωθείσα ἐν τῷ Περσίου οὐχ εἶλετο τῷ πατρί ομολογεῖν οὗ δὲ τῇ μητρὶ, taken in their exact sense, imply that Cepheus and Cassiopeia both argued with their daughter, and both in vain. Probably the father laid stress on paternal authority and the external conditions of birth and position, while the mother would urge parental rights and filial obligations. It is easily seen what a good subject for dispute this makes, and the poet would bring forward the strongest arguments to induce Andromeda to remain, so that her independent resolve to follow her preserver in love and gratitude, disregarding all traditional obligations, might be thrown into triumphant relief. So, too, we should like to assign Andromeda's words, Fr. 132.

\[ \text{ἄγου δὲ μ', ὁ ξένι, εἶτε πρὸς τοῖς θέλει.} \]
\[ \text{εἶτ' ἀλογον' εἶτε διολίθοι...} \]

to this final resolve, and not to her first dialogue with Perseus.

A second turn of affairs and a new obstacle might now occur through the claim of a rival lover previously betrothed to Andromeda, whether he is called Phineus, Agenor, or any other name, and an episode of this kind would not be difficult to fit into the action of the drama, if tradition supplied it. The betrothed might add his expostulations to those of the parents, only it would be necessary to assume that this relation was indicated in the first part of the drama as well as in the second. The objection that here would be a superfluity of motives must give way if tradition required it. But the reverse is the fact. Eratosthenes does not mention Andromeda's betrothed, and among the fragments there are none which needs must be interpreted as spoken by Phineus or to him or about him, nor is there any such frag-

---

1 In Wecklein's attempt to assign the character of Phineus to Euripides' drama, we look in vain for any argument even partially satisfactory. His theory which gives Fr. 149 to Phineus (in whose case we should expect to find the most emphasis), 141 to Phineus, spoken to Cepheus, 142, and then later 143, to Phineus, similarly addressed to Cepheus, is to me
ment extant of the *Andromeda* of Ennius, which we know to have been a Latin rendering of Euripides' play. In the vase-pictures, again, which show us separate scenes of the play or summarise the situation, Phineus does not appear, nor is his mask one of those forming the group in the Pompeian wall-painting which has been interpreted by Robert. Opinions vary, however, about the value of the last piece of evidence. In Sophocles' drama, on the other hand, Phineus, as we shall presently see, played a principal part, and the mythographers, as Ovid had done before them, combined the motives of the two dramas each after his own fashion.

The content of Euripides' drama, thus defined, is reflected in a number of ancient representations, the older of which are the more faithful and complete. Usually Andromeda is seen as she must have stood on the stage when the play opened, with arms outstretched, fastened by chains to the rocks or to a couple of tree trunks, or (in one instance) to two pillars. The objects which serve the double purpose of wedding and funeral gifts are placed round her. A maiden is in the act of bringing an amphora, the *laesura boreos*, or some other object. This may imply that in the drama the Chorus were still bringing on the gifts, or possibly the painter added this feature of his own accord to explain the objects already standing there, for, as we shall see, he might have borrowed this idea from Sophocles or from the representations which followed Sophocles. Persseus stands beside Andromeda and speaks to her in C, G, Cepheus appears in E, and Persseus turns from Andromeda to address Cepheus in D. The mother is present in B (and F?) seated (a characteristic position for her, cf. the constellation 'Cassiopeia's Chair', v. Eratosthenes, who refers to Sophocles, c. 16), and bowed down by sorrow in such a manner that she could easily be represented in the scene by a *kophon prosotypos*. In A, on the other hand, she is looking vaguely up to one of her attendants, and, as in the other vases, is turned away from Andromeda, a posture which seems to imply that in the drama they did not converse.¹¹

inconceivable. Indeed, even though Wecklein found in Fr. 144 "the most convincing proof of a dispute of the kind between Phineus and Cepheus," there are obviously no proofs of it.

¹ I have marked the first four vases with the same numbers as Treu.dehnburg, *Anz.* 1872, p. 169; thus:
B. *R. Neuchhauser*, *Mon. d'Art*, 8, Pl. 41; Engleman, p. 73.
D. Berlin Krater, *Arch. Anz.* 1893, p. 91, 50; *Jahrb.* 1896, Pl. 2; Engleman, p. 89.
F. *Vase in Gari*, Engleman, p. 8, perhaps the ones briefly described by Bannabell in *Jahrb.* 2, I. 1885, p. 50, which Hethig, p. 50, compared with a Capcan vase not represented in any of the drawings belonging to the Institute.

H. S. Anger vase. See below. All these vases were found in Lower Italy (F 7). E is assigned by Furtwangler as Attic to the end of the 5th century B.C., so that it might have been painted soon after the performance of Euripides' *Andromeda*.

¹¹ Cf. *Treu.dehnburg*, p. 118. But the special form to which Milchhölzer and particularly Wolters (*Arch. Mitt.* 1891, 81, 391 f.) drew attention can perhaps only be traced on H and, imperfectly, on G.

¹² It is impossible to guess what the unskilful craftsman who painted G meant by the two "conversing" figures to the right. Their gestures
This situation is again indicated by the Pompeian wall-painting already referred to, which, after the favourite Alexandrine fashion of "short hand," groups the masks instead of the complete characters. The mask of Perseus is to the left, Andromeda's is at the top, the masks of the parents are below, and in the centre appears the head and neck of the κῆτος. The absence of the messenger, and perhaps also the absence of the δεσμὸς, etc., etc. (Athena, as Robert conjectures), together with the arrangement of the masks, corresponding to the grouping of the actors in the scene, shows distinctly that the painter intended to represent, not the masks of the whole drama, but only those belonging to that principal scene as represented on the stage. While the parents remain with Andromeda, Perseus goes away to the fight. The fight and the group round Andromeda are combined into one picture on vases A, B, and F, the scene of the fight being placed on a lower plane than the other. Etruscan urns, and similarly a cista showing, as usual, a preference for the most drastic stage effects, represent Andromeda close to the κῆτος, which is about to devour her, while on the other side Perseus is just raising the gorgoneion to turn the monster to stone. In the urn-reliefs Cepheus is present, seated, as in E, showing that his share in the action was more important than Cassiopeia's. Wall-paintings representing the fight omit all the other characters except Andromeda.

The second part of the drama offered much less attraction to the vase-painter, evidently because the emotions dealt with lay deeper below the surface. In the first part, even if the monster was not visible, Andromeda's figure chained to the rock and surrounded by funeral gifts was enough in itself to arouse terror and pity in the other characters of the drama and in the spectators. But how could a painter represent a dispute between Perseus and Andromeda's parents as to which had the stronger claim on the rescued girl? Hence the only vase-painting, H, which gives this later scene, was not at once correctly interpreted by the archaeologist who performed the valuable service of freeing it from the distorting restorations with which it was encumbered. In this painting Andromeda, though unbound, is still standing between the two tree trunks, a clear indication of the earlier part of the story, and a proof that this scene was enacted on the same spot as the earlier one. The dish of fruit and the fillet of victory, which Andromeda is evidently about to offer to Perseus, form the visible expression of her gratitude.
and the fruit seems at the same time to be a reminiscence of the thank-offerings brought by the Ethiopians to refresh the hero after his struggle. The exhaustion and fatigue of Perseus is indicated here by his leaning on his left elbow against a pillar. Philostratus indicates his weariness by making him recline on the grass—also on the left elbow, στηρίζων ἐκ σαυτῷ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀριστεροῦ ἄγκυλος.17

It is true that Cepheus on his knees as a suppliant before Perseus is conceived quite differently from the Cepheus of the fragments which contain the dialogue. This is not really, however, an inconsistency in character but an alternation in mood, such as Euripides loves to elaborate. The Ethiopian King mean-spirited in danger, haughty and arrogant when the danger is removed, becomes once more humble and cringing (though in vain) when Andromeda turns against him and gives her decision for Perseus. This final humiliation of Cepheus could hardly have been invented by the vase-painter. The presence of Cassiopeia, seated, fits in with our reconstruction of this part of Euripides' play. Only when Cepheus has done his utmost and failed will she try to persuade her daughter, but the vase-painter introduces her by anticipation into the preceding scene. The youth with the two spears, although nothing of his Oriental dress remains but the shoes, may certainly be classed as an attendant of the King (by comparison with Α). There is no thought of Phineus: on the contrary, the wreath, which can only be intended for Perseus, recalls the gratitude of the people in Euripides (Philostratus).

II.

It has been supposed by some (of late by Ribbeck),18 that the Andromeda of Sophocles was a satyr play; but no convincing evidence for this view has been brought forward. The feeling, however, that the quotation from this piece—ἐπιστειλεν ἥ κύμβασι ναυστόλει τῆθεν—had a comic intention, may not be quite mistaken. We shall soon see that the question, just because of its rather affected expression, admirably fits the character to whom, according to its content, we must assign it. Mythographic notices and fragments, not of the Greek original, but of the Latin rendering by Accius, give us some notion of the action of the piece, and definite information is supplied by a vase-painting clear and easy of interpretation, although, with shame be it spoken, so often misunderstood by accomplished archaeologists,19 a remarkable instance of the paralyzing force of a time-honoured tradition.

17 If this, as we may assume, was referred to in the narration of the fight, then certainly Perseus himself could not have been the narrator.
19 Birch, Archæologia, 1855, 36, 1 p. 53, 68; Pi. 6; Minervini, Memorie di soc. archeol. vechiana, 9, p. 221; Tranckelmann loc. cit., p. 171; Knecht, Quaestio Persei fabulæ artifices græcis et romanis transmisserat, Bonn diss. 1848, p. 34, 3, and 53; Böthe Jahrb. 1896, p. 299; Wurmack, loc. cit., p. 215, 1; C. Smith, B.M. Vases, iii. p. 122; Engelmann, loc. cit., pp. 10 and 69.
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The hydra of the British Museum (Ε 169; here Pl. V.), the only Andromeda vase, as Furtwängler rightly stated, found not in Lower Italy but in Vulci, has been acknowledged by every one except Panofka as a representation of the Andromeda myth. But it cannot be founded on the Andromeda of Euripides because the style shows that it must have been painted some decades before the year 412 B.C. It was Knatz who saw this most clearly, and traced (loc. cit., p. 53) the style of Polygnotus in the painting. There remains the play of Sophocles, and it was suggested (e.g. Knatz, loc. cit., p. 53 f.; Bethe, loc. cit., p. 296) that this was the origin of the vase; but the idea bore little fruit.

The picture is composed as a frieze in the older manner, and runs round the shoulder of the hydra, possibly with some reference to the funereal destination of the vase. At the first glance one might think that the one group of three figures, placed among separated figures, forms the central point of the composition. But this is not quite correct, for while there are only three figures to the left of the group, there are five to the right, and the principal action is among these five. Indeed, the middle line falls between the five figures to the right and the six, whose value is about the same as the five, to the left. The Hellenic youth to the extreme right, in chlamys, hat and boots, holding two spears, evidently wears the typical travelling dress; hence he is a stranger, arrived from a distance. The others are clearly non-Greeks, barbarians. Perses is recognisable even without harpe and gorgoneion, for he wears little wings on his boots and others on his hat. The right hand, as often occurs in figures of Hermes, is raised to the hat, not merely to press it more firmly on the head, but as an expression of painful emotion. The King too, who wears a long robe and an Oriental cap, seems to be crushed by affliction. He rests both hands on his staff, and with the fixed look of hopeless despair watches the three Ethiopians at their work. One of them is digging a hole in the ground, a second holds up a post ready to drive in, while a third has another post evidently meant for the same purpose. Doubtless these are the posts to which Andromeda is to be bound. The posts do not belong to the Euripidean story, for he speaks of the victim being chained to the rock, hence they must be remnants of an older tradition incorporated with Euripides version as illustrated in AR(D)GH. The offerings to furnish forth the bride of death are being carried in from the left; a

19 Arch. Anz., 1875, p. 65. His own explanation (Tithonus, Eos; Memnon) was as foolish as possible.
20 Probably the painter did not intend to make one post shorter than the other. It happened while the background was being blanked in round the head of the kneeling Ethiopian.
21 Fr. 125. The words παράσεως ῥήμα το εἰς ταυτήν
τε εἰς τοῦτον εἶναι
περιοχῆς ἡγεμόνας
καὶ ἐπέδωκαν ἑγεμόνας
εἰς τῇ ἐπικράτεις
χιλιάδοις
have been misunderstood by those ancient writers who talk of an οὐραφός θόλοι.
22 Αὐτομορφὸς i.e. "natural formation" means the stone structure in front of which, like an image in high relief, made by an artist (ποδός, χειρῶν), the maiden stands. In υ, where one is almost reminded of skulls (cf. Aecidius, Fr. 9. Iunius se habet templum obvallatum ossibus), and on Etruscan vases it resembles a niche in the rock. Cf. Bethe, Jahrb., 1896, p. 294. From this is taken Antiphanes' epigram in Ovid iv. 672, Apollodor. Il. 45.
chest, vases of ointment, a garment (on the left arm of the middle figure), a mirror, fillets and a chair. This agrees in many points with the play of Euripides, and yet there are essential differences. In Euripides and the pictures that are founded on his version part of the action is finished before the scene opens; here, all is preparation. In Euripides Perseus comes flying through the air after Andromeda has stood in chains all through the night; here, Perseus is present while the pests are built up to form a kind of gallows. In Euripides most of the gifts are in place; here, they are only being brought in. And where is Andromeda herself? Any unprejudiced reader would surely expect to see her represented, according to tradition, as a figure of girlish grace and modesty. It seems hardly possible, but is nevertheless true that all archaeologists from Birch to Engelmann, with the one exception of Panofka, interpreted the half-comic, lazy, effeminate figure of a youth as Andromeda! This figure wears the same shoes and headdress as the old King, but instead of the long robe he has a short tunic girt round the hips, while through the arm-holes of the tunic appears a variegated Oriental garment closely fitting to arms and legs. When Panofka disputed the figure being female (there being no evidence that it is female), the other critics, strangely enough, neglected to seek for the name of the young barbarian prince, which lay so near the surface, and adduced the Amazon costume as favouring their own theory. True, the costume is similar to the Amazon dress, but the figure could not be an Amazon, unless she were wounded, and eastern women in their everyday life were not dressed as Amazons, so far as we know.

How the old vase-painters imagined Andromeda, Cassiopeia and other women is sufficiently shown by the known Andromeda vases (especially A, B, D, G), and everybody knows that ancient art individualised the female figure with much more reserve than the male. In short, the supported figure is a youthful barbarian, a prince by his dress. The Oriental τρυφή, to collect examples of which was a special theme for Greek historians, but which in later times also was only too common among the Greeks, is shown by his posture of fatigue, leaning on two servants who, like all the subordinate characters in the picture, have Ethiopian features. In the same way Hephaestus leans on his attendant nymphs, and Dionysus, old or young, is supported by two of his retinue. The most exact literary description of this attitude is contained in what Poseidonius says about Alexander, son of Ptolemy VII. Athenaeus XII. 550 b.: ἐν τολῆς δὲ τρυφής ζωῆς, οὐδὲ πατέριστο κλέος τ᾽ ἤν εἰ μὴ διείν ἐπαυσιδομένου ἐπορευτῇ. The young Ethiopians hold their master’s hands, not, as one might suppose, to lead him along against his will, for there is no sign of force or of resistance, the prince being too weak even to keep hold of his supports. The vase-painter has expressed with...
unusual skill in the whole posture of body and limbs 24 and in the fixed stare on the face his idea of the nerveless, effeminate youth. The instinct which suggested Sardanapalus to the first author who published the vase was therefore correct.

This degenerate prince can be no other than Phineus (or Agenor), betrothed to Andromeda. In order to bring out his characteristics in the most effective way, the painter has set him and his attendants in full front view. And yet no one could say that he is disconnected from the other figures to the right and left. It is he on whose behalf the three young Ethiopians are bringing the bridal gifts. 25 As the attendants approach Phineus their steps resolve themselves into a standing posture. For Phineus has arrived at the "grave," as one may say, of Andromeda, and even if we did not know it from the other vases, we should guess that the funeral offerings are meant for her. The place of the action is apparently the same as in Euripides, 26 for the stakes must have been set up on the sea-shore. The time may be later in the day, but is earlier as regards the action, for here we see going on what in Euripides was accomplished before the drama opened. Cepheus has arrived with his servants (who do not form the Chemis) in order that he may obey the oracle by preparing the place for his daughter's death. Keeping to the picture we must next suppose that Perseus enters as a traveller on foot. Everyone must feel that the wonderful entrance through the air, invented by Euripides, and the opening of the piece by the lament of Andromeda chained, are two features which must exist together or not at all, and which form a wonderfully effective combination. What an error of taste it would be to make Perseus enter flying while the gallows was still being erected! The wings on his hat and shoes tell us who he is, but his whole appearance, if we may trust the picture, is more that of an unassuming wayfarer than of a marvellous prodigy. Attention is here concentrated on Phineus; therefore Perseus must have been on the scene before, and must have held a conversation with Cepheus to prepare the audience for Phineus' entry. Phineus comes with funeral gifts for his bride, but

24 This flabby figure reminded Engelmann (loc. cit., p. 99) of a puppet, or at least he assumed that this idea had occurred to others. Further, in the representation of the Andromeda of Euripides, A. B., Cepheus is supported by an Ethiopian. Whether Euripides transferred this attendant figure from Phineus to Cepheus, regarding it merely as a support of old age as in the case of Hecuba (Hec. 594), or whether the vase-painter made the change, seems impossible to decide.

25 On this account Birch and Trendelenburg supposed the figure to be female, for the offerings were such as could be intended only for a woman.

26 Robert, p. 17, with whom Beetha agrees, conceives of Sophocles' Andromeda as played in front of the palace. He appears to have no definite grounds for this view except his own opinion that Perseus (whom he quite rightly thinks of in Sophocles' play as walking, not flying on at his first appearance) could arrive on foot only near the palace and not on the shore. There seems to be no difficulty here except in Robert's own preconceptions. For the Yukai vase-painting refutes his view that "Perseus' first appearance is from the shore after slaying the minotaur." TümpeI Die Attischenmaler der Andromedagraffius, p. 132, would like to shift the scene to Persia because the σαῦρος mentioned in Fr. 183 is a Persian serpent! In p. 177 he tries to exclude Phineus from the Andromeda of Sophocles! Unfortunately the vase shows, not only Phineus, but also his negro attendants.
his whole attitude shows that he will not think of lifting a hand to
save her.

A scene very similar to this one occurs in one of the plays of Euripides,
A esteis, the young wife of Admetus, has, like Andromeda, fallen a victim to
the anger of an offended deity, for she has unhesitatingly offered herself, in
the absence of any other substitute, to suffer death in her husband's stead.
She might live if another could be found to suffer the penalty. But
Admetus' parents, though aged, still cling to life, and Pheres contents him-
self with bringing offerings for the grave. As the Chorus see Pheres
entering and announce his approach to Admetus, v. 611 ff., they utter words
which might almost equally be said with regard to Phineus in the Andromeda
of Sophocles:

\[
\text{kai µην ὀρεὶ σοι πατέρα γηραιὰ τοῦ \alpha\nu\varepsilon\iota\varsigma}
\text{στείχοντι, ὃπαθὼς τ ἐν χεροῖν διαμαρτὶ σὴ}
\text{κόσμῳν φέροντας, νεφεῖρον ἀγάλματα.}
\]

The similarity is too great to be accidental. We may assume that
the Andromeda of Sophocles was earlier than the Andromeda of Euripides,
merely from a consideration of the great heightening of stage effect brought
about by Euripides' innovations in the entrance of Andromeda and Perseus.
But whether Sophocles' Andromeda was earlier than the A esteis (acted
in 488 B.C.) or not can only be decided when we have discovered which of
these two plays treats with greater freshness, force and originality the
motive of affection commuting its obligations to the form of gifts. It
stands to reason that the effect is the stronger, or, in other words, that the
despicable character of the person commuting these obligations is the more
emphasised, the greater the claim the victim can make on his generosity
and courage. Pheres, though near the end of his span of life, lies under
no such strong obligation to sacrifice himself in the place of his son's wife
as Phineus does towards his betrothed, especially as Phineus is not required
to give his life, but merely to risk it in the conflict while fighting for her
safety. This contrast would come out more clearly if we were in a position
to compare the whole scene of Sophocles' Andromeda with the similar one in
the A esteis. The situation in the A esteis is a painful one. One man buys
his own life by the death of his wife, while the other clings to his few
remaining years, and refuses to sacrifice them for his son. The scene in the
Andromeda, as we can see from the vase-paintings, is more of a nature to
rouse the sympathy of a Greek audience. After the exchange of a few
words between Phineus and Cepheus, the dispute develops itself between
Phineus, the cowardly barbarian who abandons his betrothed, and Perseus,
the Hellenic hero, who will fight for her and win her. If, thus, we conclude
that Euripides borrowed the dramatic motive from Sophocles, we must date

\[\text{\textsuperscript{2} Did did Pheres, like Phineus, walk with the situation to represent him as fickle as some support? Certainly it was in accord with possible.}\]
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the vase-painting also by its style rather before than after 438. Since
the vase-painting represents the transition between the scene of Perseus'
entrance to Cepheus and the following scene where Phineus is also
present, we may clearly assume the existence of these two scenes in the
Andromeda of Sophocles. The first scene would explain the situation
and the second would unfold a contrast of character such as Sophocles
loved to portray. As to the continuation of the piece, we can find no
better evidence than the picture, and with a knowledge of the myth as
a background it will not be difficult to sketch the principal features of
what remains.

The dialogue between Phineus and Perseus might have taken place
before Perseus had seen Andromeda. But it seems scarcely conceivable that
Andromeda, the chief character, should only enter after the two scenes
depicted on the vase. Perhaps she opened the piece with her mother, and
went off after the parodos. The stasimon must follow the dialogue between
Phineus and Perseus, and after that Andromeda may have been led to the
place of death, mourning like Antigone. Her mother seems, from Eratosthenes 16, to have gone with her and to have sat beside her while
she stood in chains. This was the crisis at which Perseus might have first
seen Andromeda, and when once Phineus had given up his betrothed as
dead, Perseus could woo her, and Andromeda could give her promise in
return for the promised rescue. Perseus himself might announce the fight
and the victory. The consequence of this will be to produce a περιπέτεια of
which the vase-painting gives a premonition and which Euripides' version
confirms. Phineus, who had abandoned his bride when she was to be the
prize of the monster, claims her again as soon as she is saved. Euripides
transferred this change of mind from Phineus to Cepheus and allowed the
character of Phineus to fall out altogether. In the play of Sophocles
Cepheus was a man of honour, if we are to judge by the deep distress he
evidences on the vase-painting. It is not he but Phineus who threatens
the lovers in the second part of the drama. We know that the story ends
happily for them and that Phineus dies, but we cannot even conjecture how
this came about.

Reversing the order we followed in examining the Andromeda of Euripides, let us now start with what certainty we can obtain from the vase-
painting and see how much more we can add from literary tradition. Of
the few extant fragments the one cited on page 104 is more suited to the
Phineus of the picture than to the Cepheus, because of the affectation
which it evidences; Fr. 124 would be a worthy expression of the
courage of Perseus; 126 αὐτοχειλέως λεγόντως perhaps another blundering
remark of the Ethiopian prince, must refer to the funeral vases brought by
Phineus, and possibly 131 designates the Oriental garment called σάρπος.
Fr. 127 ἀμφιπρομὸν πλοῖον might be a metaphor for the sea-monster rush-

27 Compare the Cepheus of Euripides on the vases ABE.
ing backwards and forwards in the fight with Perseus. Ovid, in telling the story, compares the monster to a ship, iv. 706, and later on, 721, describes its movements upwards and downwards, backwards and forwards. Possibly Fr. 125 ἰδοὺ δὲ φοῖνικας πιάσθησα δίγανον may belong to the same narrative passage, and may refer to the incident which Ovid v. 727 describes as 

facit, verberat ensæ, following it up immediately by the words beliva 

πυνήσσω μαχεστε αυρείναι δικτασιον αρεις νομίζα. Finally Fr. 129, the one word ζυγίζεις, explained by Hesychius as ζυγιτός λαός, or, as it probably stood ζυγιτής λαός ὢ ν υπεξαγωμένοι εἰσι λαοί, fits, in almost literally with the Phineus of the vase-painting, who places his arms like a yoke on the necks of his subjects that they may carry or push him forward. Thus conjectures may be made about the meaning and place of these few slight fragments, though they do not add much to our conception of the whole.

We are rather better off as regards the Andromeda of Accius. Ribbeck, Die römische Tragödie, p. 584, rightly perceives that it was founded on an original different from that which was the source of Ennius' play. But as he assumes that the Andromeda of Sophocles was a Satyr play, he naturally does not find his original there. Ribbeck's attitude (evidently quite unprejudiced) to the drama of Accius may be given in a translation of his own words: "It was not a foregone conclusion, as in Ennius and Euripides, that Andromeda herself was exposed to the monster. On the contrary, the parents must have disputed the question with the betrothed, Phineus or Agenor, and this would bring out the inherent weakness in the character of the betrothed, complicated by the motive of love to the maiden." If for "parents" we read "Cepheus" we have the very scene represented on the Vulci vase. Hence we should assign Fr. 3 nisi quid tu faculas tubat opem, persous, to Cepheus (addressing Phineus), and Fr. 4 seu que te adiutem inveni, horatvi viget, non præsec ut pudet, to Phineus (addressing Cepheus). Fr. 6 namque ut diecum te matut int seugetatem adversae (') dumtaxaque hand suspendit might have been previously spoken by Persous to Phineus. When Persous first sees Andromeda he may compare her to a statue of a divinity, and then might follow Fr. 10. Fumane te habet templum obvallatam osibus. These words do not necessarily imply that Andromeda had stood a long time on the spot, a circumstance inconsistent with the vase-painting. For in the version of Sophocles (followed by Fr. 1 of Accius), as well as in that of Euripides, the monster devoured many victims before the oracle was appealed to. Therefore Andromeda would naturally be bound at the place where the dragon always seized his victims. Fr. 12 reads quod beneficium hostis deere est segete, voc. to obscene intelleges. Ribbeck supposes that Persous spoke these words to Cepheus after his betrothal to Andromeda. This is certainly correct, but is it not evident from the words that Persous is not asking the consent of Cepheus (as in Euripides, Ovid iv. 703), but that Cepheus has offered his daughter to Persous of his own accord after Phineus has abandoned her and after the mind of Persous has been sufficiently revealed by his dialogue.
with Phineus, and that now Perseus is promising gratitude? This fits very well with the upright character of Cepheus as we become aware of it in the vase-painting, a character which finds expression in the words he speaks to Perseus and Andromeda after the rescue, Fr. 11 abui, eduues?: id fociit gratum ut sit sem. Certainly in Fr. 14 he seems unwilling to give up his daughter, but Fr. 103 meminitin te spondere mehi gratam tuam? if rightly introduced here from the incerto, might very well be spoken by Phineus, instead of by Perseus as Ribbeck supposes. In any case the former suitor must come on the scene again after the rescue of Andromeda. It is very clear that Ribbeck separated two halves that belong together in assigning the first, viz., the abandonment of Andromeda by Phineus, to Accius (Sophocles), and the second, viz., the quarrel with Perseus and the renewed claim on the rescued girl, to Ennius (Euripides). Ribbeck himself admitted that these two parts were related to each other, and the evidence of Ovid makes it certain that they should be joined. For Ovid relates, circumstantially and vividly how Phineus came with a troop of armed men and fell on Perseus at his wedding feast "Ex, ait, en, adsum praecipue conjunxit ultor," V. 10. Cepheus takes the part of Perseus against him as we should expect, 28 and reproaches him for his cowardice: selicit haud satis est quod te spectante revicta est (corresponding almost exactly to the vase-painting) et nullam quod open patres sponsum tuisti. The scene referred to here as already past was acted in the drama of Sophocles, and we must assign to the same drama the scene in which this reminiscence is made. The contrast between the cowardice of Phineus and the courage of Perseus, as shown in the vase-painting, is here pointed and sharpened by the words timidiissime Phineus, 224, given as a repartee to Persu se fortissime, 216, 221.

We see, then, that Ennius (and possibly Livius Andronicus before him) chose the newer and more famous drama of Euripides for his adaptation, while Accius, two generations later, placed the Andromeda of Sophocles on the Roman stage. Ovid made use of both, the first part of his narrative being taken from Euripides and the second from Sophocles. Sophocles’ tragedy, if it was earlier than the Alcestis of Euripides, must have been performed in Athens about three decades before the Andromeda of Euripides. It has been pointed out (p. 109) that there may have been a certain similarity between this play and the Antigone, performed in 441 B.C. What we know of the two plays makes it clear that that of Sophocles was the earlier. The entrance of Perseus, the bringing in of Andromeda, are much simpler and more natural than the elaborated stage effects added by Euripides. It is hardly conceivable that the more elaborated form preceded the simpler. Sophocles seems to have found his chief dramatic interest in the contrast between Perseus and Phineus, set off by the gracious presence of Andromeda,
barbarian by birth, but Greek in beauty of form and spirit. Yet the Andromeda of Sophocles can hardly have found opportunity to express that noble self-forgetfulness which the Andromeda of Euripides shares with the other heroines of his plays, with a Theonoe, a Makaria, an Iphigenia.

E. Petersen.

Rome, August, 1902.
FIRST REPORT OF A JOURNEY IN PISIDIA, LYCAONIA, AND
PAMPHYLIA.

PART III.

Continued from Vol. XXII, p. 376.

E.—KHATYN SERAI (Aύσφα) AND NEIGHBOURHOOD.

We were at Khatyn Serai for four days, arriving on the fourth day of July, 1901; and leaving on the seventh. Our road from Konia lay through Baiyat, where we copied the following inscription.

"Baiyat.
No. 150.—W.M.R., H.S.C., G.A.W.

ΟΥΛΑΙΙΑΝ
ΜΑΡΚΕΛΛΑΝ
ΑΙ ΦΥΛΑΙ
ΤΗΣ ΚΟΛΩ
ΝΕΙΑΣ
Μχ χ

Οὐλαίιαν
Μάρκελλαν
αἱ φυλαί
tῆς κολω
νείας
μ(νήμασ) χ(ιμάν).

The length of our stay at Khatyn Serai enabled us to become acquainted with a good number of inscriptions. Besides verifying almost all the inscriptions already published from Professor Sterrett’s copies, or from Professor Ramsay’s earlier ones (cf. W.E, pp. 242 ff.; C.I.L, vol. iii, pp. 1239 and 2061), we heard of and copied twenty-four new inscriptions, ten of which are in Latin and one bilingual. We were also able to make some examination of Zoldera, the site of the ancient city, which lies rather more than a mile N.W. of the village.

The inscriptions are most conveniently considered according to the language in which they are written; for if they were found on the site of the modern village, they were in all probability carried thither from Zoldera.

H.S.—VOL. XXIV.
Latin Inscriptions.

151.—In a hut on the south side of Zoldera. W.M.R.

Pro salute Imp(eratoris) Ne[rvae
Caesarius Augusti Germanici
M(arcus) Ulpius Diddianus
Sacerdos Martis.

Some of the inscription, which has been published from our copies in the C.I.L. (vol. iii. No. 14400), has been lost on the right. The date of the inscription is Oct. 97—Jan. 98. For the name Ulpius at Lystra cf. our No. 150 and W.E. No. 254; for Diddianus cf. C.I.L. vol. iii. No. 6827 (the inscription is at Copto, but C. Didius was from Ancyræ), and L. Didius Martinus (No. 6753, Ancyræ).

No. 152.—Western Cemetery. W.M.R. 1882 and 1893.

Loct. Modestus
Omnibus
Ribvs
Sibi vivus po-
V T

Between lines 1 and 2 is a horseman galloping spear in hand. Cf. B.C.H. 1898, p. 816; C.I.L. vol. iii. No. 6788.

No. 153.—W.M.R., H.S.C., G.A.W.

Lennivsrvfrvs · Ennio rvfopatriet x
Enn Niaesoriëtennio,
R AH Iñitenniaëmatriví

The letters are small and well formed; the surface of the stone is much worn. This is C.I.L. vol. iii. No. 12141.

No. 154.—Zoldera, in a hut between the tepæ and the Ayasma. H.S.C. G.A.W.

Lollia Secundæ
Socrates
Pannius
Nzv Memoriae
Caesa

For Annius cf. No. 155 and perhaps No. 156. This is C.I.L. vol. iii. No. 14400.
No. 155.—W.M.R.

QLAITILIONEPTI  Q(ainto) Laitillo Nepoti
ANNIAVETTIIAVXOR  Annia Vettia uxor
EIVSMEMORIAICAVSA  eius memoriai causa.
ET SIBI RESTITVIT  et sibi restituit.

This is C.I.L. vol. iii. No. 14400 e.

No. 156.—W.M.R., H.Sc., G.A.W.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L·AN</td>
<td>VR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQV</td>
<td>I·IIVR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LUcius) An[u]nius  Equ[es?]  [m duumv(i)r(?)]

The stones A and B are, the one in the eastern, the other in the western bridge. They are similar in character and the letters are of the same size, five inches high, and are finely and deeply cut; they belong to the early Imperial period. Apparently both are complete on three sides indicated; there is no clue to the extent of the gap between them. The interpretation of VR as vir is uncertain. This is C.I.L. vol. iii. No. 14400 b (cf. No. 6797 and B.C.H. 1883, p. 317).

No. 157.—W.M.R.

\[\triangleleft\]  A

\[\triangleleft\] PROBI  Probi-

\[\triangleleft\] M·C  no m(emoriae) c(ausa)

Complete at bottom and on right.

No. 158.—On a pedestal; slightly ornate; much broken.  W.M.R.

AQVI  Aquil[iam] legatum Aug[usti] pro
PRAE  prae[tere]
XII  xii[ribus]

Good early Imperial lettering. Complete except on right and, possibly at top. If our restoration be correct, there must have been a line above our first line with the full name of Cornutus Aquila, who was governor of Galatia in n.c. 6 (cf. our No. 7, 11, and 12). The monument must have been erected at the time of the foundation of the colony. For the tribes of Lystra cf. our No. 150. This is C.I.L. No. 14400 d.

1:2
No. 159.—On a lion. W.M.R.

\[RVFVSETLV\]

Rufus et Lu[cius]

Complete on right. This is C.I.L. 14400 b (cf. 6796 and B.C.H. 1888, p. 317).

No. 160.—W.M.R.

\[HUS::SOC::P///LIN\]

\[ILLIAGRATPIA\]

\[\check{\text{AE}}::MONOMENTIV///\]

\[IL\]

\[SV\]

\[VIXIT\\text{ANN}XXI\]

vixit annos xxii

Complete at bottom only. There is a broad blank space between lines 4 and 5.

In addition to these inscriptions, seven (Nos. 242—248) are given by Sterrett on pp. 142—145 of the Wolfe Expedition. We examined all. With regard to No. 242, I need only here\(^1\) call attention to the spelling Lastra which is found on coins and in Latin inscriptions of the colony. In No. 243, the transcription is correct. No. 244 should read

\[NCHARE\]

\[NASECUN\]

\[XLL\]

The symbols at the end of the third line are very uncertain—perhaps XL annorum.

In No. 245, delete the second P in line 2.

In No. 246, the first line appears to be \[\text{ISAI}\]. In line 5 the first word is SVIS, but the second is apparently IRPESIS, the first I being very uncertain. P should perhaps be R. We could not read PRAEDIS, which Mommsen suggested. CAVSAE is the last word, an engraver's error for CAVSA. Lines 4, 5, and 6 are complete on the right.

In No. 247, we have no record of any point in lines 1 and 2. There is an erasure after the O in line 4. The first F in line 5 should be a P.

In No. 248. The copy in the C.I.L. (vol. iii., No. 6791) is right, where it disagrees with Sterrett. The first letter of line 2 is A not M.

\(^1\) See p. 122.
Bilingual Inscription.

No. 164.—W.M.R., H.S.C., G.A.W.

[float text in Greek]

This is C.I.L. 14400d.

Greek Inscriptions.

No. 162.—W.M.R.

[float text in Greek]

No. 163.—W.M.R.

[float text in Greek]

Relief with two figures above the inscription. There must also have been a line containing the husband's name above the relief.

The name Βαβ[ω] occurs in C.I.G. 4142 (Oenus, Ogur, or Ogut in Galatia, nine miles from Amasia on the road to Ancyra).
No. 164.—W.M.R.

ΔΣΘΕΟΙΟΙ ΠΟΣΕΛΙΔΑ ΔΥΜΒΙΩΣΕ\nΜΝΩΣΑΘΗ \nΜΝΗΜΗΧΑ ΠΙΝ

Θεότοκος Ελευθήρος συμβίω σε\nμνημής χάριν.

No. 165.—W.M.R., H.S.C.,

ΟΥΛΑΛΕΡΙΟΣ Ωσάλερίος
ΖΩΣΙΜΟΣ Ζωσιμός
ΖΩΣΙΜΗΔΗ Ζωσιμήδη
ΘΥΓΑΤΡΙ Θυγατρί

Below the inscription are two small arches containing reliefs.

No. 166.—W.M.R., H.S.C.

ΑΓΑΘΗΜΕΡΟΣΚΗ Αγαθήμερος κέ ἢ
ΓΥΝΗΑΥΤΟΥΖΩ ο ἀνή αὐτοῦ ζω-
ΝΤΕΣΤΕΚΝΟΙΣ τείνες τέκνους
ΓΛΥΚΥΤΑΤΟΙΣ γλυκυτάτοις
ΜΝΗΜΗΣ ΧΑΡΙΝ μνημής χάριν

No. 167.—W.M.R.

ΑΥΡΝΗΙΟΣ Αὐρνήιος
ΛΟΝΓΕΙΝΟΣ Λονγείνος
ΣΤΡΑΤΙΩΤ Στρατιώτ
ΗΣΛΕΓΙΟΙΗ

No. 168.—W.M.R., H.S.C., G.A.W.

ΜΩΝΗΣ ΝΕΙΚΟΜΗΔΟΣ ΚΕ ... Μόνης Νεικομήδους κε ...
ΝΕΙΚΟΜΗΔΟΥΣ ΜΩΝ[ΕΙ] ΤΩ ΠΑΤΡΙ-
PΩ και Τάτας τή μάρα [ΚΕ ΝΕΙΚΟ-
ΜΗΔΟΥΣ ΤΩ ΓΛΥΚΥΤΑΤΟΙ ΠΑΤΡΙ

The stone now measures 15 inches in width. Above the inscription is a triangular pediment, containing the representation of an eagle. This fixes the centre of the stone, which was apparently originally 22 inches in width, and contained 5 or 6 letters to the right of those which still remain. The inscription is not complete at the foot. A short name stood at the end of line 1.
No. 169.—W.M.R.

LEI, 
LEINIO, 
LMAKAPI 
ΔΕΗΜΟΥΝ 
ΑΠΟΥΣΔΙΖ 
ΕΜΕΨΝΤΟΕΓΕΡΕ 
PΑΝΙΟΙΟΠΑΛΙΝΚ

This is a fragment of a metrical epitaph.

No. 170.—On a very large block of building stone. W.M.R.

ΠΡΟΚΛΟΥΤΙΤΙΝ/// 
Πρόκλου Τίτιν[ανου]

Complete to left. Large good letters.

No. 171.—In the fountain. W.M.R., H.S.C., G.A.W.

ε///ΚΕΧΟΛΩΜΕΝΟΝΈΧΟΙΤΟ 
θ[ε]ών] κεχολωμένον έχοιτο

For έχοιτο, cf. No. 42.

No. 172.—W.M.R.

ΙΚΛΑΣ 
ΔΟΜΝΑ 
ΔΟΡΚΑΣ 
ΓΑΘΗΡ 
ΓΙΟΙΕ 
ΜΝΙΧΕΙ 
ΝΠΟΝΤΕΣ 
ΑΤΕΣΚΕΥ 
'ΕΑΝΗΑΥ 
Τ ΊΚΑΣ 

'Ηρα[κλάς 
και] Δόμα 
και] Δορκάς 
θυγάτηρ [και 
νυί 
μημεί- 
ο[π] ζωντες 
κατεσκευ- 
αιν

No. 173.—W.M.R., H.S.C., G.A.W.

ΛΟΝΓΕΙΝΙΣ/// 
ΑΛΛ ΙΟΥ 
Horseman 
right. 
ΠΛΟΥ 
ΕΥΧΗ 

Or, perhaps, Α[μα]θ[ο].
The Greek inscriptions (Nos. 249—255) in Sterrett occupy pp. 145—148 in the Wolfe Expedition. The following corrections should be made.

St. No. 249, line 1, the two upright strokes of the N of άνέστησεν are legible; line 3, Κ can be read at the beginning; Τι should be Π, i.e. επανέστησον for Π άνεστησεν.

St. No. 250.—This inscription may be restored as follows:

'Α. Σε[...]ν κέ' Α. Μάρκος
κέ' Α. Καπίτων ὧδε αὐτῶ κέ
Α. Ἡγελίνα θυγάτηρ αὐτῶ
ἐποίησαν τῷ κοιμητήρι
5. ον τε ἀναλομάτων δύν
ο μὲν [μ]έση τοῦ Καπί-
τωνος, μέρος δ[e] ἐν
]οις ἀδελ-
φ[ος]ς [μ]έσης
10. χάμων.

It was copied by Professor Ramsay in 1882 and 1901; in 1901 Mr. Wathen and I were with him. In line 1, the letters placed between brackets are broken, and uncertain, but Sterrett's restoration Σε[π. Καπί]των is wrong. In line 2, the punctuation mark after Α is taken for an I. In line 5, the word ἔλθων has probably been omitted either before or after ἀναλομάτων by a slip of the engraver. In line 9 a symbol like χ after the first C must be a punctuation mark.

St. No. 251.—For ΚΑΤΩ in line 1, read ΚΑΤΙ, Ω, i.e. κατιφ.

St. No. 252.—Read and restore as follows:

ΛΥΡΟΣΕΟΔΩΣ
ΣΔΙ ΥΝΘΗΛ
ΘΟΥΓ ΤΡΙΓΛΩ
ΑΘΟΘΑΚΛΗΜ
ΜΗ ΠΙΝ

Λυρή(λιος) Θεόδωρ(ος)
Δ[ος σ]π τῇ ἱδι-
γ θυγατρίς γναθ[ε]
τι[σ]θη Θ[ε]κλη μ[η]

There is a cross above the inscription. The inscription is complete on the left.

St. No. 253.—Read and restore as follows:

ΑΝΧΑ
שירות
ΛΛΑΚ
ANXARPH
ΝΠΠΕΠΡΩ

Ἀνχα-
ηνα Κοιν-
τιλα Κοινη-
Ἀνχαρ-
φρ Πετρο
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Στ. Ν. 255.— Restore Σανίλλη Παππάδος.

Concerning Sterrett’s inscriptions from Giomse (Nos. 266-268) we have nothing to say except to suggest that lines 9 and 10 of No. 267 should be restored thus: kai γ]ου[ει-

σιν

Nos. 261-263 of Sterrett are republished from copies by Prof. Ramsay in C.I.L. vol. iii., No. 12215, with a complete text and the name Col. Lustrensim. Prof. Ramsay also sends me the following inscription —

Sari Kyz.—W.M.R.

ΜΑΡΚΟΣΑ Μάρκος Ἀ[τιλας(?)
ΟΣΑΝΩΟ ος Λόγος[ς Φα-
ΑΥΙΑΜΑΛ αυ[ας Μαλα[λας (?) τε]

The inscription is not complete on the right. Sari Kyz is a mile and a half north of Zoldera.

Zoldera.

The time which we had at our disposal enabled us to make some attempt at examining the site. Regular excavations were out of the question, not only because we were not provided with the necessary authority, but also because both time and funds for such research would have failed us. It was possible, however, to make a rough sketch of the site (Fig. 1), which besides serving an immediate purpose may prove of use to future explorers. The sketch together with a photograph of the tepe, taken from the south-east and shewing the inscribed pillar, is given on p. 121 (Figs. 1 and 2). The letter Α on the sketch marks the foundations of a small church; B marks the course suggested along the side of the tepe for the road from Iconium. C is the spot pointed out to us as the site of the gate. D marks the Ayasna described in Ramsay’s The Church in the Roman Empire, p. 50, and E the inscribed pillar.

2 See p. 122.
Fig. 1—Sketch-Plan of Site of Isthra.

Fig. 2.—The Tepe from the S.E.
Inscribed Pillar.

The identity of this site with Lystra is fixed by the inscription on the pillar, which is a dedication to Augustus, its founder, by the colony. The inscription was discovered by Prof. Sterrett, who published it in the *Wolfe Expedition*, p. 142, cf. C.I.L., vol. iii. No. 6788. It was suggested by Prof. Ramsay (*The Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 51), on the analogy of a similar dedication to Augustus found in the temple of Artemis at Ephesus, that this stone marked the site of the temple of Zeus o bēn πρὸ τῆς πόλεως (Acts xiv. 13). This suggestion may be right, but the removal of two or three feet of soil showed that the stone was at all events not exactly in its original position. We found no traces of Roman work near it, or between it and the other pillar shown in the photograph. The stones had been moved from their original position, which may or may not have been near, and had been used as the door-posts of a Turkish house, the foundations of which could be traced between the pillars and on either hand. The pillars measure respectively 4 ft. 11½ in. high by 2 ft. 7½ in. broad and 1 ft. 11½ in. deep and 4 ft. 5½ in. by 2 ft. 7 in. by 2 ft. 1 in. The larger, which is on the right, is inscribed. The distance between the two stones is 9 ft. 5 in. The foundations of a small building (*A*), which we examined on the east side of the tepé, proved to be those of a small Byzantine church. The annexed plan (Fig. 3) makes any further description of it unnecessary.

![Fig. 3](image-url)
The Site, Roman Road and Gate.

It will be seen from the photograph and sketch that the tepê rises sharply from the plain on all sides, and that it is somewhat higher at the south end than at the north. In the centre of the south end there is a depression through which a road must have entered the city; a short distance from this depression, on the slope of the tepê south of its south-east corner, at the spot marked C, we were told that a gate had once stood. No traces of the gate could be seen above ground and, though we removed some of the soil, we could find no trace below ground of its foundations. The tradition is, however, worth putting on record; it came to us on the authority of an aged inhabitant of the village, who had seen it in his childhood. It appeared to us that the tradition might be true, for there was an incline along the face of the slope leading from the depression before alluded to, past the site assigned to the gate and round the south-east corner of the tepê. This incline was continued along the east side until it joined the plain, and was on the whole such as might mark the ancient course of a road. It is marked BBB in the sketch.

H. S. Cronin.
MYCENAEAN VASES AT TORCELLO.

In view of the importance of ascertaining the limits of the influence of the early civilization of the Aegean, the existence of four Mycenaean vases in the little museum at Torcello has a certain interest.

This museum contains a miscellaneous collection of antiquities, some dug up in the island itself or coming from the ecclesiastical buildings close by, some from the adjacent islands in the lagoon. Amongst a number of vases of later date are the four in question.

The first of these (No. 727) is a small pseud amphora of somewhat flattened form. The buff slip is decorated all over the body of the vase with bands of red glaze-paint. The spaces on the shoulder of the vase not occupied by the spout and handles are filled with parallel strokes gradually decreasing in length, which thus form the triangles of bars common on late Mycenaean ware.

The second vase (No. 760) is shown in Fig. 1. The technique is the same as that of the pseud amphora, but the slip is paler and thinner, and both it and the paint are not so well preserved. The decoration consists of five waves of paint rising and falling and forming a band of ornament below the handles. These were three originally; two are now missing. Above the handles near the turned-over lip of the vase is a plain band of colour, and the neck and lip are also coloured. The vase was found in 1881 in the island of Mazzorbo. Three vases figured by Furtwängler and Löschcke (Mycenische Vasen Pl. I. 6; Pl. VIII. 45; Pl. IX. 52) from Ialysus form an almost complete parallel both in form and in decoration. The only difference is that the Ialysus vases have either a star or a tendril added to the wave pattern.

The third vase (No. 914), shown in Fig. 2, is of rougher make than the others. It is of the 'feeding-bottle' shape, of which so many have been found at Kourites in Crete, and in other late Mycenaean deposits. It is made of rather coarse grey clay, apparently without slip, and roughly decorated with strokes of dull blackish paint. It was found in the island of Torcello in 1881.

The only other vase to be mentioned is a very small pyxis-shaped

1 Both the figures are a little less than 1/4 size.
vessel of very much the same shape as No. 33 in F. and L.'s table of vases.

The linear decoration of the pseud amphora, which strongly resembles that of the Ialyssus vases, the wave-pattern on the second vase, and the shapes of these vases, and especially of the third, make it clear that these importations date from the later period of the Aegean civilization.

In the same museum is a string of amber beads, some decorated with strigations, and one or two clay spindle-whorls, which resemble the Mycenaean whorls in shape, though they are not formed so cleanly. On these, however, no stress can be laid, as such whorls are found in great abundance in all the North-Italian prehistoric sites.

The interest of these vases lies in connexion with the question of early trade routes, and their use by the Mycenaean and early Greeks. The commercial importance of the head of the Adriatic in the earliest times is well known. Aquileia is mentioned by Strabo (V. i. 8) as a centre of trade. The whole question is dealt with in the chapter on Primeval Trade-routes in Ridgeway’s Origin of Metallic Currency.

In regard to the use of these routes by Mycenaean traders it should be noted that these vases may be assigned approximately to the same period as the Mycenaean vases found in Sicily and now preserved in the Museum at Syracuse. These vases were found with native ware of Ora’s second Sicilian period, and are of shapes that are also found among the Ialyssus ware.

Mr. Bosanquet has called my attention to two other finds of Mycenaean objects which have a bearing on this question. The first is the discovery of vases at Scoglio di Tonnino, near Taranto, of the latest Mycenaean style, together with clay female idols of characteristic Mycenaean form. These were found in a stratum immediately above the Terramare deposits. Quagliati also claims that a figure found in the Terramare deposit of Taranto is an imitation of this Mycenaean type, and Pigorini believes that objects akin to Mycenaean occur in the Terramare deposits of the lower Po valley. Apart from this question, however, the discoveries at Scoglio di Tonnino clearly show, as Quagliati points out, a connexion between Mycenaean civilization and the latest period of the Italian bronze age.

The other discovery of Mycenaean vases in question is that made in 1843 by de Bosset, the governor for England of the Ionian islands. These vases come mostly from Cephallenia, but some probably from Ithaca. They are at present in the Museum of Neuchâtel, and have been published by M. Paul Dessoulavy in Revue Archéologique, Vol. xxxvii. pp. 128 sqq. From the Po, see Pigorini’s article, Mem. nat. Vol. i. col. 143 sqq.

A beehive tomb and other Mycenaean tombs have been found in Cephallenia at Messarkata, see Frazer, Preconicae III. p. 140.
illustrations which he gives it is clear that they belong to the same late period of Mycenaean art to which the vases of Syracuse, Torcello, and Tarsus must be ascribed. Shapes characteristic of this collection are the pseudo-amphora, the shape shewn in Fig. 1, three-handled, pyxis-shaped vessels like the fourth vase from Torcello, and three-handled vases of the shape shewn by Furtwängler and Löschcke (op. cit.) Pl. I, 3, Pl. VIII, 48, and mentioned above as characteristic of the Syracusean vases. The linear style of the decoration also points to the same period.

The finding of Mycenaean vases all of the same period at these different places, the east coast of Sicily, Taranto, and Cephalonia, points to so much maritime enterprise on the part of the later Mycenaeans that it seems more than probable that the Torcello vases came by sea from the Aegean. Herodotus (i. 163) preserves the tradition of the Phocaean voyages to Adria. On the other hand, in iv. 33, he gives an account of an overland route from the Adriatic to Delos by way of Dodona, the Malian Gulf, Carystus, and Tinos, and at the present day there is considerable traffic across the Pindus range where this route must have crossed it. The modern road leads from Jannina, which is close to Dodona, eastwards over the Zygos pass, and then descends to Kalamaka in Thessaly. Thence to the Malian Gulf it is flat country all the way as far as Pharsalus, where the road turns south over the hills to Lamia. No Mycenaean objects, however, seem to have been found at Dodona.

It is a noticeable fact that practically all the Mycenaean pottery found outside the islands of the Aegean resembles both in form and decoration the vases discussed above, and must therefore with them be set down to the later period of the Aegean civilization. The vases found in the islands present a much more vigorous and fresh appearance, and a less conventional dead style of decoration. The contrast can be well seen by comparing Furtwängler and Löschcke's plate XII, which represents vases from Therasia, with the plates they give showing vases from the mainland, or still better by comparing the Malian pottery from Phylakopi with the mainland ware.

The relative lateness of this latter is clear, and in Crete a gradual transition can be traced from the earlier to this later deader style, and from it to the geometrical.

These facts, therefore, illustrate and confirm the conclusion that the age of the decadence of Mycenaean pottery is also the age in which its diffusion was widest. 6

The historical interpretation of this remarkable fact is one of the most interesting of the many unsolved problems presented by the early civilization of the Aegean and the neighbouring countries.

Mr. Bosanquet sends me the following note:

In connection with the "furthest north" which you have established

for Mycenaean vases, it is interesting to notice how far their range has been determined in other directions.


(2) East. The fragments found at Tell-es-Sāfi and other sites in Southern Palestine are described by Welch in *B.S.A.* vi. 119. For the interior of Asia Minor I know only of a fragment obtained by Crowfoot in 1900 at Utch Euyuk in the Konia desert, on the road leading from Iaconium to Tyana.

(3) South. The Egyptian finds extend up the Nile as far as Thebes.

In the Museo Aesuvario, which stands a few yards off and contains the same sort of miscellaneous collection, is a large Corinthian black-figured vase. It stands about eighteen inches high, and its body is nearly spherical. The neck is short and the mouth large. The rim is sharply turned over and flat. At two points this lip widens into a broad lug which touches the tops of the horizontal handles. A vase of exactly similar shape, except that the body is not so spherical, is figured in Tafel II. 25 of Wilisch's *Die Altheloditisches Thonindustrie*. The lower part of the vase is black; the upper part is decorated with two friezes, of which the upper consists of warriors fighting, the lower of animals. The figures, being in black on the clay ground, have their details inside the outline indicated by scratches on the black paint.

The vase is of interest because Wilisch (*op. cit.* p. 109), in giving a list of places where vases of this style have been found, states that, though found north of the Alps, they are entirely lacking in the plain of the Po.

R. M. Dawkins.
THE BRONZE STATUE FROM CERIGOTTO AND THE STUDY OF STYLE.

The article of Mr. Frost in the preceding number of this Journal (pp. 217, seq.) gives me an opportunity to protest against what I consider a dangerous development of archaeological study in our days. I must thank the Editors for having, in spite of the great pressure upon their space, granted me a few pages in the present number to record this protest; while I must defer to a later issue of this Journal the fuller exposition of my views on the Cerigotto Bronze, the statue of Agias from Delphi, on Scopas and Lysippus.

The protest—or, perhaps better, the warning—which I wish to publish concerns the course given in the present day to the study of style in Classical Art. To this study, as practised by the late Heinrich v. Brunn, Archaeology owes its greatest advance; and the serious students of Mediaeval and Renaissance art have borrowed these methods from classical archaeology, thus opening out a vast field of accurate information. I have myself devoted my energies to its cultivation and endeavoured to lay down the principles of its proper application in the first chapter of my Essays on the Art of Pheidias published in 1885. I believe, moreover, that we are only at the beginning of this line of work which promises such great results in the future. Nor need we remain content with the establishment and amplification of our knowledge of Greek art in the great classical period, as little as in Greek literature study, and especially research, are to be confined to the great classical writers. Still, even as regards the art of the classical periods, with the thousands of statues and other works of art still unidentified in our museums and the enormous increase of rich material every year yielded by new excavations, there is enough original work to be done in the great historical periods for generations to come. But the time has come to go further in the differentiation of works which by their origin distinctly belong to a later date; though—and I shall recur to this later—we must be careful in defining the nature and true meaning of such a term as 'Hellenistic,' or else we shall increase the confusion. In an article in this Journal in 1886 (Vol. VII. pp. 240 seq.) I wrote as follows with regard to some monuments belonging to the Roman period of Greek art in Asia Minor: 'There can be no doubt that the interest attaching to such works will grow with the development and systematisation of the study of archaeology.' For we may reasonably hope that, as our
power to fix in time and to distinguish with accuracy the broader characteristic points of distinction between Greek and Graeco-Roman art grows, we shall not halt at this stage, but shall advance still further in successful endeavours to establish more detailed distinctions of time and even locality within these broader divisions, &c.

There is thus a right way of developing such methods; but there is also a wrong way which is finding favour at the present time and threatens to demolish the whole archaeological system. This wrong way is, to my mind, represented by an archaeologist of much prominence, of extensive knowledge and indefatigable industry, I mean Professor Furtwängler.

In his endeavour to increase our store of identified works of ancient art he has put forward hypotheses which are, many of them ingenious, some well founded as hypotheses. But in a large number of cases these hypothetical identifications rest upon comparisons in which late and debased Roman works are compared with early Greek works, slight similarities in some one detail—the curls of the hair, the curve of the mouth, nay an attitude which a work may share with many others not at all considered in such a relationship—are insisted upon and exaggerated, while essential differences in other points are ignored. There is not a single chapter in his Meisterwerke in which I do not feel prepared to point to such misleading comparisons. But what is still more harmful is a habit, into which he has allowed himself to fall, of gliding into full assurance from beginnings of mere surmise as he proceeds in his methods. Thus a very tentative hypothesis, resting upon slight foundations of probability, when once stated and published by him, is afterwards referred to as a firm and well established starting-point for further surmise: 'We have seen,' or 'I have shown, that the Hermes is Myrian, or by Praxiteles or Argive [which was a mere surmise], now the work under consideration has the following important points in common with it.' This is a familiar form of his stylistic method. When once one has recognised this peculiarity, however much one may disapprove of it, one can make allowances in dealing with any piece of evidence presented by that distinguished master; but one is sorry to see the same tendency spreading among younger archaeologists.

Of this recent development of the practice of studies in style Mr. Frost's article is a striking instance. Thus without giving any reference, he speaks of the 'Portrait of Pericles after Kresilas' (p. 234), of 'the same Praxitelean method' in the Hermes, the Eubuleus, and the Hygieia' (p. 218), —I am absolutely at a loss which head of Hygieia is here meant) which ought to be thus taken as a starting-point in the study of Praxitelean style; he refers to the 'Sabouroff bronze' without reference; we are also informed

---

4 Such well-known works as the Apollo of Tervis, the Dischumenos from Delos, the portrait of Sophocles (I suppose the one in the Lateran) might be given without reference; though it must help the non-specialist reader to be referred to some illustration. But when the 'Portrait of Icarius of Pompeii,' the bronze Satyr at Munich, statues in the Museum of Athens and in the British Museum are mentioned without reference, we have the right to ask for more details.
that the Lysippean hair stands up to fall down again, as in the Zeus, Poseidon, and Alexander heads' (p. 218). I am utterly unable to guess which head of Zeus or of Poseidon and which extant head of Alexander are thus taken as loci classicus of Lysippean style. We have no right to assume that the extant portraits of Pericles are by or after Kresilas—an artist about whom we know very little that is positive. I am far from being convinced that the so-called Eubuleus is a work to be ascribed to Praxiteles, and I know nothing about the 'Hygieia.' It is certainly not admissible to take them as fixed starting-points for Praxitelean style. I could continue, were it worth while, to give instances of this exaggeration of the defects in Professor Furtwängler's 'stylistics'; but there is one more case concerning which I gladly take this opportunity of correcting what may become a serious abuse.

In connexion with the small bronze statuette from Ligurio (Fig. 1) which Professor Furtwängler has, with some slight probability, ascribed to Ageladas (none of whose works are extant or described in detail by ancient authors) Mr. Frost says p. 223: 'Professor Furtwängler has shown how the way was paved for the canon of Polycleitus, nay, how the whole school seemed to be tending inevitably towards a canon: the continuity of the tradition of the Argive school both before and after Polycleitus is one of its most striking characteristics.' Now, if ever there was a hasty theory resting on the most precarious grounds, it is this one which Mr. Frost again makes the sole basis for his further theories. In the Berlin Winckelmannsfeastprogramm for 1890, pp. 125 seq., Professor Furtwängler published his proposed identification of the bronze from Ligurio with some unknown statue by Ageladas, and then proceeded to show the continuity of this influence from the beginning of the fifth century B.C. down to the latter half of the first century B.C. He did this in maintaining that the small bronze showed essential and unmistakable similarities of style with the statue signed Stephanus, the pupil of Menelaos, who again signs himself as a pupil of Pasiteles (Fig. 2). We have thus fortunately a series of works illustrating the interesting reactionary and eclectic character of Pasitelean art in Rome. As the illustration here given (Fig. 1) will show, the Ligurio bronze gives a youth of unusually thick-set muscular type, squat in proportion, with a large head in which Furtwängler sees the forerunner of the Polycleitan 'canon.'

* Cf. my remarks on Furtwängler's treatment of this artist in Argive Heraeum, vol. 1, pp. 164 seq.
attitude of the statue, especially as regards the legs,—for which there are other instances in the early fifth century—is supposed to be the same as in the Pasitelean statues. Some of the most striking characteristics of the Stephanus ephelus, however, are the simple modelling of the body, without accentuation of muscular development, the curious eclectic proportions in which the slimmess, attributed to Lysippus (contrasted in this respect to the Argive canon), is much exaggerated, as is the smallness of the head. Even the squareness of the shoulders and chest has nothing in common with Polycleitan types; for the shoulders are peculiarly straight, almost pointed in their angles, while the upper part of the chest is very flat. There is

![Fig. 2.—Stephanus Statue and 'Orestes and Electra' at Naples.](From_Casts_in_the_Fitzwilliam_Museum.)

absolutely nothing to go on; and the attempt to establish a continuity of Ageladian or even Polycleitan influence means stylistics run mad. With singular univited Professor Furtwängler gives his reasons for choosing in his illustration the replica from the Naples group called 'Orestes and Electra,' which he takes pains to tell us are inferior, in preference to the signed statue by Stephanus. Practically they are: that its differences from the Stephanus statue are in the direction of the work with which he desires to establish a
stylistic relationship *contre que moïa.* But I feel bound emphatically to protest against the misleading character of the drawing I here reproduce (Fig. 3) and on which the 'stylistic comparison' rests. The figure of Orestes has been materially shortened and thickened in the drawing.

I have made careful measurements of the figure in Furtwangler's drawing and of the same figure and the Stephanus ephesus as given by Collignon (Hist. I. A. Gr. vol. ii., pp. 61 and 62). The result is that the figure (from arm-pit to heel) in Furtwangler's drawing is 3'83 times as high as the torso (from arm-pit to hip), while in Collignon's cut it is 4'18 times as high. In Furtwangler's drawing the whole statue is 6'73 lengths of the head, in Collignon's it is 7'27, while in the Stephanus ephesus it is even 7'43. In round figures: in the one it is 6 1/4; in the other 7 1/4 heads. Imagine the difference in a living figure, both in size and slimness, of half a head's length! [The Lágurio statuette, by the way, is 3 1/4 heads in height.] I have had photographs made here reproduced of the Stephanus statue and the Orestes from the casts in the Fitzwilliam Museum and I think the whole question will answer itself.

As I shall not recur to the other works from Cérigotto again, I must point out in a few words that the marble figure which I interpreted as a crouching fighter and compared with a Lapith from the Parthenon, is dealt with summarily by Mr. Frost. He says that the Lapith, however, is only taken from a drawing. What can this 'only' mean? I here repro-

---

*Fig. 4.—Mezzo from the Parthenon, after Carrey.*

---

*1 am happy to find that Mr. J. N. Svororos, in his remarkable publication, *Das Athenes Nationalmuseum* ii. pp. 66 seq. Pl. XII., had also maintained that this statue represented a combatant. I am not, however, convinced from his plate that the crouching fighter had an opponent fighting on foot before him. It was more probably a horseman or centaur.*
duce the drawing* made by Carrey of a metope no longer extant and beg the reader to compare it with the Cerigotto figure on p. 231 of the previous number. After considering the right hand with the oval opening and imitating the posture of the crouching youth whose left arm, the stump and shoulder, is raised high (too high, by the way, for the act of shielding the eyes to look into the sun), I would ask what the youth could be doing? After considering extant statues of fighters on foot meeting the advance of horsemen to which I referred, I should have thought that the metope from the Parthenon showing this action on the reversed side, would settle the question to all conversant with such evidence. But Mr. Frost suggests that the youth in that forced attitude, with his right hand in which a round shaft was inserted, and the other arm strained up, formed part of a group of ἀνταραγώνες. 'The player was in the act of picking up his die, but has stopped suddenly to hurl some gibe accompanied by a gesture of disdain at his opponent, who has probably made a remark.'

CHARLES WALDSTEIN.

* I have to thank Mr. John Murray for permission to use this block, already published in the Monthly Review, May 1901, p. 124.
ON THE TOPOGRAPHY OF CYZICUS.

[Plate VI.]

The site map of Cyzicus reproduced in this number (Pl. VI) represents the results of Mr. A. E. Henderson’s survey in the summers of 1902—3. The first season’s work, of which alone I can speak at first hand, accounted for the coast line, prominent remains (including the city walls), and main roads: the limits of the marsh land on the isthmus were also ascertained with considerable exactness with a view to the recent discussion of the original nature of the Cyzicene Peninsula1: these limits, however, are subject to a certain amount of variation with the season, and cultivation is yearly encroaching upon them. The maze of walls within the enceinte—some of them modern vineyard boundaries, others doubtless resting on ancient foundations—was added by Mr. Henderson and Mr. Peet in 1903; contouring was found impossible in the time at their disposal, and indeed the general levels of the site are fairly adequately shown on the excellent Admiralty Chart of Artaki Bay (of which a section is here reproduced in miniature in Fig. 1) and on the sketch maps of Perrot and De Rustafjaell.

The walls, which are built chiefly of the local granite, enclose an irregular space stretching practically from sea to sea, and, with the exception of the acropolis hill, fairly level. This height slopes steeply east and west to the valleys which form its natural defences and more gently southwards to the isthmus: on the north it is connected with the mountain mass of the Kapa Dagh.

The very varied structure of the walls betrays that they were built and rebuilt at many periods. Records help us but little: the town was unwalled in 410,2 and defences were under construction towards the middle of the fourth century.3 The commercial prosperity of the city as evidenced by the stater coinage hardly allows us to suppose that it was then defended for the first time, and Thucydides may allude to a result of the Spartan occupation.4 We may assume local demolitions in the peaceful Antonine period, but the

1 Rec. Err. Gr. vii. 92.
3 Rec. Err. Gr. iv. 49; but cf. Frontis. iii. 9, 8.
4 At Teos the walls were levelled under similar circumstances (Thuc. vii. 16).
encaustate was so restored as to be considered impregnable in the fourth century A.D. and had probably repulsed the Scythians a hundred years before. Villehardouin mentions the defences of the Crusaders, who made the place their headquarters in 1296, and the accounts of Muntaner* and Pachymeres* show that the isthmus wall was kept up as a defence against the Turks as late as the fourteenth century—practically, that is, down to the final conquest.

---

* Anon. Merc. xxxvi. 5.
* Zon. l. 43. Pius Gallicai xiiii. Cass. xxxi.
* § 226.
* § 203.
* l. 200 a.
ON THE TOPOGRAPHY OF CYZICUS.

The styles of building found in the existing remains of the enceinte may be roughly classified as follows:—

I. Granite blocks laid in irregular courses, frequently with diagonal jointing; interstices filled with mortar or small stones. This is the construction of the great south-eastern bastion. Perrot gives a measured drawing of a section of this wall, which he assigns to good Greek date; his opinion was borne out by a fourth century inscription, relating to the building of a tower, which was discovered by Cambella clamped to the base of the wall in this neighbourhood. The wall has evidently suffered since, and it is now difficult to distinguish it from the stones which have been gathered from the vineyards and piled against it. We found no architectural detail built in except a large Doric drum of brown sandstone.

II. Facing of rectangular dark granite blocks slightly bossed and laid in regular courses about 40 m. deep; the blocks are disposed alternate headers and stretchers, the exposed surface of one stretcher equalling about that of two headers; the jointing is fair in this and the succeeding style (III); the core of the wall is generally of whitish cement.

The best examples of this style are to be found (a) in the stretch of wall between Demir Kapu and the central harbour, where both facings are preserved, giving a thickness of about 1-50 m., and (b) in the fragment immediately south of the Upper Road, where the stretchers have disappeared so as to show the headers talling into the cement; (c) this is also the construction shown at the west postern gate.

III. Facing of very long stretchers (sometimes as much as 2-20 m.) of various granites; headers only a few centimetres in thickness and often of marble; courses vary from 0.50 to 0.30 m. deep.

The best examples are:—(a) The hexagonal towers and the curtain wall between them: the towers stand to a height of some 5-00 m., their upper parts being of unfaced rubble set in coarse red cement. This may be a later addition to the substructure, but outside the western tower only the quoins are of squared stone, the rest rubble-faced. The wall between the towers is about 1-40 thick:—(b) A long stretch south of the conspicuous fragment below the Upper Road standing to the height of about 2-00 m. and well preserved.

IV. Massive but irregular white granite facing with coarse joints, filled with white cement, which is daubed carelessly over the face of the wall. This is shown (a) in the stretch of wall adjoining the Ennek road (where many architectural remains and fragments of tile are built in) and (b) in the square tower opposite the head of the aqueduct. This construction may well date from the fourteenth century defences of the isthmus.

V. Rough rubble building with facing of small stones is found in the wall and buttress towers running from Demir Kapu towards the sea. This seems to be a late addition to the enceinte probably along the line of the original harbour defences.

The south-eastern corner is a convenient starting-point for a circuit of the walls. From Demir Kapu westwards to the mole of the central harbour the line of defence is represented by an embankment about forty feet high, still crowned in one place by the strong and well-preserved section of wall we have mentioned as characteristic of our style II. In front of this is a short stretch of moat, still filled with water. The mole is so overgrown that its masonry is no longer visible. The curved sweep of the harbour is defined by a very irregular and largely modern stone wall generally one or two metres high. That the original wall lies behind or under this is evidenced by a considerable drop toward the marsh in the levels. [Inside the wall at this point are remains of a large rubble building, marked in the map, among which a vault some five metres high and a large semi-dome flanked by remains of two smaller are conspicuous.—A.E.H.] West of Baluk
Tash a point of low ground, sprinkled with trees, runs out southwards. The extremity of this was mistaken by Mr. De Rustafjaell for a mole, and from the acropolis hill, as he says, it presents exactly the same appearance as the brushwood-covered mole we have referred to: there is, however, no vestige of masonry, and the wall continues west of this point, curving gradually south to enclose the harbour, and returning west again at the square tower nearly opposite the entrance of the aqueduct.

This latter, of which no vestige remains within the city, is easily traced outside it across the low ground adjoining the wall and up the embankment opposite. From this point it continues with inconsiderable gaps, though the piers are hidden in brushwood, right across the marsh to the Erdek and Panderma road, which is level with the spencs of the aqueduct at the point of junction. The piers are built of rubble, and the examples at the north end, which are preserved to a height of about 60 m., are placed some 300 apart, and measure about 1.80 x 2.20 m. The only surviving arch, adjoining the Erdek road, is of rubble and the spencs (about 0.30 square) is lined with cement.

About the point where the aqueduct entered the town we again encounter a stretch of moat, and here there seems to have been a double line of fortification, viz., a low wall abutting on the moat and supporting a broad terrace (it is fair to state that no masonry of this wall is visible) behind which rises the main wall; the latter is here much overgrown and only occasionally visible. In this section Mr. Henderson discovered the outlet of a stream through the wall, just west of this is the opening described by Perrot and Guillaume as a postern: we hesitate to give it so definite a name, for though there are traces of a facing of squared stone running through the wall on the west side of the gap, an opening built in the same axis would be overlapped by the eastern boundary of the supposed gate.

[The difficult and largely uncultivated ground in the south-western portion of the city within the harbour contains remains of several buildings of importance, including (a) a series of vaulted substructures (somewhat similar to those of the temple of Hadrian), in the neighbourhood of which are many coarse architectural fragments, (b) a long vault (upwards of 24 m. long) to the north-west of this, and (c) an apsidal wall standing seven metres high further westward, which marks the point where the soil changes from loam to sand. — A. E. H.]

An irregular platform, perhaps the foundation of a strong corner tower, terminates the terrace, the wall being extended westwards to the Erdek road in the massive but careless masonry of Style IV. There are also traces of masonry leading south, perhaps representing the entrance of the western causeway from the mainland. The main line of the wall strikes north from the corner tower, crossing the stream and road and eventually connecting with the hexagonal towers of Balkiz Serai. This section has all but disappeared, though the remains shown on the map give the probable line.

The hexagonal towers have been described as characteristic of Style
III. They are connected by three or four courses of a massive wall, and between them, beside the giant plane-tree, which is a conspicuous mark from many points of view, a stream of clear water issues from a long stone-vaulted passage beneath the wall. At the back of this stretch of wall are conspicuous remains of a large Byzantine building.

From Balkiz Serai northward the line of the wall is for some time doubtful: a conspicuous fragment rises nearly opposite the Temple Ruins, where the Agora of Hadrian probably met the wall. Such a scheme would bring the temple into the middle of the south side of a long rectangular enclosure, some 450 × 100 m., whose western termination, with most of the southern wall, is clearly traceable. The ground at the western end has every appearance of having been artificially levelled, and the bank running along the north side, where even now broken monolithic shafts of red-veined St. Simeon marble may be seen, possibly represents a portico.

The temple itself is today represented only by the substructures of the podium. A general view shows a great mound, or rather agglomeration of mounds, measuring about 120 × 180 m., rising four to six metres above the surrounding country and overgrown with stunted holly-bushes. While the marble of the temple has been consigned piecemeal to the kiln, the substructures, being of laser material, have escaped, and rather tempt one to doubt the correctness of Cyriac's description of the temple, and consequently of Reinač's restoration from these data.

The mound is traversed by seven parallel tunnels running east and west, for the most part built of rubble and very dilapidated. The best preserved portion, measured and planned by Perrot, probably supported the cela, and is (so far, in accordance with Cyriac's description of the deep colonnade on the east front) somewhat west of the centre of the mound: it occupies the breadth of the three central tunnels, and its outer walls are carefully built of squared blocks, now stripped of their metal clamps; the walls of the central nave and the vaults throughout are of rubble set in coarse pink cement. In the southern wall of the central nave is contrived a stairway, (now ruinous) opening at right angles to the nave, but running parallel to it. Nearly opposite in the corresponding wall is a short passage leading to a domed well chamber; the entrance to this passage is nearly blocked by fallen debris.

The particulars given by Cyriac, and his dimensions in feet, imply a hexastyle building with fifteen columns a side and a long porch at either end, but it is to be noted that this restoration does not harmonise with his rough measurements (in cubits) even in the proportion of side to front: the dimensions in feet, though remarkable for their simplicity, are based on the column diameter, give in reality a mathematical rather than an

---

88 Perrot gives a plan of the westernmost.
11 Mr. Henderson sees in some semicircularly disposed rubble fragments at the eastern end the remains of an apsidal termination to the Agora; personally I cannot consider the evidence sufficient.
12 Cf. Pasco, p. 115. "The Piazza probably had a portico round it, because in digging for stones they found at the west end sixteen very large square pieces of marble which were probably the foundations of as many columns."
architectural symmetry: Cyzicus's good faith is not always free from suspicion, and the ruins as he saw them were obscured by débris. The evidence of the seven vaults rather suggests that the temple was octastyle, which plan would moreover be natural for a temple of such vast dimensions: the idea is borne out by all known coins representing the nereate temple of Cyzicus; most of these, again, show a further peculiarity in the wide central intercolumniation, which is also implied by the wide nave and narrow flanking aisles of the temple vaults.10

The temple at Aezani, which must be nearly contemporary with the Cyzicene (as its composite capitals and the Hadrianic inscriptions on its walls testify), shows the same vaulted substructures, and even the same stairway from the vaults and similar ventilation holes. This temple, though much smaller than the Cyzicene, is octastyle and has a wide central intercolumniation; it is further pseudopodal, has fifteen columns a side, and a normal intercolumniation of about 1 1/2 diameters.

Working from a column diameter of about seven feet at Cyzicus (on which all authorities are agreed) and Perrot's measured drawing of the central vaults, we get a nave width of about 14 feet or two diameters and against an aisle width of about one and a half. In the cells above the vaults two ranges of columns (five a side, according to Cyzicus) probably continued the alignment of the central intercolumniation.11 We will assume therefore that the central intercolumniation was equal to two diameters, and the flanking intercolumniations to one and a half, the normal intercolumniation at Aezani. The length of the passage from the east gives us a promenade in minos of two intercolumniations' depth if we assume that the lateral intercolumniation is also one and a half diameters. Applying this ratio to the length measurement of the central vaults we find that the cells wall above accounted for six columns and five intercolumniations—again paralleled at Aezani. Following out the Aezani plan we shall add front and back porches in minos of two intercolumniations' depth (the former it will be remembered has been found independently from the measurements of the ruins), thus accounting for ten of the fifteen lateral columns. Of the remaining five, two must probably be given to the back and three to the front.

Bending away north-west from the Agora the wall is traced to the crossing of the stream, and past it by confused masses of ruin, amongst which two huge granite corbels are conspicuous, to the crossing of the Lower Road: here the foundation stones of its two faces are visible in the ground; shortly after this the wall mounts the left bank of the stream to the postern gate mentioned by Mr. De Rustafjaell, which is a small opening with granite vousoirs measuring 1.25 m. × 1.60 (to spring of arch): its position in an angle of the wall, and the steep fall away to the stream, probably led Perrot to mark it in his map as a portion of a theatre. From this point round the three sides of the Acropolis back to the Upper Road the general line of the wall is unmistakable, though it is entirely overgrown with the exception of the prominent fragment (called Kalé), at the N.E. corner.

[We may here remark in parenthesis that we can add nothing to previous descriptions of the amphitheatre: it was difficult even to obtain the general measurements (180 × 155 m.) satisfactorily in the present overgrown state of the ruins. As regards Mr. De Rustafjaell's cutting from above the dam passing west of the amphitheatre the levels do not seem to permit of its having been a bed for the diverted stream: it was more probably cut to take the

10 Cf. A.-E.M. viii. 162.
11 I am inclined to doubt this correspondence since my last visit to the ruins.—A.E.H.
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place of the natural road up the valley—perhaps the ‘Jasonian way’ of Apollonius—when the latter was blocked by the building of the amphitheatre.

The theatre is apparently a Greek embanked building, enlarged in Roman times by the addition of a rubble superstructure, and now completely overgrown with brushwood. The diameter is about 110 m. North-east of it are foundations of a Byzantine building, and glass-mosaics are here plentiful.—A.E.H.]

Almost immediately after crossing the Upper Road a stretch of wall, before mentioned as a typical specimen of style II, stands to a height of six or seven metres: below this the wall is preserved for several hundred yards to a height of about two metres, showing the massive construction of style III. At this point there is a maze of flimsy walls outside the moat and a good deal of architectural detail is lying about or built in. At the south-east bastion, which is built on the first level ground after the slope of the Acropolis hill, the walls are, as has been said, ill preserved: the curious series of curves and angles perhaps implies that the eastern harbour originally extended further north.

The fragment of wall opposite the eastern harbour, originally of style II, is now stripped of its facing and stands only to the height of a few feet. From this point to the southern limit of the city the course of the wall is indicated by a broad low mound skirting the eastern marsh, and occasionally retaining remnants of its granite facing: we found no break in this wall which could have admitted De Rustafjaell’s canal, and the hollowness of the ground between this and the central harbour may perhaps be accounted for by the removal of earth for the embankment of the city wall on the inner side.

Demir Kapu is a mere mass of rubble masonry, overgrown with brushwood, and for the most part stripped of facing: in plan the ruin is a large projecting square tower: in the inner wall is still visible a small brick arch, too small, however, for that of the gate itself. It seems certain that one of the causeways entered the town at or about this spot: here is, in fact, one of the only points on the isthmus where land, as opposed to marsh and sand dune, extends the whole way to the mainland: along this line, moreover, architectural fragments are fairly plentiful, while potsherds and coins are found in the adjacent fields; on the mainland side remains of it are probably hidden under brushwood. The second causeway ran probably along the line of the Erdek-Panderma road.

We thus obtain a fairly symmetrical plan for the southern portion of the city: in the middle of the isthmus is the bight of the central harbour, flanked by projecting wings, at the extreme corners of which entered the two causeways from the mainland. From these points the circuit of the city bends northward and seaward, while the south wall is extended towards both

16 Hamilton, p. 109, remarks on the fertilizing properties of the local granite when decomposed.
seas. The walls thus partially enclose two marshes, which, from their connection with the dilapidated mole, we are justified in accepting as ancient ports. We have in a previous paper 18 identified the central harbour with Panormus and the λάινυ of inscriptions, and the western conjecturally with Chytus. The eastern, being certainly on the right side of the isthmus for the returning Argonauts, may be the 'Thracian Harbour' mentioned by Apollonius 15; from the name we may assume that it was the harbour regularly patronized by the traders from Byzantium and the Thracian ports, and compare the similarly named 'Egyptian harbour' at Tyre, 18 and for the general idea Aristides' allotment of the three ports of Rhodes; 18 it is worthy of remark that the arrangement of the southern portion of the site of Cyzicus, with its three harbours, bears a striking resemblance to the harbour quarter of ancient Rhodes.
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SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE PERSIAN WARS.¹

3. The Campaign of Plataea.

Mardonius reoccupied Athens, Herodotus tells us (ix. 3), in the tenth month after Xerxes had taken it, that is to say not earlier than June of the next year. The pause in the war lasted therefore far beyond the winter. Both parties were no doubt anxious to gather the new harvest, but there were also other reasons for their delay.

Mardonius had been left in a difficult situation. The forces at his disposal were, it is true, still formidable. First, he had his own division, which we have reason to suppose was one of the six Persian corps d'armée: 60,000 strong. In confirmation of that estimate it may be noted that Herodotus assigns to him one sixth of Xerxes' army, which he conceives to have been the levy of the whole empire; and that if we compare the details of Mardonius' division (viii. 113, ix. 31) with the catalogue of Xerxes' host (vii. 61-5), and reckon a myriad for each contingent of infantry (Immortals, θερμηκερατος: Medes: Sacae and Bactrians: Indians), we get 50,000 infantry, which with 10,000 cavalry gives the exact composition conjectured for a Persian army corps. The small drafts incorporated according to Herodotus from other contingents may be assumed to have filled up the gaps made in the ranks by the first campaign. Second, Mardonius had his Greek auxiliaries, say 20,000 men, including the valuable Thessalian and Boeotian cavalry. Herodotus (ix. 32) estimates the Greek contingents at 50,000 men, but he expressly says that he has no authority for their numbers, and both probability and analogy (e.g. vii. 185, viii. 66) are against so high a computation. It may also be noticed that he assigns the same proportion of auxiliaries to Mardonius as to Xerxes (50,000 : 300,000 : 300,000 : 1,800,000). Third, Mardonius could draw upon the corps of Artabazus so far as troops could be spared from the siege of Potidaea and garrison duties,² that is to say to the extent of 40,000 men (Hist. ix. 66, 70). Herodotus no doubt implies (viii. 129) that Artabazus had lost the remaining third of his force in the siege, but that is merely an inference from the numbers, 60,000 in chapter 126.

¹ Continued from vol. xxi. p. 332.
² It is pretty clear from Thucydides that 20,000 men were far more than enough to besiege Potidaea. Was it the entry of Artaeum through the sea (Thuc. i. 67) that revived the memory of Artabazus' attempt?
40,000 in Book ix. Similarly he infers from the subordination of Artabazus to Mardonius (cf. ix. 42) that the former's corps was only a detachment of the latter's (viii. 126).

Thus Mardonius might concentrate as many as 120,000 men for an attack on the Peloponnese. But the wall at the isthmus, defended by the best troops in Greece, must have appeared even to Xerxes impregnable by direct assault, and if we are to believe Herodotus (ix. 7–9) was still being strengthened. The position could not be turned by land, and Mardonius had not command of the sea. He might of course call across the Aegean the remnant of Xerxes' armada, which mustered at Samos in the spring and still numbered 300 ships (Hdt. viii. 130). But he must have known that it was no match for the allies if they met it with the full force of their united fleets, especially as a large proportion of the 300 ships were Ionian.

Under these circumstances irresponsible advisers might well recommend the policy of patience and corruption (cf. Hdt. ix. 2, 41), but Mardonius had to redeem his promises to the king. His best hope of effecting something seemed to lie in offering favourable terms to the Athenians. He might perhaps detach them from the league and bring over their navy to his side (Hdt. viii. 136), or failing that might use them as a lever to put pressure on the Peloponnnesians and force them to come out of their 'island' and offer battle in Boeotia.

In this attempt the position of Athenian parties seemed to promise some chance of success. Themistocles, whose conspicuous loyalty to the common cause had been amply recognized by the Spartans, had surrendered the direction of affairs to his old rivals, Aristides and Xanthippus. We have seen in his retirement and their accession the bargain whereby he purchased their support for his policy in the war. But such an arrangement was not likely to be publicly known even among the Athenians, much less to Mardonius. In his eyes the new government, elected doubtless in the winter, represented only the party traditionally favourable to an alliance with Persia and hostile to Sparta. This was moreover the party of agrarian interests, and he held under his hand a precious hostage in the soil of Attica. It was also the party of the hoplite army, inclined to fight out the war on land rather than on sea. The new government assumed office in the spring (Hdt. viii. 131, cf. vii. 173–4) whether by the ordinary practice of the time or as an exceptional measure. Mardonius naturally waited for its installation before opening his negotiations. Meanwhile he had doubtless plenty to occupy him in organizing the new provinces and his own comissariat and Greek public opinion—if that was the purpose of the mission of Mys. It was not until diplomacy had been tried and failed that Mardonius took the field.

But what were the Greeks about all the early summer? Leotychidas mustered a fleet at Aegina at the beginning of spring, but to the great disgust of the Chian conspirators refused to proceed beyond Delos. The
allied army was not yet assembled. If the Greeks advanced after midsummer, why did they not move sooner? Herodotus has a ready answer (viii. 141, 144, ix. 6–8). The Lacedaemonians were busy fortifying the isthmus. When Alexander came to the Athenians with the seductive offers of Mardonius, they promised to meet the Persians in Boeotia. But once they had finished their wall they had no further care for the defence of Attica. It was only the danger pointed out to them by Chilocus of letting the Athenian fleet pass over to the enemy that roused them to action. But the more this account is scrutinized the less satisfactory does it appear. (1) The wall must have been for all practical purposes ready long before (Hdt. viii. 71, ix. 10). (2) A defence of Attica can scarcely have been seriously contemplated by any responsible person. It is an afterthought suggested by subsequent events and fostered by Athenian prejudices. Attica had been deliberately abandoned in the previous year. Xerxes had ravaged the country and sacked the Acropolis. Individual citizens may have ventured back to their homes to take stock of the damage, but the notion (Hdt. viii. 109–10, ix. 6) that the population returned en masse and fell to building and ploughing; however effective to enhance Athenian sacrifices and blacken Peloponnesian selfishness, is an outrage upon common sense. Thucydides (i. 89) ignores it, and Herodotus here as elsewhere supplies hints for his own refutation. He does indeed send Alexander to Athens (viii. 136, 140), but he afterwards implies that he had to cross the strait to Salamis (διεπόρθμενα εν ix. 4). The Athenians sowed their corn (viii. 109–10), but they did not reap it (καρπον εστηρησαν δεθων ηνον viii. 142), although they might have done so by the middle of June. There was no sufficient strategic motive to defend Attica. What was wanted was an offensive campaign to oust the Persians from Greece, and according to Herodotus own version (ix. 7) the Athenians are even more urgent that the Spartans should march after Mardonius had occupied their territory. (3) The fact said to have been pointed out by Chilocus must from the very first have been obvious to the meanest intelligence. (4) Herodotus does not account for the inaction of the fleet, except by the transparent hypothesis of timidity. Why was the Chian invitation declined and the Samian accepted (Hdt. viii. 131–2, ix. 90–2)? What accession of strength had meanwhile emboldened Leotychidas? The answer throws a curious side-light on Herodotus' story. We have already had some practice in dealing with his numbers. They are not arbitrary inventions, but neither are they always statements of literal fact. They are sometimes conventional, and sometimes cover a calculation. We have seen that the Athenian ships are still 200 at Salamis in spite of all their losses at Artemisium, and that the total number of the Greek fleet there may have been calculated from the Aeschylean figure 310. Now Herodotus (viii. 131) puts the fleet that assembled at Aegina in the spring under Leotychidas at 110 sail. Has he reformed his methods? I think not. These '110'
represent only the Peloponnesian and other contingents. The '200' Athenian ships were absent! This inference is confirmed from quite a different quarter. It has often been observed that there is a redundancy of 800 in Herodotus' figures for the light-armed troops at Plataea (ix. 29). Professor E. Moyer (Gesch. d. Alt. iii. p. 408) has neatly explained it by supposing that the Athenian archers (Hdt. ix. 22, 60) are included in the reckoning, and his suggestion has been generally accepted. But we learn from Thucydides (ii. 13) and the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία (24) that 1600 Athenians were bowmen. If 800 were serving at Plataea, where were the other 800? Plutarch (Them. 14) assigns 4 archers to each Athenian trireme in the fleet at Salamis. The obvious conclusion is that the Athenians still had 200 ships in commission and the missing archers were on board. The Athenians probably did not join Leotychidas until midsummer, after they had landed their army in Attica (Hdt. ix. 19). Hence Xanthippus was still able to go on the embassy to Sparta (Plut. Arist. 10). It may also be noted that Diodorus (xi. 34) reckons the allied fleet which crossed the Aegean at 250 ships. Probably he put the Athenian contingent at 140, as at Artemisium (xi. 12).

The equivocation about the ships (for that is what it comes to—mark the word πᾶσαι at the beginning of Hdt. viii. 132) is doubtless to be imputed not to Herodotus himself but to his Athenian informants. But it is none the less fatal to his attempt, already somewhat discredited, to fix the whole responsibility for the delay upon the Lacedaemonians. For it would seem to show that the authors of this version felt that there was something less heroic than they pretended in the attitude of the Athenians at this crisis. The withholding of the fleet was at least open to criticism, and prima facie the Athenians were no less to blame than the Spartans.

Are we then to accept the theory of most recent historians, that the allies were pulling different ways? The Spartans wished to remain on the defensive by land, but make a diversion in the Aegean, which by threatening the Persian communications might force Mardonius to withdraw without a battle. The Athenians wished to make the Peloponnesian army march out and cover Attica before consenting to use their fleet. This hypothesis, plausible at first sight, is not, I think, really tenable. Our dispute with Herodotus has reinforced it on one point by showing that the Athenian fleet was actually withheld, but on the other hand it has robbed it of its strongest argument by discrediting the supposed return of the Athenians to their homes. There are also other objections. (1) It is surprising on the face of it to find Sparta advocating a naval expedition and shirking a campaign on land, while Athens withholds her fleet and insists upon taking the field. Very different was their attitude after the battle of Salamis. And it was not by reversing their natural rôles that either would make the most of her proper advantages whether for the common cause or for her own ulterior objects. (2) It can hardly be said that the numerical superiority of the Persians, reduced to its true proportions, was enough to deter the Spartans, for it did not deter them a few weeks later. (3) If a diversion in
the Aegean had offered any immediate prospect of getting rid of Mardonius; would the Athenians have refused it? Would they not rather have been the first to propose it? (4) The interests of the two partners were not really opposed. Both wanted to get rid of Mardonius as quickly as possible. The Athenians had, to be sure, the more pressing need, but the Spartans had reasons urgent enough. So long as he remained on Greek soil Sparta could not rest. His presence incited against her every enemy inside as well as outside her entrenched camp, and was a standing menace to her whole political system. The strain upon the allegiance of her allies was perilous. Her very existence was in jeopardy. Historians have somewhat failed to appreciate the critical position of Sparta. Distracted by the noisy importance of Athenian grievances they have not observed that the tardiness of Spartan action demands some better explanation than a conventional phrase such as 'selfish apathy', or 'characteristic slowness.'

The fact seems to be that although the situation called for an offensive campaign, and the general plan of it had doubtless been agreed upon during the winter, both the allied governments found serious difficulties in carrying out their undertaking. The great obstacle to a Spartan advance was, as before, the danger from hostile neighbors in the Peloponnesse. Persian intrigue penetrated, we have seen, behind the isthmus. Mardonius had an alternative plan in case the Athenians stood fast to their allies. He had concerted a scheme with the Argives (Hdt. ix. 12), whereby they undertook to hold back the Spartans from marching to the defense of the isthmus, while he was doubtless to attack the wall. How the Spartans were to be held in check may be gathered from subsequent events. The Mantineans and the Eleans arrived too late for the battle at Plataeae, and afterwards banished their generals. Probably these two states were infected with Medism, and the delay was due to treason. Mardonius, in fact, like other enemies of Sparta—Phleidou, Themistocles, Aleibias, Epaminondas—combined against her the central zone of disaffected states, Argos, Mantinea, and Elis, which runs across the Peloponnesse. The roads to the isthmus were to be blocked and the Spartans cut off from their allies in the north. This danger explains, very differently from Herodotus (ix. 8–11), the backwardness of the Spartans, the secrecy and suddenness of their march, and the indirect route by which they went. The road by ORetheusium kept well away from the Argive frontier, and held open to them the choice of passing by Mantinea or to the west of Maenalus as might prove advisable. The confederates, unready or irresolute, let them through. The Mantineans and Eleans waited for the issue of the battle of Plataeae and then tardily gave their adhesion to the victors. The banishment of their leaders probably means a political revolution.

---

*Hdt. ix. 77. The significance of the passage was, I think, first suggested to me by a remark of Mr. E. M. Walker's.*

*On ORetheusium, or ORethasium, and the road see Mr. W. Loring's excellent discussion in this Journ. vol. xiv. (1895) pp. 29–31 and 47–52. It was a route not infrequently used by the Spartans when the Arcadians were hostile.*
Another reason, closely related to the former, must also have contributed to recommend to the Spartans a policy of waiting. It suited the political situation in the Peloponnesian and the conditions of the campaign much better to let Mardonius come as far south as possible rather than to march north to seek him. A distant expedition was not only much more difficult, but also greatly increased the risks which the Spartans were leaving behind them.

Moreover the Ephors may well have felt some uneasiness as to the loyalty of the Athenians. The same considerations which encouraged Mardonius to hope must have filled them with misgivings. No Alcmaeonid statesman from Megacles to Alcibiades had many scruples about throwing over principles and changing sides when it suited the interests of his party or himself. The Spartans had reason to remember the shiftiness of Cleisthenes. And even if the fidelity of the leaders were above suspicion, could they guarantee the steadfastness of an ill disciplined and inconstant Demos? Until Aristides had prevailed on the Athenians openly and definitely to reject the overtures of Mardonius, the Spartans may not have felt sure on which side the Athenian fleet might eventually be ranged.

Aristides and Xanthippos had indeed a difficult game to play. They had to carry out at the head of one party the policy proper to another, and many of their own followers must have been puzzled and dismayed at their conduct. To many the league with oligarchic Sparta must have seemed an unholy alliance, and no danger so great as absorption in her political system. The loss of their country seemed to put the Athenians in complete dependence on their ally. How could they reassert themselves but by coming to terms with the Persians? How far the tenacity to Medes extended amongst them is not easy to say, but that it existed there can be little doubt. The repeated overtures of Mardonius awaken distrust. The embassy from Sparta is surely significant. The answers attributed to the Athenians are pitched in so loud a key of rhetoric that they inevitably rouse the suspicion which they are designed to allay. Had the loyalty of Athens been above cavil it would not have needed to be so vociferously asserted. Lyceides, we may be sure, did not speak for himself alone. Plutarch (Arist. 13) tells a story, which is none the worse attested because it is not to be found in Herodotus, of a conspiracy among the Athenians at Plataea to overthrow the constitution and, if necessary, betray the Greek cause to the Barbarians. Plutarch speaking the language of a later day represents the plot as antiderocratic, but we may probably recognize in it a revolt of the Agrarian party, with which interpretation the extreme leniency shown by Aristides in dealing with the conspirators is quite in harmony. The presence of the θαυτηκοί may have been needed to counteract the discontent of the sorely tried ἀγωγοί, and uphold the policy of Themistocles and the government against the temptations of Mardonius. In the retention of the fleet at Salamis we may see a symptom of the internal crisis through which the state was passing.

Possibly another motive may also have influenced the Athenian
government. After the victory of Salamis politicians so astute as Aristides and Xanthippus could not mistake their part. They were now as zealous in appropriating the ideas of Themistocles as they had before been in combating them. Themistocles had been eager to push on across the Aegean in the wake of the vanquished enemy, had already laid (or relaid) the foundations of the Athenian empire among the Cyclades, and had looked forward to an expedition in the spring against the Hellespont and Ionia (Hdt. viii. 108–112). The subsequent policy of Xanthippus and Aristides shows how completely they adopted his imperial schemes. But the Spartans, we may suppose, were opposed to offensive action by sea, and would have confined the rôle of the fleet to covering the flank of Greece against naval attacks. They checked the pursuit of Xerxes' fleet, and declined the invitation of the Chians. They would have preferred to leave Asia to the Persian (Hdt. ix. 106). Conscious of the limits imposed upon them by their peculiar institutions they were unwilling to incur responsibilities across the sea, and they were naturally averse to conquests for the benefit of a possible rival. The Athenian statesmen may have used the diplomatic advantage given them by the offers of Mardonius and the need of their fleet to bargain for a freer hand in Asia. The fleet may have been withheld partly in order to extort the assurances which they desired, and Leotychidas' acceptance of the Samian proposals may have been due to Athenian pressure as much as to Athenian reinforcements.

Alexander's negotiations with the Athenians, dramatically condensed by Herodotus, probably occupied several weeks. It may have been about the middle of June that Mardonius broke up his cantonments in Thessaly and took the road for the south. Presumably he had with him his own corps and the Thessalians. The other Greek auxiliaries would join on the march or in Boeotia. An order was doubtless dispatched to Artabazus to follow in support with all the troops that could be spared from the army of Thrace.

Herodotus (ix. 1, 3) assumes that the objective of Mardonius was Athens, and attributes to him some very inept motives for re-occupying the city. He asks us to believe that Mardonius had occupied, and (on receipt of the Argive message) evacuated Athens, before Pausanias and his force arrived at the isthmus (ix. 13, cf. 6, 7, 12). But it is clear from the compact with the Argives that Mardonius must originally have directed his march against the isthmus, and it is incredible that he should have wasted time on Athens, and missed his opportunity, if the isthmus was undefended or only weakly defended. If the Argives had fulfilled their promise and held back the Spartans in the Peloponnese, he would of course have carried the wall, and certainly would never have deviated down to Athens. The Spartans therefore must have arrived at the isthmus before Mardonius quitted Boeotia, and Herodotus has put the Athenian embassy, the Spartan march, and the

Argive message too late in his story. The message probably reached Mardonius not at Athens but at Thebes, and determined him not to evacuate but to occupy Athens. His two first plans had both miscarried. He had failed to seduce the Athenians, and the Spartans had safely got through to the isthmus. But if he occupied Athens and renewed his offers to the Athenians backed by the threat of thorough and instant devastation, he would raise such a ferment among them (cf. Thuc. ii. 20–1), and such alarm among their allies as might compel the Spartans to come out to the rescue. Moreover the occupation of Attica was calculated to detain the Athenian navy at Salamis, while the Spartan advance would denude the Peloponnesian of its strongest garrison. If the Persian fleet could defeat or evade Leotychidas at Delos, it might land troops in Argolis or elsewhere and provoke the contemplated outbreak. We may suppose that this idea, and not mere vainglory as Herodotus fancied, was the purpose of Mardonius' signals to Asia—πυρσοίς διὰ νῆσον ἑδόκει βασιλέα δηλώσειν έσωτεν εν Σάρδισι ἦτε ἔχοι Αθῆνας (ix. 3). Since almost all the Cyclades must by this time have been in the enemy's hands, the words διὰ νῆσον, if significant at all, may be taken to mean the islands of the northern Aegean, and it is not unlikely that Aeschylus has preserved for us in his famous description of the beacon-chain from Ida to Argos (Agam. 281–314) the list of Mardonius' signal-stations. Aeschylus may of course have adapted the extremities, but it is not impossible that Mardonius signalled also to Argos.

The Greeks on their part were probably as eager to come forth as Mardonius could desire. We may conjecture that the details of the expedition had been settled between the Athenian envoys and Pausanias at Sparta. Herodotus' account of the embassy (ix. 7–11) clearly cannot be treated as historical, and at best merely reflects Athenian impatience and gossip at Salamis. Pausanias waited at the isthmus only to give time for the Peloponnesian allies to join him. Mardonius by his sudden march southward had put a long gap between himself and his supports in Thrace. It was the obvious strategy for Pausanias to bring him to close quarters and force a battle before the arrival of Artabazus. Moreover by his advance to Athens Mardonius had, perhaps purposely, offered his enemy a chance of cutting him off from his base at Thebes. We are not told with what force he entered Attica, but probably the main bulk of his army had been left behind on the Ασopus.

Pausanias accordingly pushed forward without waiting for belated contingents (Hist. ix. 28, 38, 41). But Mardonius was forewarned, and after burning Athens had set his force in motion for Boeotia. The message which came to him at Athens must have been, not the Argive message as Herodotus fancied (ix. 12), but another, from the isthmus. His intention seems to have been to take the road through Eleutheria, by which he had probably come, but hearing on the march that the Spartan vanguard had already reached Megara, he changed his route and withdrew by way of Deceis and Sphendale to Tanagra, covering his left flank by a cavalry
demonstration in the Megarid, which was no doubt meant to head off the Peloponnesians from the direct roads to Thebes over Cithaeron. From Tanagra Mardonius gained Sceous, where he set to work to erect a stockade, (if that had not really been done during his absence, as we may suspect,) and camped his army in the plain of the Asopus. Pausanias moved out eastwards to Eleusis, where he picked up the Athenians, and then advanced north of Cithaeron and drew up his forces on the skirts of the mountain facing the enemy (Hdt. ix. 15. 10).

Mardonius, we have seen, may have had with him something like 80,000 men, of whom about a fourth part may have been cavalry. Artabazus with his 40,000 must have been still far away in the north, for Mardonius, hoping to anticipate the Spartans at the isthmus, had marched suddenly and fast—οι άπονοστήσας Αλεξάνδρος τα παρά Αθηναίων έσημεν, ορμηθεὶς εις Θεσσαλίαν ἄρις τιν οπτατιν σπουδή ἐτι τας Αθηνας (Hdt. ix. 1). The Greek army, when all or nearly all had come in, mustered according to Herodotus (ix. 28-30) 110,000 men, composed of 38,700 hoplites, 35,000 Helots, 34,500 other light-armed troops, and 1,800 Thespians. These figures have been much criticized. The Thespians are a rather obvious complement to make up the round number. The light-armed are confessedly a conjecture on the assumption of one for each non-Spartiate hoplite. The Helots are in extraordinary force—no parallel can be quoted for the proportion of seven to each Spartan. The numbers of the hoplite contingents have been vigorously impugned, and their authenticity remains open to question. On the whole Herodotus' list looks like an estimate of the forces, heavy and light-armed, which the allies (except Athens and Sparta) might have furnished if their citizens had turned out ταύστρατα. Although such an estimate is no historical record, and might be based on data of a later day—e.g. statistics of the contingents required of their allies by Sparta and Athens, or calculations, such as must have been much discussed at Athens at the opening of the Peloponnesian war (cf. Thuc. ii. 9), of the relative strength of the rival leagues—it can hardly be pretended that modern critics are in a position to form a better. But it may reasonably be doubted whether the entire levy was in every case present. Is allowance made for those serving on the fleet, as it is in the case of the Athenians? or in garrison, as it is in the case of the Spartans (cf. vii. 234)? At all events the conjectural number of light-armed is probably exaggerated, and it is scarcely to be believed that the Spartans took every available Helot. There was however, as Stein remarks, special need of light-armed troops on this

---

8 Hdt. ix. 14-15. of Paus. 1. 44. 4. Herodotus does not see the point of the cavalry demonstration. For the site of Sphendale v. Miltichsoer Karten von Attika, Text. ix. pp. 37-38. As Harvett, Herodotus pp. 434-4, justly contends against Delbrück, we need not take Herodotus to imply that all Mardonius' movements were crowded into a single day.

9 The redundancy of 800 has already been explained above.

10 Notably by Beloch and Delbrück. If Beloch's ingenious suggestion, that Ναυίς in Hdt. ix. 28 is a misreading of Παλοβίδ, could be accepted, it would much enforce the argument that the figures are conjectural, for 300 hoplites would be a natural contingent from Peloponnesus, not from Klis. But it is too venturesome,
campaign, and, it may be added, there was special reason for not leaving too many Helots at home. Herodotus repeats the number of Helots several times (ix. 10, 28, 29, 61). Possibly the great revolt made the Spartans more chary of using Helots in their later wars. After every allowance for exaggeration, we may suppose that the two armies were approximately equal in numbers, although the Greeks had an advantage in their heavy armour and the Persians in their cavalry. But, in view of the advent of Artabazus, we should expect that caeteris paribus Pausanias would press things to an issue, and Mardonius maintain the defensive.

Every interpretation of the campaign of Plataea must now take account of Dr. G. B. Grundy's valuable survey of the field and Prof. W. J. Woodhouse's brilliant criticism of Herodotus. It is not necessary to labour points which these scholars have settled. But unfortunately much remains obscure, and Plataea must rank after the Scythian expedition and the Ionian revolt as the most difficult of Herodotus' detailed military narratives. At Salamis we can correct Herodotus by Aeschylus, at Marathon and Artemision he supplies clues for his own emendation, at Thermopylae the topography comes to our aid. But at Plataea Herodotus has his say without much check, dark places remain in his story after all the elucidations of Prof. Woodhouse, and in spite of Dr. Grundy's researches the fixed points in the topography are still too few. What is here offered is mainly tentative suggestion, and on many difficulties I have nothing useful to say.

Our first question must be, where was Scolus? Mardonius, having reached Tanagra from Decelea and Sphendalle and spent a night there, turned to Scolus, where he was in Theban territory. There he built his wooden fort, more than a mile square, on the left flank, as appears from Herodotus' description (ix. 15), of his position on the Asopus, which extended from Erythrae past Hysiae into the Plataeid. Agesilaus in 376 B.C. (Xen. Hall. v. 4, 47-9, cf. Polyaeum, ii. 1, 11) made a feint from Plataea in the direction of Thespiae, then doubled back on his tracks, and taking the road to Erythrae got inside the stockade at Scolus before the Thebans came back from their other frontier. He then proceeded to ravage the country as far as the bounds of Tanagraean territory. Strabo (408) describes Scolus as a village of the Paracopia under Cithaeron, δεσφυγυς τοις και τραχως. Most explicit is Pausanias (ix. 4, 4), who says that if one turned off the road from Plataea to Thebes just before crossing the Asopus, and travelled down stream for about 40 stades, one came to the ruins of Scolus. Since he entered Thebes by the Eletran gate (ix. 8, 7), he seems not to have followed the direct road through the plain, which is sometimes impassable, and was perhaps bridgeless, but to have struck across onto the main road to Thebes from Megara, which probably coincided near Thebes with the road from Athens and Eleutheria, and was presumably the usual driving route between Plataea and

11 Grundy, The topography of the battle of Plataea, 1894; 'The great Persian War, 1901. Woodhouse, The Greeks at Plataea in this

12 Leake, Northern Greece, ii, p. 324; Grundy, Topography, pp. 24, 50.
Thebes. Measured from the crossing of the river on this road Sculus ought to be about where Laske placed it, near the village of Dariabari, and with this situation the other indications very well agree. But if so, Sculus must have lain close to the point where the roads from Athens by way of Phyle and from Eleusis by way of Oenoee and Panactum cross the Asopus. Mardonius therefore built his fort, not (as Greek afterthought fancied, Hdt. ix. 13) to be a refuge in case of disaster, but to guard this important point on the river.

We have next to determine, if possible, the sites of Erythrae and Hysiae. The passages already quoted throw some light on them. It is clear from Xenophon that Erythrae lay on the road from Plataea or Thessale to Scolus. It is clear from Herodotus (ix. 15, 19, 25) that Erythrae lay to the east of Hysiae. Pausanias here comes to our assistance with some welcome 'cross-bearings' on Hysiae. He says (ix. 1, 6) that when the Thebans marched to surprise Plataea in 373 B.C., the Boeotarch Neocles spha arks antike of the forces that could not have seen the works, and the Thebans before the gates of the city. It seems as if the Hysiae therefore was on the main road from Thebes to Athens by way of Eleutheran. This is the road by which Pausanias himself enters Boeotia (ix. 1, 1 and 2, 2). The branch to Plataea probably diverged from it at about the same point as the modern loop road through Kriekouki. Pausanias notes (ix. 2, 1) that the ruins of Hysiae and Erythrae (in that order) lay a little off the direct Plataea road, on the right. He appears to have made a loop to the right to visit Hysiae, where he notices an unfinished temple of Apollo and a sacred well. Probably he kept on down the Thebes road as far as Hysiae, and then back up the lower side of the Kriekouki loop to rejoin the Plataea road. Now close under the rocky base of Cithaeron and immediately to the right of the Thebes chaussée there is an ancient site marked by a great quantity of loose stones, traces of buildings, and (that surest of tests) Hellene pottery, and crowned by the ruins of an old fortress on the rocks above. In view of the references in the ancient authorities there can be little doubt that this site represents Hysiae, as Leake suggested. Other passages in Herodotus support the identification—vi. 108, the Athenians tows o Koriopliou Θηκαν Πλαταιάς,  είναι ουρων, τούτως ἐπερβάντες τὸν Ἀσυπάτον αὐτὸν ἐποίησαντο ὁδορ Θηβαίον πρὸς Πλαταιάς εἶναι καὶ Ἑσαγόμενον, obviously the Asopus on the north and Hysiae on the east of the Plataean territory. Leake's site would make a very natural frontier on the east—ix. 25, the Greeks move past Hysiae from their first position near Erythrae to their second position in the Plataeae. The road from Erythrae would lead them a little below Leake's site, or if they kept to the hills their natural point for crossing from the bastions of Cithaeron to the ridges out towards the Asopus would be just there. Thucydides iii. 24 presents a slight difficulty. The fugitive

19 Leake, J. A. R. Munro.
Plataeans turn out of the road to Thebes and take τὴν πρὸς τὸ δρος φέρονταν ὁδὸν ἐς Ἐρυθράς καὶ Τσίας. Thucydides appears to invert the geographical order of the places, but his form of expression is not unnatural if we remember that the road was "the Erythrae road" (cf. Xen. l. c.), and that Hysiae lay a little off it on the Eleutherae road. His phrase may be paralleled on a hundred guideposts. For Erythrae, which is rather less prominent in history than Hysiae, no better site has been suggested than Leake's, who puts it at Katula, a hamlet about two miles east of the proposed Hysiae. If this distance seems to any to overstrain Pausanias' words ὅλογον τῆς εὐθείας ἐκτραπεῖσιν, (which I do not feel that it does), it may be urged that Pausanias does not appear to have gone on to Erythrae, and may well have accommodated his expression to the nearer of the two places. In a general view, e.g. a retrospect from Thebes, it would be the conjunction not the separation of the two villages that would impress itself on the memory (cf. Euripides, Bacchae, 748–54).

Our topographical investigation has led us to adopt Leake's sites for Scolus, Erythrae, and Hysiae. Dr. Grundy has, I venture to believe, been misled partly by a prepossession as to the first position of the Greek army, and partly by a misapprehension as to the ancient roads across Cithaeron. To begin with the latter, Dr. Grundy clearly distinguishes and marks on his map three passes: (1) the Eleutherae, or so-called Dryoscephalae,18 pass; (2) a pass about one mile to the west of it, which he calls the Plataea-Athens pass; (3) another pass about a mile and a quarter to the west of the second, and one mile or less from Plataea, which he calls the Plataea-Megara pass. Dr. Grundy’s special interest in Plataea has led him to view these routes primarily in relation to it. But however prominent in history, Plataea was after all but a little town, which did not determine the course of the main roads, or their nomenclature. If we would see them in their true bearings we must start from Thebes. There were two great highways from Thebes over Cithaeron, although they probably coincided for a short distance out of the city. The first was the road to Eleusis and Athens through the "Dryoscephalae" pass. This was the road to, or from, or through, Eleutherae, and no other could be so described. The second was the main road to Megara and the Peloponnese. It ran probably a little to the west of Kriekoniki, and traversed Dr. Grundy’s second pass to Villa, which may be identified with the Megarian village of Krenielia, and thence over Mt. Karydes to Megara. This road did not touch Attic territory (Xen. Hell. v. 4, 19), and had therefore great political importance. There was a branch from this road to Plataea from the northern exit of the pass, where Dr. Grundy has discovered its wheel-ruts. The rough track through the third pass can be nothing else than another branch used as a short cut by travellers from Megara to Plataea on foot or on horseback. Travellers driving from Megara to Plataea would take the other branch from the second pass. Travellers driving from Thebes

18 I am not convinced that the Eleutherae pass has any exclusive right to the same Dryoscephalai. Herodotus, iv. 39, seems to apply it to the whole group of passes, and Thucydides, iii. 24, is quite consistent with this interpretation.
to Plataea would probably follow the Megara road to a point near Leake's Gargaphia, and there find another branch up to the town, by which we have supposed Pausanias to have journeyed in the reverse direction. Doubtless there were also cross routes between the two great roads. The southern side of the Krieckouki loop is an obvious one, and has been already suggested for Pausanias' direct road to Plataea from the Eleutherae pass. Perhaps there was another higher up the mountain near the brow of the ridge, where there seems to be a modern cross cut. In particular it was no doubt possible for a traveller from Attica to cross the frontier from the valley south of Eleutherae to the Megarian road at Villa, and so up to Plataea. But to treat this route as the ordinary Plataea-Athens road seems to me to be a gratuitous perversion. Whether Pausanias at Plataea (ix. 2, 3) means by the road from Megara the branch from the second pass or the short cut through the third, is unimportant for the general question. To Cleombrotus (Xen. Hell. v. 4, 14), advancing presumably from Megara, 'the road to Plataea' was naturally the road by Villa; the particular branch is again of little moment, but Dr. Grundy is probably right in sending him through his second pass. Xenophon's words τὴν μὲν ὑπὲρ τῆς Ἐλευθέρου ἄδον Χαβρίας ἔγιον Ἀθηναίων πελατίας ἐφιλαττον ἐς Κλέαμβροτος ἀνέβαινε κατὰ τὴν ἄλλην Πλαταίας φέρωσαι give the reason, not of Cleombrotus' choice of this route, for he could hardly have contemplated any other, but of the fact that he did not encounter Chabrias. Why Dr. Grundy takes him almost to Eleutherae, and how he gets him there without violating Attic territory, I cannot understand. So much for the roads over Cithaeron, which have a not unimportant influence on the campaign, but may be dismissed with this summary treatment because no one who has read Prof. Milchhöfer's authoritative account of the country south of the range requires much further explanation.

We come now to the problem of the first position of the Greek army. If we accept Leake's site for Erythrae, and Herodotus' statement (ix. 19) that the first position of the Greeks was there, we have to account for their taking up this somewhat inconvenient station. The ground was, to be sure, inassailable for the most part by cavalry (Hdt. ix. 21)—which shows that the army must have been drawn up along the top of the rocks which overhang the Hysiae-Scolus road—but water was scarce (Hdt. ix. 25); communications must have been difficult, and supplies precarious. Herodotus unfortunately gives no details of the Greek movement from Eleusis to Erythrae. It has been generally assumed that it followed the Eleutherae road. But it would be strange if Mardonius made no attempt to hold the Eleutherae and Villa passes. By doing so he would secure his own retirement from Attica, gain time for Artabazus to come up, and force Pausanias farther eastwards, that is to say farther away from his base at the isthmus. We have already seen that before quitting Attica he flung his cavalry into the Megarid, probably with the object of checking any advance by these routes, and Her-

11 In the text to Karlin von Attika, ix. § IV, Kiepert, Nouv. arch. d. minoises orient. et libére, 1892) p. 389.
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dotus' statement (ix. 15), that part of his position lay in the Plataean territory, can only mean that his right wing was thrown forward for the defence of the passes. I would suggest that Pausanias may have contended himself with a mere demonstration on the Eleutherai road, and marched with the bulk of his forces by Oenoe, Panactum, and the Portae pass, with the idea of turning the Persian left flank and crossing the Asopus at Scolus. Here he was checked by the stockade, and deployed his army to the left along the base of the mountain, continually extending his left flank to the westward as the troops came into line. By this manœuvre he would threaten to cut the enemy's centre near Hysiae, and force him to withdraw his right wing and evacuate the roads over Cithaeron.

Herodotus gives no precise indication of the spot at which the conflict with the Persian cavalry occurred, or in what part of the Greek line the Megarians were stationed. The scene may possibly be laid at the little valley between Katsula and Bubuka, up which the German map marks a path. But it is a tempting conjecture that the encounter was near Hysiae and that Mardonius was covering with his cavalry on the Eleutherai road the withdrawal of his right wing to the Asopus by the Megara road. We may perhaps suppose that the Greek contingents held the same relative stations as afterwards in their second position (Hist. ix. 28). If so, the Megarians were presumably the last deployed troops, and thus temporarily formed the extreme left of the army at the moment of the Persian attack. The [Plataeans and] Athenians would be the next to come up, and on them naturally fell the duty of relieving the Megarians. Aristides rightly pushed forward his most active corps [of hoplites?] and his archers to the rescue as soon as he learnt that the Megarians were in distress. The main body came upon the scene later.

It is characteristic of Herodotus' history that whereas he is frankly ignorant of the strategic manoeuvres of the Greek army, he knows all the details of this skirmish. The reason has been generally recognized. The hero of the day was Olympiodorus, son of Lampon, and father no doubt of the more famous Lampson, who played a part in the foundation of Thurii. Herodotus probably had relations with the family, and heard the story from some member of it. It is likely that it lost nothing in the telling, but the details may be trusted. Hence it is worth noting that the body of Masistius is carried along the Greek lines on a cart (ix. 25), a touch which fits in very well with the road close along the front of the army. The breastplate of Masistius is doubtless described from the original in the Erechtheum (Paus. i. 27, 1), and the tradition which hung about it may have contributed to the tale.

If our interpretation of the action may be accepted, the importance of the repulse of the cavalry lay in the fact that it cleared the Hysiae gap.

19 The words οἱ Ἑρεβάζων in Hist. ix. 22 qualify παρθένος, not παρθένης.
20 Much where Dr. Grundy puts it. The words οἱ τῶν σταδίων οἱ Ἐλαμνηταὶ τῶν τελευταίων (Hist. ix. 20) are no objection, and Hysiae is not too far west of Erythine if we remember how long the Greek front must have been.
between the bastions of Cithaeron and the hills to the north-west, and so opened the way for the next move. Mardonius had been taken by surprise and manoeuvred out of the Plataean. He fell back behind the Asopus leaving the passes in the hands of the Greeks. Pausanias was encouraged to continue his advance towards the west, and attempt to carry out on the enemy’s right flank the turning movement which had been foiled on his left. The credit of having first seen the meaning of the change of position is due to Dr. Grundy.

The Greek army moved down past Hysiax into Plataean territory. Herodotus (ix. 25) describes its new station as πάνων τῆς τε κρινῆς τῆς Ταραγίσης καὶ τοῦ τεῦμειν τοῦ Ἀνδροκράτους τοῦ ἄρωνος, διὰ δύσην τε ὅπερ ὑψηλῶν καὶ ἄπεσαν θάρσοι. Hauvette and Woodhouse seem to me to be right in putting the shrine of Androcrates at the church of S. John (see Dr. Grundy’s map). Thucydides (iii. 24) says that the fugitives from Plataea, έχομεν ἄθροι τὴν ἐν Θηβαις φεύγουσιν ἄδων ἐν ἐξιά ἐχοντες το τοῦ Ἀνδροκράτους ἄρων, then after proceeding for six or seven stades along this road they turned towards Erythrai. The words ἐν ἐξιά ἐχοντες το τοῦ Ἀνδροκράτους ἄρων, although grammatically constructed with the subject of ΠΛΑΤΑΙΩΝ, really describe the road, which Thucydides wishes to distinguish from the other road to Thebes, which passed to the right of the shrine. This latter was, after the first mile and a half out of Plataea, simply the highway from Megara to Thebes. It was probably the ordinary route for vehicles, and we have already seen reason to suppose that Pausanias the traveller used it. The road taken by the fugitives on the contrary was the direct road over the plain to the Asopus, and passed to the left of the chapel of Androcrates. The distance traversed by the Plataeans is therefore immaterial for the position of the shrine. What is important is the prominence of that position, which made the chapel a landmark on the right of the road. The church of S. John is the most conspicuous site which can be suggested. Plutarch’s description (Arist. 11) also to my mind conveys the idea of a conspicuous point in a general view of the field.

For the fountain Gargaphia there are according to Dr. Grundy two and only two possible sites—either the Apotipri spring close under the church of S. John, or ‘Leake’s Gargaphia,’ a spring about half a mile to the east of the Apotipri. Too much stress must not be laid on the measurements given by Herodotus, which are obviously in round numbers—10 stades or 20 stades, a mile or a couple of miles. There is practically nothing to choose between the

---

23 Similarly Pausanias in a passage already quoted (ix. 1, 6) is at pains to distinguish from the direct road the still more roundabout route through Hysiax.
24 Plutarch probably knew the ground at least as well as Herodotus or Thucydides. Objection has been taken (e.g. Leake, N. Greece, ii. p. 360; note: Grundy, Topography, p. 35, note, 62, Persian War, pp. 466–8) to his grouping together Hysiax, the temple of Demeter, and the chapel of Androcrates. But it ought to be remembered that he is preoccupied with the oracle and inclined to stretch a point in its favour, and that he is describing the scene on a panoramic scale. Dr. Grundy (Topography, p. 3) notes how the mass of Cithaeron falsifies impressions of distance at Plataea.
two springs as regards distance from the 'Island' and the probable site of the Heraeum. Prof. Woodhouse prefers Apotripi, Dr. Grundy Leake's Gargaphia. I agree with Leake and Dr. Grundy for the following reasons. (1) Gargaphia is introduced into Herodotus' narrative as a familiar landmark, which needed no description to identify or locate it. But Apotripi is hidden away in a hollow beside the comparatively little frequented road to Thespiae, whereas Leake's spring must have lain close not merely to this road, but also to the main highroad from Megara and the Peloponnese to Thebes, and just at the probable junction of the branch from Plataea. It was in fact the most important meeting-point of roads in the whole Plataean territory, and doubtless well known to all wayfarers in that thirsty land. (2) Gargaphia lay near the right of the Greek position (Hdt. ix. 49). But we cannot believe that Pausanias had relinquished his hold on the Megara road, the main artery of his communications. The Spartans must have occupied the valley of Dr. Grundy's stream A. 4 on their right flank, and probably the hill beyond it on which stands the church of S. Demetrios. The enemy's cavalry, to whom the Eleutherae road lay open, raided freely round the right of the Greek line (Hdt. ix. 38-9). It would not be difficult for them, by a combined attack along the Megara road on the Spartan front and a turning raid round their right flank, to get momentary possession of Leake's Gargaphia, whereas the Apotripi spring would be considerably harder to reach, and to get away from, without being intercepted. (3) Leake's fountain agrees much better with the distance (Hdt. ix. 57) to what I regard as the probable site of the temple of Demeter.

Wherever Gargaphia and the chapel of Androcrates be placed, it is evident that only the right wing of the Greek army could be near them. The Greek line can hardly have been less than three miles long. Where was the left wing? Perhaps Herodotus' Athenian informants preferred not to be too explicit about their countrymen's share in this part of the operations. After Prof. Woodhouse's analysis of the Athenian element in the narrative it is unnecessary to demonstrate its influence and character in detail. The prominence of the Athenians in the opening and closing encounters is paraded before us, but between these valorous feats all their best endeavours seem to be frustrated by the cowardice of their allies. We are given to understand that it was owing to the timidity of the Spartans that nothing came of the advance, and owing to their losing hold of both the water and the food supply of the army that retreat became inevitable. The retreat itself nearly proved disastrous through the flight of the Greek centre and the insubordination of a Spartan captain. The Athenians suffered for the sins of their confederates! Now anyone who has studied the controversial methods of that amiable people will easily divine that the 'tendency' underlying these chapters is an attempt to shift the blame of the failure on to other shoulders, and can, I think, form some conception of what probably happened. The general idea of the advance seems to have been to force the passage of the Asopus at the crossing of the direct road from Plataea to Thebes, the road over the plain. As it had to be carried out in face of the enemy, the movement from the first
position may have been made by brigades. The Athenians, who formed the left wing, would stand fast near Hyæne, while the Lacedaemonians moved from the right, passed behind them, and occupied the plateau and hills to the west as far as the Megara road. Then the centre would move to the ridge on which stands the church of St. John. Finally the Athenians would push rapidly along the Thespiae road behind this screen of hills and troops into the plain of Plataea, and make a dash for the ford. Such a manœuvre would account for the extraordinary story of the change of wings, worked up in Herodotus' narrative (ix. 46-7) to the glory of the Athenians and discredit of the Spartans. But however the movement was managed, we find the Athenians still on the left flank and to them must have fallen the honourable responsibility of leading the advance across the river. Once across they would take the Persians on their right flank while the other Greeks assailed them in front. What happened is of course not told. It looks as if the Athenians had quailed before the task, and instead of rushing the ford had taken refuge from the enemy's cavalry on the Pyrgos hill at the western edge of the plain, leaving a gap of a mile of level ground between them and the centre. Pausanias then had to close the gap by moving the centre down into the plain, and shifting the Lacedaemonians along to the station vacated by it on the 'Asopus ridge' (v. Dr. Grundy's map). This hypothesis may appear somewhat adventurous, but it would explain three facts which present no small difficulty. First, the fact that Pausanias entirely abandoned the Eleutheræum road to the enemy, although he thereby risked the loss of his communications and the fate of the whole army. Second, the fact that the Greek centre appears to have borne the brunt of the Persian attacks on the position, and to have been harassed, if we may believe Herodotus, to the verge of demoralization. Third, the fact that the Athenians, when they start to retire to the Island, begin by descending into the plain (Hdt. ix. 56).

At all events the forward movement failed miserably, leaving the Greeks in a very critical situation, and the Athenians, who led it, must bear the chief blame for the failure. There was nothing for it but to withdraw to a safe defensive position covering the passes of Cithæron. This necessity must have become obvious at once. The attempt to cross the Asopus, if it was to succeed at all, must have followed instantly on the advance, or rather formed part of it. The Persian counter-attack on the Greek communications surely cannot have been long delayed. It is almost incredible that Pausanias can have stayed on in his perilous situation for nearly a fortnight, as the ordinary interpretation of Herodotus demands. Prof. Woodhouse's chronology of the campaign, 28 which would limit the occupation of the second position to three days, seems to be much more probable.

The new position to which the retreat was to be directed is given by Herodotus (ix. 51) as 'the Island.' The earlier modern explorers boggled a little about describing as an island what is really only a peninsula, but the

---

28 J. H. S. xvi. 1898, p. 57, note B.
Greeks were less pedantic, e.g. Peloponnesus, Arctonomus, or indeed "chersonesus. The description in Herodotus is too precise to leave much room for difference of opinion as to the site, and the general identification of the Island has never been seriously in doubt since the topography was first investigated. But whereas the earlier travellers fix their attention on the lower part of the strip so designated, Dr. Grundy has justly insisted upon the far better defensive character of the upper part, the ridges at the foot of Cithaeron as opposed to the flat meadow in the Plataean plain. There can be little doubt that Dr. Grundy is right in his contention that this upper part of the Island was the position intended by Pausanias and his staff. The earlier explorers were misled by the statements of Herodotus (ix. 51) that the Island is ten stades from the Asopus, and in front of the city of the Plataeans. But the words της Πλαταιας πολιος naturally mean not north of Plataea but east, the side from which most travellers (especially Athenians) approached the city. The sentence η δε εστι απο του 'Ασοπου και της κρους την Γαργαφίαν, ετε η εστρατοπεδευμα τοτε, δεκα σταθαις, απεγεμωσα is more difficult. Dr. Grundy is driven to suppose that by the Asopus is meant in this passage the tributary stream which he labels A. I. Prof. Woodhouse suggests that και (20) has dropped out of the text before και, and if we insist upon finding a topographical fact in the statement this solution seems to be the best. But I suspect that the real explanation is psychological. The Lacedaemonians alone were posted near the fountain Gargaphia (ix. 49, 50). The rest of the Greek line stretched away northwards towards the Asopus (ix. 49), and the Athenians formed the extreme left. A measurement from the Asopus would have suggested, what was true, that the Athenians ought to have occupied the Island. A measurement from Gargaphia suggested, what was false, that the Lacedaemonians ought to have done so. If, as is fairly obvious, Herodotus' source for these chapters was Athenian, there was sufficient reason for the equivocal and invi dious turn given to the sentence—'the Island is distant from the Asopus or rather from the fountain Gargaphia, at which they were then encamped, about a mile.'

For the idea attributed by Herodotus to the council of war, and doubtless insidiously suggested to him by his disingenuous informants, that the whole Greek army was to move to the Island, is surely absurd. So large a force could not be crowded onto so narrow a ground, and the main purpose of the movement, the recovery of the passes, would have been barely half attained. It is significant that this purpose is represented in Herodotus' narrative as merely secondary—to rescue a particular convoy by a sortie, as it were, from the Island, after that position had been occupied! But it is clear from Herodotus himself that only the Athenians were to go to the Island. Prof. Woodhouse has pointed out that the centre, in spite of the Athenian story of its panic, took up its proper station in good order at the

\[\textit{Note:} \text{It does not affect my point that the termination of these and similar words may prove to have nothing to do with \textit{vibes}, but to be the same or \textit{vibes} so common in Anatolian names, for the Greeks certainly took it for \textit{vibes}.}\]
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Heraeum, and that the movement of the right wing was directed to quite another quarter of the field.

The probable site of the Heraeum is marked by a large temple discovered by the American excavators in the northern part of the ruins of Plataea. It lies to the east of the fortified north-west corner of the town, which has been identified by Dr. Grundy as the citadel and original (or at least fifth century) Plataea. Herodotus (ix. 52) says of the Heraeum to ἐκ τοῦ τόπου ἐκ τῆς Πλαταιαν, ἐκεῖοι σταδίων ἀπὸ τῆς εἰρήνης τῆς Γαργαφίας ἀπέχειν. The distance, twenty stades, is somewhat exaggerated for a bee-line measurement, but is not far wrong if it be taken as a sum of two reckonings, (1) from Gargaphia to the Mound on the Island (see Dr. Grundy's map), (2) from the Mound to the Heraeum. The description 'in front of the city of the Plataeans' is perfectly appropriate if πρὸ means 'east of' as we have already proposed. Now the Greek centre took up its new station πρὸ τοῦ ἱπτομένου, 'in front of the temple,' and these words again naturally indicate the east, whether we think of the general direction or of the orientation of the building. We may suppose therefore that the fortifications of Plataea, which were doubtless still defensible although the town had been burnt by Xerxes (Hdt. viii. 50), were to cover the left flank of the new position, and the contingents which had composed the centre were now to form the left wing, and were drawn up between the Heraeum and the Island.

The course taken by the Lacedaemonians and Tegeans on the right must be inferred from the spot on which the battle was fought, and that depends on the situation to be assigned to the river Molosses and the temple of Demeter Eleusinia, for Herodotus' third landmark, Ἀργαίωπος χώρος καλεόμενος, gives us no clue. Dr. Grundy's second suggestion for the river Molosses, viz. the stream which he calls A. 6, seems much the most probable, it, is the largest stream of the neighbourhood after the Asopus and Oeue, and the most likely to have had an independent name. But there are many streams, and the really decisive point must be the temple of Demeter. Dr. Grundy, followed by Prof. Woodhouse, puts this temple at the church of S. Demetrios on the hill between his streams A. 4 and A. 5. Of course modern names often preserve an echo of ancient, and many a pagan deity has become a saint. But S. Demetrios is a particularly common saint, e.g. there is another (ruined) church dedicated to him just outside the wall of Plataea, and modern sites do not always exactly correspond to ancient even when they preserve their names. The church of S. Demetrios is only 4½ stades from Gargaphia, whereas Herodotus (ix. 57, cf. 49, 51, 52) implies that the temple of Demeter was about 10 stades from the fountain (which is evidently the starting-point of his measurements). On the other hand it is fully 7½ stades from the probable Molosses, whereas Herodotus implies that the
temple was quite near the river. Now beside a well a few yards west of the Kleatherae road, and close under the rocky foot of Cithaerion, two inscriptions have been found, which relate to the worship of Demeter, and seem to date from the early part of the fifth century B.C. They do not of course prove that there was a temple of Demeter on the exact spot where they were found, but the natural presumption is that there was one not far off. This presumption is confirmed by Plutarch's description (Arist. 11) of the situation of the temple on the field of battle—τῶν Τειχών πλείων ὑπὸ τῶν Κιθαιρῶν μαζὲ ἄρχατοι πάντων Δήμητρος Εὐερείας καὶ Κόρης προσγορεύμενος. εὐθὺς οὖν παραλαβὼν τὸν Ἀριστείδην ἤγετε ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον εὐφύστατον ὑπὸ παρατήοις φάλαγγα πετυχή ἐπικρατούμενον, διὰ τᾶς ὑπαρξιῶν τοῦ Κιθαιρώνος ἀφίσσα ποιοῦσας τὰ καταλίγομενα καὶ συγκεράνοντα τοῦ πεδίου πρὸς τὸ έρων. There can be no question that Plutarch means the same temple as Herodotus. He describes it as situated at the edge of the rocky foot of Cithaerion near Hysiae, that is to say in the very neighbourhood to which the evidence of the inscriptions points. If it stood at the northern extremity of the village of Krieckouki, it would be about 11 stades from Gargaphia, within 2 stades of our supposed Moloces, and about 6 stades from the site already assigned to Hysiae. This position—also well accords with what Herodotus says of the course taken by the Corinthians and other Greeks who came from near the Heraenum to the assistance of the Lacedaemonians and Tojeans (ix. 69)—οἱ μὲν ἀμφὶ Κορυθῶν ἐτράποντο διὰ τῆς ὑπαρξίας καὶ τῶν κολονῶν τὴν φέρουσιν ἄνω τοῦ τρόπου τῆς Δήμητρος—where ἄνω signifies, not that the road went uphill, but that it was the upper road over the ridges of Cithaerion, not the lower road at the bottom of the slope. The attack of the Persian cavalry with which the day opened (Hdt. ix. 57) is not inconsistent with Plutarch's description of the ground, for there is no indication that it was pressed to close quarters. The cavalry drove in Amompharetus, and doubtless harassed the Lacedaemonians with their arrows (cf. ix. 49), but this skirmishing is probably magnified by Herodotus' informants in order to give colour to the obviously apocryphal message from Pausanias to the Athenians which follows (ix. 60). It is significant that the cavalry takes no part in the actual battle, but reappears during the Persian flight to the stockade (ix. 68). Pausanias wisely refused to be drawn from his strong defensive position on the rocky ground until the Persian infantry was fairly engaged.

If we have rightly identified the site of the temple of Demeter and the battle, certain important consequences result from it. It is evident in the first place that the Greek right wing reached its proper allotted station, and was not overtaken by the enemy on its march as Herodotus was given to understand. The notion (Hdt. ix. 56) that the Lacedaemonians were making for the Island by this roundabout route in order to be secure against the enemy's cavalry is simply an Athenian misconception or rather misrepr-
sentation designed to involve them too in the blame of not having carried out orders. For in the second place it becomes clear what was the new position which the generals intended to occupy. The left was to be covered by the walls of Plataea, the right was to rest upon Hysiae or the high bastions of Cithaeron above it: the centre was to occupy the Island, and perhaps the next ridge to the east of it. It is evident in the third place that this central station was assigned to the Athenians, and that they alone of the three divisions failed to take up their post. What hindered them of course we are not allowed to know. The excuse put forward in Herodotus (ix. 54) —ἐγὼν ἀτρέμας σφέας αὐτοῖς ἵνα ἑταίρησαν, ἑπιστάμενοι τὰ Λακεδαίμονιον φρονήματα ὅις ἄλλα φρονεῖτον καὶ ἄλλα λεγότων— is justly stigmatized by Prof. Woodhouse as transparently false. The most charitable explanation is that they were delayed by the slow procession of the old centre (new left wing) across their path. But it ill accords with the precipitate flight ascribed to that body in their own version of the retreat, and their obvious anxiety to throw blame on their allies suggests a more discreditable reason. Perhaps we may take a hint from their recriminations on the Lacedaemonians, and infer that it was fear of the enemy's cavalry that deterred them,11 for the Athenians, if our conjecture as to their starting-point may be accepted, had to cross the open plain north of Plataea to gain the Island. Finally the tenacity of Amompharetus assumes a very different character from that attributed to it in the Athenian tradition. Prof. Woodhouse has argued that Amompharetus and his company were left behind to cover the retirement of the right wing. One might go further and suggest that the delay of the Lacedaemonians, and the messages which passed between Pausanias and the Athenians (Hdt. ix. 54–5, 60), are best explained on the hypothesis that the Spartan general waited as long as possible in order to protect the movement of his allies to the Island, and that Amompharetus was ordered to hold the Megara road at the valley north-east of Gargaphia till the last moment as much in their interest as in that of the Spartans themselves. If so, the treatment of that gallant officer in the Athenian story is peculiarly infamous.

Sunrise found the two Greek wings in position, but separated by a gap of a mile's breadth which ought to have been filled by the Athenians, still trailing across the Plataean plain. Like their own Amompharetus the Athenians would seem to have come to their senses only when they realised that Pausanias was in very deed leaving them to their fate. The Persian attack on the Lacedaemonians must have been developed along the two main roads to the passes, the attack on the Athenians along the direct road from Thebes to Plataea. Hence the centre at the Hesenum, when it goes to the support of the wings, splits into two sections, of which the one turns (eastwards) along the slope of Cithaeron, the other makes (northwards) over the plain, τὴν λειτοτάθην τὸν ὀδόν (Hdt. ix. 69). The isolation of the three

11 If the left wing was indeed a coveted post of honour (Hdt. ix. 26–28) the Athenians may also have resented being ordered out of it, however richly they deserved the degradation.
divisions of the enemy, which had lost all touch with one another, was an opportunity such as no general could have neglected. Mardonius must have thought he had the Greek army at his mercy, and theoretically he ought to have won an overwhelming victory. What saved the day was the steady discipline of the Lacedaemonian hoplites, and the masterly judgment of Pausanias in timing his charge.

Mardonius in fact was unfortunate in his opportunity. It brought about what Pausanias had doubtless hoped for when he pressed forward from the isthmus over Cithaeron—a pitched battle on something like equal terms. For the part played by Artabazus in Herodotus' story is hardly to be taken as strictly historical. The dramatic instinct of the writer demands a foil to the infatuation of Mardonius and finds it in him. He is one more impersonation of a stock character in Herodotus' répertoire. What Solon is to Croesus, Croesus to Cyrus, Artabanus and Demaratus to Xerxes (to mention only a few of the examples), that is Artabazus to Mardonius. Artabazus and his 40,000 men took no part in the battle (Hdt. ix. 66). Did he ever effect his junction with Mardonius? I think it more probable that he was still several marches in the rear, but Herodotus (or his informant 22) has construed his absence into prudence. The victory of the Greeks is glorious enough without exaggerating the numbers of their enemy.

J. A. R. Munro.

22 Basolt, Griech. Gesch. II.5, p. 713, note 1, conjectures that Herodotus may have had relations with the family of Artabazus.
NOTICES OF BOOKS.


Prof. Blass' fourth edition of the Aristotelis Πολιτικὰ includes practically no new readings of the papyrus, but it is marked by a further development of his theory of metrical correspondence. He has so firm a belief in the reality of these correspondences (which, he is observed, do not in any way follow the rhythmical structure of the clauses, but must be reckoned with much toil and labour), that he uses them as a test for the detection of corruptions and the verification of conjectures. Prof. Blass has not yet persuaded any prominent scholar of the soundness of his theory (as applied to such a writer as Aristotle, whom it is difficult to conceive as counting his syllables with the elaborate art of Isocrates); and until he has done so, it is not likely that the conjectures which he bases on it will find much acceptance. The apparatus criticus continues to be very useful for its record of the readings and conjectures of various editors and critics.

Mr. Kenyon's edition for the Berlin Academy is the result of a fresh collation of the papyrus, and aims at giving an accurate reproduction of it, with amendments only where necessary, and with a full statement in the apparatus criticus of all departures from it, even the smallest. In the greater part of the work the text does not differ much from those found in the third editions of Blass and Rabel-Wilamowitz (φασοεις for ἄργοεις in c. 6, 3 is perhaps the most notable new reading), but there is a considerable amount of change in the mutilated conclusion of the book. These last six columns are now so far restored that they can be printed in chapters and sections like the rest of the work, of which they now form chapters 61-68; and except in c. 67 (the upper part of col. 34) the sense is now continuous and intelligible throughout, though not all the readings and restorations are regarded as certain. The testimonia (printed in full) have been edited by Prof. Wentzel, Mr. Kenyon adding some parallel passages from the Politics and the historians; and a very complete index verborum has been compiled by a young Berlin scholar, Mr. Neustadt. The preface is mainly palaeographical.


A full commentary, critical and explanatory, on Herodas has long been needed, and has now been very adequately provided by Mr. Nain. His introduction, in five chapters, deals with (1) Herodas and his work, (2) the Mime, (3) Herodas and his contemporaries, (4) Evidence for the text, (5) Dialect, Grammar, and Metre. The textual notes give full and detailed information with regard to the evidence of the papyrus. The commentary
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faces all the difficulties fairly, and takes into account the views of other scholars, while containing many new and probable suggestions. The illustrations (from cases, wall-paintings, and sculptures) are good and in the point; and, at the end, is a facsimile, in three plates, of the new fragments of the papyri, published by Mr. Kenyon in the Archiv für Papyrologie in 1901; but not hitherto photographically reproduced. Altogether an indispensable edition for the student of Herodotus.


This collection of all the extant fragments of pre-Socratic philosophers, on the same lines as Professor Diehl's separate edition of the remains of Herodotus, is intended to serve as a basis for the instruction of students in Greek philosophy. Prof. Diehl's original plan was for a critical edition, but this he was forced to abandon for want of adequate editions of many of the authors from whom the material must be drawn, such as Galen, Clement of Alexandria, Plutarch, etc. He has therefore been obliged to content himself with providing a simple text, without annotation, but with a German translation; but even this will be a very great convenience to those who wish to examine the entire remains of any of the early philosophers, and not to be dependent on the selections of editors. It is needless to say that the work, within its own limits, is very thoroughly done.


In 1896, Dr. Ritter published an abstract or analysis of the Laws; and in the present volume he follows it with a similar abstract of the other works of Plato's, i.e., the Parmenides, Sophist, Politicus, Philebus, Timaeus, and Critias. Those (with the exception, perhaps, of the last-named fragment) are less read than many of the earlier works; yet an acquaintance with them is essential for a full knowledge of Plato's mind, and many readers will be grateful for this very full and careful abstract, whether as an assistance to or a substitute for a study of the difficult original. Dr. Ritter claims—and apparently with truth—that he has omitted no important thought or even expression which occurs in the original; yet the whole goes into a clearly printed volume of moderate size, of fifty pages are occupied by a very full index. In England we have Jowett's introductions and translations to serve the purpose of a guide to Plato's philosophy; but even in this country there may be use for the more objective and minutely faithful work of Dr. Ritter. A sequel, dealing with Plato's earlier works, is hypothetically promised.


This work, by the editor of the forthcoming revision of Passow's Lexicon, is the fruit of a visit to Naples, subsidised by the Berlin Academy. It is a grammar of the forms found in papyri and inscriptions, with the dates of the various forms carefully noted. Two books deal with orthographical (and some palaeographical) questions; two with grammatical questions affecting the modifications of the vowels and consonants: one with nouns; one with verbs: one with the forms of certain words in composition: and one gives an alphabetical index of verbal forms. Altogether an indispensable book for editors of papyri, and indeed to all who have any interest in lexical questions. It is provided with full indices.
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A History of Classical Scholarship from the Sixth Century B.C. to the end of the Middle Ages. By J. E. SASTRY. Pp. xxiv + 672. Cambridge University Press. 10s. 6d. net.

It is quite impossible to treat such a book as this adequately in a short notice. It is executed with characteristic care and thoroughness, full of compact learning in a readable form; and it fills a place occupied by no other work in English, nor, on a similar scale, elsewhere. It has a number of facsimiles of MSS., and other illustrations, and is very cheap at its price. The present volume comes down to about 1350; and Dr. Sandys promises a second volume to deal with the history of modern scholarship.


Five of these lectures, on (1) the feeling for nature in the Greek and Roman poets, (2) the beliefs of the Greeks and Romans concerning a life after death, (3) the supernatural in ancient poetry and story, (4) the Age of Gold, (5) the vein of romances in Greek and Roman literature, deal with the ideas embodied in classical literature; two, on (6) the language of poetry, and (7) the metrical form of poetry, with its form, two, on (8) literary criticism at Rome, (9) a sketch of the revival and progress of classical studies in Europe—while the last is on the aims and methods of classical study. Of these the seventh is the most important contribution to classical scholarship. The rest are mainly popular, but popular in the best sense, giving clear, if slight, studies of the several topics by a scholar endowed with taste and a full knowledge of the literatures in question.


The author of this work, who wished to remain anonymous, died before it was quite completed, and left it to Dr. Jevons to see through the press. It is a history of Greek religious thought, based, not on mythology or archaeology, but on the literature. Preliminary chapters on the land, language, and people are followed by an examination successively of Homer, Hesiod, Pindar, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Herodotus, Plato, and Aristotle. The pre-Platonic philosophers are hardly touched at all, but for the rest the book is the result of a full study of the great writers.


This reproduction of the Codex Ravennæ in Sijthoff's well-known series, following close upon the edition of the Codex Venetus by the Archaeological Society of America and the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies, places the principal authorities for the text and scholia of Aristophanes beyond the reach of destruction, and makes them accessible to scholars in all parts of the world. The plates are as good as usual, and Prof. van Leeuwen's introduction deals fully with the character of the MS. and especially with the various classes of transcriptional errors found in it. In date it is assigned to the end of the tenth or beginning of the eleventh century. The superiority of the Venetus in respect of the scholia is not disputed.
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H. Schliemann's Sammlung Trojänischer Alterthümer. By Hubert Schmidt, etc. Pp. xx + 364. 9 plates and 1176 figures in text. Berlin: Reimer, 1902. 20 m.

This is the authorized catalogue raisonné of the Schliemann collection in Berlin, as it has now been rearranged in the light of the farther discoveries made at Hisardik since Schliemann's death. The products of Stratum I are kept apart: those of II-V are grouped together, subject however to distinction not only of the strata, but of the three successive periods of construction visible in the remains of II: VI-VII go together as 'Mycenean'; and VIII-IX as Greek and Roman. A little comparison of objects from other sites is introduced,—mainly objects of Cypriote provenance. The comparative dates, which Crete would supply, are not given; indeed Cretean evidence seems to have come to light too late to be of use for this catalogue. The catalogue is profusely illustrated with small cuts; and the nine plates are devoted exclusively to the spinning-wheels, now arranged in series according to their ornamentation.

Geschichte der Bankkunst. Von R. Bormann and J. Neuweiler. 1 Band, Die Bankkunst des Altertums, der Sassaniden, und des Islam. Leipzig: Seemann, 1904. 8 m. 50; in linen, 10 m.

The first volume of this work by Prof. Bormann; in the preface it is stated to have been begun as a new edition of Lübbe, though it has now taken an independent form. The only part that strictly concerns this Journal is Griechenland, pp. 87–178, though of course there is much that has Hallænic relations in the architecture of the east and of Italy. On so small a scale only the barest sketch is possible; but, within its limits, the account is clear and well up to date, including recent discoveries at Croesus, Miletus, Delos, etc. In some cases brevity may be misleading; for example, on p. 147 the plan of the Hall at Eleusis is given in a form it did not assume until Roman times; yet in the text the only comment is that the portion of Philo was a late addition. Again, in a popular work, it may cause confusion to see figures from the Parthenon frieze drawn as part of the frieze of the Erechtheum. The treatment is systematic: first some buildings of the Mycenean age; then classical Greece, the greater part of the space being assigned to the temple, and halls, civic buildings, theatres, etc., being very briefly treated; and then the Alexandrian age, mainly Pergamum, with a short account of private houses.


A searching and brilliant examination of the archaic 'poros-stone' sculptures of the Acropolis, considered in relation to the various buildings supposed to have contained them. The first and most striking reconstruction is that of the 'Old Heunompedon,' which is shown to have been a temple in units, with polyhedral decoration. The front pedimental group consisted of two halves, separated by a tree stem in the centre. In the right half was the well-known figure of Typhon, and in the left half the group of Heracles and the Triton. Hitherto these subjects have not been regarded as belonging to the same pediment. The rear pedimental group consisted of a central figure of a goddess, presumably Athena; an enthroned figure of Zeus on the left, turned towards the centre, and a corresponding figure, now entirely lost, on the right. Towards the angles were two large serpents, whose convoluted tails filled the remainder of the space. This primitive sculpture, assigned approximately to the time of Solon, is supposed to have been demolished in the time of Peisistratus, when the old temple in ortie became the nucleus of the hexastyle.

This is the first volume (text and plates) of the long looked-for catalogue of the Vatican sculptures. It deals with the collections of the Braccio Nuovo, the Galleria Lapidaria, the Museo Chiaramonti, and the Giardino della Pigna. The objects are dealt with under their official numbers, which follow in sequence round the galleries. The order is therefore arbitrary in respect of subject, style, or place of discovery, but suits the convenience of visitors to the Museum. The history of each object, so far as known, its material, restoration, and literature are very carefully given, and in most instances an attempt is made to define the period. For the first time, the catalogue of a large Museum of Sculpture is illustrated throughout by collotype plates, showing every object. The author does not seem, however, to have adopted the logical consequence, and to have modified his verbal descriptions, on account of the abundant illustrations.

Die Elouisinischen Göttinnen. Entwicklung ihrer Typen in der Attischen Plastik. By MAX RICHLAND. Pp. 31 + 108. 3 plates and 8 illustrations. Strasburg : Trilmer, 1901. 5 M.

The book is mainly occupied with a minute examination of the sculptural types of Demeter and Persephone, which can be referred to the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. Starting with the great Elouesian relief of the two goddesses and Triptolemus, the author finds the nearest parallel (in the round) to the Demeter in the statue at Cherchel, published not long ago by Kokult von Stradonitz. To this he assigns an Attic origin of about 400 B.C. The type represented by a Demeter in the Capitoline Museum, which Overbeck regarded as connected with the Demeter of the relief, he takes to be a later development in the school of Acanthius, of about 420 B.C. In the same way two various types of Persephone are connected with the Persephone of the relief. Further sections discuss a fifth century thinned Demeter, a fourth century Demeter with a veil, a Persephone with a mantle, and a Demeter with a mantle. The last section is devoted to a lost group of the two goddesses, the mother seated and the daughter standing, and to the group of Thalamon of Messene.


The appearance of an Atlas to accompany the Catalogue of the Athens vases (see vol. xxiii. p. 200) is a matter for much satisfaction. In 52 photographic plates, illustrations of
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256 vases are given, and special attention has been paid to the forms of the vases, in order to include besides the ordinary shapes all those which are rare or exceptional. Naturally this entails a considerable preponderance of the smaller fabrics. As regards the sixth and fifth century vases, photography can never be a very satisfactory medium for reproduction, but it is claimed that in view of the copious descriptions given in the previous volumes, a comparatively rough presentation of the principal specimens will suffice. The plates are preceded by a summary catalogue or review of their contents, giving dimensions, subjects, and bibliographical notices of the vases. Thus the volume is intended to give the student a general idea of the contents of the collection, but not to provide definitive publications of the vase-paintings.


The completion of the series promised us by Herrn Furtwaengler and Reichhold has been reached, and it is satisfactory to note that in view of the favourable support it has received, a second series is now promised. The two parts under consideration include twenty-three vases, all but five of the red-figure period. Part V. is devoted entirely to Dionysiac subjects, and includes the famous Würzburg Phaenopsis cup, the beautiful Exekias cup in Munich, others by Chelle, Hieron, and Brygos, and the Duris Pyxis in the British Museum. In Part VI. we have the Caerean Hydra in Vienna with the subject of Bostis, two cups by Duris, three R. P. pyxides in the British Museum together with the magnificent lebes from Olynthi formerly in the Forman collection, and the Phaen Krater at Palermo, with its interesting subject, which is almost certainly from the hand of Melas. The reproductions are fully up to the mark of the previous numbers, and the text as usual is illuminated by Prof. Furtwaengler's acute criticism and valuable suggestions.


After an interval of several years the publication of the Descriptive Atlas of the Cypriote Antiquities in the Cesnola Collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York has been resumed and completed in the appearance of the third volume in five parts. The third volume deals with the objects in gold, silver, bronze, lead, rock crystal, glass, Egyptian pottery, alabaster, ivory, bone, seals and cylinders, engraved jasper, and inscribed stones. The purpose of the book is to present illustrations of the objects accompanied by a text which is purely descriptive. The objects are grouped by their nature, and not by their place of discovery, which are given in the text when known. The illustrations are amply sufficient for objects of minor importance, but little attempt seems to have been made to discriminate between the important and the trivial, and to illustrate the former in a really adequate fashion. The volume has been prepared under the general supervision of General Cesnola, by Messrs. C. R. Gillette and J. H. Hall.


Dr. Winter's monumental Corpus of terracotta types, begun in 1889, has now appeared and its value to all students of the subject can hardly be overestimated. In addition to
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130 pages of introduction, it contains about 1500 outline drawings of typical figures, each carefully described and collated with similar specimens and with full museum and literary references, while a long list of 'Additions and Corrections' at the end of each volume brings the work almost up to the date of publication.

The Introduction, which affords a valuable conspectus of the whole subject, gives, under geographical headings and subheadings (e.g. Greece, Athens, etc.) a short survey of the general characteristics and circumstances of the principal finds, with references to the plates on which the various 'types' are figured. This is followed by the 'Corpus of Types,' volume i., containing those of earlier, volume ii., those of later style; in this section of his work Dr. Winter is solely guided by questions of style and subject. Volume i. contains all primitive figures, including those painted in Mycenaean and Geometric style and Rhodian and Cypriote specimens; next the archaic types, divided into the two main groups of male and female, which are again subdivided into seated and standing figures, groups, caricatures, etc. In volume ii., which deals with later types, the same principles of subdivision are followed, only that the subdivisions are more numerous as it is possible also to group the figures by their attributes and actions, i.e. female figures, standing; indefinite; dancing and playing; Niké, female figures with wings. Male figures, seated; youths; crouching boys; Erotes; groups.

Great pains have been taken to verify all references and wherever possible the museum numbers are given, though, considering how often the latter change, it was hardly worth while to do so. It is however a further proof of the care with which the Corpus has been compiled.


This volume, the eighth of the fully illustrated catalogues published by the Department during the last ten years, makes the collection of terracotta statuettes for the first time accessible to those who cannot study it in the Museum. It includes everything exhibited in the Terracotta and Etruscan Rooms with the exception of the lamps, the moulded and glazed ware, and the moulds of Arretine vases, in all 3018 objects, and is profusely illustrated, with 44 plates (of which 30 are collotypes), and numerous woodcuts in the text.

The classification adopted is, in the main, geographical; the Greek terracottas (with the exception of those from Cyprus) are grouped under B (Archaic) and C (Later Periods); the Italian ones of Later Period under D; stamps, moulds, and seals under E. All the Cypriote figures which, throughout a period of (circa) 800 years, show marked local peculiarities, are grouped together under a.

Mr. Walters prefaces his catalogue with a very interesting and useful Introduction, in which he deals with the history of the collection, the little art in antiquity, the methods employed in making the statuettes, and the different centres of productions. The vexed questions of the use and meaning of the figures, and the date of the 'Tanagra' are clearly stated, with the conclusions now generally adopted. The work is completed by a full index.


An official publication of the Greek terracottas in the Berlin Museum, with the exception of those from Tanagra. The specimens are mainly from Athens, Megara, and Corinth, but the classification adopted is neither purely geographical nor strictly according to style. Dr. Pernie's text is confined to details of insight, dress, gesture, etc., with special attention
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to an accurate description of all existing traces of colour. References are given to Dr. Winton's 'Typenkatalog.'
The collotype process of reproduction has been employed, as giving the best rendering of the uneven and often mottled surface of the terracotta, which are shown five-sixths of their natural size.

Antike Schnitzereien aus Elfenbein und Knochen in photographischer Nachbildung.
Dr. Graeven's new work consists of a small volume of text with one plate and twelve woodcuts, and an album of eighty photographs. It deals with ivory and bone carvings in all the principal Italian museums, excepting the Vatican, where the forthcoming publication by Father Ehrlé (Avveri della Biblioteca Vaticana) made a further one unnecessary, and the new Capitoline Museum, where permission to photograph was refused.
The photographs are all to scale; the text gives full details about each object, its place of discovery and its bibliography.

This is a collection, of the acclamated type, of brief essays by sixty-three contributors, gathered together in one volume, issued in honour of the sixtieth birthday (March 16, 1903) of Professor Otto Hirschfeld. A fine etched portrait of that distinguished scholar forms the frontispiece. The contributions, first among which is one by the late Th. Mommsen, deal with questions of history, epigraphy, papyri, Roman law, provincial history and antiquities, religion, numismatics, and architecture. To these must be added a few papers touching on literature and scholarship.

This is the first instalment of what promises to be an important enterprise, a corpus of the ancient coins of Italy. No attempt is to be made to compile an exhaustive list of published specimens, but it is hoped to include all known varieties. While the geographical order of the districts is to be retained, the alphabetical arrangement of cities is to be discarded in order to secure greater clearness in the historical explanations. Apparently the question of dies is not to receive much attention. Evidence of provenance is, however, to be carefully recorded. A special feature is the effort to estimate the current commercial value of each variety. The engravings in the text are all from the author's own drawings. The advantages attaching to this are obvious, although the plan is not without its dangers, especially where obscure legends have to be reproduced. The classification of the coins of Etruria is beset with so many difficulties, metrical and other, that one turns with keen anticipation to any fresh essay to grapple with the problem. Mr. Samson has no startling theories to propound. He frankly confesses that, in the meantime, no satisfactory solution seems possible, and he therefore contents himself with a sober and careful statement of facts. The general result is to make it increasingly probable that a large proportion of the uninscribed coins were minted at Populonia. It becomes clear too that Hual was right in declining to accept Desceke's theory as to a chronological succession of the standards. The
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Eagle and the Cynocephal (or Persic, as Samson prefers to consider it) were employed for a long time simultaneously within the limits of Thrace. Materials are given for forming a judgment on the relation of the bronze currency to the coinage of Rome. On grounds of style Samson rejects Babylon's attractive suggestion as to a connection between Hannibal's Italian campaign and the small bronze pieces that have for types a negro's head and an elephant.

Jewish Coins. By Théodore Reinach. Translated by Mary Hill, with an Appendix by G. F. Hill. Pp. xxiv + 77. With 12 Photographic Plates, and 5 cuts in the Text. London: Lawrence and Bullen, 1902. 3s. 6d.

The well-known Monnaies juives of M. Théod. Reinach is here presented in a very attractive English dress. The book, however, is more than a translation. It is really a new edition, specially revised by the author. Reinach now abandons his attribution to the First Revolt of the familiar shekels with the jewelled cup and the flowering lily, and assigns them once more to the Maccabean period. He bases his change of view on grounds of historical probability; the difficulties of style and fabric are but lightly touched on. As a general guide to Jewish coins, especially in their relation to Jewish history, no sketch could be more luminous or more interesting. Mr. Hill's appendix deals with a curious chapter in the annals of coin forgery. The illustrations are very good.


This book establishes from ritual evidence the importance of certain neglected aspects of Greek religion. The author first seeks to show that the familiar distinction between 'Olympian' and 'Cithonian' ritual was based on a fundamental difference of intention. The Olympians received 'cheerful tendance' (σπουραία), the underworld powers were the objects of systematic 'aversion' (ἀποστροφή), Following Prof. Ridgeway, the Olympians are regarded as the gods of immigrant conquerors, the Cithaeans as those of the indigenous race. Hence ἱππαρτεῖα and ἁρπαγμῷ represent, not complementary aspects of one primitive religion, but the leading principles of two never wholly reconciled faiths. Apotropoeic rites are shown to play an important part in the Anthesterae, Thargelia, and Thesmophoria; but the presence in the two latter of equally primitive 'rites of induction' tells against the author's theory, which seems indeed to invert the natural sequence of ideas. For unless early man conceived of the unseen potencies enveloping him as evil per se, and not till later as 'good to me or bad to me,' avoidance pure and simple cannot have been his sole method of dealing with them. Again, the distinction so sharply drawn between Achaean and Pelasgian religion should surely not be based on Homeric evidence. Homer's Achaeans are after all not Prof. Ridgeway's, nor can we be certain how far the religion of the Northern invaders, at its entry into Greece, differed from its Epic afterglow. Three chapters on the evolution of divinities, while admirably illuminating dark corners of demonology, do not bridge the gulf between it and theology. One great fact in the making of a god seems left out of sight, viz. the savage conception of the physical solidarity of kinship, inherited or sacramentally acquired. With the advent of Dionysus, whose worship is taken as a revivifying graft on the Pelasgian stock, the author reaches firmer ground, and the book its best chapter. The four concluding chapters form a brilliant and sympathetic study of Orphism, regarded as the raising of the ancient faith of Greece to its highest spiritual expression by the genius of a great reformer. Mr. Gilbert Murray's Critical Appendix on the Orphic Tablets is a valuable supplement to this part of the work. In illustrating her arguments, Miss Harrison has throughout made effective use of her profound knowledge of vase-paintings.
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Cilicia. By FRANZ X. SCHAFER. [141st Ergänzungsauf zu Petersmanns Mitteilungen.] Pp. 110. 2 maps, 5 figures. Gotha; Perthes, 1903. 12 m.

Dr. Schaffer's exploration of Cilicia during the years 1900 and 1901 was made mainly in the interests of the natural sciences, especially geology. But he did not neglect archaeology altogether, and contributed a paper to the Jahrbücher of the Vienna Arch. Inst. on the route taken by Cyrus' general Memon across Taurus. The substance of this he now includes in his general account of the whole region, and notices briefly other questions of ancient history and topography, e.g., the situation of Mallus and Mopsuestia; the former navigability of the Cydnus; and the passes across Taurus. He describes with some fulness the ruins of Tarsus, Anaarba, Elaeon-Sabast and Olba, and mentions in passing many minor monuments of the Greek, Roman, and Lesser Armenian periods.


In the Preface to the second edition of the indispensable Syllagse, the author promises a supplement containing a selection of Greek inscriptions of the East. The first volume of this Supplement now appears, two years only after the completion of the Syllage. The book is arranged on the same plan; the inscriptions themselves are not provided with descriptive titles, but reference is facilitated by headlines giving somewhat more detailed information. It is hardly necessary to speak of the high quality of the work, or to point out how convenient to the historian is the inclusion in one volume of new critical editions of monuments like the Canopus Decree, the Rosetta Stone, the Adulis inscription, the Illyrian law concerning tyrants, the Smyrna-Magnesia treaty, the dispute between Mytilene and Piraeus, the Neustrian-Dagh inscriptions. The 434 inscriptions are classified under the following heads: (1) Regna Alexandri; (2) Antigoni, Demetrii, Lysimachi; (2) Regnum Lagidarum; (3) Nabia et Asthioyia; (4) Regnum Seleucidarum; (5) Regnum Attalidarum; (6) Regnia Asiana Minoria (Bithynia, Galatia, Indica, etc.); (7) Regna Arsacidarum et Sasanidarum. The largest numbers naturally fall to the Ptolemies (133), Seleucidae (53) and Attalids (76). Recently published inscriptions of importance are reserved for Vol. II., which is to contain inscriptions relating to the Roman provinces, down to the time of Justinian, and Indices.


The present part of the Corpus of Greek Inscriptions contains 797 inscriptions, of Ion, Sicinus, Naxos, Paros, Olerii, Siphnus, Siphnus, Gythium, Cesa, Gyretis, Syros, and Andros. Among the new or recently published inscriptions are: No. 100, treaty between the Parions and Thasians, c. 411 B.C.; No. 114, decree in honour of Cephalophon for services rendered to Paros and Thasos; No. 444, the Parian Chronicle, with the new fragment; No. 445, the Archilochus inscription; No. 489, the Siphnian version of the Athenian fifth century decree regulating the coined, weights, and measures of the allies; No. 381, Siphnian decree in honour of Perigones, admiral of Ptolemy Philopator, who was in the Aegean in 297 B.C., after the battle of Raphia.
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This work is divided into two parts. The first deals with outlawry, the second with banishment. The method followed is that of collecting from literature and inscriptions instances in which outlawry and banishment are threatened as penalties for particular crimes, and in which these punishments are recorded as having been inflicted upon particular persons. In Part I cases of outlawry pronounced as penalty for offences in Attica are first brought together, after that similar penalties threatened in places outside Attica. Thus the law of the Hypoedemonian Locrians relating to a colony at Naupactus threatens outlawry as the penalty for attempted rape. Specific cases follow, within or without Attica, in which the penalty of outlawry was actually inflicted. Finally conclusions are drawn from these instances. It is pointed out that a variety of words—ἀγων, ἀπογείωσθαι, ἀκατάστατος, ἀναστάτος—are used of the outlaw, but that the first expression is old and falls into disuse at Athens towards the end of the fifth century. Outlawry is a punishment inflicted particularly for offences against the community as a whole. An appendix is devoted to a discussion of the difference between ἀκατάστατος = capitis diminutio and ἀπογείωσθαι = outlawry. Part II deals with banishment, first as the result of a judicial sentence, secondly as coming into effect ipso facto. Then follow cases of banishment for political reasons, whether pronounced by the banished persons' own government (cf. the banishment of Alcibiades and Xenophon, or enforced by a foreign power, e.g. the banishment of the Messenians by the Spartans 455 B.C.). An interesting Examen discusses cases of banishment in the First and Second Athenian Confederacies. The treatment of banishment in the latter Confederacy is very useful, though the author does not altogether avoid the error of drawing too wide conclusions from very scanty evidence. The remainder of the book is occupied with the attitude, favourable or otherwise, assumed by foreign states to those banished for political reasons, and with an examination of the various annuities recorded in Greek history. The work is well arranged and admirably indexed.


In this massive volume the author tells in continuous narrative the whole story of the Peloponnesian War. Taking into account the size of this part, the book is rather longer than the two and a half volumes which Grose devoted to the same subject. Nor does it deal at all with Literature and Art, or speculate on Weltanschauung. It is a detailed record of events, concise, weighty, and severe. As the fullest modern commentary on Thucydides, it ought to be in the hands of all who deal with him. 167 pages are devoted to Sources, and the modern literature on the subject is adequately noticed, and, at least in the case of German work, well digested. Many interesting pages are devoted to financial matters, and to the strength of the forces engaged on either side. Proportion is well maintained, and the judgments given are fair and reasonable. There are no maps and plans. The absence of an Index, which will presumably come at the end of the whole work, is rendered less serious by a full table of contents, and a strictly chronological arrangement of subject matter.
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In this volume the author carries his history from Alexander's entry into Ecbatana in 330 B.C. to the peace between Philip and the Antolian League in 217 B.C. An introduction deals with the old question whether the Macedonians were Greeks, and answers it vigorously in the affirmative. Separate chapters are devoted to the development of industry, to the general conditions of society, to literature and art, to Wissenschaft, to Weltanschauung. As might be expected from the author of the Bevölkerung der Griechisch-römischen Welt, pages of interest are devoted to statistics of population, and the new evidence furnished by papyri is used on this and other questions. The rest of the book is concerned with the general aspects of constitutional changes and the general march of events. It does not attempt to give details, but, like the volumes that preceded it, it is the impression of a period formed by a thoughtful and original mind. The second part of the third volume is announced as already in the press, and to be published at Easter. It will apparently carry the History no further in point of date than the present volume, but will discuss sources, and deal in greater detail with special chronological and constitutional points. It will also contain an index to both Parts, and maps. It may be hoped that some competent English scholar will at once get Dr. Biloeh's permission to take in hand the translation of both parts. The fact that all specialists now read German should not mean, as it unfortunately does, that hardly any German works are translated, and that the general public of English students and English schoolmasters is brought less directly into touch with modern German thought than it ever was.


This book is a vigorous criticism of J. Kronmayer's Antike Schlachtfelder in Griechenland, noticed in the last volume of this Journal. A general introduction on the method of ancient military history, and Kronmayer's treatment of his sources, especially Polybius, is followed by a chapter on Epaminondas' strategy, and another on his tactics. Having in these chapters challenged Kronmayer's account of the Battle of Mantinea (B.C. 362), Roloff devotes only six pages to Chaeronea (B.C. 338), not going into detail over what is one of the most interesting parts of Kronmayer's work, his reconstruction of the chronology of the campaign. The campaign of Sellasia (B.C. 221) he discusses at length, and ends the book with a chapter on the Battle of Mantinea (B.C. 207). The whole book is frankly an attack on Kronmayer, and to a large extent a defense of Dullbruck's views, as presented in his Kriegskunst. Students of Polybius will find it valuable to read Kronmayer and Roloff side by side, even if they are not immediately concerned with the particular battles discussed.


The first title of this book is misleading. It is not in any sense a monograph on Cyrus. Indeed there are only about two pages directly concerned with him. The book only justifies itself in regard to its second title: it is an account of the ancient civilizations of the East, written from the popular point of view, but, so far as can be judged, sound and accurate. There are 126 excellent illustrations, 5 pages of chronological tables, and a well-engraved map of Mesopotamia and Egypt.
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A volume of Hoffmann's Gymnasial-Bibliothek, containing an introduction on historical writing before Herodotus, life of Herodotus, account of his travels, analysis of his work, etc.

The following books have also been received:


RICHARD CLAY AND SONS, LIMITED,
BREAD STREET HILL, E.C., AND
BUNGAY, SUFFOLK.
FURTHER NOTES ON THE GREEK JUMP.

In my last article I tried to show that there is no adequate evidence for the statement that the Greek frequently jumped fifty feet or more, and still less for the theories of a 'triple jump' or of a 'hop, skip, and jump,' which have been suggested simply to explain such a record. Other misconceptions are due to the same cause. The old idea, that the rods which so frequently occur in vase-paintings of the palaestra are jumping-poles, has been long since abandoned, and they are now recognised as akontia, or possibly measuring rods (καρπαίες). On a black-figured kelebe in the British Museum (Fig. 1), we see a bearded athlete carefully laying down rods as if to measure a jump, while another with rods in his hands watches him. The other figures are a diskobole, akontistes, and flute-player. If we can connect the kneeling figure with the jump, we have a typical Pentathlon scene, but as the akontion is frequently represented as a plain rod without a point, the precise object of these rods is sometimes difficult to determine. They may be akontia, or they may be measuring rods, and possibly they served for both purposes; at all events no one now regards them as jumping-poles.

But it is still sometimes stated that the Greeks used a springboard. That the springboard (περανάιος) was known to the Greeks and was used by acrobats, is shown by the literary evidence and by the monuments, but there is not the slightest indication that it was used by athletes either in practice or in competition. Nor are we justified in saying that the Greeks jumped from a height. French and German writers, following Dr. Krause, tell us that the Greeks practised the various forms of jump known to the modern gymnasiun, the high jump, the long jump, and the deep jump. But beyond Dr. Krause's authority the evidence in literature and art for any form of jump except the long jump is practically non-existent. We have a single passage from Seneca, who speaks of 'saltus vel ille qui corpus in altum levat vel ille qui in longum mittit vel ille, ut ita dicam, salutem aut ut contemptuosum dicam, saltus.' Such a statement is no evidence as to the practice of the Greeks, and even if it were, there is no ground for explaining

1 R. M. Vane, B. 361.
2 F. Kraus, Gymnasiu der Hellen, p. 225.
the 'saltus saltaris' as a deep jump. The expression would be more appropriate to an exercise such as skipping, hopping, or jumping up and down in the same place, after the manner of a fuller treading clothes, an exercise actually described by Lucian, and well known in our own physical drill. M. de Rudder, indeed, enumerates a number of vase-paintings as representing either the high jump or the deep jump. Those will be discussed later; for the present, it is sufficient to say that most of them undoubtedly represent the long jump, a few possibly represent the high jump, none can possibly represent the deep jump. On the other hand, we know that the long jump formed part of the Pentathlon, and we know of no other competition in jumping. Moreover, the silence of Philostratus, Aristotle, and other writers who mention the long jump is strong evidence that if, as is not unlikely, the represented on the wall paintings of the Fulvianus at Pompeii and on a relief in the museum at Sens, v. Scharf, Atlas, ii. 19. To this character. The treading of the clothes 9.
Greeks did practise other forms of jumping in the gymnasia, such forms were considered of quite secondary importance compared with the long jump. And the reason of this is obvious. Greek athletics were largely militaristic, and in a land without hedges and fences the obstacle which a man would have to jump would be generally a ditch or a stream. Hence, the long jump must have been useful, the high jump useless, except for such physical training as is described in the passage quoted from Seneca.

Having thus cleared the ground of statements for which there is no authority, we may proceed to discuss the evidence of the monuments as to the method and style of the Greek jumper.

I.—The Halteres.

The various forms of halteres have been so carefully examined by Dr. Jüttner that it is only necessary to give a brief summary of his results. The oldest and simplest form is represented by an inscribed halter of lead found at Eleusis and now in the Museum at Athens. It is merely an oblong block of metal with slightly concave sides weighing 1.888 kg., and the inscription in which Epæneus ascribes his success to this halter enables us to assign it to the early part of the sixth century at the latest. On the earliest black-figured vases the halter appears as a nearly semicircular piece of metal or stone, with a deep recess in the straight lower side which affords a grip. The two club-like ends are almost equal, and the effect is that of a curved dumb-bell. This type does not occur after the sixth century, towards the close of which we find the halter improved by an increase in the size of the end held to the front, and a decrease in the hinder part. Numerous modifications of this type are found on the red-figured vases, differing merely in the shape of the club-like ends. In the later red-figured vases the actual exercises of the palaestra are seldom represented, but though the halteres are seldom seen in use they constantly appear lying on the ground or suspended on the wall by a cord passed round the two smaller ends, as a symbol of the palaestra in scenes representing the life of the Ephori. To the few existing specimens of this type of halteres enumerated by Dr. Jüttner may be added a pair in the British Museum (Fig. 2). They are of lead, about 8 inches long; 3 inches wide at the thick end, 1½ inches wide at the grip, and about half an inch thick. One of them is much damaged, but the other is perfect, and weighs 2 lb. 5 oz. Side by side with this type in the fifth century we find another consisting of an oval piece of metal or stone with the ends sometimes pointed, sometimes round, the upper side of which is pierced or hollowed out so as to afford a grip for the thumb and fingers. The existing specimens are of stone and considerably heavier than the leaden halteres which we possess. A pair found at Corinth weigh 2.018 kg. each, and a
somewhat similar but more primitive specimen found at Olympia weighs as much as 4.629 kg, or four times as much as the British Museum weights. This is the type described by Pausanias as represented on the statue of Agon. Elsewhere he speaks of ἀρχαῖοι ἀλτήρες; but whether he means by this the club-like or the oval type is not clear. Under the Roman Empire a new cylindrical type of halter makes its appearance. This is merely a long cylinder slightly narrower at the centre than at the ends, and though very useful for dumb-bell exercises cannot have been as serviceable for jumping as the older forms. We know, indeed, from Roman writers, and writers on medicine, that at this period halteres were used chiefly as dumb-bells, and not as jumping weights.

II.—The Method of Using the Halteres.

The halteres are never mentioned except in connection with the long jump, or as a means of physical training. We have no literary evidence of their use as dumb-bells until Imperial times, and the evidence of the monuments as to their use for this purpose in the fifth century is by no means clear. With regard to their use as jumping-weights the monuments confirm the evidence of literature that they were used exclusively for the long jump, in the only monuments which can possibly represent a high jump the halteres

---

15 Furtwangler, Brenna, 3, 47, 180.
16 Paus. v. 26, 3.
17 id. v. 27, 12, vi. 2, 10.
18 Jähnert, op. cit. p. 10, 11.
19 Mart. vii. 67, 5, iv. 48; Semon, op. cit.
20 and ibid.; Antyll. apud Origen. vi. 14; Galen, De Sens. Vn. ii. 1, etc.
are absent. The few representations which we have of the actual jump leave us in no doubt as to the manner of using them. Two moments are clearly represented. At the moment of taking off, the hands are swung to the front, and a Bourguignon kylix shows us the jumper in mid-air, legs and arms extended forwards to their full extent and almost parallel (Fig. 3). Immediately before alighting, the arms are forced quickly backwards, a movement which increases the length of the jump and enables the jumper to land.

Fig. 3.—R. F. Kylix. (From Arch. Zeit. 1884, xvi, 29.)

Fig. 4.—B. F. Amphora. B.M. 448.
firmly and securely, the two-fold advantage which, according to Philostratus, the use of jumping-weights secures. This moment is clearly represented on the black-figured imitation Corinthian amphora, B.M. B.48, already published in Vol. II. of this journal (Fig. 4).\[1\] The three vertical lines underneath the jumper seem, as has been already stated, to represent either pegs or lines drawn on the sand marking the performances of previous jumpers.\[2\] This appears to be the natural interpretation of the three curved lines, usually interpreted as spikes or arrows, on an Etruscan cornelian\[3\] representing the jump, but here, though the jumper is on the point of alighting, the hands are still to the front, and he appears likely to land on all-fours (Fig. 5). The artist, indeed, appears to have sacrificed truthfulness to the desire of filling the space at his disposal.

Another attitude generally recognised as representing the moment before the actual jump is familiar from the Berlin and British Museum bronze diskoi.\[4\] The athlete stands with one foot advanced and the halteres held out horizontally to the front at arm’s length. But the variations in this type and the numerous vases where athletes are depicted bending forward with halteres in their hands have not, as far as I know, received the attention which they deserve. Dr. Jüttner sees in this stooping position merely a form of gymnastic exercise,\[5\] but an examination of the whole series makes this view very doubtful.

It is obvious that no jumper could take off immediately from the position shown on the bronze diskoi, and the perception of this difficulty has induced some writers to regard this attitude also as merely gymnastic, and therefore as having no connection with the jump. But it would be very strange that in monuments which clearly represent the various events of the Pentathlon the jump should be represented by a dumb-bell exercise. The fact is that this position, though it is not the position immediately preceding the jump, does form a part of the preliminary swing. In a standing jump it is usual to swing the arms to the front and back again two or three times, at the same time straightening and bending the knees, the final spring taking place as the hands are swinging to the front, and the knees begin to straighten. With weights, this swing of the hands and the alternate bending and straightening of the lower limbs are still more important, and these are the very movements which we can trace in the vase-paintings.

1.—The Upward Swing.

The beginning of this movement is shown on a vase now lost, but figured by Dubois-Maissewine xvi. 4, and Tischbiirn v. 90. Here we see a

---


\[2\] Jüttner, op. cit. Fig. 39, 21. Beazerendorf, Fig. 612. Gaz. Arch. 1878, II. 35.

\[3\] Taut, Pierre Gravés, ii. 46 = Furt-
youth with right leg advanced, and body leaning back holding the halteres low down to the front. The flute-player opposite him shows that this is no mere gymnastic exercise but the actual jump. For Philostratus expressly tells us that the Greek jumper was assisted by the music of the flute. An almost identical scene occurs on a British Museum vase, E 427 (Fig. 6), the only difference being that the arms are slightly higher. This position cannot possibly belong to the downward swing, for a few experiments with a pair of dumb-bells will convince anyone that if the body is leaning backwards in the downward swing, it is most difficult to preserve the balance, and the force of the return swing is thereby impaired. It follows that whenever the body is leaning backwards the movement of the halteres must be upwards. The figure on the B. M. diskos is still inclined backwards, and the hands are slightly above the horizontal. On a red-figured krater reproduced in the Annali for 1846 M. (Fig. 7), the hands are still higher, and the left foot which is advanced is actually lifted off the ground in such a way as to suggest that there might actually be a step forward taken between the upward swing and the downward swing. A single

![Image of a Greek scene](image_url)

vase is hardly sufficient evidence for such a theory, but, as we shall see, such a movement is quite natural in the case of a running jump. On a British Museum Panathenaic vase, B 134, the halteres are raised above the head and the arms are slightly bent as in other black-figured vases to be discussed later. As is usual with Panathenaic vases representing the Pentathlon the figures have a conventional, processional character, which

---
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Krauss, *op. cit. lx. 22.*


*Bull. anat. soc. sce. v. 12.*


1885, ii, both r. f. kylikes.
diminishes their value as evidence. The body is here perfectly upright as it is in the Berlin diskos and on numerous vases.\textsuperscript{39} Is the position of the body in these cases accidental, or are we justified in saying that it marks the commencement of the downward swing? Such an inference seems not improbable when we compare the series of vases on which the downward swing is certainly represented.

2. — The Downward Swing.

The commencement of the downward swing is clearly shown in the interior of a red-figured kylix in the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris, 511,\textsuperscript{38} and on a kylix at Corneto reproduced in Mon. d. A., xi. 24. The position of the hands corresponds to that in the initial movement of the upward swing, but the position of the body is reversed, the shoulders being slightly rounded and the whole movement forwards. This forward inclination of the body is still more marked on a kylix reproduced by Zannoni,\textsuperscript{31} showing an athlete with a robed official opposite him. Another Bologna kylix \textsuperscript{52} shows us the movement still more advanced (Fig. 8). Two athletes stand on either side of an official; they are bending forwards so that their bodies are almost horizontal and their hands almost touch the ground. Parallel with the athlete on the left is the familiar fluted pillar, and on the right is a pair of spears or rods. An almost identical scene occurs on several red-figured kylikes\textsuperscript{33} in all of which we see either the pillar, or the spears, or both. The repetition of these details justifies us in supposing that they represent the \textit{strophe}, or take off. Further, the presence of these details and of the robed official, and the large number of vases on which this scene occurs, are strong evidence that it is


\textsuperscript{39} de Ridder, Catalogus. Pl. xxxi.

\textsuperscript{31} Scavi di Bologna, xxxvii. 2.

\textsuperscript{32} Jullier, op. cit. Fig. 26, from the same vase as Zannoni, xxxvii. 1.

not, as Jüttner suggests, a merely gymnastic exercise. Much less can this stooping attitude belong, as M. de Ridder believes, to the deep jump; for anyone who started to jump from a height in such an attitude would inevitably alight upon his nose.

The examples which I have quoted of the upward and downward swings, though by no means exhaustive, are sufficient to show that the various positions pass almost imperceptibly into one another, and indeed often occur together on the same vase. Any of them might, were it an isolated example, pass as a dumb-bell exercise. But, as has been shown, they are all closely connected, and when we remember that the swinging of the weights is an essential part of the jump, and remember, too, the importance attached to the jump by the Greeks, it is surely better to connect a series so numerous and so carefully graduated with the jump itself than with a mere physical exercise. If the halteres were freely used as dumb-bells in the fifth century, it is hard to explain why a simple dumb-bell exercise should have been so often repeated. At the same time we know that in wrestling the various movements were taught in the form of drill, and it is quite likely that the same system was applied to jumping and other exercises. If so, jumpers may often have practised swinging the weights upwards and downwards as an independent exercise, and this would, if necessary, explain the pairs of figures swinging the weights with an instructor between them, although the artist’s love of symmetry is of itself sufficient motive for such an arrangement. In such a movement, originally practised in connection with the jump, we may trace the beginning of the use of dumb-bells for general physical training.

III.—A Standing Jump or a Running Jump.

It has been generally assumed that the Greek long jump was a standing jump, and at first sight the vases which I have enumerated as representing the swing seem to support this view. There are, however, other vases which clearly depict a run, and a consideration of these will show that the swing is not inconsistent with such a run as they represent.

First, we have a number of archaic black-figured vases showing an athlete with halteres walking or running. On a stamnos in the Vatican we see a band of athletes engaged in various sports, one of whom, holding halteres with his elbows by his side and arms bent at right angles, appears to be commencing to run. Very similar is the figure on an amphora at Würzburg, save that the arms are slightly raised. The actual run is shown on another Würzburg amphora on which the flute-player also appears, on a kyathos in the Bibliothèque Nationale, 334, and on a Panathenic vase at

---

24 Dar. Sagg. loc. cit.
29 Gerh. A. F. 256.
Leyden. In all these cases the arms are bent, as in the case of the B.M. amphora B 134 mentioned above. On the Leyden amphora the diskobolos and akontistes are also running in the same grotesque and exaggerated style, a fact which diminishes the value of its evidence. There can, however, be no doubt that the whole series represents the run, the general attitude and especially the position of the arms being confined to the black-figured vases. With the red-figured vases the style changes, but the evidence is equally clear. Connecting the two series is a vase figured by Tischbein iv. 43, where the jumper seems about to start, holding his arms bent close to his sides in a way which reminds one of the black-figured Vatican vase denoting the same moment. Another Vatican vase shows a jumper with his arms hanging by his sides just commencing to run. More frequently the arms are held slightly

in advance of the body, which is somewhat bent forward. The treatment of the feet in the circular spaces in the interior of a kylix makes it sometimes difficult to determine whether a figure is really running or not. There is a tendency to make the line of the feet follow the line of the circle, as can be clearly seen in the figure on the Berin diskos. 

But there can be no doubt that running is intended on the interior of the following vases: *Mus. Chius.,* 154. 1, figured Klein *Euphronios,* p. 306 (Fig. 9) (= Noel des Vergers xxxviii.), *Mus. Borb.,* xiv. 36, Gerh. *A. V.* 294 (Fig. 11). The run so depicted is by no means incompatible with the use of the halteres. The modern long-jumper depends principally on pace, and, as has been pointed out, pace is inconsistent with the use of halteres. **Fig. 9.—R. F. KYLIX. (From Klein's *Euphronios,* p. 306.)**

---

42 Kranz, op. cit. viii. 18. Dar. Sagg. loc. cit. 43 Mus. Greg. lviii. 1 b. 44 So too on a vase in the British Museum depicting Hoplitodromos, the device on one of the shields is an athlete running with halteres. *J. H. S.* 1903, 286, Fig. 15.
halteres. But the Greek jumper certainly does not sprint*2: like the modern high jumper he takes a few short, springy steps, intended to give elasticity to the limbs; and so to prepare for the final spring. Before he can jump, the halteres must be swung upwards and then downwards, and therefore a pause is necessary. This pause is clearly shown on the krater already referred to (Fig. 7). There we see an akontistes, diskobolos, and two jumpers, all performing to the accompaniment of a flute-player. The jumper to the left has been already described, the other is leaning back with elbows forced back, and right leg forward, checking his pace in the way in which the Hoplitodromos is so often represented. When we compare this figure with those which denote the commencement of the upward swing, there can be little doubt that the two moments are consecutive.

The attitude of the jumper on the left of this vase suggests, as I have already remarked, that in a running jump the upward and downward swings were accompanied by one or more forward strides, and modern experience confirms this view. In the present day the long jump is seldom practised with weights, and such weights as are used are not sufficiently heavy to interfere with the pace, but in the high jump weights of five pounds and upwards are used by professional jumpers, and Mr. George Rowden, who some years ago held the championship for the high jump, sends me the following description of the method of using them:*— The jumper starts about fourteen yards from the posts, taking two-thirds of the distance with short, quick steps, scarcely swinging the weights at all, after which he takes one or two comparatively long slow strides, swinging the bells together twice, and on the second swing taking off from the ground as the bells come to the front.

With heavy weights the run for the long jump would be very similar to that for the high jump, the chief difference being that while in the high jump the weights are thrown away at the moment of jumping, in the long jump they are retained all the time.

We can now reconstruct the Greek long jump.

1. The jumper starts with arms bent, and elbows close to the side.

2. He takes a short run, holding the halteres to the front.

3. On nearing the bater he checks himself by throwing the body back, immediately swinging the halteres upwards and making a slow stride forward.

4. With the next stride he swings them sharply downwards, bending the body and the front leg as the arms descend.

5. On the return swing he takes off, shooting both legs to the front, so that arms and legs are nearly parallel.

6. Before alighting he forces the arms vigorously backwards.

There is, then, no difficulty in reconciling the evidence of the vases with a running jump. But we need not therefore exclude the standing jump, the method of which was in many ways similar. In particular, some of the

* The only example to the contrary is on a

* evidence of little value. Schredder, Athos,

Romana mosaic from Tarsilium. Its late date

xiii. 10, Mem. d. L vi. vii. P. 82,

and the exaggeration of the drawing make its
figures represented as stooping forward and swinging the bells downwards are often more appropriate to a standing jump. We may conclude, then, that both kinds of jump were practised. In the Pentathlon the somewhat doubtful evidence of the Panathenian vases is slightly in favour of a running jump.

IV.—Variations in the Use of Halteres.

The types which have been discussed seem to represent the method of using the halteres for the long jump. It remains briefly to consider, and if possible to explain, the motives of certain variations from these types.

![Fig. 10.—B. F. Kylix. B.M. E 58.](image)

1. On the interior of the Vatican kylix 46 we find a variation in the run. A wreathed athlete is running with halteres, not holding them before him, but swinging the arms alternately after the manner of the Stadiodromos. It is the ordinary conventional representation of a runner, the right arm moving with the right leg, and not as it should do with the left. 47 The attitude is a favourite one on the interior of kylikes 48 and the artist appears merely to have added a pair of halteres to an ordinary runner, perhaps to show artistic effect, and ascribes to the same cause a similar insufficiency in depicting the movements of a horse.

46  *Ias. Greq.* 3. 2 b.
47  Pallack in *Hippodromea*, p. 69, uses this as an illustration of the way in which the Greek artist sometimes sacrifices truth to artistic effect.
48  E.g., *B.M. Vases*, E 21, 22.
that he is a pentathlete, the halteres being the recognised symbol of the Pentathlon.

A similar explanation may be given of the figures on a red-figured kylix in the British Museum (Fig. 10).\(^\text{40}\) where we have two jumpers running forward and swinging their halteres alternately. On either side of this kylix are a diskobolos, an akontistes, and a jumper with an instructor. The vase is an excellent example of the influence of symmetry in the arrangement and the attitudes of the figures. The jumper is on the left, the instructor one from the right on each side; in each case the instructor looks towards the two figures on his left, while the figure to the right looks towards the instructor. Finally, in all eight figures there are practically only two attitudes, attitudes

![Image of a red-figured kylix](image)

Typical rather of the diskobolos and akontistes than of the jumper. We can only conclude that the artist has simply drawn two figures in a favourite attitude and added to them a pair of halteres, to indicate that they are jumpers.

Similarly, on a kylix in the Forman Collection \(^\text{58}\) there is a delightful little figure moving away to the left, with halteres in his hands, and turning his head and body round to the right. He certainly has nothing directly to do with the actual jump, nor have those athletes whom we see carrying

\(^{40}\) E. R. K. 68. -- Mon. a. d. ix. 33.

\(^{58}\) Catalogue, 233.
the halteres in one hand or both,\footnote{Arch. Zeit. 1884, ii. 271.} or stooping down to pick them up.\footnote{Ibid.} In all such cases the halteres are merely added as an attribute of the pentathlete, or the jumper.

2. Another slight variation seems due to the desire for artistic effect. We have seen that the halteres are naturally swung to the front parallel to one another. When the figure is represented in profile, the effect of the two arms parallel to each other is as stiff as the effect of a profile drawing with the feet together. So the artist sometimes (e.g. Fig. 11) draws the arms at slightly different angles,\footnote{Stackelberg, Grdb. der Hell. alt. xxi, 5.} and thus produces a much more pleasing picture. Yet the variation is due to artistic considerations, not to any difference in the scene depicted.

3. Lastly we have a few vases which really do seem to show the halteres used as dumb-bells. In the kylix representing the actual jump (Fig. 8), we see another athlete to the left swinging the bells sideways left and right.\footnote{B. M. Pausa, E 376, 697, E 499. B. M.} He strides forward with his right foot, his arms level with the shoulders. His right arm is bent towards his breast, while the left is extended, and his head is turned towards the left. On a Berlin kylix figured by Krause\footnote{B. M. Pausa, E 5, Arch. A.F. 29.} we have the reverse of this scene, with the right arm extended and left bent. The drawing of both these figures is remarkable for its vigorous action. Less vigorous but essentially similar is a figure reproduced by Jähnric from a drawing in the Roman Institute.\footnote{Arch. Zeit. 1884, xvi.} The attitude is one which is generally associated with the akoustes, but the drawing in the first two vases is so vigorous that we can hardly explain it as merely an akout-
iates with halteres substituted for the akontion. The exercise of swinging the dumb-bells alternately right and left is a familiar one in the modern gymnasium, and is especially valuable for developing and giving flexibility to the muscles of the shoulder, the muscles which are particularly important in throwing the diskos and akontion. It seems, therefore, only natural that some such exercise should have been employed by athletes training for these events, just as the jumper may have often practised swinging the bells upwards and downwards in the manner actually required in the jump. This view is confirmed by the drawing on a red-figured oenochoe in the British Museum, E. 561 (Fig. 12), which represents a different moment in the same swing. On opposite sides of a pillar stand an athlete with halteres and a robed spectator or official. The former is leaning to his left with the head turned towards his right hand. The arms are not, however, horizontal, but the central moment of the swing is depicted when the arms are still swinging on either side of the body.

We may conclude, then, that the pentathlete in the fifth century did use the halteres for developing the special muscles required for the jump, the diskos, or the akontion. These exercises were subsequently adopted by trainers and medical men, and incorporated by them in their systems of physical training.

V.—Jumping without Halteres.

Aristotle in his Problems \(^{37}\) discusses the question why the pentathlete jumps further with halteres than without them. Even if we had no such direct evidence the monuments leave us no doubt that, whatever was the case at athletic festivals, jumping without weights was certainly practised in the gymnasium. Dr. Hauser, in his articles on the Tübingen bronze, has collected all the vases illustrating such a jump in support of his theory as to the position of a runner at the start. In discussing the footrace I tried to show the fallacy of classing these vases with the Tübingen bronze, and suggested that they really represented jumping without the halteres.\(^{38}\)

On a vase given by Krause \(^{39}\) we see a youth with feet together, knees bent, and hands stretched to the front, standing on a low beam, ready to jump. In front of him is a low pillar, and Krause supposes that he is preparing to jump over it. The attitude, however, is at least as appropriate to a long jump as to a high jump, and unfortunately for Krause’s theory the interior of a red-figured Munich kylix shows an almost identical figure, but in this case the pillar is behind him.\(^{40}\) The pillar, then, cannot represent the object to be cleared. The same figure but without the pillar appears on a roughly drawn kylix in the British Museum, E.101. Still better is the figure on a red-figured pelikos,\(^{41}\) belonging to Dr. Hauser, opposite to whom stands a robed official stretching out his hand with a gesture of command.
There can be no doubt that these figures represent jumpers, but whether long-jumpers or high-jumpers, we cannot say for certain. What is certain is that here we have a standing jump, whereas we saw that the evidence of the vases was in favour of a running jump with halteres. Perhaps we may add to these vases a bronze in the Museum at Athens 88 which, as far as can be judged from its mutilated condition, represents the same attitude.

The interpretation of the second group quoted by Dr. Hanser is not so certain. A Leyden krater shows us a youth striding forward with his arms stretched out horizontally (Fig. 13). 89 Before him we see another youth holding a skapane, and a pillar. Martin Faber suggests that this is an illustration of the two 'Sprungschritte' which, according to Fedde, formed part of the triple jump. Now Fedde is trying to explain the jump of Phayllus in the Pentathlon, and there is no doubt that in the Pentathlon halteres were used. Unfortunately, in this case the halteres are wanting, and therefore it cannot be used in support of his theory. The attitude, save for the exaggerated stride, resembles that of the jumper on the Berlin diskos. A similar position occurs on an Athenian skyphe 90 showing a bearded athlete and an official on either side of a pillar. The athlete stands with his feet less widely apart, apparently waiting for the command, or receiving instructions from the official, who stretches out his hand towards him. Again, on a Bologna skyphe 91 published by Zannoni we see the same attitude twice. The details of the officials, the pillar, the skapane make it certain that the motive is athletic, and the analogy of the vases representing jumpers with halteres suggests that there, too, we have athletes preparing for the jump, presumably, as in the jump with halteres, a long jump. We may conclude, then, that the Greeks did practise jumping without halteres, that they practised thus a standing jump, certainly a long jump, and possibly a high jump.

My thanks are due to Mr. Cecil Smith for permission to publish various vases in the British Museum, to Professor Furtwängler for his kindness in enabling me to reproduce the gem, Fig. 5, and to Mr. George Rowden for much information about modern jumping.

E. Norman Gardiner.

88 De Roden, Catalogue, n. 729.
89 Arch. Zeit. 1881, ii. 2.
90 Jahrbuch, 1885, p. 180, Fig. 8.
91 Scritti di Bologna, xxii.
92 The following records may be of interest: Running long jump without weights, 24 ft. 11½ in. Running long jump with weights, and off a board, 29 ft. 7 in. Mr. Rowden considers that Howard who did this performance would not have jumped more than 21 ft. without assistance. High jump without weights, 6 ft. 3½ in.; with weights, 6 ft. 8½ in. Mr. Rowden estimates that the weights were worth an extra foot.
A NEW FRAGMENT OF THE "EDICTUM DIOCLETIANI"

DURING a visit to Corone (the ancient Asine and medieval Corfu) in March of this year, I copied and took impressions of a stone which had been recently found in the Venetian fortress there, not far from the church of

"Αγιος Χαράλαμπος. It is a fragment of a white marble stele, of which only the left margin is preserved. Height 365 m.; breadth 16 m.; thickness 90 m.

N.S.—VOL. XXIV.
The letters are small and carelessly formed, often running into each other and rendering the reading somewhat difficult.

We have here a fragment of the well-known 'Editio Dioecletiani de praetii rerum vestitum', of which portions, both in the original Latin and also in Greek translations, have been found in Egypt and various parts of Greece and Asia Minor. The known fragments have been collected and the Edict comprehensively treated

(1) in 1851 by Mommsen (Berichte der sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Phil. hist. Classe, iii);
(2) in 1864 by Walldington (Édit de Dioclétien, établissent le Maximum dans l'Empire Romain, reprinted from his commentary to Le Bis, Inscriptions grecques et latines, No. 535);
(3) in 1873 by Mommsen (C.I.L. iii pt. 2, pp. 801–841);
(4) in 1893 by Mommsen and Blümner (Mommsen's reconstruction of the text reprinted from C.I.L. iii. Suppl. pp. 1900–1953, with an introduction and commentary by Blümner).
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Since 1893 an important addition has been made to our knowledge of
the Greek version of the Edict by the publication (B. Σταγών. 'Εφημ.
Ἀρχ. 1899 pp. 147–176) of two fragments from Αεγίτα, containing, besides
the heading—‘τήνας τιμᾶς ἑκάστου ἵδους ἐκ τῆς ἐξωτερικῆς ἐπτείθητας’—
chap. i 1–vi. 10 and vii. 74–viii. 42.

For a general introduction to the Edict it is enough to refer to the work
of Mommsen-Blümmer above cited, and also to a concise summary of the main
points of interest in W. Loring’s edition of the Megalopolis fragment (J.H.S.
1890 xi. p. 299 foll.). I must content myself with noting here the following
points:

1. The Edict was promulgated towards the end of 301 A.D., but proved a
failure, and was soon abrogated.
2. The prices are reckoned in copper denarius, represented usually by *
sometimes in Greek by * and in Latin by ₣. The value of this coin is
fixed by the Elaea fragment (Bull. Coll. Hell. 1885 p. 222 foll.), which gives
the price of a pound of pure gold as 50,000 denarius; the value of the denarius
is therefore 1/50 of a pound of gold, i.e. (Mommsen, Hermes xxv. 1830 p. 23
foll.) 18.27 pfennig of German currency, or a little less than 1/11 of an
English penny.
3. The prices named are maxima. Cf. the heading quoted above, and the
following sentence from the preamble of the Edict: ‘non praedia venalium
recens—neque eam loci id justum putas, quam plurima iterum, provinciae
felicitas optime satisfaciat et velit quidam officinam, privilegio gloriatur—sed
modum statuum esse consimilum; atque eis dignitas emergit—
quid dii omen avereat!—acarditia, quae ceterum cuncta quidem immensitate
diffusa teneri non poterat, statutum est aliusque et moderaturae legis terminus
stringeretur.’

The Cormes fragment contains lines 30–48 of Chapter vii: the chapter
is entitled ‘De inercibus operariorum,’ but vii. 24 introduces a second title
‘De concilium’ (ἐπὶ χαλκοκυατορ). A designation which strictly applies only
to items 24 a–28 and 33–37. The Greek text of vii. 30–48 has been hitherto
unknown, save for two fragments, (a) I.G. ix. 1, 279 frg. a col. ii, (b) I.G.
vii. 3061.

\[
\begin{align*}
30 & \text{TOI} \\
31 & \text{Y} \\
32 & \text{KE} \\
3 & \text{*}
\end{align*}
\]

The Latin text, however, is known from the Stratonicea copy (the largest
fragment of the Edict yet discovered), while the Aezani fragment contains a
few letters from 38–42 and 45 foll.

To facilitate comparison I quote in full the Latin text (Mommsen-
Blümmer, op. cit. p. 22).
I must acknowledge my obligations to Blümner's commentary (op. cit. pp. 112, 113) for some of the matter contained in the following notes: I have, however, tried as far as possible to avoid repetition by confining myself to points directly suggested by the Greek version. I have marked with an asterisk (*) those words which do not occur in Liddell and Scott (seventh edition), and with a dagger (†) those which are wanting in the Thesaurus.

30. To other models in plaster, i.e., all save the plastae imaginii just mentioned (vii, 29). The word †γυναικαριος is not found elsewhere; but the formation is parallel to that of βρακυριος (42), διφθεριος (38), καψυριος (vii, 75), ιατρων (xxi, 1), μαθητας (vii, 69), μαμωνας (vii, 3), etc. The wage is reckoned by the day, and is exclusive of the workman's board, which is supplied by the employer.

31. Like the Latin aquarius, the Greek word ιδιαργαγος is applied either to an official attached to an aqueduct or to a water-carrier employed to carry water for gardens, baths, etc. Here it is used in the latter sense. Compare Manetho, Apotelesmata, I (v), 84.

In connection with this description we may notice that only one class of labourer, the pastor, receives a smaller wage than 25 denarii daily. Cf. also Artemidor. iv, 74.
32. The *ekoutrias is he who keeps the drains in order: the reference seems to be to the drains of private houses rather than to the public sewers. The usual Greek equivalent for the Latin *cloaca* is ὑπόρροια (Dittenh. *Syll.* 580. 17; 536. 11, 15; *I.G.* ii. pars 5 180b 16; Strabo v. 3 § 8; Appian, *Hist. Rom.* iv. 40; etc.), but ὑπορροσίς occurs with the same meaning in Strabo xiv. 1. §§ 37, 43. Possibly we should read λιαφρας (Aristoph. *Pax* 90, 138), or the Latin word may have been transliterated into Greek. This last, however, seems to me unlikely, for had the word been intelligible at all in Greek, we should probably have found *ekoutrias* rendered by κλακαριος (see analogous instances quoted above, 30), avoiding the paraphrase ὁ ἐργαζόμενος εἰς κ.π.λ.

33. The *akoutris is a polisher of metal ware, especially weapons, corresponding to the Latin *summitr* or *summitrus*: the latter term occurs also in a Greek form in Joh. Lydus, *de magistr. i.* 46, where among the elements composing the Roman legion are mentioned *sarmatius*, *oi tōn δηλου στελιονταν*. The word *akoutris* occurs in *Corp. Gloss.* ii. 178. 8; ii. 228. 12; iii. 25. 57.

The σπαθη is a broad, two-edged, pointless, cutting sword. Ἀπὸ χρυσίας, used.

34. Περικεφαλαία, 'helmet.' The word is found in *I.G.* ii. 727b 16 (316/5 B.C.); *I.G.* xii. fasc. 5 pars 1 647 (beginning of third century B.C.); Polybios iii. 71. 4, vi. 23. 8, etc.; Schol. Arist. *Ac.* 1203; Suidas and Hesychius s.v.; Pollux i. 135 (with a description of its parts); LXX. The form *perikephalaios* occurs in Polyb. vi. 22. 3 and *Eph. Magn.* s.v. γλαυκόν. The words *as is* used of the Latin text are omitted in the Greek.

35. ῶΣκόφλρον, *securis,* 'an axe.'

36. ῶΒιεύκρανον, *bipennis,* 'a double axe.' Cf. Quintilian i. 4. 12. A pinna (quod est asutum) securis urinque habens sic enim bipennis. This word and *skopelior* are, I believe, ἀπὸ λεγόμενα.

37. Θήηη σπαθη, 'the sheath (Pollux x. 144) of a sabre.' See above, 33.

38. ῶΔιφθεραριον or ῶδιφθεροποιος (Corp. Gloss. iii. 371, 25, cf. 25, 35) 'parchment maker.' As in all these cases, the price is that of the labour alone, the materials being supplied by the employer. Διφθερας, prepared hides, were from early times used as writing material (cf. Herodotus v. 58 τοις βυζινας διφθερας καλουν άπο του παλαιου oi *i*ones. ώτι κατε ἐν επιπολ βιβλων ερχεται διφθεραι διαφέραι τη και σετες ώτι τοι κατ' έμε παλαιο τον βυθιάνων ες τοισίτων διφθέραι γράφοναι, but the preparation of parchment on a large scale was first undertaken at Pergamum under Eumenes II (197-159 B.C.), when Ptolemy IX Euergetes II. Physeon (170-117 B.C.) prohibited the export of papyrus from Egypt. See E. M. Thompson, *Gk. and Lat. Palaeography,* p. 34 foll. The usual form of the word is *pergamophoros,* but the neuter is found in Joh. Lyd., *de mensibus* i. 24 'Ρωμαίοι τα μιμβρανα περγαμοφα καλοντιν.
- I am unable to restore the word following τετραδείον: the latter word confirms Mommersen's conjectural quaternione for the corrupt //ede om of the Latin text. We would expect the Greek version to have τετράδειον ποδιαίον. Another doubtful point is the meaning of τυρκοτάτο [v], which occurs only in Ducange. Gloss. Grac. τυρκότατο: Reuben in Turner, Crussi. The word is almost certainly a transliteration of the Latin crucatam (cf. Pliny Nat. Hist. xvi. § 147 senem crucatum; Fronto Ep. ad M. Cn. 2, 1. crucata vestis), past participle of cruco, 'to dye saffron-yellow' (Isid. Orig. vi. 11, 4). We are reminded of Juvenal's cruco membra. tabella simpliciter (vii. 23). As regards the Latin text, the Strattonica copy fails us for the end of this line, but the Aezani fragment has //ICROCV // Le Bas read (νυνιέρο C, which the context shows to be untenable, while Mommesen (Mommesen-Blümner, ad crit. p. 22) has the note 'id est ΠΕΡΓΑ,' to which, however, the resemblance is of the slightest. Evidently the Latin version had *crocelit*, though I cannot explain the II preceding it, where we would expect SIBER or VEL.

39. 'To a writer for the best writing, 25 denarii per hundred lines.' Mit jener sind vermuthlich Luxuseditioen gemeint (Blümner ad loc.). The word καλλιγραφός is common in the fourth and succeeding centuries of our era, but before that it seems to occur only in: Herodianus Gram., Philol. 435 (p. 477 ed. Piers), whose floruit falls about 170 A.D. The verb καλλιγραφέω is found as early as Aristotle (Eth. Anim. i. 7) and Josephus (Ant. ii. 31), but in reference to style, not to handwriting; καλλιγραφία is used by Plutarch to denote beautiful writing in either sense (ii. 397 C contrasted with 145 F).

40. 'For writing of the second quality, 20 denarii per hundred lines.'


†Διβελλα καὶ τάξιδα cover all documents of a legal or semi-legal nature which would be drawn up by a notary. Διβελλα: a petition, 'memorial,' is common in late Greek (examples in Sophocles, Lecis of the Roman and Byzantine
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Periods), but I know no other case of the neuter ιχθύλειον. Libellus is similarly used in Latin for a petition, a lawyer's brief (cf. Juv. viii. 107 quid exauditis praeest magno commite in facie libelli), or a certificate (Dig. 39. 4. 4 significant id libello vacuo aut subcopysto). Τάβλια (ταβλία), as a translation of the Latin tabula is common in Late Greek for 'the disc-bound': so also ταβλίτια, ταβλιατία, etc. For its use with the meaning 'tablet,' 'label,' Sophocles (Lexicon of Rom. and Bue. Periods) quotes the epigraphical Acta Andreeae et Matthiae 3 (ed. Tischendorf), Malalas p. 103 (ed. L. Dindorf), and Porphyrogenitus Cerim. p. 338 (ed. Reiske). The word ταβλία also occurs, as Mr. Kenyon has pointed out to me, in Berl. Papp. 338 (second to third century) and 347 (A.D. 182-3), while ταβέλλα is found in Berl. Papp. 338 (second to third century) and Olympodemus Papp. 273 (A.D. 95).

42. *Βρακάρος. Originally the word, which in its Greek form occurs here only, meant a 'breeches-maker,' but both here and in the instances where it occurs in Latin (Lamprid. Alex. Sec. 24, Cod. Inst. x. 64. 1) its range is much wider. The βρακάρος undertakes the cutting out (τυμη) and finishing (κοσμημα) of such articles as are made of course woollen cloth or felt, while the tailor (παπτης) is chiefly engaged (below, 48 foll.) in the sewing of finer garments, especially those of linen or silk.

Βιπος προτεσσιυ: 'a cloak of the best make,' for it is with the workmanship and not the material that we are here concerned. The various kinds of βιπος are detailed in xix. 26-42 and xxii. 21-26; in the latter passage the fuller's payment for his work is fixed, while in the former we have the maximum prices for the finished articles, ranging from 1,500 to 10,000 denarii. The βιπος (probably etymologically connected with πυρρός, 'red') was a thick mantle with a hood (cf. Juv. viii. 145: tempora Scantomico adoperta cuiculio, with the scholiast's note: cuiculio de hierio Gallico zellectae), contrasting, with the lighter and more plain lacerina (Salp. Ser. dial. i. 21, 4: illa ut bivrwm rixgetam, have ut fluentem texuit lacerum). The word is usually spelt with two ρ's, as in the following line, but the form βιπος occurs again in the Megalopolis text of xix. 35 foll. The word is also found written βιπος and βιπρος and in the diminutive βιπριος, βιππιος. Cf. Ducange, Gloss. med. et inf. Graec. k.r.

44. A somewhat similar garment was the coracalla tabaris, a long mantle or great-coat with a hood, which gave the emperor Caracalla his name. Here, however, we have probably to deal with a different garment, either a short close-fitting tunic reaching to the knees with sleeves and a hood (E. Saglio op. cit. p. 171) or a kind of hood protecting the head and shoulders (Blümner ad loc.). In xxvi. 120 foll. we have an elaborate list of the various qualities of coracallae at prices from 3,500 to 600 denarii. In Latin the word is always feminine, coracalla or coracallia: in Greek καρακαλλος is the only form met with—Passio S. Christophori quoted by

* Blümner (op. cit. p. 171) speaks of καρακάλλας, but in the passage referred to (xxvi. 120 foll.) Mombauer writes καρακαλλιας, not καρακαλλιας. Sophocles (Lexicon A.D. καρακαλλιας) also makes the Greek noun feminine, but without ground.
46. The **βρακία** are the breeches which, originally Gaulish (Cf. Diodor. v. 30 ἐσθήσας δὲ χρώται [οι Γαλάται] καταπληκτικάς ... ἀναξυρίσιν ὡς ἐκίνησεν βράκας προειρεύοντας), were adopted by the Romans from contact with their Gaulish subjects (Tac. Hist. ii. 20) and by the time of Alexander Severus (222-235 A.D.) seem to have been worn by Romans generally, including the emperor (Lamprid. Alex. Sever. 40 § 11, βράκας ἁλῶν ἥλιστον, non cecinens, ut prius solentur: cf. also § 5). A reaction, however, took place under Honorius, who forbade the wearing of **βράκαι** in Rome (307 A.D. Cod. Th. xiv. 10, 2). In Greek, the word usually, as here, appears in the form **βρακία** (Schol. Arist. Vesp. 1082; Suid. 392C; 2954B, 3256C, 3812C; Kl. Mag. 98 s.v. ἀναξυρίδας; Photius, Lex. p. 21. 15; etc.), but it also occurs as **βράκες** (Hesych. s.v.) and **βράκας** (Diodor, loc. cit., etc.).

47. **Οὐδόνια** are a kind of shoes made of felt. Cf. Martial xiv. 140, lett., Udona Cilicii. The word does not occur elsewhere in Greek, though Pollux (x. 50) uses the form **οὐδόν** and Charisius 552, 33 οὐδόναρον. It is to be noticed that the translator has a strong tendency to turn into Greek neuters words which in Latin are masculine or feminine—σεκόριον, βιτίνιον, περγαμηνίον, ιβηλίου, καράκαλλον, βρακία, οὐδόνιον.

48. It is not possible to restore this item with certainty. The αὐφθεγγία seems certain both from my copy and from the scribes, and if so, it is most probable that we have some compound of ἀφθηγγία. Ἀναφαραγγία suggests itself, and both it and the cognate ἀναπραγγία, ἀναφαραγγία, ἀναφραγγία, are frequently found in medical writers (Galen, Aetius, etc.) in the sense of ‘sewing up.’ It must be admitted that this is not the meaning required here. In C. Glos. i 172, 43 ἀναφαραγγία is given as the Greek equivalent of *replication*, but that this need not necessarily be the word here employed is proved by the use of ἄντιθεραριον in 38 (C. Glos. iii 871, 28 gives ἄντιθεραριον as the Greek for *membranae*) and of οὐδόνια in 47 (C. Glos. iii 296, 26 ἐμπετίλιον udo).

Marcus Niebuhr Tod.
TWO HEADS RELATED TO THE CHOISEUL-GOUFFIER TYPE.

I. In spite of much discussion, the question of Apollo versus Athlete in this famous group of monuments remains undecided. Though there is considerable difference in detail, the rendering of the hair as a purely athletic coiffure is common to all the replicas, but an additional feature in an unpublished head in the British Museum seems to have escaped notice, and the

The argument for the Apollo attribution, based on the curls round the brow, fails to the ground in view of the coiffure of the accumulating ophtha heads of this and a slightly earlier period.

* I have to thank the late Mr. A. S. Murray for permission to publish this interesting head, and to reproduce on a larger scale than heretofore that which follows.
light it throws on the subject is such as perhaps to justify a fresh consideration of the evidence.

This head (Fig. 1), whose provenance is uncertain, answers closely to the other replicas save in one point, the hair. The position and character of the locks about the face are very similar, and it agrees with the majority of examples in the arrangement of the plaits behind, which are carefully worked out, the Choiseul-Gouffier head being quite exceptional in its rendering. Just behind the ear, however, and attached in a thoroughly inorganic fashion, are two large corkscrew curls \(^8\) side by side, so entirely unsuitable to the type of head as instantly to suggest an addition; even were the existence of numerous replicas in which they are absent not a proof of this. What has happened is clear. The sculptor adopted a well-known athletic type, and tried to turn it into an Apollo by the use of the ordinary external attributes of the god, hair loose round the face, long curls behind the ear.\(^4\)

The only other instance of an Apolline attribute in replicas of the statue is the quiver on the support in the much modified example in the Palace of Torello. But (a) the statue is a copy of a bronze original, in which a support would be absent, (b) the quiver does not appear elsewhere, and would seem to be another instance of the change of athlete into god visible in the Museum head; (c) the presence of the quiver does not always indicate a god, as \(e.g.\) in the Delos replica of the Diadumenos.

An instance of a similar use of this type of head appears in a statue of Apollo from Olympia, of interest in this connection. The coiffure is precisely the same, and the presence of remains of a lyre render the attribution certain, but it is instructive to find that the excavators do not assign it to the fifth century\(^5\) but to a much later period. When long hair was no longer the fashion for athletes, it is easy to see how a free creation of later date might come to receive the plaits as genuinely Apolline, though in reality a commonplace of earlier athletic art. This confirms the theory suggested by the Museum head and the Torello statue, which illustrate the ways of copyists in dealing with a famous original, and throw fresh light on a much-disputed question.

Finally, I should like to bring forward three arguments not yet, I believe, brought to bear on the controversy as to the attribution of the original to Calamis. First, as Prof. E. A. Gardner has pointed out\(^6\), in the exceptionally long list of statues ascribed to Calamis,\(^7\) one class, the athlete, is conspicuously absent. This fact, in connection with the use of the words χιτων and λευτόρημα\(^8\) to characterize his style, should make us hesitate to

---

* Overbeck, Apollo, p. 109; points out the untrustworthy character of this replica.
* Overbeck, S. Q. 508-526.
* Taf. 531.
assign to him a work of so markedly athletic a character. Secondly, if the attribution to him of the Delphi Charioteer be correct—and it tallies with the literary evidence in every particular—the Choiseul-Gouffier type cannot be the work of the same man, or even of the same school. Thirdly, the type is not identical with the Alexikakos of Calamis reproduced on Attic coins as Furtwängler suggests. Careful examination of these coins had convinced me of the presence of locks of hair on the shoulders in the true archaic fashion of a cultus statue, and a specimen of the bronze coin in question, recently acquired by the British Museum, decides the matter (Fig. 2). Two long curls hang down behind the ear, while the hair is knotted on the neck and rolled back from the forehead under a fillet in a fashion entirely different from that of the Choiseul-Gouffier type. If then the coins, as is most probable, represent the Alexikakos of Calamis, that statue differed widely from the group of works under discussion, and was of the delicate late archaic character, peculiar to Attic Art of the transitional period, and to Calamis as the representative of that period, a position clearly assigned to him in our literary evidence.

II. In connection with this head I propose to take another (Fig. 3), also in the British Museum, ably analysed by Mrs. Strong, who points out its Apolline character. A unique electrum stater of Mytilene confirms the attribution in a striking manner (Fig. 4). Though somewhat more youthful, and bound by a laurel wreath instead of a fillet in accordance with the usual practice on coins, the resemblance of the squarely built skull with its waving locks to the Museum head is very great. The features too are alike, as are the proportions of the face, both differing widely from the other Apolline heads on coins of Mytilene. It is difficult to believe that the die-cutter had not—some such original in his mind when executing this remarkable type, which was issued c. 400 B.C. That the Museum head is closely related to the Choiseul-Gouffier is certain, and as is the relation between them, so is

---

9 *Cf.* the famous ephebe head from the Akropolis for the arrangement over the fillet and the knot behind.
10 A round hole just above the palms would seem to show that the Museum head was supported from behind. The statue therefore may have been placed in a niche.
that between our coin and a well-known class of Syracusean tetradrachms probably, as Furtwangler suggests, reflecting the style of Pythagoras, certainly connected with the Choiseul-Gouffier type. Our Apollo and the coin of Mytilene are later in style but clearly belong to the same school as the Choiseul-Gouffier figure and the tetradrachms, which a plausible conjecture assigns to Pythagoras of Rhegium. Pythagoras was a Samian by birth, and it seems no far-fetched hypothesis that an artist belonging by race to Samos, by adoption to Sicily, by his athletic works to Greece proper,

might be known in the Eastern Mediterranean as in Sicily and the mainland. It is true that we have no literary evidence for such works, but statues by his purely Attic contemporary Calamis stood in Sicily and on the borders of the Black Sea, so that even without the witness of the coin we might conclude that works of the school of Pythagoras were to be seen in

---

16 Masterpieces, p. 305 and Pl. 73. 14.
17 Notably in the plastic treatment of the hair.
18 Works of his stood in Delphi, Olympia, and Thébes.
19 Remains of the Choiseul-Gouffier type have been found in Europe, Asia, and Africa.
20 Paus. 6, 22.
21 Strabo, vii. 319.
the islands. The Mytilene type thus confirms the attribution of the head to Apollo instead of Aeschylus, the interpretation proposed by Furtwängler, and both are derived from a later work of the school that produced the Choiseul-Gouffier figure and kindred works. The differences between them are as

![Image](image-url)  

FIG. 4.—STATUE OF MYTILENE IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM (2:1).

important as the points of likeness, proving with what care and delicacy the sculptors of this school distinguished between Apollo and Athlete, and giving us examples, confirmed by numismatic evidence, of either type.²³

KATHARINE A. McDOWALL.

² Mrs. Strong's position (Strong, loc. cit.) great, and the distinction of type is, to my mind, fundamental. The difference in date is, as she allows, not
NITOKRIS-RHODOPIS.

One of the most curious of the Greek stories about Egypt is that which ascribed the building of the Third Pyramid of Gizeh to a woman, according to the usual tale, the famous courtesan Rhodopis. We find this story given in various forms by Herodotus, Diodorus, and Strabo. Herodotus would not credit it (ii. 134), but it was evidently generally accepted among the Greeks in Egypt, so much so that the native historian, Manetho, whom called upon by the Greek rulers of Egypt to write the history of his country, himself attributed the building of the pyramid to a woman, an Egyptian queen, Nitokris, the heroine of another Herodotean story (ii. 100). This Nitokris Manetho places at the end of the VIth Dynasty. Thus Nitokris and Rhodopis were connected, and Professor Petrie in his 'History' (i. p. 105) considers that the Herodotean Rhodopis is 'evidently another version of Nitokris, whom Manetho describes as fair and ruddy.' In reality however it would seem that Manetho's Nitokris was a version of Rhodopis rather than Rhodopis a version of Nitokris.

The historical existence of a queen Nitokris at the end of the VIth Dynasty has hitherto been generally taken for granted, because on a fragment of the Turin Papyrus of Kings which might possibly be referred to this period, occurs the name of a monarch, probably a queen-named Neit-skerti. Now Neit-skerti or Nitakrit, 'Neith is pre-excellent' is without doubt the correct Egyptian original of the Herodotean name Nitakris; so that the Turin papyrus name Nitakriti has very naturally been generally identified with the queen Nitokris whom Manetho places at the end of the VIth Dynasty. Hence we find the queen Nitakrit or Nitokris regularly placed at the end of the VIth Dynasty in modern histories of Egypt, as in Prof. Petrie's.

Former historians have not hesitated partly to accept Manetho's further story about his Nitokris having built the third pyramid. We know, as Herodotos did, that this pyramid was in reality built by Menkaure (Mykerinos), of Manetho's IVth Dynasty. Perring however, the first explorer of the pyramid, thought that he could discern traces of later additions to it, and these supposed later additions have been regarded (e.g. by Bunsen and Wiedemann) as the work of Nitokris, and the origin of Manetho's statement.

1 Correctly interpreted as paraphrased in Eratosthenes as 'Neith vasaphet.'
2 *Egyptian* ii. 228 ff.
3 *Agyptische Geschichte* i. 214.
Prof. Petrie however does not accept this; while equating T.P. Nitakerti—Men. Nitokris,—Nitokris-Nitakerti is a VIth Dynasty queen regnant, he does not admit that she can have added to the pyramid of Mykerinos: though the third pyramid has been enlarged; it is certain, from the excellent masonry of the core, from the granite casing of the outside, and from the absence of all inscription inside, that it belongs entirely to the IVth Dynasty, and has no connection with the rubble pyramids of the VIth Dynasty at Sakkara. With this opinion all archaeologists would agree, as far as a VIth Dynasty addition is concerned; the Manethonian story of Nitokris and the pyramid is an impossibility.

But how did the story originate? In the royal list of Abydos occurs the name of a monarch Menkara following Neterkara at the end of the VIth Dynasty. This Menkara bore the same name, to all intents and purposes, as the king who really built the pyramid, Menkaura (Mykerinos). Prof. Petrie thinks that this VIth Dynasty Menkara must be the throne-name of the queen Nitakerti-Nitokris; the real builder of the pyramid being Men-kau-ra, he has been confounded with the 'queen' Men-ka-ra of the end of the VIth Dynasty, who was so hypothesised Manetho’s Nitokris.

Prof. Petrie’s explanation of the attribution of the building of the Third Pyramid to a monarch of the end of the VIth Dynasty as being due to a confusion of Menkaura with Menkara is undoubtedly correct, but his criticism does not seem to me to go far enough. He does not doubt the historical reality of the Manethonian queen; he accepts the identification of her with the Nitakerti of the Turin papyrus without demur, and identifies her with the VIth Dynasty Menkara, a queen pro hac vice; and regards her ast being, because Manetho describes her as γεμενικοτάτη και ευμορφοτάτη τῶν κατ’ αὐτὴν γενομένων, ἐνεύθυ τῆς χροίας, the original of Rhodopis Lepsius, on the other hand, thought that she was thus described by Manetho not on any independent authority but merely because he identified her with the Rhodopis of the tale—he made her beautiful because Rhodopis was beautiful—and this seems the more correct view: Rhodopis was the original of Manetho’s Nitokris, not vice versa, as Prof. Petrie has it. But Lepsius again fully accepted Nitokris as a historical queen of the VIth Dynasty.

9 Dr. Bomhardt is of opinion that the additional work of the Third Pyramid is to be attributed to an ‘Umhu’ of the XXVIth Dynasty, under which special care and attention was given to the work of the Old Kingdom (‘Zur Geschichte der Pyramiden,’ Ap. Zeit. XXXI. (1892), p. 92). See Note II below.

9 Prof. Lepsius’ theory (Chronologie der Ägypter, 307 ff.) was, shortly, as follows: Manetho must have known who the real builder of the pyramid was. Therefore he cannot have written the words τῆς γεμενικοτάτης τῶν κατ’ αὐτὴν γενομένων. They are the addition of later copyists, who identified ‘Rhodopis’ with Nitokris (and so in all probability also added the words ένεύθυ τῆς χροίας; certainly added the ‘tubris genis’ of Eusebius, because there lived under the XXVIth Dynasty a King Paumesi-Menkara who married a θαλάκη Δεας named Nitokris, and, since the Third Pyramid had certainly been built by a Menkara, the ‘plein-lête’ Interpretum au Sabt naturally took him to be the XXVIth Dynasty Menkara and his wife the θαλάκη Nitokris to be the same as the fictive Rhodopis of the tale. This was a very ingenious theory, but since it was propounded in 1849 we have learnt
We may perhaps go further than this in a critical examination of the matter.

The third pyramid of Gizeh was built by Menkaure (Herodotus's Mykerinos) of the IVth Dynasty. Herodotus knew this as well as we do. There was however current in his day among the Greeks in Egypt a tale that it had been built by the courtesan Doria, the 'rosy-cheeked' (Rhodopis). This tale survived for many centuries. The Arab historian al-Mu'tadhid mentions a story current in his day to the effect that the pyramids were haunted, and that the spirit of the Third Pyramid was a beautiful naked woman, who appeared to men with a wonderful smile upon her face, which so infatuated all who saw her that they immediately followed her and wandered in the desert bereft of their reason. The story of the Woman of the Pyramid was then equally current in Manetho's time. The best theory of the origin of the tale seems to be that of Prof. Pielhöfer, who believes it to be due to the presence by the pyramids of the great Sphinx, which the Greeks assumed, as they naturally would, to have the face of a woman, and, because it was painted red, regarded it as a portrait of Rhodopis. If we modify this explanation somewhat, and suppose that the Greeks called the red-faced Sphinx, which they erroneously assumed to be female, Ἀϊδαρκε, and that afterwards by a natural transition they took it to be a portrait of the greatest Poisōi they knew, the rosy-cheeked Doriaka, the famous Greek courtesan who had lived so long by the banks of the Nile, this theory gains considerably in probability. Prof. Wiedemann's objections that in Herodotus's time the Sphinx was invisible (being covered up with sand) and plays no part in the legend are, as he himself says of Pielhöfer's theory, 'nicht entstellend.' Prof. Wiedemann merely assumes that the Sphinx was buried in Herodotus's time because the historian does not mention it; but we have absolutely no right to use such an argument. We have not even the slightest right to doubt that Herodotus passed Thebes and went to Elephanta merely because he does not describe the former place. It is odd that he does not mention the Sphinx or Thebes, but we have no right to suppose from his silence that he never saw them. Suppose it was buried; then Pielhöfer's theory becomes more probable than ever, instead of being disproved. For then we should have a popular legend about the rosy-cheeked woman of the pyramids, founded on a reminiscence of the long buried and hidden rosy-cheeked Sphinx; this woman the Greeks

that there was no such king as Menkaure in the XXXVIIth Dynasty—the name is that of a private person of the Roman period who usurped the sarcophagus of Ankhe, mastabat (Brit. Mus. Egyptian Saloon, No. 52, published by Dr. E. A. Wallis Budge, The Sarcophagi of Ancient Egypt, London, 1885) queen of Ptolemy II., and placed his name next to that king's in the royal tombs— and that the title 'Son of the Sun' borne by the XXXVIIth Dynasty queen Nitkarn in question does not necessarily betoken a sakkara (see note 3 below).


† The Arab historian Abd el-Latif thus describes the appearance of the face of the Sphinx in his day (transl. de Smuy, p. 170): 'On voit sur la figure une teinte rougeâtre et un sourire vague, qui sort de sa figure de la figure. Cette figure est belle, et sa bouche porte l'empreinte des grecs et de la beauté. On dirait qu'elle sourit gravement.'

called Rhodopis and imagined to be their Doricha, who must have built one of the pyramids.

At any rate the legend must have been well known in Manetho’s day, and the educated had their locus classicus for it in Herodotus. Now for the compiling of his history Manetho had before him copies of the official Egyptian lists of the kings, no doubt also other Egyptian sources unknown to us, and Herodotus, whose work was so well known to the Greek king and court for whom he was writing. Now the stories of Nitokris and Rhodopis were very likely to be regarded as gospel by many of his readers, who in the case of Rhodopis would, as is so easily done, forget the 

οὐκ ὅποθεν λέγεται, and claim Herodotus’s authority for its authenticity. Manetho had therefore to hedge. He absolutely rejected the Greek idea of the courtesan Rhodopis having built the pyramid: he knew the story to be absurd, and he had Herodotus’s authority for rejecting it. But the story of the connection of a woman with the pyramids—a story which may have been of pre-Greek and native Egyptian origin—he had no strong reason for rejecting. He knew that the Third Pyramid, the pyramid specifically connected with Rhodopis in the Greek story, had really been built by a ruler named Menkaura or Menkara. But there were two Menkara in the official lists. The first of these was a well-known king, the successor of Khufu (Cheops) and Khafra (Chophren), and belonged to Manetho’s IVth Dynasty; the second came at the end of his Vth Dynasty, and was placed in the lists from which he worked next to the name Neterka, This name was probably pronounced in Manetho’s time as Ntekri or very much in Coptic fashion, as "Nitek-ri,

ΜΟΤΕΚΡΗ. Is it not probable that Manetho thought he could find a place for Herodotus’s queen and at the same time an explanation of the story of Rhodopis and the Third Pyramid by supposing that the names Neterka and Menkara were the personal and throne-names of one and the same person, queen Ntekri = Nitokris? In this case the Third Pyramid would indeed have been built by Menkara or Mykerinos, as Herodotus said and as Manetho knew to be the fact, but this Menkara would be, not the king of the IVth Dynasty, but a queen, probably Herodotus’s Nitokris, who would then be none other than the famous Woman of the Pyramid, whom the Greeks of Herodotus’s day had in their insouciance identified with Rhodopis the courtesan. Manetho then naturally attributes the fair and ruddy complexion of Rhodopis to Nitokris, as Lepanus said his copyists had. Thus Stein’s note ad Heit. ii. 134, ‘Diese Angabe war nicht eine hellenische Fiktion, sondern beruht auf einheimischer Sage, die sich bei Manethos erhalten,’ will then be the exact converse of the fact: Manetho’s Sage really rests on the fiction, whether it be Hellenic or pre-Hellenic.

I think that this new explanation of the Manethonian passage about Nitokris is probably correct. Hitherto, while Manetho’s placing of his ‘Nitokris’ in the Vth Dynasty has been generally accepted, ‘she’ has not been.
identified with Neterkarā, but with the causal name Nitākerti in the Turin Papyrus, as has been said above. But the name Nitākerti or Nitākrit is of a type more usual in the Middle Empire (cf. such names as Antet-sker, etc.) than in the VIth Dynasty and occurs in the XXVIth. The Manethonian name Nitokris seems to me to be sufficiently explained by the occurrence of the name Neterkarā in the lists after the Pepia. Manetho's queen Nitokris, η την τριτην θιρείρα πυραμίδα, is a compound of Neterkarā and Menkarā, who no doubt were, in reality, neither of them women, but two successive kings. There is then no need to identify Menkarā with Nitākerti, as Prof. Petrie does, and queen Nitokris must be struck out of the list of the monarchs of the VIth Dynasty.

We have no reason to accuse Manetho of manipulating his sources with perverse intent in order to produce his VIth Dynasty queen; he no doubt considered that there must be some historical ground for the tale of the connection of a woman with the Third Pyramid, and did his best to find a reason for the story.

It may be objected that Nitokeris still remains a more probable Greek form of the name Nitākerti or Nitākrit than of the name Neterkarā, and that this being so we are not justified in identifying Nitokeris with Neterkarā rather than with the Turin Papyrus Nitākerti. That is so, but my argument is that it was Manetho who identified Nitokeris with Neterkarā and his identification is intelligible enough when we remember that the final ṯ of the word ṯēter, god, was certainly dropped, and that Manetho probably pronounced it ṯēτ or, as in Coptic, ṯāτē. The name Nitokris first occurs in Herodotus, and is certainly a Greek form of Nitākerti or Nitākrit. This name was one familiar in Herodotus' day; it had been borne by queens and princesses of the Saitite Dynasty, since Neith or Nit was the goddess of Sais. It is then natural to find it given to the legendary queen of Hitt. ii. 100: she bears a familiar name of the Saitite period, just as the personages of the Joseph story, which deals with events of the eighteenth century B.C. possibly,

—Zaphnath-paannenkh, Potipher, Asemath, and the rest—bear Egyptian names, not of the eighteenth century B.C. by any means, but of the eighth and seventh,10 conferred upon them by scribes familiar with the Egyptian names of their own day. The Nitākerti of the Turin Papyrus, whom, from the character of her name, and since the Turin Papyrus was written long before the time of the XXVIth Dynasty Nitākris, we must place among the ephemeral monarchs of the XIIth-XVIIth Dynasties, may of course be the original of Herodotus' Nitokris (who, it should be remembered, has in Herodotus nothing whatever to do with Rhodopis or the Third Pyramid), but

---

10 Zaphnath-paannenkh is, in the most cases and he lives, a name of a type which never occurs before 1000 B.C. and was used down to the Ptolemaic period. Potipher or Potipher is, of course, the name of the Saitite and Ptolemaic age. Potipher, "He whom the Son has given," a typically Saitite and Ptolemaic name.
it would seem more probable that his informants gave her a name familiar to them in their own time. Manetho took the name in all probability simply from Herodotus: the name Nitetkerti or Netakrit was not of a type usual in his time, three hundred years after the Saite; and it seems highly probable that he identified it with the Neterkarâ (*Netekri or *Natekrî as he would pronounce it) of his VIth Dynasty. Then, because in the lists the name Neterkarâ stood next to the name Menkarâ, and he knew that a Menkarâ had built the Third Pyramid, on my hypothesis he jumped to the conclusion that here was the explanation of the story of the Woman of the Pyramid: Neterkarâ (*Netekri) and Menkarâ must be really the personal and throne-names of a woman, a queen Neterkerti-Menkeri, who really built the Third Pyramid, and she must have been very beautiful and fair of skin, to account for the Rhodopis story. Further she must be Herodotus's Nitokris.¹¹

This, at any rate, seems to me very probable. Whether we identify Herodotus's Nitokris with the Nitetkerti of the Turin Papyrus, and place her in the XIIth-XVIIth Dynasty, or not, it seems to me that we must abolish the Nitokris of the VIth Dynasty, who is a mere theory of Manetho's. Neterkarâ and Menkarâ II. were two separate kings: and the twelve years' reign which Manetho ascribes to his Nitokris are no doubt the total of their two reigns: the kings of the end of the VIth Dynasty seem to have been very ephemeral monarchs.

H. R. Hall.

¹¹ H. Dr. Bernardi's theory (Note 4 above) of a XXVIth Dynasty rebuilding of the Third Pyramid he accepted (it rests solely on his authority as an architect); the fact of this alteration under the Saite may also have influenced Manetho in attributing its building to a queen Nitokris, since this was a Saite royal name (see above); he may have heard that a Saite Nitokris had rebuilt it and have thought that this must be a mistake for his VIth Dynasty Nitokris. But this would be a far-fetched theory, and would entail the supposition that there existed in Manetho's day a tradition that the alteration had been carried out by a XXVIth Dynasty queen Nitokris, and of this we have no manner of proof. Lepsius's theory identifying Pamnetochius II's queen Nitokris with Rhodopis (Note 5 above) has, as we have seen, nothing to back it up now that we know that the name Menkarâ in the accounts of Pamnetochius II. on the Serapeum of Aukhnesmenkherâ does not belong to that king.
THE CHASM AT DELPHI.

Those who have written upon the Greek Oracles in this country have been content, for the most part, to accept without criticism the traditional accounts of the procedure at these institutions. Where the meaning of a custom appears entirely strange and unsympathetic, there seems to be little to choose between one account of its details and another. Truth is hard enough to discover when the subject is intelligible; when the whole sphere of enquiry is dark, its claims yield to those of the picturesque. This has been the fate of the oracles; their place in the life of the Greeks cannot be explained to the satisfaction of our reason and therefore they demand that they should be represented to our imagination with all possible violence. But the very reason which makes us prone to accept any account of the oracles and their procedure, if it be sufficiently lurid and effective, should make us exercise the greatest caution before we endorse any traditional account as a fact. We are not the first to refuse our approbation to the oracles, and to demand in the place of intellectual conviction a striking appeal to the imagination. Even among the Greeks themselves, romance and legend found no centre so accommodating as the oracles. Not only is the faculty of prophecy one which attracts supremely the poetic fancy; but, since the oracles themselves declined in importance as they figured more largely in literature, the poet was left free to embroider or to invent with no fear that his hearers would check him through knowledge of their own. In the matter of the actual prophecies delivered this has long been recognised, but it is no less true of the procedure which led up to the delivery of the prophetic word.

Moreover the period during which the oracles were active was a double one. After a long interval during which the oracles decayed and were all but ignored they burst forth again in a general renewal of superstition. It is from this second period that most of our first-hand evidence dates. At this time even if the oracles had themselves preserved a pure tradition of their ceremonies it would not have satisfied the renaissance. The later oracles not only were required to revive the features of the old days; they were forced also to live up to the romances woven around them in the time when they were dumb and powerless to restrain the imagination of their literary devotees.

It is the object of this paper to examine the popular and traditional account of certain features connected with the oracle at Delphi. It will be
shewn that much which is readily accepted by modern writers is based only on the evidence of late authors and is inconsistent with the statements of earlier authorities and with the existing remains of Delphi. But while the Delphic legend was powerful in producing imitations of its fancied customs at other oracles, we shall see that the theory of its procedure which is based upon earlier evidence finds a welcome corroboration in the correct interpretation of the one late author who knew Delphi well. Pending the publication of the monumental work on Delphi which will crown the industry and care of M. Honolle and his able staff, no pronouncement on the antiquities of the oracle can be complete. But the little that can be done may serve perhaps to shew the poverty of the evidence upon which rests the greater part of the statements generally found in text books; and the conclusions which seem necessarily to follow upon a revision of the evidence are to some extent independent of archaeological discoveries.¹

I.

The traditional account of the oracle at Delphi reads somewhat as follows. In the innermost part of the temple of Apollo there was an underground cellar or adytum. Into this vault the priestess descended when the time came for her to deliver oracles. There she chewed laurel, drank the water of a sacred spring, and took her seat upon a large tripod which was placed directly over a natural orifice in the ground. From this orifice or chasm arose vapours whose special quality lay in their inspiring powers. These the priestess inhaled, and thrown into a frenzy she uttered wild words which were heard and edited by temple priests and thus given to the world.

The central notion of this account is obviously the mephitic chasm. The fumes afford an easy explanation of the frenzy of the priestess, and, thanks to them, there seems to be no more ground for misgivings as to the possible supernatural origin of her frenzy than there would be were it produced by alcohol.² The underground adytum in which the vent-hole was supposed to exist is no less a welcome detail. The opportunities it offered for secrecy and mystery appeal to all three classes of those who have theorised about the oracle. It is picturesque for the poets and the writers of prize essays; it is adapted for the practice of fraud and so favourable to the historians who think the oracles

¹ The main conclusion of this paper—that the mephitic chasm under the temple never existed, and that the real chasm is the Castalian gorges—has been definitely asserted by Prof. van Willemstee-Meillendorff. Cf. Hermes xxxvii. 1904, p. 579. Arist. and Athen. ii. p. 44, n. 17. He has, however, published no arguments, as far as I am aware, supporting his contention.

² There is an ancient authority for the description of the vapours as mephitic, but that is the invariable epithet applied to them in modern books. It seems not to possess a very clear meaning. Servius ad Aen. vii. 84 says 'Mephitis proprius est terrae putor, qui de aquis nausea subitum et in memoriam gravitas ex detestate silvarum.' Modern writers seem mostly to connect it with volcanic fumes. The notion that any natural gas can create a prophetic excitement is totally erroneous, and therefore it does not matter much what is understood by mephitic; cf. 1 T. Rhet. 8. For the analogy with alcohol cf. Myres, Greek Oracle, p. 34 n.
were a mere pretence, and since it separates the priestess from the consultant it gives full freedom to the intermediation of the priests whose wise direction of international politics is the main feature in a third theory. But these two are of all the traditional details the most suspicious and the most deserving of examination. In subjecting them to criticism three points must be clearly remembered. The first is that according to this story the chasm was actually under the temple and was of such a nature as to give off vapours of an inspiring influence. The second is that the priestess ascended into an underground chamber to experience the effects of the vapours; and the third that she did so alone. All three details will be shown to be false. The evidence for one has been taken to corroborate the others and it would perhaps be sufficient to show that so far from doing this the stories are independent, even inconsistent. But since it is possible to prove the evidence altogether worthless, that way is more drastic and better.

II.

It has been generally recognised by those who have devoted special attention to the oracles that the evidence for the mephitic chasm is very late. It is ignored entirely by the Homeric Hymn to Apollo, our oldest document relating to Delphi, and throughout the whole range of literature down to the first century B.C.—when, by the admission of the very writers who tell the tale, the oracle was dead or dying.—there occurs no mention which taken by itself would lead us to infer its existence.

For such a chasm there existed words enough in the Greek language. Later writers speak of it as a χαμάμα, στάμα γέφ, or στάμων. None of these words is ever connected with Delphi by classical authors, for the reference to a στάμων at Delphi in some editions of Aeschylus (Choephoroe 800) is due only to a recent emendation which robbs Hades of his due and credits Apollo with something which he did not possess. The other words μυχός and γιράδων which occur in paraphrastic descriptions of Delphi in Pindar and the tragic poets, if they possess some vague association with the idea of a cave, are not used with this intention in the passages which are concerned with Delphi—much less with a reference to a mephitic hole. Μυχος, which is used frequently by Aeschylus and once by Pindar, in most cases is a mere synonym for adytum and means the temple itself. In others it possesses a reference to the notion that Delphi was in the centre of the earth

* Choephoroe 806 τα ἐκ ταχοττε στάμων. η μυχα ρήμα στάμων. The scholiast notes * Aνπα.* Dr. Verrell is clearly right in refusing to accept σταμων, the emendation of Bamberg, and depart from the ancient tradition. A reference to his article in this Journal xiv. 8 will show that his decision has not been influenced by any prejudices against the existence of a chasm at Delphi. The word στάμων is far more applicable to Hades than to Apollo, who would scarcely have been recognised by this appellation. The context, moreover, in which the gods invoked are Zeus, the gods of the house and finally Hermes, who was especially connected with the dead, inevitably suggests that Hades and not Apollo is the god intended here.

* See note at end of paper.
and no more suggests a subterranean centre than the navel—from which through the omphalo-stone the notion was derived—demands a situation in the entrails of the body. Its use is vague, and still vaguer is that of the word χώλον which, rendered conventional by the Homeric Hymn and Hesiod, is employed with special fondness by Euripides. But though both he and Sophocles use it, as μυγός is used, in the sense of a cave, that meaning is never possible in the places where it is employed in speaking of Delphi. In these passages it means either the temple itself or the temple enclosure and is merely a misapplication of the epic phrase used as a poetical synonym for ἄδουτον, μυγὸς, or ματτεῖον.

Both these words, however, may have owed their appropriateness partly to the general situation of Delphi as it lies in a hollow of Parnassus and partly perhaps to some loose notion of the existence of a cave or chasm. In themselves they do not require this interpretation, but that there was such a tradition appears from Euripides and a scholar of Aristotle, Clearchus. The tragic poet speaks of the cave of the dragon at Delphi, a cave which by comparison with a parallel passage we may understand him to have connected with the oracle. Similarly Clearchus speaks of the cave of the dragon Python, though he does not identify it in any way with the oracle. This story is inconsistent with the tale found in the Homeric Hymn but as it agrees with the best authenticated of all Delphic legends, that of its connection with the goddess Earth, it may well possess antiquity. But it does not in any way point to the existence of a subterranean abyss which opened in a secret chamber of the temple and gave forth the inspiring vapour. What truth the legend does contain will be considered below; at present we must pass on to the authors who give the common version of the story and subject their accounts to a strict examination.

III.

That there was a chasm at Delphi and that vapours arose therefrom which inspired the Pythia upon her tripod is stated most clearly by Strabo (ix: 419). After having described accurately enough the position of the town he introduces with the words 'They say' his account of the oracle itself. To quote his words: 'They say that the oracle is a hollow perpendicular cavern (ἄντρον κολον κατὰ βάθος) with a not very large mouth. Out of this rises an air which causes frenzy (πνεύμα ἐνθουσαστικὸν) and

6 καὶ Ἰταλ. 232 ἂλεξαν τοῦ ἄντρος ἐπιβάλλει. Ἰ. Ὠ. 97. ἄλεξαν αὐτοῦ οἰκεῖο χώλων ἐκεῖον ἐπιβάλλει κοιλίας ἐμπέλει, γιὰς κατολ. ἐπιβάλλει, λαμφρά ματτεῖον χώλειν.

4 Clearchus ap. Athen. 703 e (Ε.Ε. Θ. II. 215). The story is told in explanation of the phrase to παύειν. J. H. Middleton was quite right in identifying this στήλαιον with the

article; the story of the dragon-slaying as told in the Hom. Hymn is quite independent of the oracular chasm.

5 The full identification of the oracle with the chasm in this myth appears in Apollod. Bibli. 1. 14. 3. The dragon guarded the oracle and prevented Apollo from approaching the chasm.
above the mouth there is placed a large tripod upon which the Pythia mounts and, inhaling the air, prophesies.'

This account is followed by Longinus (de Sull. xiii. 2) who tells in a similar how the Pythia approached the tripod and was filled with a divine exhalation which arose from the chasm, and by Iamblichus who professes ignorance as to the truth of the versions which he is reporting (de Myst. p. 73) and, though he is doubtful whether the Pythia sat upon a tripod or upon an ordinary chair, yet describes the air which inspired her to prophecy as thin and fiery. The story gave opportunities of obscene parody which were not missed by the Christian Fathers who borrowed from each other their comic account of the entrance into the Pythia of a ὄνερος ὄνειρα. From them the story found its way into a late scholium on Aristophanes* and there have actually been scholars who quote it in connexion with the corroboration of Strabo's account without, presumably, noticing the source from which it is derived.

These passages are of no importance, but of about the same date as Strabo, and perhaps from the same source, is the story told by Diodorus Siculus (xvi. 26) and described by him as the ancient and traditional account of the discovery of the oracle. 'Where the adytum of the temple now stands,' he says, 'there is (or was) a chasm. Here in the days before Delphi was inhabited a shepherd brought his goats. Each of these as it approached and looked into the chasm began to leap about and to bleat in an unusual way. The shepherd was astonished and going himself to the chasm looked down and was affected in the same way as his goats. They behaved like people in a divine frenzy, he foretold the future. The fame of the marvel spread abroad and all the neighbours came to see it and they, testing it for themselves, all became frenzied. Hence the oracle became famous and was held to be an oracle of Earth. For some time those who wished to consult the oracle went to the chasm themselves and foretold the future for each other, but afterwards, owing to the number of those who fell down the pit in their frenzy and were never seen again, the neighbouring inhabitants decided to avoid this peril by appointing one woman the prophet and getting their oracles from her. They therefore constructed an apparatus which would enable her to become frenzied and to prophesy without danger. The instrument had three legs whence it was called a tripod and it was the prototype of almost all the bronze tripods now made.' This tale is referred to by

---


* The words used by Diodorus πορευθεῖσαν (of the goats) and κατάβοτα (of the shepherd) and the absence of any reference to a ὄνειρα ὄνειρον seem to imply that he looked upon the inspiration as visual in origin. Clearly antiquity was very doubtful about the orphic vapours; but these minor inconsistencies in such poor evidence are not of much account.

The matters which are explained by the astrological legend quoted by Diodorus are: 1. The 'oracles from goats' practised at Delphi, i.e. the preliminary rites known to us from Plutarch (de Def. Or. 36, 49, 51). 8. The attribution of the oracle to Pēr. γ. The invention of the tripod. 3. The virginal dress of the Pythia.
THE CHASM AT DELPHI.

Plutarch (de Def. Or. 7. 42-46) and by Pausanias (x. 5. 7) and is to be found, taken straight from Diodorus, in a scholium to Euripides (ad Or. 165).

In these two accounts the Pythia is represented as seated upon the tripod above the mephitic chasm. Another batch of passages presents a conflicting account in which the tripod is omitted or reduced to no importance, and the Pythia is conceived not as sitting above but as descending herself into the mephitic chasm or cavern. The more scientific descriptions do not inform us to which of the two traditions they refer. The pseudo-Aristotelian treatise, the de Mundo (p. 395), in enumerating the various qualities which belong to different natural exhalations, couples Delphi with Lebadeia as a place where airs arise from the earth and produce prophetic inspiration. So too Cicero refers to the theory in his de Divinatione (82 70, 38, 115) and he may safely be presumed to have found it in the writings of Chrysippus or another Stoic.

The discrepancy between the two accounts is most noticeable in a passage of Justin (xxiv. 6. 6) who, while he does not actually say that the priestess enters a chasm, omits all mention of the tripod. This is remarkable since he is presumably following Strabo or a common source, as appears from the fact that, among other coincidences, both go out of their way to philosophise upon the existence of a city devoted to the cult of a god. The chasm he describes as a 'profundum terrae fornix, quod in oracula patet' and he defines the nature of the prophetic air as a 'frigidus spiritus.'

The reason of his forsaking his authority and omitting the tripod lay perhaps in his preference for Roman writers. Livy (i. 56) speaks of the oracle as a chasm from the bottom of which arose the oracular voice, and Valerius Maximus (i. 8. 10) is more detailed if more confused. According to him, during the Civil War Appius compelled 'the priestess of the Delphic tripod' to descend into the lowest part of the sacred cave where the noxious but divine vapours were strongest and most fatal. This account is embellished by Lucretius in a passage (Phars. v. 79) too fantastic to be quoted as evidence even in this company. It, with all the other passages from Roman authors, is evidently based upon Vergil's description of the consultation of the Cumaean Sibyl by Aeneas.

The chasm is also referred to by Dio Cassius (lxiii. 14) and by the pseudo-Lucian (Nero 10) when they narrate that Nero destroyed the oracle by throwing corpses of murdered men into its mouth. To Dio the chasm is the source of the holy air, while to the pseudo-Lucian as to Livy it is the orifice from which the divine voice ('θυματικὸν') proceeded. Other references to the chasm are vague. Pausanias though he refers to the story told by Diodorus only mentions the chasm when he says (x. 5. 12) that the bronze temple at Delphi had, according to one account, fallen into its depths, and Varro, if he does refer to the chasm at all in his remarks about the Omphalos, does so without suggesting that it was connected with the oracle.20

16 Varro de Ling. Lat. vii. 17, et J. H. S. vi. p. 394 n. I am unable to agree that the 'quod vacant Delphis in adeo ad latem est quidam ut
thesis specie quod Graeci vacant 'θυματικὸν'
Among the authorities for the chasm and its mephitic vapour it is customary to place Plutarch and, as is only just, the greatest importance is ascribed to his evidence. Of the authors quoted, none speaks at first hand, and Strabo, the most important, deliberately dissociates himself from the account he gives. But Plutarch was a resident at Delphi and, as a priest of the temple, he must have been well acquainted with the oracle and its proceedings. If his word could be quoted as corroborating the account of the Pythia’s inspiration from the mephitic vapour, his evidence would be decisive for his own time at least. But as a matter of fact Plutarch not only ignores the chasm but uses words which are totally incompatible with its existence.

He refers, it is true, to the legend preserved in Diodorus and adds a new detail to the story, the name of the shepherd Koretas. It would be strange if he had not known a tale which was evidently the stock legend of the Delphic guides, and it is the manner and not the fact of his reference that is important. But neither in his allusions to the story nor, as we shall see, in the context which evoked the reference does he mention the chasm. The words he uses are purposely vague and in both the passages wherein Koretas is spoken of he chooses with care the same formula. To give his own words: ‘They say that the virtues of the spot (i.e. Delphi) were first discovered through a shepherd who chanced to come upon it, and then uttered ecstatic cries which the byssanders at first laughed at, but afterwards held in awe, when the things which he foretold came true.’ In the other passage he says ‘The man Koretas, who, the Delphians say, first proved the virtue of the spot by chance upon it.’

In both passages, although the peculiar property of the Delphic air is the subject under discussion, there is no mention of a chasm such as Diodorus and Strabo identify with it. On the contrary the most general word τόπος is used and the participle εκτεστήμενος can receive no other object. In this word there might be a memory of the tradition, but it is a word which was very generally used in the sense in which it has been given in the translation above. Taken by itself the passage could never suggest that either τόπος must be taken to mean a chasm, or that a chasm must be supplied as an object to the participle. Had he meant to insist upon the

quam Pythous siunt esse numine" of Varro means "what in the temple at Delphi is called the χάραμα (the sacred chest in the rock)." His words suggest rather that there was an amphiitheatre such as Rehoboam, Paschal 1, 132, and Miss Harrison, J.H.S. xix. 226, conclude to have been the case. To this question I hope to return on another occasion.

Plutarch took part in the dedication of a statue to Hadrian, cf. C.I.L. 1. 1719.
legend nothing could have been simpler for Plutarch than to supply the word. But his language appears to be deliberately chosen. He is correcting a legend which he qualifies as an empty fiction.\footnote{13} Has Plutarch spoken elsewhere of a chasm it might just have been possible to translate *ἐμπεύουσα* as if it meant 'to fall in' and to interpret the whole phrase as elliptical. But as a matter of fact in the whole context Plutarch says nothing which can be taken as pointing to the existence of a chasm. The dialogue it is true is concerned very largely with the theory that the Pythia’s prophetic powers are due to some mysterious quality in the Delphic air. But this atmospheric quality is spoken of in the most general way and is never connected with any feature peculiar to Delphi. It is said to be the result of a combination of Sun and Earth and therefore rightly regarded as due to both Ge and Apollo (cc. 43, 48). It is subject to the decay which affects all terrestrial things and the prophetic inspiration (*πεύμα* καὶ *πεύμα*) is divine and holy *per excellence* whether it is manifested alone and through the air or in combination with a liquid spring. These are words which would apply equally to any oracle in any situation, and there is no mention of any cavern \footnote{14} or chasm from which the air arose, though Plutarch wished to refer to it he might have done so as easily as did the writer of the *de Mundo*.

It might indeed be said that the chasm was so well known that Plutarch had no need to mention it. But he is not merely silent. He speaks of the air in such a way that there can be no doubt that he conceived it as pervading the whole sanctuary (*de Dei. Gr. 40*). It is impossible that when the goats were sprinkled with water to test the presence of the oracular god, the ceremony took place within the secret chamber in which the Pythia breasted the chasm. Yet the manifestation of the divine presence which was the result of a successful trial—the shivering of the animal—is assigned to the same cause as the prophetic frenzy: if a god be the inspirer, he causes the goat to shiver as he causes the Pythia to prophesy; if a natural quality of the air, then goat as well as Pythia receives it. Nor are goats the only creatures which have their share in breathing the exhalations. Ammonius, the speaker in the dialogue who is combating the theory of an inspiring air, asks, if this is the cause of prophecy, why the Pythia is alone to feel it. Surely, he says, it would affect all alike. His argument would have been quite pointless if the Pythia had been conceived as being alone in experiencing the ‘mephitic vapours’ as is generally supposed to be the case. Yet Ammonius’ objection is never met, and since it is probable that Plutarch puts into the mouth of the speaker, his old master, the ideas which he himself

\footnote{13} Ammonius the speaker who makes the second reference to Koroxē dismisses the story in the words of *τινος ἑπικοινούσα μη εἰς τον μνημικόν πάθος τὸν κοροξήν* αὐτὸν ἐγγενέσθαι. The importance of the choice of speaker will be noted below.

\footnote{14} Middleton *J.H.S.* ix. 304 asserts that Plutarch in many passages speaks of the Pythia according to the vault or *ἰάρπω*. This is presumably a misprint for *θέση* since in the two references given there is no mention of an *ἰάρπω*, nor is there as far as I am aware in any writing of Plutarch’s. There certainly is not in the treatises on the oracles. But if a misprint it is a very misleading one.
held, it is clear that he had no belief that the vapours arose from a chasm in a secret place and that the Pythia alone retired mysteriously to inhale them.

It would be impossible to exaggerate the importance of this testimony. Plutarch knew the oracle as no other of our authorities knew it; he knew the legend and he knew and he made use of the theory of the prophetic air. If he is correcting the legend, as he is evidently doing here, there can be little doubt that he does so through his knowledge of the place. Since he means by the prophetic air nothing more than the air of Delphi, he is clearly in direct contradiction with the theory that it was a vaporous exhalation from a subterranean abyss.

V.

But if there is no passage from an author earlier or more trustworthy than Strabo which directly asserts the existence of a chasm and its vapours, there might be preserved some incidental remark, some reference to a detail of ritual which would corroborate his account. Such a piece of indirect proof is generally adduced from Plutarch, who, as we saw, refuses to recognise the existence of the chasm. He speaks several times of the priestess as "descending" (καταβαινεις) for the purpose of delivering oracles. His words are taken to imply that the oracular chamber was underground, and by the aid of a picturesque imagination the whole scene has been conjured up. The Pythia descended into some secret and subterranean chamber in the floor of which there was an orifice. There she mounted a tripod and alone experienced the frenzied effect of mephitic gas. The wild words were heard by the priests who stood above the adyton and they either edited her utterances or concocted them according as the historian is a sceptic or a believer.

Of course this is a combination of two distinct traditions. Even if the priestess did descend into a subterranean vault, this does not in the least suggest that the vault contained a chasm or that any vapours inspired her as she sat upon the tripod. But as the two details have been taken to corroborate each other, it is necessary to enquire into the truth of the second as of the first.

As to the existence of something known as an adyton at Delphi there need be no doubt. It is mentioned once, if not twice, in the Homeric Hymn to Apollo.15 The oracle itself uses the word and Herodotus (vi. 140, 141) makes the Athenians, in a reply to whom the word is used, employ it in a second question. To it Aeschylus refers in the commencement of the

---

15 Hy. Hom. ad Apoll. 443. In l. 123 Allen and Sykes read Καταβαινεις κατικανος Αθηνας max niciage which is from an inferior group of MSS. but ανικανος οικεωσι. Here, if there is any distinction between ένικανος and ηφαίστεως it would seem that the former is the wider term. The identification of the adyton, as opposed to the temple, with the building of Tophannahus and Agameus spoken of by Steph. B. 12, s. is ἀνταφοι is not very convincing and the second interpretation put forward by Allen and Sykes (p. 103, ad. l. 261) is preferable.
Eumenides where he describes it by the name μυχὸς. Towards this place the Pythia is making her way when she enters upon the scene, and her intention, as she herself says, is to go there for the purpose of prophecy. She describes it as covered with garlands and doubtless she refers to the laurel to which Euripides frequently alludes.16 It contained the omphalos to which Orestes clung as to a sanctuary and is generally spoken of as a holy of holies.

Euripides as is his manner is more vague. In the Ion he uses the word, as he uses γῆλαον, in a double sense. Xuthus says of himself (Ion 662) that Ion is the first person to meet him as he passes out of the adytas—meaning the temple. Later on in the play (I. 1300) Creusa, threatened by Ion, takes refuge at the altar of the god and prays Ion to slay her 'within the adytas of the god.' No doubt stage conventions were sufficiently loose to allow the audience to imagine that the altar to which Creusa was clinging was within the temple. But the whole machinery of the play would lead one to believe that the altar stood somewhere outside the temple, as it stood in fact at Delphi and at all other sanctuaries. In that case Euripides is using the word vaguely, and his reference is not to the topographical position of the altar, but to its general sanctity. Its untouchable character is extended to cover the whole of its surroundings.

In another passage (Andr. 1147) Euripides speaks of a voice which pretended to be divine as issuing from the innermost adytas17 and Aristophanes (Eq. 1016) says that Pheidias shouted from the adytum through the precious tripods. He is here parodying the line in the Homeric Hymn to Apollo.

But in all these passages adytum means no more than the interior of the temple. Euripides himself speaks of the meeting of Xuthus and Ion three times and on each occasion uses a different word. For ἀδύτων ἔξωτοι, μυαί in I. 662, he says ὑπὸ τοῦ ἔξωτο ἔξωτοι in I. 585, and ἐκ ναοῦ συνέχει in I. 787.18 Moreover, he explains the use of the word when he makes Ion say (I. 226) to the Athenian women of the chorus that they may not enter the temple (and see the omphalos) unless they have sacrificed.19 That restriction is quite enough to justify the whole temple being called an adytum.

---

17 Cf. Fr. ii. 32 ἐλαστοδίας ἐνδόθεν ἐκ ἄδυτοι, etc. on which the scholiast remarks ἔξωτον διότε τοῦ ναοῦ τίτικα πολεμασίον. See Aristophanes Acharn. I. 14 ἐφοίτησεν ἐν ἄδυτοι ἐκ Ναοῦ. There are of course many phrases, how they are to be understood appears from the story of Aristodorus at Branchidae (Hist. 3. 159) who went round the outside of the temple destroying the birds and their nests when ἄδυτον φωτείν ἐκ τοῦ ἄδυτο τοῦ ναοῦ καθαίρεται κ.τ.λ. Similarly Euripides, I. T. 974 says that when Creatus—in the occasion of his second appeal to Apollo—ἐν ἄδυτοι ἐκ ἄδυτοι τεκέσθαι, ἐκατέρτω ἄδυτοι εἰς ἔνειαλον ἐκ Ναοῦ λαβὼν θυσίας.
18 If more than of these passages is there any notion of an inner chamber, Euripides also uses the word ἀδύτων very vaguely in I. T. 1257 (ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ) and Andr. 1035. A similar vague use of the word appears in Ion 789, where it—ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ.
19 The first person and with it, leaving the temple is described in various ways. Hist. vi. 34 ὁ ἀδύτων ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ τεκέσθαι καθαίρεται κ.τ.λ., Magnesian Inscription. Kent. 37. 1. 23 ὁτα ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ ταύρον ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ καθαίρεται κ.τ.λ. 38 ὁτα τεκέσθαι τεπτικά κ.τ.λ. τοῦ ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ.
20 Plutarch (de sp. divin. 2) says that he woman may approach the oracle, Euripides seems to have known of no such restriction.
Herodotus is still more definite. The oracle which he cites is the one commanding the Athenians who were consulting about the Persians to quit the temple. The god says 'ἀλλ’ ἵνα ἔσται ἀδύτω' and on the occasion of their second consultation they refuse to leave the temple in the words οὗ τοῦ ἄτιμου ἐκ τοῦ ἀδύτου. He himself does not use the word adytum when speaking of the temple but the more usual prose word megaron. That the two are identical is obvious since they are both used in the same passage without any hint of a difference in meaning. 'Having performed the customary rites,' says Herodotus, 'they entered the megaron and sat down. Thereupon the Pythia prophesied thus: 'Hapless men, why sit ye? Nay, leave the adytum.' Clearly the place in which they sat was called indifferently megaron or adytum—indeed the identity is never questioned—and since in other passages the words μέγαρον, εἴρον, and ἀδύτων are used as synonymous, there can be no doubt whatever as to the meaning of any one of the words. The whole temple was adytum as a hallowed place, a place tabu, just as a whole enclosure might be adytum, or a grove, or a cave.

The procedure at the temple as far as it concerns the adytum is definitely stated by Herodotus. In two passages besides the one just quoted he describes the consultation of the oracle and in all he uses the same words. Of the messengers of Croesus (i. 47) he says 'As soon as they entered the megaron and put their question, the Pythia spoke in hexameter verse;' of Lycurgus (i. 65) 'Immediately after he entered the megaron the Pythia spoke as follows.' The phrase is something of a formula but there is no reason to think that it is in any way misleading. Both the tales, of Croesus and Lycurgus, are evidently derived from Delphic sources, and the hand of the advertising agent is visible in the emphasis laid upon the miracle of an immediate answer. If this is the account of a consultation given by the Delphians themselves we may not believe it unless we like, but our scepticism would scarcely justify itself if we preferred any other. In any case the meaning of the phrase is perfectly clear. The enquirer entered the adytum and sat down, and thereupon the Pythia answered the questions put to her, or in more miraculous cases answered the question before it was uttered. The temple of Delphi is thus exactly parallel to that of Athena on the Acropolis. Just as the Pythia prophesied to the enquirer as soon as he entered the megaron, so, when Cleomenes was forcing his way into the adytum (Herodotus uses the word) of Athena, the priestess stood up from

1 C. S. Hammond to leave the temple occur in other oracles, cf. Aul. f. έτοι ἐκ τλικρεῖας. Gallus, Procur. c. v. 9, 8, σπέρματα. For the ἐκλεισίας ὑπό τοῦ ἦκτος cf. Aul. c. v. 8, Λακ. xxii. 35. Homer, ἔκλεισεν. For ἐκλεισίας as applied by Apoll. ἐν τοῖς ἑλλήν. xxii. 35. He seems to have been at the temple of Athena of the Acropolis (v. 1. 53) into which Athenians fled when the Persians had made their way think of this by the secret ascent. It is the same at the adytum in this passage of Dio. Phy. Ath. Μηθύς, ii. p. 27. In i. 116 there is mention of the ἱερέας ἕκτος of Proteus as at Eleusis, which may or may not have been underground. If it was, Artayctes had a queer idea of comfort, but his sanctuary would have been as great if the adytum merely means the temple, cf. Pind. Ποιοτ. 34. For ἱερέας as applied to Branchides cf. supra n. 17. There were certainly
her seat and before he had passed the doors ordered him not to enter the temple (μὴ ἔσθις καὶ τὸ ἱρὸν). Neither in one case nor in the other is the priestess imagined as seated in a separate chamber, much less in one below the ground.

It would be idle to accumulate proofs since this theory of the adytum fits every reference to it in classical times. But two corroborative details may be mentioned. In all the vases which represent the scene at the beginning of the Eumenides the Pythia is portrayed with the temple key. This is in itself of no great importance since the vase painters might naturally represent the Pythia as they were accustomed to represent Iphigenia or any other priestess. But it probably reflects the tradition of the Attic stage, and it corroborates the view that Aeschylus and Euripides meant the temple when they spoke of the adytum. The other testimony bears out the description of the procedure found in Herodotus. Xenophon in the Apology says (Ap. Socr. § 14) that the oracle declaring to Charesphou that Socrates was the wisest man was delivered in the presence of many people. So Herodotus in his account of a consultation at Ptoiaon (viii. 135) says that Mrs was accompanied by three chosen men of the place when he put his question to the prophet and was answered at once.

We may, if we please, discount from the miraculous in these descriptions. It may have been the case that the questions were delivered in writing or that they were given beforehand as they were later at the oracle of Apollo Korouchus in Thessaly. But that question does not affect us here. The one thing certain is that no amount of ingenuity can twist the adytum known to Herodotus and the tragic poets into anything akin to a secret and subterranean vault.

VI.

In the face of all this evidence we have only the one phrase of Plutarch, namely κατάβαινειν, upon which to base a theory of a subterranean vault and of a secret place in which the Pythia was inspired and uttered raving words to the priestess. Inconclusive as this poor shred of evidence must be, it is proved to be utterly worthless when strictly examined.

It is true that Plutarch regularly uses words compounded with κατά to describe the progress of the Pythia into the place of oracles.22 But even if

---

22 cf. Pyth. Or. c. 6 ἐπὶ...πρὸ χαμόνας μέχριν ἡμέραν ἐπὶ...πρὸ χαμόνας ἐπικοινωνίαν εἰς τὸ ἱερόν, c. 22 ἐπὶ...καὶ συνάντησεν ἐπὶ...καὶ ἐσπρεπάτει καὶ ἑπεμβαίνει εἰς τὴν κατάλυμαν εἰς τὸ χρήστημα. c. 28 ἐπὶ...καὶ κατέλαβε καὶ γένεται καὶ τὴν δεξ. c. Def. Or. c. 2 ἡ γένος ἐκχύοντο προφητεία ἐν μέρει καθόλου. c. 51 κατάβης εἰς τὸ μαντείον, ἐς ἀγίαν, ἀκκοφ.
she did thus 'descend' into the adytum she was not alone in doing so. The word is indifferently applied by him to the priestess and to the consultant. It has been often noticed that in the life of Timoleon (c. 8) Plutarch says of him that he 'descended' . . . into the oracular chamber. But a passage in a different work may conflict with a common usage through many reasons. Plutarch may be following some authority who is describing a different temple or he may be speaking with a knowledge of the Delphic procedure less accurate than it afterwards became. But this passage is not alone. Even in the dialogue on the Pythian oracle—the dialogue from which nearly all the references to the priestess' descent are culled—Plutarch refers to the consultant as 'descending' and uses the word which should, ex hypothesi, be reserved for the priestess. The passage is never quoted, apparently it has escaped the eyes of the curious.

These passages prove that the adytum was open to the consultant—not a secret chamber of the Pythia. We must now ask whether being open, as it was in the days of Herodotus, it was yet underground. In the passage describing the consultation of Timoleon which has been quoted above Plutarch says that as he was 'descending' into the place of prophecy a filled slipped from some offering and all embroidered as it was with crowns and victories fluttered and fell upon his head. It would surely be impossible to hang offerings in an underground and secret cellar; but we know that in the megaron or adytum at Delphi offerings were hung as in all other temples. Herodotus (viii. 37) speaks of arms placed there and kept sacred from human hands, and though the temple which he knew had been destroyed before the days of Timoleon the new one was not very different—at any rate it was similar enough to allow all later writers to be totally ignorant that there had been any change. In the new temple as in the old—according to the picture given us by Aeschylus and Euripides—the omphalos stood in the cela or megaron. This is proved by a reference to the omphalos in one of the engraved 'Naos' accounts which details the money spent in the fourth century on the rebuilding of the temple and by the corresponding mason-marks on the walls of the cela. The place in which the omphalos stood was probably the adytum in later days as in earlier, and thus the chamber

without an object would suggest that the technical meaning of the term is connected with the consultant rather than with the Pythia, and this is borne out by the passages from earlier authors quoted below.

26 M. Homolle concludes that the present temple was exactly similar to that built by the Acheamenids and destroyed in the fourth century. Cf. B.C.H. xx. 1896, p. 454.

into which Timoleon and others "descended" would appear to be still the same one as that wherein the Athenians, Croesus’ messengers, and Lycurgus sat.

Of the two passages which seem to conflict with this view, and to suggest that there was a separate chamber for the consultants, neither is conclusive nor definite. Plutarch speaks of the chamber in which the consultants sat as an ἀλκός and seems to distinguish it from the adyton. In the de Def. Or. c. 50 he says: "The chamber (ἀλκός) in which the priests seat the consultants is occasionally filled with a sweet scent and an air which wafts... perfumes from the adyton as from a spring (ἀποφόρας ὀστέρ ε ἐκ πυγῆς του ἁδύτου προσβάλλοντος)." There is nothing in these words to suggest that the adyton was underground, for it would be a most superficial mistake to invest the word πυγή with ideas which belong to our word 'well.' Certainly ἀλκός is a very strange expression for the main cells of a temple, but it cannot equal ὀσέμα as Botticher makes it when he speaks of a vestibule leading to the underground adyton, and if it was the final point reached by the consultant, then, as the two passages quoted above make clear, the 'descent' whatever it was must have been into it. The only way out of the difficulties presented by this duplication is to suppose that the ἀλκός is nothing but the cells and the explanation of the use of the word can be found in the very fact with which it seems to conflict. If the consultant and the Pythia were both in the same chamber—the adyton or megaron of Heraodotus—then, in order to distinguish one part from the other, Plutarch was forced to employ an unusual and incorrect term. By limiting the extent of the 'adyton' in a way which was unknown to earlier authors, he was forced to find a new word for the remaining portion of the cells in which the consultants sat. The other passage is notoriously obscure. Pausanias (x, 24.5) speaks of an innermost part of the temple into which few penetrate and which contains a second, a golden statue of Apollo. He distinguishes this from the main cells in which he saw, ἀνά θηρίων, the hearth but not the emphases. But he is strangely silent as to this chamber and though he speaks later (x, 24.7) of the adyton into which the water of a spring Cassotis penetrates by an underground channel and makes the Pythia prophetic, he does nothing to connect the two. The general confusion of his account suggests that he was not privileged to see the oracle at work; but the words he uses for the innermost chamber merely lead us to believe that either the presence or the absence of the golden statue and not the mystery

---


28 Tchekhov, ii. § 22. 6. Rayet’s theory that it was a vestibule similar to that discovered at Branchithas receives no support from the name of the latter, cf. Pentzieii and Hausseiller, Didymaon, p. 82. But for this theory, cf. supra, H.S.—VOL. XXIV.

29 The whole notion is an extension of a phrase of Pindar, Ck. vii. 22, supra n. 17, and therefore the word adyton is used while it is elsewhere avoided by Plutarch, cf. supra n. 23. Incidentally, we may notice that the sweet-smelling adyton is very far from the megalithic cistern or the cave whose lower depths were fatal. Of course in Pindar the epithet is quite synonymous.
of the oracle caused it, to be kept sealed from inquisitive eyes. Nor is the second passage conclusive as to the underground nature of the adyton. The only thing that Pausanias notes is that the water of Cassotis passed underground; he does not in the least imply that the place in which it reappeared was underground also. We are thus thrown back upon the use of the word άρτασαίσιες for evidence of any descent into the adyton. But before we decide that it implies this notion we must subject it to a stricter examination.

The word is used, it is true, regularly when, as in the case of Trophonius at Lebadeia, there does really seem to have been something of the nature of a subterranean adyton. But it is also employed occasionally where there does not seem to be any reference to an underground chamber and almost appears to be a technical term for the entrance into any adyton. Thus Ἰπήλλος speaks of the consultant 'descending' into the adyton of Asclepius at Trikka. There is no reason to believe that the chambers in which consultants slept at temples of Asclepius were underground, but that they could be called adyta appears from the inscription giving a list of Epidaurian miracles. Similarly Pausanias employs the word alternately with πέρανες when he is speaking of the great temple of Isis at Tithorea (x. 32), though this temple, as far as one can judge, was in its entirety of the nature of an adyton. On the other hand, compounds of ἕκτε are regularly used by Herodotus when he speaks of the Delphic or any other adyta, and even Plutarch uses the word ἔκαγωσεν (de Def. Or. 40) of the priests leading the Pythia to her place of prophecy.

But Plutarch's use of the word is too definite and constant to be explained by these occasional parallels. With him the phrase amounts to a regular formula, and there must be some reason why the word should be regularly connected with the oracle at Delphi. If it were the case that the reason lay—as is generally supposed—in the peculiar construction of the Delphic temple with its underground adyton, then, since we have seen that in earlier times the whole temple was spoken of as an adyton, we should expect that Plutarch's use of the word, if it corresponds to his own experience, should be unique. But as a matter of fact the word is not employed with reference to Delphi first or only by Plutarch. It is found in older authors and found in such combinations that it refuses absolutely to bear the meaning which is commonly attributed to it.

The word in an allied form occurs first in the poem which for antiquity as for us was the chief document of the oracle's history. In the Homeric Hymn to Apollo the god is described as entering the temple in the words:

28 Cf. Wilamowitz, Ἰπήλλος p. 21, I. G. iv. 860, 39 ἐκ τοῦ ἀσκοτίου τοῦ Ζέπην τιναδείχει διὰ θεσποτένθες Άσκοτίου. We do not know enough about Trikka to say with certainty that it possessed an underground adyton, but it is very unlikely. For Epidaurum cf. Birtkam Sp.Pl., 382 Karvallas, Poetics, 12. I. G. iv. 950. 112. There certainly the sleeping place was not subterranean. The use of σάρασις in connection with illumination may be due to analogy with the regular words καραβίδαι, καραβίδης of the consultants. (Professor Ernst Gardner suggests to me that the inscription should read ἐκαγωσεν and not ἐκαγώσεν. I have no means of checking Karvallas' reading.)
An echo of the epic phrase was caught up by Pindar. Describing in detail the consultation of Theopomus at Delphi he speaks of that hero as Πυθιον σαυδι καταβαίνει (Pyth. iv. 55). There is nothing here to suggest a descent into an underground chamber nor even a reference to an adytum or a μυχή; it is merely a poetic employment of a classical phrase. And, votary of Delphi as he was, Pindar must yield before the Pythia as an authority upon the rites and language of her own oracle. Clear and unambiguous for once she answers the question that we put to her in the line quoted by Herodotus as delivered to Cypselus (v. 92, d.):

διήνυς οὕτως ἀνήρ ὃς ἐμέν δόμων εἴσοκαταβαίνει. 28

This line seems finally to clinch the question. The word is applied to the oracle at Delphi simply through the force of epic usage. It owes its employment not to the actual experience of Plutarch but to its usefulness in filling out a hexameter and to its existence on the classic page of the Homeric Hymn. Traced back to the epic it must be interpreted, not according to the fancied picture of Delphic ritual, but according to Homeric usage. In Homer, as Mr. J. L. Myres has pointed out in this Journal (vol. xx, p. 149), the prepositions ἀνήρ and κατά and their compounds are employed regularly with a special significance. In speaking of a house the epic poet uses κατά to denote direction from outside inwards, as he uses ἄνηρ for the direction from inside outwards. The use of the word καταβαίνει in connexion with a temple merely puts that building in the same category as a house and, in one case as in the other, it does not afford the slightest indication that there was any descent into any part of it beyond, perhaps, the step down from the threshold into the main chamber. If any more reason be required for the association of the word with the temple at Delphi than the exigencies of the hexameter and the influence of the epic it may perhaps be found in this notion that the descent implied in the word was the descent from the threshold. For the λαίμος οὐδός at Delphi was itself one of the marks connected with the oracle in the Golden Book, 29 and it may perhaps have helped to stereotype the phrase.

The use of the word by Plutarch loses all value as evidence when it is

---

11. Herod. Hist. ed. Apoll. 443. The commentators do not seem to have remarked the irregular use of the active aorist in place of the middle.

22. In quoting this oracle Dio Chrys. xlii, p. 193 reads εἰσοδολαίης and when the same line occurs in an oracle ap. Cerinthus Homeri et Hesiodi, p. 17 δαμαμελείς is introduced from Hymn xxiv. 1, ἀστώθη ἡ θεοσκοτική ἂδυλαλοιχαίς δέκανον Ποῖον ἢ γενάτης ἔχον δόμων δαμαμελείς, where δαμαμελείς is thoroughly applicable to Heuses who deals within, but scarcely suitable to Hesiod. The two last lines had to be filled up. Another oracle, Ath. Pol. xiv. 77, varies the phrase δαμαμελείς οὕτως ἐνεύτη πάντες ἐνεύτη λαίμος οὐδός. Ποίειν ἁγίαν μονομενήν εἴσοκαταβαίνει. So ibid. xiv. 100, Mursicinus and Paris are said to have εἴσοκαταβαίνει (edited, A. H. v. 84). The fact that the form which occurs in Hdt. is the nearest to Epic usage seems to prove it genuine.

28. II. lex. 704, Od. vili. 89, Hes. Hymn. 226. It occurs with the tripos in or. ap. Aelian V. H. iii. 45, Ath. Pol. xiv. 77. For a possible meaning of εἴσοκαταβαίνει, see 89.
seen to be a mere stock phrase, a sacred tag from the epic. That it was not originally employed at Delphi with any notion of descent into an underground chamber appears quite clearly from the words ραον and δομον which Pindar and the oracle couple with it. Even in Plutarch it is not once used with the word ἀδυτον; he joins it with μαρτεῖον and χρυσινθέλον, words which are commonly employed by older authors as equivalent to ναὸς and δομος. Plutarch also agrees as we have seen with the older authors in employing the word to describe the consultation by the visitor. His use of the phrase, therefore, so far from bearing out the usual account of a subterranean adytum, actually seems to corroborate our contention that the adytum for Plutarch, as for Herodotus and the tragic poets, was merely the interior of the temple. No doubt the Pythia was seated in an inner portion of the cella; but to say this is merely to make an inference from our notion of probability. It is a very different thing from believing her to have been placed in a subterranean and mephitic hole.

VII.

Even if the adytum could be proved to be subterranean its underground position would be no proof of the existence of a vent with noxious vapours. The inference from one to the other seems generally to have been made by the link of the Pythia. She descended into the adytum whereas she was thrown into a wild frenzy. Some cause for the excitement must be found and none is so handy as the inflaming gas. Therefore the subterranean adytum is assumed to corroborate the account of a mephitic chasm.

But the Pythia’s frenzy is a flimsy basis for an argument. Most writers who speak of it are agreed in rejecting the wild accounts of Latin authors, but with one accord they point to an anecdote told by Plutarch which proves that on one occasion the Pythia’s frenzy was of the nature which they commonly associate with mephitic vapours.

On this occasion as Plutarch says (De Def. Or. 51) the Pythia went unwillingly into the adytum and there became mad. Some days after she died. The event is dated and as it was all but contemporary with Plutarch we may accept its truth. But it would be hard to say what it proves. Plutarch himself adduces the incident as a sign that sometimes the prophetic power possessed by the priestess is out of tune with the properties of the air. But he might equally well have said that it proved ‘there were spirits about,’ and most Greeks would have approved this inference. We prefer natural causes, but an attack of hysteria may be brought on by many things besides vapours arising from crevices in the ground.

The whole question of the character of the Pythia’s frenzy demands fuller treatment than it can receive at this point. But here it may be said that her
reluctance to prophesy is generally attributed by classical authors to ritual or political reasons and not to her fear of the natural effects of the gas. Moreover since the appeal is made to Plutarch we may allow Plutarch to answer it out of his own mouth. Divested from its context the anecdote which is introduced as an exception is quoted by scholars as if it embodied the rule. Had the writers who use it as a basis for their theories troubled to pursue their researches a few pages back in the same dialogue they would have found that Plutarch distinctly states (de Def. Or. c. 48) that the air was not too frenzying or exciting and caused neither harm nor pain to those who inhaled it. Indeed had such a frenzy been the necessary condition of inspiration, as the writers seem to imagine, it is difficult to see why the priest and the enquirers and the Hostoi were so alarmed when the Pythian's voice showed signs of disturbance and why they all fled better-shelter out of the temple when she rushed shrieking to the entrance.

Plutarch himself as we have seen does not connect the air with any cleft or chasm. We see now that the kind of prophetic inspiration which he credited to the Pythia does not in any way suggest that she experienced any effects from her supposed descent into the adytum which would justify us in supposing the mephitic chasm to be seen there. Nor, as we shall see, had there been a mephitic chasm would it have produced the effects with which it is generally credited.

VIII.

Literary evidence is thus proved unsatisfactory. On the one hand we have a circumstantial and definite account preserved in late authors and generally accepted by modern writers. On the other we find that this account is in no way corroborated by the words of authors who knew the oracle in its prime and that the evidence of Plutarch who knew the oracle well in later days does not bear out the usual statement. In the case of such a conflict of evidence the natural appeal is to the authority of archaeology and to that of another science even more certain in its results. There may be some indeed to whom in the face of the positive remains of the temple of Apollo a more consistent tale than the one we have examined might appear worthless. Since, however, the literary evidence is so unsatisfactory there must be even more general confidence in the results afforded by an examination of the site. Nor if it be objected that in the course of time much may have been destroyed and more thrown into confusion is the case altered. We have seen that the evidence for the existence of the chasm all dates from

---

28 The two classical instances are variants of the same story applied to different personages—Philemonos (Defal. 86, xvi. 27) and Alexander (Plut. Alex. 14). In both the excuse given for a refusal is that the day was not the regular one—at least in Dod. that seems to be the case, though the text is corrupt. Her reluctance in the case cited above is due to the unavourable omen. Only Roman authors—Valerius, Lucan—make it personal. Cf. Gardiner and Jerosch Massen p. 255 for the traditional view of the Pythia's frenzy, and Middleton J. R. S. I. 304 for the argument thence to the intoxicating air.
a period when the temple must have been substantially the same as the one the remains of which are now visible. Moreover even if there had been any change from the earlier temple even the best informed of the authors were ignorant of it. But even if the evidence of archaeology might leave us undecided, the question of the chasm and its vapours falls so definitely into the sphere of geology that it can only be a matter of surprise that that science has not been appealed to before.

Concerning the existing remains of the temple of Delphi it is impossible to speak at length. The lips of those who have visited the site are sealed as firmly in courtesy to M. Homolle as were those of visitors in earlier days through the power of religious mystery. But we hope that we shall incur no divine resentment if we repeat only what has been published and is well known. There are no signs of a subterranean adytum, though there are subterranean passages which here, as elsewhere in Greek temples, are due to no more mysterious a cause than economy in architectural construction. Nor are there signs of such a vaulted grave as certain theories would take the adytum to have been. Delphi was certainly a Mycenaean centre, but nowhere, says M. Homolle, are Mycenaean remains so rare as under the temple itself and between it and the supporting wall. Nor is it likely that a vaulted tomb should occur here in the centre of a Mycenaean habitation. A shaft-grave might well have stood there, but a domed tomb would be found more naturally outside the circle of the town cut into the rock. Of these there are not a few in the immediate vicinity.

M. Homolle, moreover, has concluded from the evidence of a certain stone that the tripod stood with the omphalos. That stone was placed in the cela and, though we cannot lay any weight upon an argument which has not as yet been publicly developed, it seems to afford a strong corroboration of the view that there was no adytum besides the cela. The temple also seems to have conformed to the ordinary rules of Greek temple architecture, but in the light of what has been published it is impossible to assert that the

---

"Cf. Frazee, Paus. viii. 392, 393. In 1894 M. Homolle thought he had found traces of the 'soubre du souterrain adytum' (C.E. xxii. 287) presumably where 'l'affleure est couvé vers le milieu du monumenet par une dépression large et profonde' (B.C.H. xviii. 177, C.E. xxii. 302, Arch. Anz. 1896, p. 4). But in 1897 he writes B.C.H. xxii. 272 that he has not found the 'futuro de la Pythie.' The reconstruction of the temple at Brachiai to which the remains at Delphi were at first compared itself owes too much to a fancied theory of the temple of Delphi to be quoted as evidence. If it does represent the tradition it would appear that the descent into the cela or adytum was a real one, but, as the arguments above would show, that descent was made by pilgrim and consultant alike; and the adytum, if lower in level than the pronaoe, was not subterranean or secret, but was hypostyle and the chief hall of the temple. Cf. Ruyet, t. 153.

"C.E.H. xii. 302, cf. Frazee Paus. viii. 392, for Mycenaean remains and tombs generally.

"Homolle quoted by Stahlriick-Hermes, xxxiv. 203.

"Cf. Frazee Paus. viii. 5. 393. This account is later in date than the provisional report of M. Homolle, C.E.H. xviii. 1894, 477, C.E. xxii. p. 302, which is contradicted in one important detail (the existence of an interior column) by the report of the next year, C.E. xxiii. 329, and conflits with the suggested restoration recently published (Famille de Delphi ii. Pl. 0). The existence of an epistle-hedemos is attested by inscriptions; C.E. xxiii. 305, and seems to disprove the suggestions of Ruyet, cf. supra, n. 38.
opisthodomos was not entered from the cells and thus converted into a secret chamber.

So much for the subterranean adytum. With regard to the mephitic chasm one can only say that with the best will in the world the French excavators have failed to find a trace of it. Of course it may be said that such an orifice may have been filled up; and such as we have seen was the legend of late Imperial times. But with the cave of Corycia, higher up on Parnassus, still remaining as it was in the days of Pausanias and with every inch of the sacred enclosure accounted for, the probability of such a disappearance is but a weak one. There have been countless earthquakes which have done their worst for the buildings of Delphi. But those which have occurred since the present temple was built cannot have been the ones which filled the chasm. In that case the subsidence would have left signs in the partial submergence of the existing foundations. Nor can it well have occurred earlier unless the chasm was destroyed before it had found a place in literary tradition.

But the whole question of the chasm and its vapours becomes an idle one, when its possibility is considered according to the laws of geology. The manner in which this feature is conceived appears most clearly in a note by the late Mr. F. W. H. Myers to the words ἐπιβρόκων χήφος which Pindar (Pyth. vi. 3) applies to Delphi. He translates the phrase 'deep murmuring earth' and in a note explains it as an epithet applicable to volcanic soils. He and many other writers—modern as well as ancient—have been too strongly influenced by the description of Ascanus consulting the Sibyl at the temple of Apollo at Cumae. It may suit Vergil to weave into his story details applicable to the neighbouring volcanic locality. But such details are strangely misplaced at Delphi. In that place it would be impossible to find any 'volcanic soils.' The whole neighbourhood of Delphi is composed of the hard limestone rock which is usual throughout Greece. Such a rock, as everyone knows, is commonly pierced with caverns and pot-holes and it would seem at first that this might easily give an opportunity for a chasm such as Strabo describes. But Delphi itself does not lie upon the limestone which forms the precipice above it and the slopes below; it rests on and it owes its whole existence to a terrace of schist which has resisted the action of water. If in the limestone there might have been a pot-hole, no such feature is possible in the schist. That rock is not hollowed by water into a cave, nor worn into a hole giving access to a cave underneath. It cannot even allow of a spring such as Pausanias says welled up in the adytum, though the water might have been carried in a conduit from a spring issuing out of the limestone above the terrace.

There might, however, have been a fault where the two strata—schist and limestone—joined, and from this fault vapours might have arisen. But in the first place it is extremely unlikely that such a fault stood immediately under the temple, or that it could have presented such a character as the account would give it. In the second place—and this is more important—the vapours arising from it could never have produced the effect which in the
traditional account it was invented to explain. Such vapours, like all others which issue from the earth, do nothing more to those who inhale them than suffocate and choke.** They might account for the dreams of those who entered the cave of Trophonius or the stupor of consultans at Asiatic Plutonia or Avernus, but they could never have inspired the Pythia to her flights of impassioned verse.  

We can see now why Plutarch rejects the story of the chasm. It did not exist. At the same time we can understand why the older authorities give no indication of a belief in any tale such as is told by Strabo and Diodorus. But these stories do not grow out of nothing and, as we have seen, even the older authors are vaguely conscious of some cavern or chasm, of some formation of the Earth which gave Delphi its peculiar sanctity. That natural formation was not an orifice with mephitic vapours, but it was sufficiently wonderful to mark Delphi as a sacred spot. We shall now enquire into its nature and at the same time we shall see in what way the story of Strabo grew up.

IX.

Outside the sacred enclosure at Delphi but in the very centre of the rocky precipices which enclose the platform upon which it stands there is the chasm or gorge of Castalia. The two rock-faces which rise up behind the town are divided at the eastern corner by a huge cliff at the extremity of which a plentiful spring wells forth. This spring is the famous spring of Castalia,** the waters of which were invariably connected by antiquity with the sanctity of the Pythian shrine; and the chasm at the mouth of which the spring rises must inevitably remind every visitor to Delphi of the legends which surround the place. Here must be the fancied scene of the dragon-slaying, for if the account followed by Euripides only speaks of a chasm, the best tradition points to the identification of the Python with some spring.***

---

** The belief that volcanic chasms were voleanic is very hard to kill. The compiler of the Guide Joanne has discovered a sulphur chasm in a fancied cave of Apollo Pythos at Thera. Certainly volcanic soils and mephitic vapours abound in that region, but the limestone mountain of Mano Yomo, where the cave is situated, is perhaps the only place in the island where they are impossible. The association of Apollo Pythos with caves is largely a fallacy produced by the belief in mephitic vapours.

*** For the geology of Delphi see Dr. Alfred Philippson in Bully, Wissenschaft und Religion, s.v. Delphi. The statements made above I owe to the kindness of Dr. Philippson himself who with the greatest courtesy has sent me privately answers to all my questions. He himself considers the story of a mephitic chasm "in German Prinstar-Bezug gewesen zu sein."

** Castalia is the one spring which is invariably mentioned by ancient authors as the prominent Delphic feature, e.g. Pind. Pyth. 1. 169, \(\text{πάραστεραν} \; \varepsilon \; \text{εκ Καρταλίας}.\) It was certainly used for ceremonial washings, Eur. Ioh. 91, 146, Phoc. 222, Aristomou Hymn. 5, vi, Hom. Od. iii, 4, 81, but the unmanning of the evidence to its supreme importance as the spring sar castrione di Delphi is the only good ground we possess for connecting it with the water drunk by the priestess. Paus. x. 24. 7 states that she drank the water of Castalia.

*** C. Hymn. Hymn. ad Apoll. 300 and Sykes and Allen but loc. Euripides and others as we have seen speak only of the cave, but in late authors, e.g. Ovid, Metamorph. iii, 34, Brugen yth.
and here at the same time is the original feature which invested Delphi with a peculiarly sacred and oracular power.

This is not the place to elaborate an account of the manner in which such a feature as the chasm with its spring became prophetic. The slightest acquaintance with the customs of primitive people will explain how a chasm in the rock proves to be the locality supremely fitted for the home of some mysterious and awful power; and the gorge of Castalia pleased where it is in the majestic scenery of the rocky hollow above the steep valley of the Pleistus gives a final touch to a locality which is already awe-inspiring enough in itself. There is no need to quote parallel customs from other nations to prove the sanctity of the Castalian gorge; but since its sacred qualities have been obscured by the romantic tradition of the mephitic vapours it is necessary to cite from Greece itself evidence which will prove that such a chasm, open though it be to the sky and as free from noxious gases as the mountain top itself, could be connected with the presence of an oracular god.

Nor must we travel far from Delphi to find a complete parallel to the Castalian gorge. Some twenty miles eastward, where the Sacred Road from Delphi to Thebes strikes the plain and the lake of Copaeis, there stood the city of Lebadeia with its oracle of Trophonius. Here, too, the prominent natural feature is an enormous and winding gorge which splits into two the spur of Helicon, Mount Laphystius, upon the slopes of which the oracle and the town were situated. High up on the hill-side but at the end of the chasm two abundant springs well forth and their waters united send a strong torrent to the plain below. In the lower part of the gorge, below the springs, there was placed, apparently, the sacred grove of the god, and somewhere near the springs there stood a temple. Here divination was practised by means of incubation, and there is nothing improbable in the traditional account that the consultants slept in a cave. But in the time of Pausanias, at any rate, there can have been no natural cavern, since the one which he describes was artificial. Nor for the same reason can there have been mephitic vapours; here as at Delphi the gorge with its two springs sufficed to suggest the presence of a god who declared himself in prophecy.

Proceeding further eastward at the other end of Copaeis we reach the oracle of Apollo Pidus. Here too a mountain explains the original choice of the sanctuary and a high precipice and a spring connect the situation with those of the other oracular shrines. But here there is no chasm and we must pass on to the oracle of Amphianus at Oropus for the third example.
of an oracular cleft. In this place the temple of the god stood in the very gorge to which it owed its sanctity. Among the still thickly wooded hills which rise abruptly from the Euboean Straits and form a high wall between the sea and the broken valleys of North Attica there is a glen closed in by the high hill-sides. There would be nothing remarkable in this alone, for the mountains which seem so solid to one sailing on the sea are broken at many points by the force of winter torrents. But in this glen some greater landslip has torn away the side of the hill to the south-west and the rock stands bare and gaunt amid and beneath the dark forest. Nor has the effect of the abrasion been merely to expose a single face of the rock. The rock is laid bare upon two faces which stand nearly at right angles to each other and here the mountain torrent which flows at the foot of the rock is forced to turn. The precipice stands exposed to the height of perhaps a hundred feet and its appearance is made yet more remarkable by the colour of the rock. This, for some reason impossible to discover from below, is partly grey and partly red.

Here also the chasm is combined with a spring, and both together go to form a sacred place which, though in the fifth century it was almost entirely confined to the cure of the sick, seems in earlier times to have possessed oracular virtues similar to those of Delphi and Lebadeia. The spring was one of the customary type in which offerings were deposited by the consultants, but the actual divination seems always to have taken place by means of incubation. But these details are unimportant; the matter of significance is the existence of chasm and spring in combination at an oracular shrine. If these two oracles shew these features we can safely conclude that Delphi was not different. The gorge of Castalia is the true chasm, and vapours arising from the ground, a subterranean adyton with an orifice into the earth, are mere figments of the priests or the historian.

X.

It is in no way surprising that the story of the vapours and chasm should have arisen. The gorge of Castalia, striking as it is, is not sufficiently mysterious to satisfy the superstition of a civilised people. The ideas which invest such a chasm with sanctity belong to a very primitive culture, and though it is to them that the place owes its original distinction, something more violent must be found to justify that distinction to later and more sophisticated minds. The gorge is open to the air and man may walk safely along its bottom when they cease to believe in the power of infesting spirits, and even the spring which always retained sufficient sanctity to be named as a prominent feature of Delphi became too familiar and intelligible to be credited with special powers. Thus we find that Pausanias is forced to assign the prophetic inspiration to a spring called Cassotis, although that name is unknown to any other author and the tradition is unanimous in credited all virtues to Castalia.
THE CHASM AT DELPHI

But the legend of the chasm still remained and was identified with the oracle. We find it in the association of the oracle with the goddess of the Earth, in the localization of the dragon in a cave and at a spring and, perhaps, in a vague memory which asserted itself in the choice of words descriptive of the oracle. But it would have been contrary to the spirit of the classical period to insist upon this feature as marking the chosen abode of the god, and therefore we find the Delphic Rock, the Omphalos, the Laurel, the Tripod, or the Hearth preferred as symbols of the oracular deity. The chasm was relegated to a second place because the ideas to which it belonged were dead, and the legends which may have originally centred around it were discredited if they were not forgotten.

But the time came when the importance of the chasm and its legend was felt again. The Pythia's inspiration was a phenomenon which needed explanation and to explain it something more plausible was required than the mere entrance of the deity. Everyone knew that the qualities of the air at different places produced pathologic effects; the importance of climate and temperature was noticed at a comparatively early date by the scientific among the Greeks. But the Pythia's inspiration was an unique and abnormal phenomenon and it required some more striking explanation than a mere reference to climate. Therefore since it was known that strange effects were produced by the vapours which arise from vents in the ground, nothing could be more suitable as a rational cause for her inspiration than just that chasm which legend had already marked out as the original feature of the oracle. And if in this development the real chasm of Castalia was forgotten and a new one invented such as never had existed and never could exist, there is nothing strange in this, since the oracle itself was already in a period of decay.

The explanation of supernatural phenomena by natural causes is a side of Euhemerism—which we notice less than the other only because it is so familiar in our everyday thought. But in Greece such explanations belong to a certain period. What might have appeared the shooest atheism in the time of Anaxagoras had become a century later the dominant mode of thought. The successors of Aristotle, if not the master himself, were busy with the task of resolving the supernatural into the natural. To that period we might assign the rebirth of the legend of the chasm in its new form, and we might even connect it with the name of Ephorus. Not only would that author have gladly accepted the physical theory of the inspiration but he would certainly have decked it with all the adornments of a legend. He was a romancer as well as a theorist and he belonged to the time when the old legends were revived not through any belief in their truth, but merely because of their picturesque qualities and literary attractiveness. He is even taken to task by Strabo for his absurd accounts of the origin of Delphic institutions which he prefaced by just such a serio-comic invocation to Truth as we might expect from him when he was launching upon the road of the picturesque. To him, then, perhaps belongs the whole account of the mephitic vapour, and since he was prince among those who sought out
mythic origins, we may credit him with adopting, if not with inventing, the legend of the shepherd, and the invention of the tripod.

How far the story emanated from Delphi, or was seized upon by the professional guides who told credulous visitors stories about what they saw, we do not know. But there were other people besides the visitors to the temple who gladly accepted the story of the chasm. The largest share in the perpetuation of the legend undoubtedly belongs to the Stoics. They were delighted with an explanation of a divine manifestation which was compatible with their general notion of a deity acting by natural means. Moreover, the theory helped them out of an exceedingly awkward dilemma. They held that prophecy—the communication of the gods with mortals—was a fundamental fact in theology, and yet they were faced with the unpleasant truth that in their day the oracles were dead or dying. To hold that the gods no longer were able or willing to speak with the human voice would have been an uncomfortable doctrine, and they could not but rejoice in a theory which left the gods without direct responsibility. Illogical as it may seem, the Stoics were quite content with a theory which surmounted the difficulty by saying that the powers of natural things were subject to change, and that therefore the oracles which derived their virtues from some qualities of earth and air suffered the lot of all terrestrial things. Meanwhile the gods remained as they were, willing to communicate with mortals, but bound down by the natural laws which they had themselves created.

At the same time with the completer decay of the oracles, the transference of the literary centres farther away from the seats of prophecy, and the growing delight in the romantic, the more lurid accounts of the procedure at Delphi naturally gained greater currency. Just as the theory of the vapour owed its acceptance to the fact that it explained the decay of the prophetic inspiration, so the picturesque descriptions of the oracles blossomed when there was no living oracle to prove them false. The legend gained force through the very destruction of the things it was intended to explain. When the oracles again flourished, with a pitiful revival of their ancient glories, we need not be surprised if they were decked with the ornaments which had been showered upon them during their period of sleep. They were forced to live up to their reputation and to assert themselves against all incredulity. But at Delphi, as we have seen, the new order does not seem to have been very different from the old. It was left to the other oracles, such as those of Asia Minor, to masquerade in the features which the legend of Delphi had made conventional.45

A. P. Oppé.

45 We have of a very at Khows, Tino, Rur. II, s. 54. It has perhaps been found situated in a chasm similar to those mentioned above, cf. Schickart, A.M. vi. 182. It must have been entirely distinct from the temple and not unlike such a Sibyl’s grotto as was artificially constructed and adorned in the 2nd century A.D. at Erythrae, cf. Bursch, A.M. xvii. 16. On the other hand the supposed masonic cave at Phokus, for which there is no literary evidence
NOTE ON ΜΥΣΙΣ AND ΑΥΣΙΣ.

Though those words are not quoted as evidence for the existence of the 'chasm' by writers who have studied the oracles, they are so often explained by a reference to the traditional story in editions of the classics that an examination of them at some length seems necessary. They will be seen to be far from possessing a definite topographical reference. On the contrary their associations are very vague and they serve as examples of the domination over the Greek mind of conventional phrases. This is of importance with reference to the use of the word κατακόλουθος which has been argued above to be a mere epic phrase and not a term descriptive of actual experience. In religious matters such as we are dealing with here this constant repetition of phrases for their own sake is intelligible and common to all times. It was, no doubt, far more noticeable in the innumerable hymns sung to the divinities than in the occasional echo which occur in the extant literature.

The primary meaning of the word μυσίς is 'that which is within.' Its commonest use is to describe the interior of a house, and in that sense it is employed for the interior of the temple at Delphi. Pindar, Pyth. v. 68 μυσίς Σίδηνας πόλεως ματισών which the scholiast explains as the adytum. In Aesch. Eum. 28, the Pythia speaks of herself as about to enter the ἁπάτην μυσίς, i.e. the adytum containing the omphalos and adorned with laurel. So ibid. 170 the Eumeneses say to Apollo μυσίς ἐξομολόγον by allowing Orestes to take refuge there. The plural is used for the singular in the same sense ibid. 180, when Apollo replies to the Puries ἐπελευθερῶν μυσίς μουρόν. Here the sense is made quite clear through the use in the same sentence of the synonymous ἐξομολόγον (179). In Eur. Ios. 290 μὲν ματισά τις μυσίς the word no less certainly means the interior of the temple, the adytum.

The same notion reappears complicated with a different one in the other passages where μυσίς is used. This second sense is emphasised by the epithet μετασχετής by the implication that the interior of the temple. Eurydice just as he could say of Apollo I.T. 1238 μεθαρμονίας ἐξομολόγον could describe Delphi in the words Τρ. 331 Περί Περί Περί Περί Περί Περί Περί Περί Περί Περί Λόγος μυσίας. But in this phrase, as Phoc. 344 shows, with its substitution of άδεστα for μυσίς, the sense is extended. Μυσίς is no longer applied in the sense of the interior of a house, but means the interior of something wider. Nor does it imply in the least that the 'interior' the 'place within' should be covered up; we speak of the 'interior' of a continent and places are spoken of in Greek as lying in μυσίς. The word is commonly used for mines of the earth and is equivalent to σκότος—which has the same ambiguity. As the omphalos marked the centre of the earth, so the place where it stood could be described as the place within the earth, as we say 'the heart.' How easily the idea of omphalos and μυσίς suggested such other appears from the use of μεθαρμονίας τοίχος for a palace hearth in Aesch. Ag. 1036; and its application to Delphi by Eur. I. 462. Delphi possessed both omphalos and hearth, and naturally their existence made the third word applicable.

In Aesch. Choeph. 933, ἀ Λογος ὁ Πνεῦμας μετασχετής άπλικτος μυσίας μεθαρμονίας the customary mention of the omphalos is not unnaturally replaced by the gerundive of the thing to which the omphalos belonged (as in I.T. 1238 quoted above). Here Delphi is frankly described as the 'heart' of the earth, but the metaphor is drawn not from an inner organ as with us but from the naval. Varro has criticised the idea, Liv. Lat. vii. 17. Certainly the phrase recalls the usual description of the realms of Hades as μυσίς γίγαντος But Aeschylus has carefully

is a humble excavation of stone very near the foundations of the temple (cf. Frase, Posse, v. 109). All these caves contain water either from a spring or brought by a conduit. The temple of Branchidae (cf. supra, n. 32) dates from the third century, and further excavations must be awaited before the account of Rayet and Thomas is accepted.
guarded against the misinterpretation by using the word *μυχαίων* which at once proclaims the sense in which μυχαί is used. Both senses of the word *μυχαί* were understood in Greek to allow Euripides to play upon the confusion *CYCL.* 230 sqq., and it is more than probable that the peculiar identification of the word with Delphi was largely helped by the position of the town and perhaps by a vague memory of the Castalian grotto. No doubt, like *γυάλων* and other phrases it goes back to a time long anterior to Pindar.

Like μυχαί the word *γυάλων* may be used for the interior of a cave, Soph. *Phil.* 1081, *Eur.* *Hed.* 169: but its original meaning appears to be ‘a hollow,’ (as of the two concave parts of the *θύραι* of Echidna, *Lyc. Hier.* s.v.). In this sense it is applied in *Delphi*, *Heodox.* 499, Ἡθαλι τε ἦτορια γυάλων ἐκ της Παρασκυίας. *Hymn.* *Hym.* (ad *Apolle.* 395, μνημο πολι βολαὶ γυάλων ἐκ της Παρασκύιας which is apparently copied from *Heodox.* Pindar uses this with other epic words in connexion with Delphi *Pyth.* viii. 63 οὐκ... ηθαλι ἐν γυάλοι, and much later Aristophanes employs it in the epic sense in his *Hymn.* 4. 6.

So far the word is quite simple; it describes the position of Delphi as accurately as does the phrase employed by Strabo *Geogr.* 21. But the word having become conventionally associated with Delphi is used carelessly and vaguely by Euripides, and his misuse of the term is instructive. Of the nine times that he employs it six are in descriptions of Delphi. This proves the influence of the epic line, and it would seem that he chooses it with no clear idea of its meaning, but merely because it was a hallowed word in this connexion. In *Phoen.* 237 μεσοπτυθν αὐλης Παλον the word is a mere synonym for μυχαί in *Oed.* 331, and the identification reappears in *Hed.* 189, στρατα μύχαρα γυάλα (not of Delphi). In *Iam.* 220 the Athenian women ask if it be allowed γυάλων ἐνεσθήσεσα ἄμω τοῖς σταθέθεσθαι; where the context shows that the word must mean the temple itself, and again μυχαί is used as an equivalent (cf. 1. 226 cited above). But in other passages *ibid.* 78 ἄμω σταθέτα μύχαρα, 234 μύχαρα τοῖς ἐκλείπουσι, 245 μύχαρα λισσαρον ἕρει, *Aithr.* 1093 ἔντυμον γέμασα γυάλα the meaning seems to vary between the temple and the whole enclosure. The latter sense would seem to be nearer to the original meaning and is definite in *E.T.* 1236 σαραφορος γυάλων of Iolos and perhaps in *Soph.* *O.C.* 1401 of Colonos. But in applying the word to the temple itself Euripides prefers literary association to accuracy of description. In *Soph.* *Pyth.* 422 (Nanck) the word if correctly restored is used as vaguely as possible, and therefore appears a convincing eumelation.

A. P. O.
Mystica Vannus Iacchi.

(Continued from Vol. XXIII. p. 324.)

I must ask the readers of the Hellenic Journal to take the somewhat disjointed notes that follow strictly for what they are, namely, addenda to my paper in last year's Journal (vol. xxiii. 1908) on the "Mystica Vannus Iacchi."

My object in writing that paper was to elucidate the mysticism of the 'fan,' and thereby, I hoped, to throw some light on an obscure chapter in the history of Greek religion, namely the shift from the worship of Demeter to that of Dionysus. Incidentally it became necessary to examine the various forms of winnowing 'fans.' My personal interest in this necessary step in my argument was slight and my statement of evidence, I fear, inadequate and superficial. Since the appearance of the article many friendly critics have supplied me with material to fill the gaps left by my ignorance, and the examination of this material has not been without its use to me in clearing up some obscurities as to the mysticism of the fan.

The new material here presented is chiefly from Ancient Egypt and Modern Greece. But for the kindness of Prof. Flinders Petrie I should never have known of the Egyptian wall-painting in the Bologna Musuem. To Mr. R. C._Bonnaquet I owe a special debt: he collected the series of modern Greek winnowing tools now in the Cambridge University Museum of General and Local Archaeology and Ethnology; and throughout the past two years he has with unwearied patience instituted on my behalf enquiries into modern methods of winnowing.

Supplementary to the remarks that follow must of necessity be, it would be worse than useless to attempt any formal ordering of the subject, but the new material may best be considered in relation to two monuments which both, I believe, depict Harvest Festivals: they are

1. An Egyptian sculptured slab now in the Museo Civico at Bologna.
2. The steatite vase found at Phaestos now in the Museum at Candia.

1.—An Egyptian Sculptural Slab (Fig. 1).

In my previous article (J.H.S. xxiii. p. 305) I drew attention to the passage at the close of Idyll vii, in which Theocritus speaks of the planting, at a harvest festival, of the pelyon, the winnow-shovel. For the reason of this
practice the Scholiast refers us to the Triptolemus of Sophocles, but unhappily none of the extant fragments offer any explanation. Mr. Holford Bosanquet, it will be remembered, noted the custom in Teneriffe and explained the planting of the πυγας as a 'sign that the winnowers' work was done.' Mr. G. F. Abbott in an account of winnowing processes in Macedonia which he kindly sent me writes: 'I do not know whether the planting of the φυγας, i.e. the

![Fig. 1.—Egyptian Sculptured Slab of the Eighteenth Dynasty Now in the Bologna Museum.](image)

... winnowing-shovel, in the heap of grain is an essential feature of the process, but it is an extremely common habit: I have often seen shovels planted in heaps of grain in shops and granaries.' Here it would seem most probable that the shovel was planted to keep it from getting lost. Mr. R. C. Bosanquet makes the interesting suggestion that the setting up of the πυγας may be a signal to the tax-gatherer that the heap of corn is ready for his inspection.
Till the landlord or tax-gatherer has made his inspection the grain in modern Greece as in ancient Egypt must remain on the threshing floor.

Many strands may go to the weaving of a custom, but these practical utilities do not, I think, exhaust the significance of planting the phenoe. In the idyll there is about the ceremony an air of ritual and it takes place in the very presence of Demeter herself. We have however for Greece no actual evidence that the ceremony is religious. For Egypt we are better furnished. This brings us to the Egyptian scenes in Fig. I. I owe the description and the interpretation that follows to the kindness of Mr. F. Ll. Griffith.

The slab of limestone in the photograph may have formed part of a tomb-wall, rock-cut or built, of the XVIIIth dynasty, preserving the terminal scenes of two lower-most rows of sculpture. Agricultural scenes abound in the tombs.

In the upper compartment the subject depicted is winnowing, done with pairs of wooden scoops. In the middle is a heap of corn; on the left is a group of three labourers, one of them with his scoop uplifted, the other two holding theirs lowered, while a smaller figure, separate, is in the act of scooping from the heap. On the right side is a man winnowing, another with branches sweeps up the loose corn, and a third carries a globular pot and offers refreshment in a bowl to the winnower; behind him is the big water-jar on a wooden stand.

The inscription names the smaller scooping figure the attendant Amen-akheh. Above on the left there are four names—Aply, Paser, . . . ba (!), and Remeser. On the right likewise were four names to only three figures, viz., Saty, Merry (?), Ramay, and Ra.

In the lower compartment is the measuring of the grain, in this case with very interesting religious accompaniments, which seem to be quite new. The corn-measure is a circular bucket, tapering to the top; the bands are clear enough, but not the sash. Only two officers are figured here, but four are named, each with the title 'measurer.'

The names are Pahmese, Huy, Merry (?), and Hat, a mulattised group. . . . hat is crowded in between the instruments upon the corn. These names throughout are characteristic of the second half of the XVIIIth dynasty.

On the left, upon a wooden stool, is a figure of Tharmathis, the serpent-goddess of the

---

1 Mr. T. Ashby was good enough to obtain for me the excellent photograph reproduced in Fig. 1, and for permission to publish it I am indebted to the courtesy of Professor F. Brissi, director of the Musei Civici at Bologna. In the catalogue of the Musei Civici di Bologna, Catalogo di Antichità Egizie descritte dal Prof. Cav. Giovanni Knobel-Scello the slab is described on p. 157, No. 1912, and the hieroglyphs are printed but no figure given. The monument formed part of the original collection at Bologna given by Pelagio Palagi, but nothing further appears to be known of its provenance. In the catalogue it is described as 'frammento di stele in calcaren, alto 0'67, largo 0'69.' Mr. Petrie considers it to be a votive harvest tablet, complete.

2 Originals of both the XIIIth and XVIIIth dynasty were found by Petrie at Abydos (Koehl, Gewob und Hauwass, p. 29, Pl. IX, Fig. 11).

---

5 A sweeper is usually figured here.

---

7 The title 'measurer' denotes a vocation or profession, not merely their action in the scene. The measurers must have been officials of the government or local administration or else representatives of some great landlord such as the temple of Amun of Thebes. The threshing was presumably done by the farmers whenever the measuring was for the administration. It is not easy to determine whether the offering to Thermathis was part of the rejoicings of the farmers or made on behalf of the administration for a good return and large measurement.
The implement used in the winnowing, etc., neatly and formally arranged on or in the heap of winnowed corn, are a handful corn-shovel, perhaps not figured elsewhere, flanked by a pair of hand-scoops and a pair of sweepers, with another pair of scoops on either side; on the left is also a three-pronged fork, apparently that used to keep the corn straight on the threshing-floor. I do not know of any parallel to this appearance of the implements in the scene of measuring the corn, and it is no doubt to be connected with the presence of Themis.

It is abundantly clear that whatever practical utilities may have originally caused the planting of the pylon in Egypt, assuredly the ceremony became a religious one. The shovel, the winnow-boards, the sweepers, are votive offerings dedicated to the goddess; their intent is the same as the bowl of fruits. The presence of the goddess reminds us of Demeter in the Idyll; her snake body even recalls Demeter’s snake. Demeter herself as an earth divinity may have once had snake-form; in any case the snake remains her vehicle.

The best commentary and illustration of the Bologna sculptured slab are, as Mr. Griffith has indicated, the harvest-scenes on the tomb of Paheri (Fig. 2) at El Kab, which is dated within a few decades of 1500 B.C. Paheri was a scribe of the accounts of corn and a portion of his tomb is decorated with agricultural scenes. These scenes speak for themselves. In the lowest row of the portion here reproduced we have scenes of ploughing and sowing, in the mid-most grain is reaped with sickles to the right, to the left flux is pulled up by men and women, the earth cleaned from its roots, the stems tied in sheaves, and later the seed-heads torn off with a comb; in the topmost row is a corn-heap high at the circumference, depressed in the middle where the oxen tread, a boy with a branch or broom sweeps in the strayed stalks.

---

6 For the name Themis see Spiegelberg, Alg. u. Or. Eigennamen aus Mumienpapiern, p. 12.
7 For this and other details compare the scenes in the tomb of Paheri at El Kab (see Fig. 2), published by Tyler and Griffith in the Xth memoir of the Egypt Exploration Fund, 1884, Pl. III.; also scenes in Wilkinson, Ancient Egyptian (Birch’s edition), Vol. II., p. 429, P raise, Monu ments, Pl. XLIII (= Prince, Art Egyptian, Tomes II., Pl. 29).
8 The great tombs of the Middle Kingdom contain no winnowing scene of any interest. The Old Kingdom scenes are described by Erman in his Egypten, pp. 574-5, with references: hand-scoops, sweepers, three-pronged forks (for winnowing) and scoops are used, and in some cases a bowl on the corn-heap or on a stand near by probably contains an offering of first-fruits to Themis. Unfortunately the reproduction of archaeological detail in the plates of Lepsius’ Denkmäler is not quite trustworthy.
9 Eleventh Memoir, Egypt Exploration Fund, Tyler and Griffith, 1884. The Tomb of Paheri at El Kab, Pl. III., pp. 12-14. To this memoir I must refer for the full account of the paintings, and in it are given the text and translation of the delightful little songs to the labourers and even the oxen which alternate with the scenes depicted.
Next, to the left is the winnowing scene. The winnowing is done by tossing the threshed grain into the air with pairs of shovels precisely like those depicted in Fig. 3. Excavation in Egypt has brought to light pairs of shovels of exactly this character: they are made of slightly different shape for the right and left hand respectively. They find perhaps their last surviving descendant, as Mr. Bousquet pointed out to me, in the beards with which

---

**Fig. 2.**—Harvest Scenes from the Tomb of Paheri.

the gardener of to-day picks up his new-mown hay. They are little more than an enlarged form of hand. One of the labourers is sweeping the grain together with a broom which also closely resembles the broom erected on the corn-heap (Fig. 1). Finally, planted on the great heap of corn to the left is not a shovel but a scribe taking account of the measurement of the corn.

It is somewhat disappointing that, as the pylon is shown so clearly erected on the Bologna slab, we find no instance on the tomb of Paheri or, so far as I am aware, on any Egyptian wall-painting of its actual use. In all the agricultural scenes known to me it is the sole-shaped shovels which are employed. The sieve and the three-pronged fork are well shown in a scene from a tomb at Sakkarah (Cairo). 8a

In the matter of the pylon the gap left by ancient Egypt is filled by

---

8 Dr. Flinders Petrie, *Kahun, Abydos and Hemamieh*, 1890; *Edfu*, p. 129, Pl. IX, 31; and again at the XlIIth dynasty.

8b Perrot and Chipiez, *Ancient Egypt*, Fig. 88.

*Note: Shovels are found in tombs of the XlIIth.*
modern Arcadia. The spade-shaped shovel reproduced in Fig. 3 was bought by Mr. R. C. Bosanquet at Tripolis in Arcadia; it is rudehewn out of the native fir and is called by the natives ϑωράκι. It has a double use: with a very long handle it is employed for lifting bread out of an oven; with a slightly shorter handle it serves for winnowing. It is the counterpart of the fan erected in the corn-heap. It is at once obvious that an implement such as that in Fig. 3 might easily be confused with an oar of the paddle shape. On p. 305 of my former article I noted that He säcious defined τηρίναξ as 'the plymn of grain' and that Eustathius believed the plymn of Homer to be an instrument with three or five prongs, an instrument substantially the same as the Cretan θωράκι. I was unable then to decide whether the implement confused by the Iansman in the Odyssey with an oar, had teeth like the Cretan θωράκι, or was a simpler form of shovel with a long handle. I now unhesitatingly decide in favour of the shovel and am convinced that the prescribed planting of the oar in honour of Poseidon was a ritual replica of the planting of Demeter's shovel-fan.

How is it then that the ancients themselves, as I previously pointed out, constantly confused the pronged τηρίναξ with the plain spade-shovel? I am again indebted to Mr. Bosanquet for solving the difficulty. He writes to me that the Cretan θωράκι is now made from a wooden spade imported from a Black

---

10 Cambridge University Museum of general and local Arch. and Ethn. No. 1994, 61. The implements reproduced in Figs. 3-6, 8, and 19 are published by the kind permission of the Director of the Museum, Baron Anatole von Hugel, and the beautiful drawings from which they are reproduced I owe to the kindness of Mr. Hugh Stewart and Miss Edith Crum.

11 The long-handled oven-shovel is known in English and Scotch dialect as a polt. In Old French polle is from Latia pola. On a sarcophagus of Imperial date in the Medici garden at Rome a bakur is represented putting a leaf into an oven with such a post (John, Ber. d. Sachs. Gesellschaft, 1887, Pl. XII, l). Mr. Paton tells me that he heard a Folk-tale recounted by a woman from Constantinople with the Odyssey incident included, and in it the winnowing fan became a bakur's post (ϑωράκι, ϑωράκινα). The shift from the country to the town implement is very natural.

12 As regards the spelling of the modern Greek form Mr. Bosanquet writes: 'I made out that θωράκι is the accepted Cretan form: θωράκε is dialect, probably confused to East Crete, θωράκε simply a misspelling.
Sea port and trimmed into the tooth-shape at home. The Arcadian makes a similar spade but leaves it toothless. In a word the δρονάξι is a modified φτωάρι, hence the confusion of commentators and lexicographers. At Tripolis in Arcadia they use not only the spade-wimnower (φτωάρι), but also a two-pronged fork known locally as διαπάρι (from διαπάρω). The two-pronged fork is also in use at Sikyon and called διπόρι. The word is according to Mr. Bosanquet a genuine survival, not a classical form revived.

the Sikyon peasants are illiterate Albanians and such Greek as they had was thoroughly ἀπουσιολογέον. On enquiry at Sikyon the name δρονάξι was not recognized, elsewhere on the mainland the word ἄλκτρωτηρ is said to be in use. The διαπάρι is made from a natural forked bough; just such an instrument (Fig. 4) Mr. Bosanquet found in use for turning over straw in a threshing-floor near Candia; the surface of the wood is polished with long use.10

In Teneriffe Crete, Sikyon Arcadia, it would seem, then, two winnowing implements are in use, (1) some form of spade toothed or untoothed, (2) some form of fork, the number of prongs varying. Mr. Hasluck kindly draws my attention to the fact that in Bithyni a toothed spade with five prongs is used for winnowing. It closely resembles the δρονάξι of Crete.14 As to Macedonia Mr. Abbott kindly tells me that during the threshing of the grain which is done by ponies the stalks of corn which lie scattered several inches thick are turned over with a two-pronged fork formed of a young tree with leaves, or with a shop-made fork armed with several prongs. The latter instrument differs from the Cretan δρονάξι inasmuch as it is a real wooden fork not a half spade. The actual winnowing is done with a wooden

---

10 Harvey, 1806, 62. In this respect it is a contrast with the rough newly-hewn surface of the winnow-spade in Fig. 3, the ground-up condition of which has been skillfully shown in the drawing. The δρονάξι of Crete had to be sawn across for convenience of transport, and unhappily the handle portion was temporarily lost; this is indicated in the drawing by dotted lines.

14 Danzé, Le Tore du Monde, iii. pp. 135, 136. Dr. Martin Nilsson kindly tells me that in S.W. Sweden a three-pronged fork was in use of a shape: I have not seen elsewhere the handle continued formed the central prong and two short side-prongs parallel to the centre are attached by transverse bars forming a kind of lattice work.
shovel (πτώρα pronounced as φεύρα). A woman generally helps the winnowers. She stands on the threshing-floor holding a rough hand-broom made of a bunch of dried twigs with which she sweeps the struggling 'chaff and grain.' In this respect she is paralleled by the Egyptian sweeper in Fig. 2.

Palestine can also show the two forms of winnowing implement, the spade or shovel and the fork. In Fig. 5 we have an implement much less rude than those already mentioned (p. 247): it is a five-pronged fork of somewhat spade-like shape. The fork shown side by side with the shovel n

---

17 Cambridge Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Inv. 1906, 63. Brought from Abilhamah in S. Palestine by Mr. MacAlister.
18 Hastings, Dict. of the Bible, s.v. Agriculture. Dr. Hastings kindly sent me the original drawing reproduced in Fig. 6.
in Fig. 6 is differently made, the prongs being tied on to the stem instead of being nailed to a cross-board. According to Dr. Paterson, these two implements represent the 'shovel and the fan' of Isaiah 26. The mixture left by the threshing and consisting of corn, chaff, and broken straw was turned about and shaken with a wooden fork, and advantage was taken of the wind to separate the grain from the lighter material. At the later stage the fork was less needed, than the fan, a kind of shovel; finally the grain was cleaned by sieves; the prophet Isaiah inverts the order of the proceeding placing the shovel (rabath) before the fork (mizreh). The translation in the authorized version of mizreh by 'fan' is somewhat misleading, as few persons connect a 'fan' with a fork.

We are now in a position to discuss our second important ancient monument.

2.—The Stratified Vase found near Phæistos (Fig. 7).

The frieze, with which this remarkable vase is decorated is explained by Sig. Savigoni who was the first to publish it as a warlike procession. The suggestion had been made to Sig. Savigoni that the scene represented a harvest procession, but this suggestion was rejected. The trident-shaped implements he explained as spears, the hooked implements set transversely as battle-axes. Mr. Bosanquet was the first to publish his opinion, independently arrived at, that the scene was a harvest procession and that the trident-shaped implements were ἄρρασκα. Since then Dr. Raymond Weill has discussed the date and affinities of the vase, and he writes 'Il parait tout à fait impossible qu'un pareil objet puisse être une arme. C'est un instrument

---

17. Isaiah 30: 28, in Delitzsch's commentary on Isaiah 2nd edit. pp. 707—708 the word rendered fan is explained as a six-pronged fork; and cf. Vogelstein, Landwirtschaft in Palästina, p. 68.
18. Savigoni, Monumenti dei Linaci, 1903, Tav. I and II.
19. Weill, Rev. Arch. 1904, p. 52. Dr. Weill is chiefly concerned with the date and ethnical affinities of the vase. He concludes, 'le vase de Phœistos appartient à cette période de l'apogée de la civilisation mycénienne, dite période de la XIXe dynastie.'
The consensus of archeological opinion in favor of a harvest-festival is strong, but so long as the trident-implements were compared with the forked spade (θπιάς) used in Crete and published in my last article, some misgiving might remain. I return to the question now because I hope that the Palestine fork in Fig. 6 will bring instant conviction. Side by side with the trident-implements the analogy is, I think, irresistible.

I had hoped to solve the riddle of the transverse instrument: is it axe, sickle or pick? The axe may I think be rejected. As to the sickle, Dr. Flinders Petrie points out to me that the blade is too short and the tip would prevent its making a cut. This curious and well defined tip points to some sort of pick or hoe. But if the three-pronged implements are winnowers we need some instrument used at harvest. Dr. Petrie asks: Is it possible that they rooted up the corn-stalk whole? Then the pick could be used to crack up the earth and loosen the roots? This would account for there being no sickles: Rooting up in place of threshing is not an uncommon practice on a light soil or where long straw is wanted. Flax was so rooted up in Egypt (Fig. 2) and Mr. Bosanquet tells me corn is often rooted up to this day in Crete, but, so far as I yet know, without the aid of a hoe. The difficulty still remains that a metal instrument attached to the θπιάς would spoil its balance and increase the labour of using it. Dr. Petrie’s conjecture is the only one known to me that explains the curved tip. I therefore by his kind permission note it here, but must leave the final solution of the question to others less ignorant of primitive implements than myself.

So far the various forms of forks and spade-shovels have led us far away from the ἱκνεύμα. The small scoop-shovel in Fig. 8 may serve as a link to lead us back. On p. 307 of my former article I noted that Hesychius in
explaining the word δέκτης says: 'the Cyprians give this name to a measure.' In Coptic Mr. Walter Crum tells me the word for winnowing-fan is very rare.

It appears to be also the name of a measure. The object in Fig. 8 is not used in 'winnowing,' but in measuring grain: it is called not πτερύγιον but σάκουλα and was bought by Mr. Bassanquet at Candia. Drawn in profile it is

8 Mr. W. Crooke kindly tells me that in Northern India the fan or winnowing-stove is called sāp, a word which comes from the Sanskrit sharpa which again is derived from the root sharpa, to measure. The Indian fan is figured by Mr. Crooke, in his 'Glossary of the N.W. Provinces.' The shape is different from that of the French fans but the process of final winnowing is as described by Mr. Crooke, identical. The rough winnowing is done by men, the final cleaning with the sāp by women.
singularly like the Egyptian winnowing boards in Fig. 2, but it is a genuine scoop. It is also, barring its handle, very similar in outline to the regular liknon figured in my former paper (Fig. 7). It was there noted that these winnowing-baskets from France, once actually used for winnowing, are now imported to Cambridge for use merely as baskets.

It is curious that the liknon proper, in use at the present day in France, seems to have died out in Greece, leaving its place to be supplied, as will be seen later, by the sieve. The latest representation of a liknon proper that can lay any claim to be called classical is that represented in Fig. 9, from a Roman ash-urn from Igel, and now in the Provincial Museum at Trèves. The liknon appears as the cradle of the Holy Child on a sarcophagus in the local museum at Arles, and again in the sculptured decoration of the tower above the choir of the Cathedral at Chartres. A careful search among mediaeval and renaissance representations of the Nativity would doubtless reveal many more instances.

In my former paper (p. 313) I noted that it was about the liknon only that mystic associations gathered; though the shovel as we have seen was planted as a religious rite, no one attempted to mysticise the fork or shovel. The reason is now abundantly clear: with fork and shovel were performed the first rough processes of winnowing and they were in the main wielded by men on the open threshing-floor—the liknon and the sieve were for the final sifting, they were home implements and used mainly by women. So it is to this day in Greece: the sieve has wholly supplanted the liknon, and so Mr. W. Crooke kindly tells me it is in modern India. Every element of mysticism that gathered round the Greek liknon can be paralleled in India in the mysticism of the sûpe, the local fan. In India the sûpe or sieve is

---

No. 193. My attention was drawn to this monument by the kindness of Dr. Hans Gräven.
*Observed by Mrs. Hugh Stewart.
the first cradle of the baby and in Bombay the winnowing-fan in which a newly born child is laid is used on the fifth day for the worship of Satt vàli. All through upper India at low-caste marriages the bride’s brother accompanies the pair as they revolve in the marriage shed and sprinkles parched grain over them out of a sieve as a charm for good luck and a means of scaring the demon who raises barreness. So Irish brides in old times used to be followed by an attendant bearing high above the heads of the couple a sieve filled with meal, a sign of the plenty to be in the home and an omen of good luck and the blessing of children. For such a purpose the French liknon would have been far too heavy, but the small fan reproduced in Fig. 10, made of bamboo basket-work and used for winnowing rice, would have been very suitable. The specimen in Fig. 10 was obtained in Malacca; it could easily be carried in one hand.

Suidas, it will be remembered (J.H.S. 1903, p. 309), defined the liknon as a keškimén or sieve. He is not so inaccurate as he at first appears though probably his notions on winnowing implements were not very precise. A keškimén or sieve is not necessarily a pierced sieve; its name connotes separation, but not the particular method by which separation is effected. Moreover, I learn through the kindness of Mr. Dawkins that even a pierced sieve is to this day in Greece used as a liknon. Mr. Xanthoudides, Ephor of antiquities at Candia, thus described the final purification of corn for the mill (the expression for the operation is κενέω = dëcsco): "The woman takes a sieve, but when the sieve is shaken the grain remains in the sieve and is not passed through it, the small impurities, e.g. sand and dust, are sieved away through the holes, the lighter impurities such as chaff and husks (φλούδια) come to the top and are thrown out by the hand." The ancient name of the process was, Mr. Xanthoudides added, ἀναβασμός. The actual liknon with its one open side does not survive, but the process goes on though supplemented by the holes.

The perforated sieve in fact, as an instrument easier to handle, seems everywhere in the modern basin of the Mediterranean to have supplanted the liknon proper. On the West coast of Asia Minor Mr. Paton tells me corn (i.e. wheat and barley), after being winnowed with the φινώμι and the ἑρώδεις, is pressed through a large sieve (βολίατης) made of gut. This is set on a stick of the giant fennel (ἀνάρτυχα = νάρθηξ) placed upright on the threshing-floor. Wheat is afterwards by the women at home passed through another sieve (σφαρίζω = σφαιρίζει) made of wire. Other and finer sieves for meal are made of bolting cloth and pierced kid-hide.

Finally as regards the sieve made of pierced hide Mr. Paton makes a suggestion of great interest. He asks: "Is not the tympanon derived from the leather sieve and consequently used in the rites of Kybele and Bacchus?" This it seems to me may be the solution of a difficulty that has long puzzled me. Among the "tokens" of the mysteries of the Great Mother in her Asiatic form as
Cybele: occur the following words: 1 have eaten from the timbrel, I have drunk from the cymbal. A musical instrument does not commend itself to the modern mind as either cup or platter, but if timbrel or tympanon be of skin and be in effect an unpierced leather sieve, the difficulty as to eating disappears.

Very briefly to resume, there are, it appears, three main processes by which winnowing can be effected: (1) the throwing of the grain into the air, (2) the shaking of it so that impurities fall out and the grain remains in the basket, (3) the passing of it through a perforated sieve. Operation (1) is performed by πτέρων, shovels or forks, operation (2) in a basket of special form, (3) in a sieve proper, i.e. perforated. Operation (1) is performed in the open air mainly though not wholly by men, and it was never mysticized. Operations (2) and (3) tend to pass over into each other, were often performed in the house and mainly though again not wholly by women. The implements used in these two last operations, likion and sieve, became symbols of fertility and of that purification which to the ancient mind was essential to the promotion of fertility; hence their mysticism.

JANE ELLEN HARRISON.

<sup>21</sup> Clem. Alex. Protre. II. 15. τὰ σύμβολα τῆς and others of Eleusis I may refer to my Pro-μυθές τῶν ων. ἡ τομάτων ἔφασμεν, ἡ ἁγωνία, pp. 155 and 336.

ADDENDUM.

Since the above was written Mr. Alan Wace has kindly noted for me a number of monuments in Rome on which likion are represented. Two of these are of special interest and I much regret that I did not receive them in time for publication. They are two Hermaphrodites, one male, the other female, in the Lateran Museum (Heilig, Cat. 663, 664. Benndorf and Schöne 187, 188. Reinach, Rep. ii. p. 525). Each Hermaphrodite carries a likion full of fruits and also, an interesting point, each supports on the shoulder a child. Here we have the double symbolism of child and fruit. The Hermaphrodite with the likion may have a very ancient lineage, Dr. Arthur Evans (Myce-nean Tree and Pillar Cult, p. 115. Fig. 9) notes that the baetyl beneath the altar-table from Cyrennaica supports a likion-shaped offeritory basket.
THE SO-CALLED 'SARDANAPALUS.'

[Plate X.]

This interesting type, of which six replicas are known, has received comparatively little attention at the hands of archaeologists. One authority (see Roscher, Lexikon, pp. 1117-8) treats it as an example of a Hellenistic statue of the bearded Dionysus, adducing numismatic evidence for purposes of comparison. There is, however, no evidence of the erection of cultus statues of the Bearded Dionysus either during the later fourth century or the Hellenistic age, and this work alone is quoted as at once the justification and the example of the assertion. Nor can the coins be considered copies of contemporary statues: they are mere types, possibly reminiscences of existing works, certainly nothing more. No better instance of the use made by fourth century die-cutters of a cultus statue could be given than the Olympic Zeus as he appears on the coinage of Alexander compared with the representation on the famous Elean coin of the time of Hadrian.

A view which has met with wide acceptance refers the statue to Praxiteles. Klein follows Treu in considering it the Liber Pater mentioned by Pliny, a view also held by Arndt and S. Reimach.

Yet, even if the archaic character of hair and beard and the richly draped figure could have been brought into harmony with his work as we know it, the present statue cannot be a copy of the Liber pater, which is named among the earliest instances of Praxiteles' masterly work in bronze (Praxiteles...fert lumen et eam aere pulcherrimo opera...et Liberum patrem). Again, this Liber pater would almost certainly be a youthful Dionysos, a subject thoroughly Praxitelean. Klein indeed says 'Der “Liber Pater” der Pinnasstelle lenkt unsere Blicke vom jugendlichen auf den bartigen Gott,' but

---

1 Naples, Figured, Reimach Titre ancienne, Pl. 197; Wolters, Jahrb., 1888, p. 171.
2 Athens, Monumentl. No. 714.
3 Palermo, id. 557.
4 Tiflis, Allure, 1820 (unpublished).
5 Vaticanum. Denkm. No. 581. It is from the inscription incised on this example by a seventeenth century hand that the type has acquired the name of Sardanapalus.
7 Praxiteles, p. 419.
8 N.H. xxxiv. 89.

---

*Eisenacher Text zu No. 557.

*Titre ancienne, p. 158.

*Of the description of a Praxitelean Dionysos by Callisthenes, Ephebian 5, where he is described as like the Dionysos of the Bacchae, ivy-crowned and clad in a nemes; this was also a bronze work and possibly that to which Pliny refers. See also Diod. iv. 8, 2, A'pollof' s' (bronze éparyon òtò òtò Daimonovtov geuètòs, tòv và polaioi kai katakymnìa và tov òpíxhíon pòntov xoríntos), tòv òtò òtò pòntov xoríntos, kai xoríntos và vío.
Flavius systematically uses the phrase as equivalent to Dionysos, with no reference to the bearded god, as the following passage conclusively proves: *Prioris [Sophiodori] est Mercuvius Liberum patrem in infantia nutriens. Finally,*

*FIG. 1.—HEAD OF THE 'SACHIANAPALUS' OF THE BRITISH MUSEUM.*

...with regard to the Praxitelean attribution it may be said that of the features mentioned by Reinach as Praxitelean, the hair finds its nearest analogues in fifth century works, not, as he asserts, in the Aphrodite of Cnidus, while we have
no example of a Praxitelean beard, and his comparison between that of the Dionysos and the drapery of the Hermes is hard to justify. Further, the Naples head of which Remach speaks is the most modified of existing replicas; if there is in it, as he maintains, "no trace of archaism," archaism there certainly is in the Vatican example and in the remains of hair and beard on the Athenian torso.

With regard to the choice of the British Museum statue here, by kind permission of Mr. Cecil Smith, first adequately published (Pl. X. and Fig. 1), a word must be said. Dr. Arnold goes so far as to say that it can scarcely be considered a replica; "nicht allein ist die Gewandung aus dem noch strengen und einfachen Stil des vaticanischen Exemplares durch reichere Faltenwicklung und Bewegung im Umriiss und Bewegte umgesetzt, sondern vor allem ist der Kopf unter Beibehaltung der Hauptsätze des alten Typus im Détail wesentlich umgestaltet." This modified character of the head especially must be borne in mind when considering the position and date of the work. The Athenian torso, though of commonplace workmanship, is yet extremely valuable from its discovery in the Theatre of Dionysos and its severe character, especially in the hair and beard, which contrast strongly with the softness and fullness conspicuous in the British Museum and other modified replicas, which are less trustworthy from their softness of feature and emphasis of detail in the drapery. The ivy wreath in our example is probably also a modification, as it appears in no other replica. In spite of these objections, the British Museum statue is here reproduced as far less known than the "Sardanapalus" of the Vatican, as being entirely unaltered, and as probably more accurate in its treatment of the chiton, especially in its fall over the left foot, a point to be dealt with later.

The god stands with one leg advanced, clad in a linen chiton and heavy himation, his hair bound with a taenia and gathered in a knot on the neck; while locks on either side fall loose on the shoulders. The right hand holds a thyrsos, the left is wrapped in the drapery. There is an absence of restlessness in the quiet pose of the arms and the stately lines of the drapery that suggests the fifth century rather than the fourth, an impression strengthened by the archaic treatment of the hair and the severity of the features in the Vatican and Uffizi examples. The brow is smooth, the line of division clearly marked, the eyebrows gently arched, the eyes set far apart with clear-cut lids, the nose (in the R.M. example alone unaltered) broad and straight, the lips rather full, serene, and passionless, the cheeks simply modelled. The hair, parted over the forehead, waves back in separate strands, and the shoulder-locks and beard are treated with similar simplicity. The drapery varies considerably in details, but the scheme is simple and dignified, while

---

7 The statue has never been reproduced save in the poor woodcut in Roscher, Lexikon, etc., and on a small scale in Sybel, Weltgesch., d. Kunst, etc.
8 Remach, text to No. 557.
9 Adjectives less applicable to the work of Praxiteles than "strong and einfach," it would be hard to find.

9 The more dramatic character of the R.M. head, its deep-set eyes and greater depth of modelling in brow and cheeks, are misleading, and due to the copyist, no even the advocates of a Praxitelean original admit.
our example is especially valuable for its careful working-out of textures. This wavy treatment of the chiton is found in many works of the later fifth century, e.g., the Hera Jacobean and the Churamonti "Flora," while the motive of the advanced leg, its shape defined through the drapery, occurs in the same class of works. In the British Museum example the left foot appears under the chiton, and the detail of the linen folds falling over the foot is so much in keeping with the statue, and its absence so much felt in the Vatican replica, that it probably belongs to the original. It is interesting to note that this feature occurs in all the works enumerated here as akin to the Dionysos.

With regard to the head, the nearest parallels may again be found in Pheidian and post-Pheidian works. The Zeus of Olympia, as shown on the well known coin of Elis, is extraordinarily similar; there is the same turning-back of the hair from the forehead, the same parallel locks waving over the crown, the same arrangement of tresses on the shoulders, though the hair behind flows loose instead of being confined on the nape of the neck. A further comparison is of great interest. A late coin of Athens (Fig. 2) reproduces on a large scale the head of the seated chryselephantine Dionysos of Alcamenes, here reproduced from Imhoof and Gardner's Illustration of the unique specimen in Herr Lobbecke's possession. This second great cultus statue of the Pheidian circle resembles our Dionysos in the treatment of hair and beard (though the latter is shorter) and in the general type of countenance, and a comparison of the profiles is highly instructive.

The roughness of the coin prevents close analysis of details, but the likeness of the "Sardinaeus" is undeniable. On the other hand, a comparison between the head of our statue and the Asclepios of Melos in the British Museum emphasizes the contrast between the Dionysos and a cultus work of the early fourth century, and makes the suggestion that the former is a work of later date quite untenable.

The Praxitelean view having been discussed, the theory of Walters, attributing the work to Cephisodotus, calls for comment. What we know of his style is based on the Eirene and Plutus at Munich, but it can for several

---

19 Other instances are the Aphrodite of Cnossus published in *RMS.* 2224, 1901, p. 21; the Hope, Athenaios, and Parnese Athenaios; and the "Schulthessiana Borgeon." The hanging sleeve is also characteristic.
20 The same treatment occurs in the Maenad of the Erechtheum.
21 Imhoof and Gardner, *Num. Chms.* Pl. CC 5. For the full-length figure reproduced on Athenian coin, see Imhoof and Gardner, *ibid.* Pl. CC 1-4.
22 None of the replicas have hitherto been reproduced in profile; for permission to have this statue so photographed I am again indebted to Mr. Cecil Smith. The lighting of the statue, in its present position, makes a satisfactory photograph of the profile impossible.
23 Deliberate anachronism was, of course, unknown to the age of Praxiteles.
reasons hardly form a basis for further identifications; (d) it is a poor copy of a second-rate original, and can hardly be made the ground for attributing to Cephasoloton a work so different in character; (e) Cephasoloton does not seem to have been a sculptor of great religious force, nor do we know that he was influenced by Phidian tradition; (c) he was chiefly a worker in bronze; (d) his date is against the attribution.

All things considered, it seems a fair inference that the Dionysos was a work of the later fifth century, probably, from the fact that a copy was there discovered, set up in the great Theatre of Dionysos towards the close of the fifth century. We may further conclude that the original was carried off to Rome—five out of our six copies were found in Italy—and replaced by the statue whose torso still survives. Its analogies with Phidian and post-Pheidian works have been pointed out, and from its likeness to his seated Dionysos we may perhaps suggest that he sculptor Alcamenes, whose works were so dear to the Roman amateur, even sunt operis Athenis comprobantur in tabulis sacris.

Since this paper was first written a copy of the Hermes Propylæus of Alcamenes, found at Pergamon, has been published by Dr. Conze. Its importance is very great, especially as confirming the archaic treatment known by numismatic evidence to have been used by Alcamenes for his Dionysos, and by Phedias for the Zeus. With its aid and that of the coins the style of Alcamenes in dealing with cultus statues can be clearly understood, and its discovery does, I venture to think, confirm the tentative attribution to that sculptor, based mainly on numismatic grounds, of the 'Sardanapalus' and its replicas.

One further point needs mention. Not only are six copies known to exist, but several archaic works appear to be derived from the same original, a further proof of its celebrity. Of these works two may be instanced here, the priest of Dionysos, clad in chiton and himation, his left arm swathed in the drapery, of the Dresden base, and the Dionysos of the so-called Icarus relief. If, as above suggested, the original stood in the theatre of Dionysos, it may well have been widely copied in Hellenistic times, while a subsequent migration to Rome would account for the number of copies found in Italy.

We may then claim that copies exist of a cultus statue from the hand of a member of the Phidian circle, possibly that of Alcamenes. If so, not only is this the only instance of an existing copy of a cultus figure of the period on such a scale, but its dignity and nobility of type may reflect, however faintly, the spirit of that crowning work of Greek art, with which it has much in common, the Zeus of Pheidias.

KATHARINE A. MCDOWALL.

18 The Theatre, though completed by Lycia, c. 336, belongs in its general design to an earlier age (Stader, Ancient Athens, p. 426). Statues of Dionysos stood in the sanctuary at the back of the stage buildings, as well as in the temples hard by (Plut. 1. 20, 3; and Feuer, Commentary, pp. 212-216).

19 Phin. N.H. xxi. 18.
20 Riecke's restoration of the coins (Etruscan Numismatics, p. 10) as the anchor for the Alcamenes statue is now shown to be hopeless.

Dendy and Soglio: Fig. 2932; J. and L., Zeitung, 1855, II. (186), Dukin, 196.
THE EARLY CHRISTIAN ART OF ISAURA NOVA

The following paper is due entirely to the suggestion, advice, and guidance of my father. But he wishes me to say that he has given me simply the same help that he has already given to many and is anxious to give to others still.

The aim of this paper is to show by examples that there is a native and indigenous art peculiar to a certain part of Asia Minor, the only part I have yet seen, namely, the district around the city of Nova Isaura. It has already been observed both by Prof. Ramsay and by others, that certain artistic forms are characteristic of certain districts of Asia Minor. In many places these forms have persisted from ancient times down almost to the present day. Thus all the carpets and embroideries woven at the village of Ladik (the ancient Laodicea Katakekaumene), nine hours north of Iconium, until the middle of last century, when the old manufacture ceased, show a vase of particular shape, while another vase of a different form is peculiar to the carpets made at Mudjin in Cappadocia. In another village of Lycaonia, every carpet and embroidery is marked by a row of little houses. The same is the case with the patterns used in several other places. I am told by friends that the carpets still woven at Kars-Bunar are recognisable at a glance by those who know the pattern characteristic of the place. Similarly we found and purchased at Dorla a piece of old embroidery, handed down for generations in a family of the village, which shows the same scheme of ornament and several of the same decorative details as the sepulchral monuments published in this paper.

Prof. Strzygowski's writings in support of his theory that the art of Asia Minor exercised a strong influence on the development of late Roman and Byzantine Christian art are likely to concentrate attention on this subject at the present time. To prove this theory it is necessary in the first place to show that there was a native indigenous art in Asia Minor, existing independently of Greek or Roman influence. This proof I attempt to give for the small district of Nova Isaura. The best way to do so is to set before the reader a sufficient number of examples of the Isaurian style. I shall endeavour also to point out the salient characteristics of each monument.

In 1890 Prof. Ramsay, in company with Messrs. Hogarth and Headlam, came by accident to Dorla, mistaking it for another village where they intended to stay the night. The sun set as they reached Dorla, but they noticed a number of inscriptions, and copied a few of them in the fading light before hurrying on to their camp at the village of Almasun, two and a half hours distant. To this fortunate accident is due the discovery of this site. Though Prof. Ramsay has been collecting information for three years in the Konia district with regard to ancient remains, no one of the hundreds who have given him reports about ancient sites has ever mentioned Dorla. It seems to have remained entirely unnoticed. But in 1901, remembering the uncopied
inscriptions of 1890, he went back to Dorla and found about fifty inscribed stones, with remains of other kinds sufficient to prove the site and reveal something of the history of Nova Isaura.

On looking at these monuments, one is struck over and over again by the love of decoration for its own sake which they indicate. They are variously and profusely ornamented, as far as one can see, merely because the engraver objected to leaving any part of the stone plain and unadorned. This love of ornament for ornament's sake is and always has been characteristic of Anatolian, and indeed of all Asiatic art. It is seen even at the present time, when the coarsest sacks bear ornamental patterns, and the very paper in which shopkeepers wrap their parcels is often adorned with coloured pictures.

There is no clue to the form of the monuments at Dorla. All the inscriptions and reliefs or patterns which are here published are on single blocks of stone, and though several of these blocks seem to be incomplete in themselves, and merely parts of large built tombs (as for example the tomb of Bishop Theophilus, where several other fragments of sculptured stone were found near the block which bears the inscription), it is not clear whether this was the case with all. It is possible and even probable that in many instances, particularly when the relatives of the deceased person were poor (cp. Figs. 26, 29, 35; etc.), the monument was simply a single block of stone.

1.—Dorla. In two parts; the right-hand piece is built into the wall of the mosque, the other, from which all the top is broken away, is in the cemetery on the opposite side of the stream. The former was found by Messrs. Ramsay, Hogarth, and Headlam in 1890, the latter by Prof. and Mrs. Ramsay in 1901.
The last letter of line 1 may be Ν, but only the upright line is certain. The reading at the end of lines 5 and 7 is also doubtful on the stone: the restoration given above does not suit the traces, which are as indicated in the epigraphic copy. This restoration was given by Mr. Souter in publishing the inscription from the first imperfect copy in the *Classical Review*, 1897, p. 96, and seems necessary, though we cannot read it on the stone. The last letter in the gap in l. 12 was either σ or ε, and the second last also was probably σ or ε, but the traces are very slight.

The importance of this inscription lies in the fact that it gives the name of the place—γῆν εὐτειχία Ἰσαῦρα, (for Ἰσαῦρα), i.e., the city of Isaura and the surrounding territory belonging to it. The name of the country is Isauria, but the city and the land belonging to the city are called Isaura, as Prof. Sterrett has pointed out, *Wolfe Expedition*, p. 150. Zenoobos was the most excellent among the young men of Isaura and its whole territory. Dorla therefore must be the site of the city Isaura. There were two towns of this name, Isaura Palaeas and Isaura Nea. Strabo, p. 368, calls them villages, meaning however not that they were small places, but that they were organized on the Asiatic village system instead of on the Greek political system. In other words, neither of them was a πόλις at the time when Strabo was writing, about 18-20 A.D. But Isaura Palaeas had become a city by the second century, when it was striking coins. The present inscription cannot refer to Isaura Palaeas, which lies fifteen or twenty miles away to the S.W. across the mountains; and thus Dorla must be the site of Isaura Nea, and Prof. Sterrett was not very far wrong when he placed Isaura Nea at Diöorma, a deserted site about twelve miles N.W. of Dorla, also situated on the extreme edge of the Isaurian highlands. The evidence for this lies in an inscription found at Diöorma mentioning Anna, the daughter of a senator of Isaura, who buried her son in Diöorma. But this inscription is not to be understood as showing that Anna lived in the city where her father was senator. He was a senator of Isaura, probably Palaeas Isaura, the great city of the country and the only one where there was a senate; and his daughter married one of the leading men in the town of Diöorma, where Prof. Ramsay is disposed to place the Byzantine bishopric Korma.
Prof. Ramsay thinks that the spelling Isara is not a mere slip for Isauro, but more likely an intentional way of representing the native pronunciation of the name, which was more like Isawra. In many words where a native sound, approximating to uren, occurred, the Greek form and spelling — very very much: e.g., Olba, Oros, Orba, etc. — represent a native Orwa or Ourwa.

The epitaph is superior to the commonplace metrical forms which are very frequent on tombstones in the country. The comparison of the dead Zenobios to the hero Hylas is neatly expressed for a village poet. But his ideas of quantity are defective — Hylas in line 1 must be scanned Hylas, and in line 10 he seems to think that the omission of a allows the scansion of Ἡράκλεας as a dactyl. ς must be inserted after πασανί in line 10. Hiatus is often disregarded. But these faults are venial compared with the crimes committed by many village poets in those times.

The ornament is a combination of two different and inconsistent types. The lower part consists of a sunk panel marked off by lines, and a border indicated by difference of level. This form is found very widely, and has nothing distinctive of the locality. Above this is ornament in the scheme characteristic of this district, many examples of which will be found in this paper. The fully expressed schema consists of a central arch or pediment flanked by two narrower pediments, supported on pillars, but the lower half of this schema is here suppressed to make room for the panel. On each side of the panel are five very conventional angular leaves, which also are usual in this district (examples in No. 27 and perhaps in No. 19; in No. 4 they are doubled).

Thus the decoration of the stone consists of three parts: (1) A sunk panel to receive the inscription after the type imported into Dorla with other ideas of the Graeco-Roman education; (2) above the panel the established and traditional type of Nova Isauro; (3) on each side of the panel an Isauroan ornament repeated in a meaningless way.

There is no single idea, no plan, no true design in the decoration. The parts are inconsistent with one another. The combination of elements from Greek and native art is quite unintelligent: the artist thinks only of decoration and ornament. Ornament for ornament's sake is the ruling principle in all Anatolian art; but ornamentation may be intelligent. Here it is unintelligent, and yet the result looked at as a whole has a distinctly decorative effect. Vine branches are represented trailing from a vase in the central arch, but the leaves are not vine leaves, and the branches have not a natural appearance.

The native and Isauroan character of a large part of the ornament makes it certain that this stone was carved by a native artisan; and it is an important observation to start from that there are two influences apparent in Nova Isauro, the indigenous custom and certain borrowed forms learned along with the general Graeco-Roman civilisation, which came by way of the great cities on the main lines of imperial communication and trade, especially Iconium.

The device of the sunk panel to receive the inscription is quite common
in Iconium. A very ornate example is published by Mr. Cronin in J.H.S. 1902, p. 361. With regard to the date of this inscription I may quote Prof. Ramsay's opinion.

'This Isaurian inscription probably belongs to the fourth century. I cannot think that so much command of Greek existed in Nova Isauria in the fifth century, when a bishop of Hadrianopoli Parygias (a city not very far distant and exposed to similar influences, but more educated, as being close to a great thoroughfare) had to get another person to sign for him because he did not know how to write (A.D. 451). The reason for the degeneration in knowledge and culture between the fourth and the fifth centuries lies in the general conditions and is almost universal in Asia Minor. On the other hand, this inscription is apparently later than No. 2; the lettering is much the same in form, but the art seems later and more under external influence. The end of the third century is not impossible, but the fourth century is the most probable date. A quite unusual command of the Greek language is shown in the metrical epitaphs of this district: if this epitaph and those in Nos. 41, 60, are compared with most of those found in such numbers in Central Anatolia, it will be observed that these are composed at home in the Isaurian territory, with superior knowledge and command of the language.'

2 (Figs. 2a, 2b).—Dorla. R. 1901 and 1904. Above the ornamental part of the stone—Novō [Δωλα έποσμέν τοις μακάροις πάπας τόις γεφυράτων και πάντων φι([Δολ. Nonilla, if that was the name—the part lost must have been only three or four letters—was probably the wife of the bishop.

Prof. Ramsay considers that this is one of the most interesting and important sepulchral monuments ever found in Asia Minor. The stone, a massive rectangular block 5 feet 1½ inches in length by 3 feet 0½ inches in height, was discovered by Prof. and Mrs. Ramsay in 1901 on the hill on the left or western bank of the stream that flows through the village. One of the long sides is an architectural ornament which takes the form of four columns supporting a round arch and two side pediments. The central arch is supported on pillars ornamented with a pattern in incised lines, and above it are two branches with leaves and bunches of grapes. The shape of these leaves is doubtful, as the stone is very much worn. They seem to be trefoils, but whether rounded or pointed it is impossible to say: they are probably intended for vine-leaves, but if so, the delicate points have been worn away. Below the arch is an open book, or rather a set of tablets opened; and in the central niche between the columns is a wreath tied above with a ribbon, and surrounding the inscription φι[λάτων ὥ μακάροις πάπας ὥ θεος φίλως; and the letters ΜΧ, for μεγαλοι χάριν. Each of the side-pediments has a round boss in the centre; and a garland hangs from the supporting pillars, and beneath it is the representation of a fish. All the ornament is in relief, with

---

1 In a paper on Isaurian inscriptions and topography intended to be published by Prof. Ramsay along with this paper, but postponed through want of space.
the exception of the ribbons supporting the garlands, and the fins of the fish, which are merely incised. The fins of the left fish were not visible on the stone, and have been restored from comparison with the other. The larger part of the epitaph is inscribed above the ornament, close to the upper edge of the stone. Several other examples of this simple style of monument, found in Lycania and Pisidia, will be published in the course of this paper, and seem to prove that it is of purely local origin.

The tomb is evidently that of a bishop. In the expression ὁ μακάριος πάπας, πάπας must be either the name or the title of the person buried there, probably the latter. Judging from the general character of Anatolian inscriptions, Prof. Ramsay came to the conclusion, in view of the stone in 1901, that it was not later than the second half of the third century, and that πάπας was the title. This opinion was afterwards confirmed by the fact that in one of the Amherst papyri ὁ μακάριος πάπας is obviously used as a title of the Bishop of Alexandria as early as A.D. 270–80. But this epitaph shows the remarkable peculiarity that the title supplants the actual name in imitation of the pagan custom, according to which a priest who became ἱερώνυμος (like the principal priests at Eleusis and in various of the great Anatolian cities) dropped his own name and was known simply by his title. This peculiarity is suggestive of a very early date; and that the stone is an early one, prior to the time of Constantine, is shown also by the lettering and by the general character of the epitaph and the ornament. The wording of the epitaph, τὸν ἱερώνυμον καὶ πάπας φίλον, is of an early Christian period, being full of human feeling, whereas the epitaphs applied to such persons as bishops afterwards became much more religious and stereotyped in character. Compare the tender expression

ἡματηρος φίλιος καὶ γόνος

applied by Aur. Xauthias to his son who died at the age of seven, in a Christian inscription of Rome, dated by the consulship of A.D. 238. The phrase πάπας φίλος is here used in an inscription which is undoubtedly Christian, and such moral sentiments are found on many Christian tombstones, but (as Prof. Ramsay remarks in Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, ii. p. 495) they cannot alone be taken as a proof of Christian origin. In some cases similar sentiments were inscribed on non-Christian tombs as a counterblast to Christianity. Thus at Tenelethyma, C.I.G. 3565 Μάρκου Πολιτήν Φιλοσόφου πάπας φίλον clearly belongs to the pagan philosophical reaction (on which compare Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, ii. p. 506 f. and an article in Expositor, Oct. 1904). It seems that they were originally Christian, and their occurrence on pagan stones is a proof of the strong influence which the new religion exerted even on its opponents. Another example is found in Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, ii. p. 386 f. No. 232. The expression πάπας φίλος occurs in an inscription of Tarsus, which may perhaps be restored [ἡ φίλος ἐκ τοῦ πάπας κ.τ.λ. Φιλοφόρος ὁ πάπας φίλος κ.τ.λ. The inscription continues in the ordinary style of epitaphs, though with some unusual features (published with some difference by Messrs. Heberdey and
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Wilhelm in *Wiener Abhandl. Denkchriften*, 1896, p. 5). It is evidently either Christian or of the reaction, when the aim was to show that paganism was superior to Christianity on its own lines. At Salonika τὸ ναὸς φίλων Θεοῦ Μάρτυρος is probably pagan (*Mitth. Inst. Athen*, 1896, p. 98). Θεοῦ φίλων is probably a play on Theophilos, the real name of the bishop.

The fish, the common symbol of the Christians in the early centuries, passed out of use at a comparatively early date, and the same is true of the open book which appears on this stone and which may represent the Bible. This symbol occurs also on several North-Phrygian tombs, which Prof. Ramsay published in the *Expositor* in 1888, arguing that they were Christian on account of the formula τῶν Θεοῦ σὺ μυ αἰεικρατος, which occurs in some of them and that the tablets must be understood to indicate the Bible. The present inscription may be regarded as complete confirmation of this argument, or at least of the first part of it: this class of gravestone is Christian.

The character of the ornament on this stone also points to an early date, probably the third century A.D. It seems at first sight to be an earlier stage of the elaborate decoration common on Byzantine and Roman sarcophagi of the fourth century, a row of figures standing in niches, with highly intricate and elaborate tracery and architectural ornament. Here we have the semi-architectural schema, without the human figures. But, as one stone after another is discovered, we see that the schema is a traditional type in Nova Isaura, characteristic of the place, which is likely to have lasted for centuries, varied, but never essentially changed. The fact that it is a simpler stage of the fourth century sarcophagus style would not, taken alone, prove anything about date. But this monument is very much larger than the other Dorla monuments, and represents an attempt to improve upon and elaborate the native type. New elements are introduced on this stone which are unknown on any of the other stones in Dorla; and yet it is indubitably among the very earliest of all the examples found in the village. This more ambitious style is a proof that more money, care, and work were spent on this stone. It was the tomb of an exceptional person (either through his wealth or through his rank) and it represented the highest stage of which local art was capable, elaborating the native schema by imported additions, especially the fish, that wide-spread symbol, which was certainly not invented in Nova Isaura, but introduced there from outside. Now, had this large and ambitious monument been built in the fourth century, it would probably have shown some of the Greco-Roman forms most characteristic of that time; taking into consideration the entire absence of those characteristic fourth century forms, and the fact that in the Dorla series this has all the appearance of being among the earliest, we must infer that it belongs to the third century.

The ornament scattered liberally over the surface of the stone contains various elements; but none of these are necessarily borrowed from a formed

---

1 The formula is always missing; but the
2 but it belongs to an older type, the ordinary
3 grave seems to have been the intention.
4 pagan hereina.
Græco-Roman art. The fish was taken as a symbol, not as an artistic element, and is placed on the tomb to be significant, and not merely to be ornamental. We have in this stone a simple development of the native art, and not a mixture of an indigenous and an exotic art.

Other elements in the ornamentation, besides the fish, are almost certainly symbolical. The vine branch above the central pediment indicates that the bishop was a branch of the true vine, the open book, as has been stated, represents the Bible, and the garland symbolises the crown of life. It is probable that the six-leaved rosettes are also symbolical. The frequency of this rosette on Lycaonian Christian monuments, and the way in which it is employed in one which I hope to publish in a subsequent article, suggest that it is a modification of the early Christian monogram Χ, originally representing Ἰησοῦς Χριστός. The book should be compared with the mosaic inscription of Naro in Africa (Hamman-Lif), instrumenta servit, on an open diploma. This inscription was in mosaic in a room beside the church, containing the sacred books, etc. Rev. Arch. 1904, p. 365 (Instrumenta servit, Tertull. Apol. 18, 21, 47; instrumenta literaturae, id. 16, 18.)

The title πάπας employed in this inscription is extremely interesting. It proves what was before probable, that this title was at first employed much more widely and was gradually restricted in use. Harnack, Archf. f. Kirch., Lex. Lexicogr. xiii, p. 157, says that the use of Papa to indicate the Bishop in Roman inscriptions begins about A.D. 300 (quoting from de Rossi, Inscri. Christ. Orbis Rom., p. cxv = Anth.Lat. epigr. 656, 2) and that from the sixth century it is confined to the Pope (quoting from Caesar, de stat. 10, Christ. p. 65). Prof. Harnack in Berl. Sitzungsber., 1900, p. 980, points out that in the West Papa was, in early times, used only in Rome, but was there employed as the ordinary term for bishop, either of Rome or of any other place. Tertullian uses it sarcastically of the Roman bishop Callistus. In the East Harnack thinks it was used only in Egypt, and only of the bishop of Alexandria, so that ιερού πάπας was the recognised title of that bishop alone, while other Egyptian bishops were styled παπας ήμων. In the pre-Nicene period, as he says, the title πάπας is not known to have been used of any other Eastern bishop: but it was customary for the Alexandrian bishops from at least as early as 250. Only in the letter of Pseudo-Justin to Zenas and Serenus the title δ(passport occurs. This Isaurian inscription shows that Prof. Harnack’s distinction is too rigid, and that the phrase was used in Asia Minor during the third century. Dr. Sanday also quotes Gregory Thaum. Ep. Cæsar. i. Οἱ τὰ βραδύτατα ἡμῶν Βαπεῖ, οἱ ψ. τ. εἰρούτατε πάπα (Routh, Rel. Sac., iii. 236), date not long after 254.

Though a bishop is mentioned in this epitaph, the name Isaura never occurs in the Byzantine lists of bishoprics. Prof. Ramsay has shown in an article on Lycaonia, which is already printed and will be published in the Austrian Jahrbücher, 1904, Part II, that the two neighbouring towns, Isaura Nova and Korna, were bishoprics in early time, but were merged in the great autocephalous bishopric of Isaura Palae, called Leontopolis, some time after 381, and probably at the same time that the name Leontopolis was given to
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Isaurum, about 474. Basil himself, Ep. 150, dreaded this loss of independence for the μικροτοπίειας ἄγω μικροκωμίας ταῖς ἐκ παλαιοῦ ἔποικωσθη ἡθονίας, and in order to prevent it when the bishopric of Isaura Palaea was vacant about 374, he wrote to Amphilochius of Iconium and recommended the nomination of officials called προστάτες for the smaller towns or cities before a new bishop was appointed for Isaura. Prof. Ramsay in 1901 discovered the grave of one of these officials at Alkaran, between Kurra and Nesa Isaura, with the inscription μημής χάρει Κώνων [προϊστάμενοι]: see No. 43.

The name πάσας, applied to the priest of Milos Galatiae in Acta S. Theodoti, is quoted by a writer in Aed. Bull. xxii. p. 327 as a proof that the document was not written by a contemporary, but belongs to a later age. In view of our inscription this argument falls to the ground, and the use of the term πάσας in that document is rather favourable to the view (advocated by Prof. Ramsay many years ago, and recently by Prof. Harnack and others) that the Acta S. Theodoti is a good document of early date.

3.—In the wall of the mosque at Derca (R. 1904). Μάσερος καὶ Ὠδ[ες] τῇ Ἀργοῃ λαξ ἄνδρα έκοψαν τῶν πάτων φιλον ἐπίσκοπην Μιμάνας. It is doubtful whether certain marks to the left of I. I indicate a letter. This stone also shows the scheme characteristic of the district, the rounded pediment flanked by two pointed ones, all supported by four columns. The more conventional form of wreath which here appears is very common on tombstones in this district, as are the two implements below it. The one on the right is evidently a hammer, while the other apparently represents some sort of knife or sickle: it appears in complete form in No. 22. Under the right-hand pediment is a complicated ornament represented in the epigraphical copy by cross lines. A more correct representation of a small part is given below. (Fig. 36). Each lozenge is indented with sides sloping to a deep point in the centre, and each is separated by a ridge, viz., the general level of the surface from the surrounding lozenges. This is probably intended to represent a fisherman's net; and, if so, the ornament is significant and not purely decorative. It is extremely unfortunate that the corresponding symbol or ornament under the left pediment has been completely defaced, probably because its character offended Mohammedan taste.

With regard to the date of this inscription I quote the following from Prof. Ramsay:—"If this inscription were late, it might be argued that Πασίφαλος" has perhaps here become a single epithet, and is no longer felt to be a pair of words, as it is in many second and third century inscriptions. But on the other hand this epithet does not belong to the later stereotyped Byzantine phraseology; and nothing in the inscription of these two places came to an end after 453, when they sent bishops to Chalcedon, but before 474."

*That date may be taken as the final legal confirmation of the suasion which had long been aimed at by the bishops of Palae Isaura (as is clear from Basil loc. cit.): the bishops of these two places came to an end after 453, when they sent bishops to Chalcedon, but before 474."—W.M.R.
suggests the ecclesiastical system as it can be seen almost fully formed in the writings of the three great Cappadocians, Basil and the Gregories. The first half of the fourth century seems to be the latest allowable date for this inscription. It might possibly be assigned to the third.

The crosses placed so inconspicuously as part of the ornamentation here should be noted. The earliest position of the cross on gravestones was probably above the inscription. In this situation it might pass for a sort of ornament, and thus it would not draw attention too prominently, while it would be significant to those who could understand. As has been pointed out by Prof. Ramsay, *Olives and Bisk. of Phrygia*, ii. p. 502, that is the char-
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acteristic of third century Christian epitaphs. An inscription (probably of the third century) found a few miles west of Laodicea Katakekenene in Galatian Phrygia, and published by Mr. Hogarth, J.H.S. 1880, p. 165, No. 23, belongs to this class; the editor has omitted the cross above the inscription (which was recopied by Prof. Ramsay in 1891).

Later than this are (1) the class of inscriptions in which the developed symbol ἀ or ἐ is placed above the epitaph, as for example *Athen. Myth.* xiii. 1887, 236, No. 70; (2) the class in which the simple + is placed before the first word (and often after the last word) of the inscription, and in the same line with it. On this subject see the concluding note.

4.—Doria, R. 1901 and 1904. *τον τεχνοτατον διάκονον Τάδειν Νάννα της μητορα και Οιαννος και Ρουφος οι ἀδελφοι αὐτοῦ ἐκσαμαν μ.χ.*

(Fig. 4). The six-leaved rosette which appears here is a very common ornament in various slightly modified forms on tombstones in Lycaonia. Rosettes of this kind are common also in Pisidia, but generally have eight leaves instead of six. Prof. Ramsay has seen no exception to the rule that the six-leaved rosette is characteristic of Lycaonia and the eight-leaved
of Pisidia; but the Pisidian examples which he has seen are too few in number to justify any confident assertion of this principle.

The symbol of the swastika Ὑ occurs frequently on stones both on the frontiers of Pisidia and on the borders of Lycania and Isauria. Prof. Sterrett (Wolfe Expedition, No. 229, et also Nos. 56, 93) mentions a stele with grape-vines and this symbol. There is nothing distinctively Christian about the inscription, but Prof. Sterrett is probably right in considering it to be Christian.

This tomb of the deacon is distinctly later than that of Bishop Theophius (No. 2). The ornament and arrangement are closely analogous to the tomb of Bishop Mammas, but later, as the phrase τοῦ τεμπετατον διάκονος has already the technical character of the Byzantine church formulas. But the general form of the inscription is still of the older type, and it can hardly be much later than the middle of the fourth century, and may even be as early as the time of Constantine; on the whole a date about the epoch of Basil, A.D. 353–370, is most probable. It is quite probable that the tombs of Bishop Mammas and Deacon Tabelis were made in the same workshop, and are separated by only a very few years from one another. The
tomb of Rufus, No. 16, comes from the same workshop, and must therefore be placed in the same period.

5 (Fig. 5)—Doria. R. 1904. Ὄ ο ἄγναταις καὶ ἤνετος καὶ πάσης ἀρετῆς ἀκοσμημένον Σισάμους εἴτεφος.

The proportions of the ornament on this tombstone are almost identical with those of No. 21; but in the one case the inscription is placed in the
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space above, in the other it is written across the ornament. The columns are a little more Greek and exotic in shape in No. 5 than in No. 21. But the two evidently come from the same workshop and belong to the same period. They were standing ready-made in the shop, and bought before the inscriptions were placed on them, according to the custom observable in many other cases, whereas No. 2 was perhaps made by special order to suit Bishop Theophilus.

It is difficult to decide whether this pair or the three, Nos. 3, 4, and 16, should be placed earlier. The language of No. 3 is more artificial and elaborate than that of No. 3, but on the other hand it differs from the formulae which were already accepted and stereotyped about 360, and must represent an older local growth of terminology which was afterwards abolished by the general custom of the Church (seen in No. 4). It might very well be that Sisamnæs succeeded Mammas, and the Deacon was a younger contemporary of Sisamnæs, while the two sets of stones came from two rival workshops.

ἡνετος is an old epic and poetic word, applied to Nestor in Homer, also to Muses, Apollo, a lyre, etc. It is characteristic of the Greek used in the rural districts of the plateau to employ old poetic words, as Prof. Ramsay has pointed out in the case of τέκμορ and others. ἡνετος seems to have become a standing epithet of bishops in Nova Isaura; cp. No. 39 in the inscriptions of Nova Isaura, which will be published by Prof. Ramsay in the Papers of the American School of Rome.

6.—In the wall of a house at Alkaran, one hour N. of Doria. The scheme is still the same as on the preceding stones, but a little more elaborated.
Whorls of curved lines are inserted in the spaces between the tops of the pediments, and beneath the rounded central arch appears a shell-like ornament, which, in a more developed form, is very frequent on Byzantine sarcophagi. Below this is a garland which, like those hanging beneath the side pediments, is of a more conventional and less natural type than those on the Bishop's tomb (No. 2). The name Indakos is a fuller form of Inzas, the name of a bishop of Korma (12 miles N.W.) in A.D. 381. On the common variation between forms in Δ and Ζ compare Histor. Geogr. of Asia M., pp. 285, 348, adding Arianzos of Cappadocia and Ariandos in an unpublished inscription of the Lydian district Katakekaumene.

7.—A broken fragment in the wall of a house at Durla; the inscription is lost. We have here a still further development of the same schema. In

the pointed pediment is an ornament of three concentric circles, above it appears the whorl of curved lines occurring in No. 6, and a bunch of grapes,
and to the right is part of a rounded arch within which is the shelf also seen in No. 6. One of the two columns supporting the pediment is twisted, and between them is a male figure wearing a cap and a flowing mantle. This monument, when complete, probably showed a female figure under the right side pediment, similar to the Pisidian inscription found at Kyr Stefan near Colonia Paribas by Prof. Ramsay in 1886, which is here added for comparison (Fig. 76). The text is published by Mr. Cronin, J.H.S. 1902, p. 114. The details were not drawn by Prof. Ramsay, who only sketched the general outline; they are added here from his verbal notes.

The Isaurian schema is here elaborated by the addition of something of the Greek anthropomorphistic tendency. In accordance with what has been said on No. 1, this addition must be attributed to the influence of Greek education and knowledge, coming through the great cities like Iconium. The native architectural schema is here still the ruling element, and the exotic idea is subsidiary, filling up empty spaces, but the pillars are in shape Graeco-Roman rather than of the old native fashion.

8.—One side of the sarcophagus of Sidamaria, in Lycaonia, now in the Imperial Museum, Stamboul. When we come to this sarcophagus, found in the same district, and so nearly resembling in scheme of ornament the stones just given, we can scarcely doubt that it is a later development of the same principle: the native schema has been embellished and added to through contact with Greek artistic ideas. Here we have still several columns supporting rounded pediments or arches, a series of figures in the niches between the pillars, and within each arch an elaborate variant of the shell which has already appeared in a simple form on Nos. 6 and 7. The lower portion of the scheme is partially suppressed to make room for the figures, and both the capitals of the columns and the pediments are decorated with highly elaborate open-work tracery. The columns themselves are twisted, a style already appearing in No. 7 (also No. 21). But the Greek sculpture has now become the ruling element, and the native schema only appears in the background. The two elements are, however, just as inconsistent with one another here as they are in No. 1: a hunting scene of the Greek fashion is placed amid the columns and arches of the South Anatolian schema, and wherever the latter interferes too much with the Greek figures it is suppressed. On two other sides of the same sarcophagus pointed central pediments appear flanked by rounded arches. This style must be attributed to an Anatolian city where Greek work was well known; but there is probably too much of the Greek element for a central Anatolian city, like Nova Isaura, or even Iconium, and the scale of the monument is too great for the humbler workshops of these cities. In Revue des Études Anciennes, 1901, p. 358, Prof. Ramsay pointed out that two great examples of this developed art had been found, one in the Lycaonian city Sidamaria, and the other in the maritime Isaurian city Seleucia, and that the sculptural ornament on both was so similar as to prove their origin from a single workshop, and hence be inferred that the point of common origin must have been the great city of
Tarsus, where alone an atelier capable of producing such works is likely to have existed. Thence one example was carried over the great Roman road through the Cilician Gates into Lycania, and the other by sea to Seleucia.

This hypothesis suits all the known conditions. Tarsus attracted the aspiring youth of Lycania and Cappadocia (see article 'Tarsus' in Hastings' Dict. of the Bible, iv. p. 685), and was itself influenced by them while it influenced their development.

9.—At Alkara. 1904.

[ὅ δέδα ἐκοσμησεν Κεφήν τοῦ θιον αὐτοῦ.]

With the difference that it has no pointed pediment and is much plainer in style, this stone so much resembles No. 6 that nothing more need be said about it.

H.S.—Vol. XXIV.
10.—Dorla. B. 1904. In a dark stable; detail, sometimes uncertain. Λέος Σαμωνίδης και Κλεοπάτρα η Εκασμήνη Δόμνα τῆς γυναικοστάτης [α' τοῦ] σύντατος Μ. Χ. Crosses approximating to the Maltese cross are here used.

This is one of the rare cases at Dorla in which the two side pediments are suppressed.
11.—Kara Senir. R. 1904. The rudeness of the letters, as well as of the figures, is too great for reproduction. The stone is mutilated, and the reading remains uncertain. The left half of the inscription is given by Prof. Sterrett, Wolfe Jourul. p. 30.

In l. 1, the letter after Π is uncertain, Ω or Ω; and the last letter seems to be Ν, but must be intended for Η. Possibly the text is Ευμήρη, 'Οσιφί καλ[θ], Παπία καλή, οδείς γαρ άδειατος: ευμήρη is for ευμήρης.

The figure in the centre is also difficult. Is it pagan, one of the Dioscuri with the star over his head, or is the star a rude cross as in No. 10? The formula οδείς άδειατος occurs often in Christian inscriptions, but also in pagan epitaphs. But the doubt as to the religious character of the relief is removed by comparison with the indubitably Christian inscription in C.I.L. iii. 14315 (from Salona in Dalmatia) +ευμήρη 'Αγουστα οδείς άδειατος. Prof. Ramsay has given examples of the use of οδείς άδειατος by Syrian Christians in Epigraphi, 1895, vol. i, pp. 58, 59. Compare also C.I.G. Ital, Sin. H4 (from the Syracusan catacombs), which ends with the acclamation ευμήρης. As the horseman is imitated from the customary representation of the Dioscuri, it appears that in this case the Christians took over a pagan type and used it to express their own ideas. The type is similar to No. 12 found at Doria, but not exactly the same. Hence it is given here though it perhaps lies outside the territory of Nova Isaura.

12.—Doria. R. 1890 and 1904. Μάρκος ἐκάσμης Νάννας Καλκίλιον τήν γλυκυτάτην αὐτοῦ γινακα μ. Χ. Side pediments suppressed, as in No. 10.
13.—Dorla. R. 1890, 1901, not seen in 1904, and presumably destroyed.

"Ἀνδως ἐκάσχοσεν Μάξιμαν τὴν θυγατέρα. The copy of 1890 has "Ἀρδος, a name which seems probable in itself, but as that copy was taken after sunset, when the light was fading, the other reading must be preferred.

Here the ordinary schema has disappeared entirely, and an arrangement in two parts is preferred. The following example from Almasun, about six miles south on the frontiers of Derbe and the Isaurian country, is more like this than any other Dorla stone; hence possibly this has been imported to Dorla.

14.—Almasun. R. 1904, Πεπλάς Οὐανωλ[θα] θυγατηρ αὐτοῦ μ.Χ. Prof. Sterrett has published his text, Wolfe Exped., p. 36, but reads Οὐανῳ. It is quite possible to take the ω as the crowning member of the pediment; this
was observed on the stone, but the letter following is Λ, not Λ, and there is space for a letter between it and Σ. Hence Ὄναναλις, a by-form of Ὅναναλις, or in later spelling Ῥαναλις, No. 27, seems preferable. With the variation in the vowel compare the many examples quoted in *Histor. Geogr.* of Ασία M., p. 437, Τάττος-Τάττος, Ατρομα-Οτρομα, Halala-Loulon, etc. The form Ὅναναλις would suggest that the penult in Ὅναναλις is long.


ἡ δείνα ἐκόσιον ἰφηθεὶν τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς [name] μενήης χ(α)ριν, 
δύνα τερμάτων Λύλου Παπίου καὶ Τά Κοττη[ν]ίου.

Κοττένιος is probably the right form of the last name, see Sterrett, *Wolfe Exped.* p. 59. This seems to be the corner of a stone of the usual
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Fig. 15.

...type, but the side pediment was round, not pointed. It must have been a stone of large size. The regular Dorla type has pointed pediments flanking a round arch; but rounded side arches enclosing a pointed central space occur in No. 14, 20, 25, as well as in 7a (which is Pisidian), and No. 9 shows all the three spaces rounded.

This is one of two cases in Nova Isaura in which the artisans, whose existence there we lay such stress on, are mentioned. Technitai are often mentioned in a district of Isaura only four or five miles south, Sterrett, *Wolfe Exped.* pp. 49, 83, and in an unpublished inscription found in 1904 by Prof. T. Callander.

16.—Dorla. R. 1901, 1904. ταυτὴν τὴν στήλην ἐστησε Ῥούφη τῷ ἀγανηστῷ τῷ ἀθλίῳ Δημήτριος ὁ πατήρ μ. χ.

On the arrangement and date see No. 3. The complicated swastika on the right side is unusual.

1 Prof. Sterrett shows this space correctly in his epigraphic copy.
17.—Doria. R. 1890, 1904. Θεόθου Μάξις ἐκώσμησεν Βάλαθθιν τὴν ἅδελφην αὐτῆς. The names are very characteristically Isaurian. It would not be natural that names of this type should persist later than the fourth century; personal names of Christian character came into use gradually from the latter part of the third century onwards. With Μαξις (which was common at Olba) compare Τας, Βας, Ζας, Πλος, also Ναζας, Τατες, etc., in Isauria, Paisidia, and Lycaonia. Thouthous, Thiothious, Sousous, Zouzos, are masculine; Thouthous is feminine.

18.—Doria. R. 1901, 1904. Αἱρ. Οὐσίλερ[ς] ἐκώσμησεν [τ]ῶν ἰῶν Κλεόπτκον. As praenomen, Aurelius, regularly abbreviated Aur., came into use about 212, according to Prof. Ramsay’s hypothesis advanced in J.H.S. 1883, p. 30, and corroborated by numerous examples seen since that time.
It is only the use of the praenomen that begins about 212, the nomen Aurelius, or M. Aurelius, was in use earlier. The use of the praenomen Aur. is most frequent in the third century, and can hardly have lasted later than about 350.

19.—Dorla. R. 1904. The stone is broken in two parts; one is built into the south wall of the mosque, and one into the north wall, ἰβδισκ αἰ[τ]α Πάπας Οκλάκ. The sixth and seventh letters of l. 2 are very uncertain and possibly a letter is lost. This inscription is one of the latest at Dorla. The letters are coarse and late in form. It may be assigned to the fifth century; and there is no reason why it might not be even later, except the analogy of the other stones. The inscription is on the sunk tablet within a raised border, resembling that in No. 1, and strikingly like the important fourth century inscription No. 40.

20.—Dorla. R. 1904. On a large stone beside the tomb of Bishop Theophilus. The names Ταῖος and Λοββᾶρος are used here together, possibly both applied to the same person, more probably two persons are meant. The simple name in the nominative on an ornate gravestone occurs also in Nos. 6, 33, 36, 37. The ornament is very simple, and the tomb is probably early.
21.—Dorla. R. 1904. Αντίρρομεων Ορσίνιον μω. χα. The last name is the Latin Hortensius. Aur. used as equivalent to a praenomen is inserted at the beginning, as one or two letters seem to have been lost there. A shorter praenomen than Aur. may have been used. Praenomina began to pass out of use in the third century after A.D. 212. They were important before that time as proving Roman citizenship; but when all free citizens of the provinces had become Roman, the value of the praenomen disappeared and it was gradually disused. The Latin character of the names also favours a comparatively early date. On the other hand it is probable that the name Valerius was introduced into Isaura Nova in the time of Diocletian. Aur. Valerius was probably born about 290-300; and the stone may be dated about 330-350, when all the circumstances of name and style are taken into account.

22.—Dorla. R. 1904. Σωρίς εκδομησιν ει[ ] τον πατέρα αυτού μνημη χαριν. The curved knife which occurs on so many of the tombstones
has here a long handle added, making it like a knife for pruning trees. The other implement on the right is one that is still commonly used in rough field work: it consists of a wooden handle inserted in the centre of an iron instrument with a point at one end and a flat edge at the other. The centrepiece of ornament occurs on Nos. 3, 4, 16. If there is no mistake in the copy Σ must be taken as the minuscule form of Σ (Σ), as sigma is represented by ζ.

23.—Armaian. R. 1904: text in Sterrett, Wolfe Exped. p. 36. A drawing is given here for the form of the curved implement. Οὐατιάλῳ ἐκόμης δῆμου νικῶν αὐτὴς. The name is Detrios, and not Demetrios.

24.—Dorla. R. 1901, 1904. Δόξα οἰκονόμησα ἡ σεμνή. Dorla may be assigned to the fifth century. Her name is of the Christian type. The old class of tombstone is now disused, though this official in a convent was likely to be buried with some state. The word οἰκονόμησα is not given by Stephanus, and it is difficult to say whether it should be taken as the title of a female official in the church, or as meaning simply the wife of an ὀικονόμος.

ΔΟΣΑΙΟΝΟΜΙΣΣΑ

*Mr. O. F. Hill points out that it occurs on coins of Ethena as an instrument of offence.
25.—Dorla. R. 1901, 1904. Νίστρόν και Ρέθοσ ἀντιστρατήγα[ν]ον χού[. . . . . . .]ρ. αἰλωνιαν μήνης [χάριν]. The restoration is doubtful. The forms of the ornament are simple and early, like No. 20.
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**Fig. 25.**

26.—Dorla. R. 1901. Πέτρος ἐκ ἀμηνατίν τῶν θείων αὐτῶν Πέτρων.

The want of the more elaborate ornament in cases like this and some others (Nos. 22, 27-37) is to be explained by poverty: a cheap stone was all that Peter could afford. His name and his uncle's name show the influence of Christian custom, but Peter was early introduced into Anatolian nomenclature, though not so early as Paul, nor did Peter ever become so common.
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**Fig. 26.**
27.—Dorla. R. 1901. Βασιλις ἔκωσμησεν τὸν ἀδελφὸν Παῖλον. 
Compare No. 26.

Fig. 27.


Fig. 28.

29.—Kara Señir. R. 1904. This stone of a simple village character is added for the symbol on the left, and as an illustration of the rule that poor people like the inhabitants of this village contented themselves with simpler and cheaper ornament.

Fig. 29.

30.—Euren, ruins between Dinuk and Dorla. R. 1901. Μαμμίσις ἔκωσμησεν Λουρμᾶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτῆς.

The name Lourmas, compared with Lourmithras in No. 88, is seen
to be compounded with an element Lour, which also occurs as a personal name under the form Lir in a Palaïan inscription. Lour-mas seems to be a compound of the Semitic type, like Abd-Allah, Servant of God. Ma is the common name of the Great Goddess, the Mother, the Earth. Prof. Ramsay points out that Lydian Mæis, Earth (Hesych.), is the same word, as is also Maia in Greek Mythology. With the variation in the vowel compare No. 14, also

\[ \text{ΜΑΙΜΕΙΣΕΚΟΣΜΗΣΕΝΛΟΥΡΜΑΝ} \]
\[ \text{ΤΟΝΑΔΕΛΦΟΝΑΥΤΙΗΣ} \]

Fig. 30.

\[ \sigma\nu \text{ for } \sigma\nu \text{ in the Ionic Greek dialect of the Lydian coast. Maussollos is derived from Mâu, by the very common Lydian and Carian suffix in personal names. Mai-andros is another derivative: compare Skam-andros (in which Skam is a word meaning earth, Skt. ksham, Greek } \chi\theta\omicron\upsilon\omicron\). The precise meaning of the word Lour or Lir remains still uncertain. The ornament within the circle is probably a candlestick. It occurs in more ornate form in No. 31.

31.—Dorla. Fragment of stone ornamented in incised lines, built into the doorway of a house close to the tomb of Bishop Theophilus.

Fig. 31.


Fig. 32.

33.—Doria. R. 1901. Π. Αὐλίος Ἰωάννου ἁγιος. A name so entirely Roman as this is likely to be not later than the third century.

34.—Doria. R. 1901, 1904. ὁ δὲ ἐστὶν κόσμημα τῆς μητέρας. The central ornament is unusual on the grave-monuments, but persists in Doria till recent times (see photograph published on p. 280).

35.—Doria. R. 1901. Φιλισενα αὐτησεμ τὸ[יו] ὑν αὐτοῦ Ἡρακλῆν μ. Χ. Rude, poor, and illiterate, the gravestone of a very humble person.

36.—Doria. R. 1901. Letters of a late form: not earlier than the fifth century.
37.—Dorla 1904. Ἀπάσκ εἰς Λούκιον.

ΑΠΠΑΣΚ ΛΟΥΚΙΟ

Fig. 37.

38.—In the cemetery of the Greek church, Agia Metamorphosis, at Konia, R. 1904. The stone has been worked over within the last few months, and much defaced, but most of the details can be recovered with certainty, except the nature of the ornaments in relief in the spaces between the columns.

In passing through the cemetery Prof. Ramsay saw this stone, and recognised it at once as being of the fine Dorla limestone and as having come from the same workshop as Nos. 5 and 21. As the grave was a recently made one, he enquired to what family it belonged, and was able eventually to trace it back to a village called Techumra, about half-way between Dorla and Konia. Further he could not trace it, and it remains uncertain whether the stone was brought to Techumra recently or not; but there can be no doubt that his first impression was correct, and that it was cut by the same workman as Nos. 5 and 21. The ornament in the central space between the columns is evidently a representation of two birds. Those in the side spaces are unfortunately so much defaced that it is impossible to say what they are, though the general outline is pretty certain.

This is the only one of the three which has been drawn to scale. It
was impossible for various reasons to make measured drawings of the others; and for them the ultimate authority lies in sketches made by my father according to simple eyesight. But he recognised the same heavy proportions in this as in the other two, which he knew the better from having drawn them, and from having already observed the difference in their proportions from the other monuments of Doria.

The last Fig. (39) shows a piece of embroidery which Mrs. Ramsay purchased in Doria, where it had been handed down for many generations in a family resident there.

The pattern is a variation of the design characteristic of Isaura Nova, adapted to suit the different material, and repeated as often as the width of the cloth permits. There are three pointed pediments, that in the middle one considerably larger than the other two, and all having a boss above the point. The pillars supporting the central pediment have been transformed into palm trees, which rise above the spring of the arch and incline over the side pediments. The side columns have disappeared to make room for a fanciful ornament of little cypress trees and large round flowers, apparently roses. Beneath each of the side pediments is a design in squares, seemingly a modification of the net which appears on two of the monuments (Nos. 8 and 4), perhaps suggested by the latticed balcony common in the country.
Immediately under the central pediment is a repetition on a smaller scale of the Iasuran design, this time with pointed side pieces, of a form similar to that which appears in No. 26, flanking a low round arch; below this again are a flower of some sort and a long garland hanging from the columns, or trees, very much like the garlands on the tomb of Bishop Theophilus, except that it is fastened to each pillar in two places, instead of merely by the ends.

On the complicated and difficult question of the period to which the whole set of monuments just given belong, and on which I have not the experience necessary to speak, I may quote the following series of arguments:

1. The period at which these monuments were made is determined by several lines of argument.

(1) Many of them afford individually some indication of date. These indications (stated already in the descriptions of each separately) point to the period 250-400 A.D.

(2) The names indicate unmistakably an early period. The stones are for the most part Christian, yet distinctively Christian names are extremely rare. Only Doxa once, Petros twice in No. 26, and Paulos once, are found. It is pointed out in the Cities and Bisphorias of Pto. ii. p. 402, that personal names of obviously Christian type begin to appear in inscriptions not earlier than the middle of the third century. As might be expected, Paulos is the earliest and commonest; but it is of course often impossible to say whether the name was due to Christian reasons, or arose from pagan causes. It is impossible that a Christian city with bishops, deacons, presbyters, profistamenoi, oikonomoi, homologetai, should be so devoid of Christian personal names, as is Nova Iasura, later than the third or fourth centuries. The lists of bishops even in the fourth century show a decided preponderance of a class of names distinctly Christian and Greek. To judge from the names alone, one would be inclined to assert that the mass of the inscriptions, especially the sculptured stones, are distinctly older than A.D. 400.

The rarity of Greek names is also remarkable. Apart from the hybrid forms, Poulos (Publius) and Hortesis (the Greek spelling of Hortensius), the only Greek names are Simonides, Nestor, Klaonikos, and Demetrios. Demetrios may be due to Christian causes, or it may have established itself as one of the commonest Greek names. Simonides and Nestor probably came through study of Greek literature.

Roman names are far more numerous. Some are due to imperial causes: the names of reigns families established themselves widely in the provinces. Julius occurs only once in one of the earliest of all the inscriptions. This proves that the inscriptions are not so old as A.D. 150; before 150 Julius would be commoner. P. Aelius Julius is a name characteristic of

---

8 On this Julian see J.H. 9, 1882, p. 86.
the period following Hadrian. Faustina, Domna, and Zenobius came into use in succession at later dates. The praenomen Aure came in after 212 A.D., and can rarely be found later than 350, and is most characteristic of the period 212–300. Valerius was probably introduced under Diocletian about 300 A.D.

Specially important is the absence of names taken from the dynasty of Constantine. The name Flavius never occurs on the sculptured monuments, but is found once in No. 52. Some proportion of persons who died between 350 and 450 would certainly bear the name Flavius; hence we must conclude that these stones are as a rule earlier than 350.

The other Roman names are either the commonest, Gaius, Lucius, Marcus, Maxima—all partially due, it may be, to Christian influence (as must be remembered)—or are of uncertain reason, as Caecilius, Aulus, Hor-temius, Rufus, Vaignus (some at least due to imitation of the names of Roman officials). Makeros may be Macer, and -illa is uncertain, but the termination is Latin.

But the overwhelming mass of names are pure Anatolian. On the sculptured stones occur the following: Andis, Andos, Amanas, Appas, Banalis, Balasthitis, Detrios, Indakos, [Ka/j]idis, Konon (may be due to Christian influence, but the name is characteristic of Isauria and Pamphylia), Kottonis, Loumas, Marymos, Manmeis, Mös, Nanna, Nannasos, Oš, Oknos, Quanolid, Ouatialis, Papas, Papas, Sisamoss, Soas, Tabies, Tas, Thouthou, Zouzou.

This great preponderance of native, non-Greek, as well as non-Biblical, names proves beyond doubt that the monuments belong as a whole to the period 250–400, though some isolated examples may be later. It will be noticed that the bishops, deacons, and other ecclesiastical officials are as thoroughly Anatolian in name as the rest of the people.

(3) The tombs of three bishops (perhaps four) give a standard: there were no bishops in Nova Isaura after about 474, as is shown on No. 2.

(4) With few exceptions the lettering is remarkably uniform in style, and little development occurs in the forms of the letters. A style was evidently formed at a certain date, and persisted almost unchanged in a school of local artisans; but such persistence could not last very long, as external causes would have forced a change. The pressure of those causes almost entirely destroyed the art, instead of merely modifying it. As to the period when that style was formed, the argument is of another kind.

(5) The earliest monument cannot be earlier than the latter part of the second century, No. 33. The majority are unmistakably third or fourth century works, and the remainder must be estimated on the same standard. Moreover, the great majority are certainly Christian. Not merely the cross, as on Nos. 3, 4, 10, 16, 29, but also the common swastika and the candlestick (Nos. 30, 31) must be regarded as Christian symbols on these monuments. Thus fifteen of the most important and characteristic monuments are marked as Christian, 2-5, 10, 16 f., 23, 24 ff., 29 ff., 34. The rosette of six arms occurs on most of the graves that are certainly Christian, and may be reckoned as a
Christian ornament also; while the more elaborate symbol on Nos. 14, 28, 34, may be regarded as a combination of rosette and cross.

We are, in short, here in the presence of a distinctly Christian art. It is not meant that every artisan in Nova Isaura who worked on these monuments, or every person who used them, was a Christian; but that the development arose during the inspiration and quickening of mind and activity caused by the general acceptance of the new religion in the city. It is no isolated phenomenon, but the invariable experience of history, that the spread of a new faith is accompanied by an invigoration of the spirit and character of the people; witness the Arabs of the seventh and eighth centuries under the inspiration of Mohammedanism. Where the religion is spread by external causes or by force, it does not so touch the spirit. In this sense the art of Nova Isaura is a Christian art, and its first development cannot be placed earlier than the third century. It used, of course, older forms, already existing in pagan use; but it used them with freedom and novelty for its own purposes.

(6) One consideration would tell in favour of an earlier date than has been yet assigned. There is an entire absence of the Christian symbolism characteristic of the fourth century. Neither &pomicr; nor the later &phicmcr; nor &alphmicr;, though all are found in the neighbouring towns of Lyconia, occur on any of the sculptured stones of obviously Christian origin at Doria. The Christian symbolism is of that veiled and half cryptic kind which we have been disposed to regard as characteristic of the pre-Constantinian period; and it would not be surprising if general opinion should ultimately place the whole set of these sculptured stones of Nova Isaura between A.D. 250 and 340. At present we may safely place them all between 250 and 400.

Mr. Croinin has published a good example of a complete series of inscriptions of a village of Lyconia in J.H.S. 1902, pp. 358–367. They may be placed roughly between 350 and 600; but not one of them could be considered earlier than even the latest stone at Nova Isaura, so far as is yet known.

In conclusion it should be stated that the most important of the drawings here given were made to scale on the spot. But for some (chiefly 5, 7h, 15, 21) I have followed the hasty sketches made by Prof. Ramsay, either because we failed to find the stones in 1904, or because they were in a position inaccessible to me. The simpler monuments, Nos. 26–37, do not need to be drawn to scale: these are all indicated on the stones simply by incised lines, without any relief.

The inscriptions are given from Prof. Ramsay’s copies, the date of which is given in every case.

A. MARGARET RAMSAY.
VASES ADDED TO THE ASHMOLEAN MUSEUM.

[Plates VII—IX.]

I have already published in the pages of this Journal some of the vases acquired by the Ashmolean Museum since the catalogue of Ashmolean vases appeared in 1898.

In vol. xiii, p. 186 is published a late Attic vase with a representation of the carrying off of Oreithyia by Boreas. In vol. xxvi, p. 1 is published a red-figured vase representing Pandora rising out of the ground. In vol. xv, p. 325 two sepulchral lekythoi are published. Two other papers (xiii. 79 and 187) comment upon vases already included in the Ashmolean catalogue, Nos. 211, 275, one concerned with the myth of Cacus, one with that of Tithonus and Eos.

With the kind and willing consent of the Keeper I propose now to publish the rest of the more interesting of the vases acquired by the museum.

---

1 One of these vases, Pl. XV, p. 325, is unfortunately in part repainted. The vase is antique, and the figure of the young man on it is genuine; but some skilful modern hand has erased the figure which stood on the other side of the stele, and painted in its place a winged Nike. The repainting had escaped the observation of both Mr. Evans and myself, and was first detected by the keen eyes of Prof. Fortwangler.
Ashmolean Museum in the last ten years, partly through the generous gift of Mr. Edmund Oldfield, partly through the unwearied watchfulness of Mr. Arthur Evans. The numbers attached to the vases are those which they bear in the slip catalogue of the Museum.

501. Attic geometric vase. H. 5\(\frac{1}{2}\) in. A cup in two storeys with four handles. This cup seems to owe its curious form to a mere caprice of the potter. But it would serve the same purposes as the deep cups figured by S. Wied in the Jahrh. 1899, p. 200. It is said to have been found near Athens together with the three vessels represented in the engraving, a basket vase, a one-handled cup, and a ring-askos. Bought, 1894.

502. Boeotian geometric flat cup, with four handles. Diam. 7\(\frac{1}{2}\) in. This is of the form called by Boeckh in Jahrh. 1888, p. 332, Schale, ohne Fuss; but it has a flat surface on which to rest. The decoration of the exterior consists of three flying eagles with hooked beaks, separated by lines of zigzags; in the interior, bands of black.

503. Boeotian cup. Diam. 7\(\frac{1}{2}\) in. This vase has really no foot; it has one handle, and opposite the handle a bird's tail; four birds' heads issue from the rim of the vase. For the decoration see the engraving. The "Mycenaean" pattern in the midst is like that on a British Museum vase: Jahrh. 1888, p. 333, No. 20. Both of these vases are said to have been found at Tanagra. Bought, 1895.

504. Proto-Corinthian lekythos. H. 2\(\frac{1}{2}\) in. This remarkable little vase has a very interesting subject. On the shoulder are a dog and two hares
running; on the body, an archaic figure of a deity clad in helmet and chiton, holding spear and shield; behind it, a man with arms raised; before it, a male figure with tall crown holding up a wreath. At the back of the vase, two horsemen and a winged sphinx; in the field, a bird flying. From Thebes, 1896.

Only two or three lekythi of this class have been published containing scenes in which the human figure appears. Noteworthy among these is the Macmillan lekythos of the British Museum, *J.H.S. xi*, Pl. I, and the lekythos at Berlin (*Arch. Zeit.* 1883, p. 155, Pl. X.), on which is represented the battle between Herakles and the Centaurs. Our vase is earlier than either of these; its drawing is quite geometric in character, and the field is not filled up with ornament, as in the Berlin vase, nor are incised lines used. Nearer in time to our lekythos is that published by Furtwängler in the *Arch. Zeit.* 1884, p. 162, where we have a hare-hunt above, and a lion, ox, and boar round the vase, the field filled up with rosettes. Our vase can
so carefully be later than the eighth century, and furnishes an interesting link between geometric and (so-called) Proto-Corinthian ware. It is probable that there is no connexion of subject between the front and back of the vase. The subject of the front group is evidently taken from cultus. The armed deity who occupies the central place at first sight appears to have the head and mane of a horse. But on comparison with the heads of the horses at the back, this is seen to be an erroneous impression. The head is human; what looks like a mane seems to be the horsehair-crest of the helmet. The head at first appears to be bearded; but here again a more careful examination suggests doubt. For the drawing of the little vase is very primitive, in style scarcely at all more advanced than that of the Dipylon vases; and when one considers such geometric vases as Mem. d. J. ix. 39, 3, or (more especially) J.H.8. xix. 8, one sees that male and female heads are in that style rendered alike, with a prominent chin which looks like a beard. The same applies to the very early Athenian vase J.H.8. Pl. VII. I am therefore disposed to think that the deity is feminine, and the chiton she wears confirms the notion. We have probably before us a statue of Athena, armed, or possibly a deity of the type of the Apollo of Amyclae, which appears in well-known columnar form on the coins of Sparta.

The figures on either side of the chief deity are also perplexing. The smaller one, behind the deity, appears to be male, but has a mane of hair at the back quite unlike the hair of the other figures. The larger figure, before the deity, seems also to be male; it turns away from the goddess, wears a tall pτόλε and holds a wreath. I confess myself unable further to unravel this interesting scene; the very faithful drawing of Mr. Anderson will enable any reader who is so disposed to attack the problem on his own account.

The two horsemen, who grasp the reins of their horses, have long strands of hair falling down their backs. The sphinx is an unusual representation; the head is human, the tail leonine, while the hoofs are represented much like those of the horses.

The hare-hunt, which connects our vase with the Proto-Corinthian class of ware, is curiously not of a very early type; we see one dog and two hares, and the subject is relegated to the mouth of the vase.


From 179 of Furtwängler’s Catalogue, Fig. 8 of Walters’, who calls it an olpe.

A panel on the front and to r. of the handle, on which, Ram advancing to right; above and below, rosettes; in front, pattern. From Laurium. Bought, 1829.

507. Corinthian aryballos. H. 5½ in. A female figure, winged, draped in long chiton, holding in each hand by the neck a swan; on one side of her a lion, on the other a bird like a partridge: rosettes, etc., in field.

From Thebes. Bought, 1896.
This is a good example of the πότερα θηρίων type. It differs from the Medusa published by M. Six (J.H.S., Pl. XXIX.) in that the face of the goddess is that of a woman, not of a monster. In this respect our vase is nearer to the Mycenaean gem (Brit. Mus. Cat. of Gems, Pl. A, No. 83) where we see an unwinged draped female figure holding in each hand a swan with wings spread. On our vase the wings of one swan are spread, of the other furred. In the British Museum Catalogue the name Leda is suggested for the goddess but the mere presence of the swans does not justify this attribution. M. Six has shown swans to be properly connected with Medusa. And we have no reason to think that Leda was known to the Mycenaeans. Rather I should consider the goddess of our vase a form borrowed from oriental art, and variously interpreted in various ages of Greece. Such a figure on the chest of Cypselus was labelled Artemis; and as our vase is Corinthian, this evidence would seem to rule out our case.

309. Attic b.-f. amphora, neck separated from body by ridge. Very stiff conventional work, folds in garments not indicated; but garments covered with red spots and white rosettes. Outlines of bodies under drapery in incised lines. Red paint used on hair, beard, and garments. H. 16½ in.

Incised on bottom 05.

Decoration, bar ornament, lotus lima. Subjects continuous round vase.

Neck:

Obs. Bearded man carrying chlamys, body wreathed, apparently challenging beardless man, also wreathed and carrying chlamys, who walks to r.
and looks back. On either side draped bearded man r., one carrying staff and wreath, one staff only.

Rev. Same figures; the bearded man is kept away to r. by one of the draped figures: the beardless man r., leads the other draped figure; the draped figures each hold staff.

Body :

Ov. Zeus seated r. on throne supported by lion, holds sceptre. Before him, Hermes holding caduceus moving to r., turning to address Zeus. On either side of the group, two draped bearded figures, three holding staves, one a wreath.

Rev. Similar group, the attitude of Hermes and of one of the draped figures varied.

Under one handle: youth r. on horseback, holding lance: above, bird flying l.

Under the other handle: draped bearded figure r., holding staff: another to l., head r., holding wreath: naked boy to r.

Purnell Cat. No. 647: Oldfield gift, 1899.

This is a vase of the 'affected Tyrrehenian' class. In the British Museum Catalogue (p. 152) these vases are spoken of as Attic modified by Corinthian influence. But Dr. Karo, who has devoted a careful study to them
(J.H.S. 1899, p. 147), regards them as Ionic in character, and probably produced in some Ionic city. The only example as yet well published is in Gaell's Foutiles de Vase, Pl. VII, VIII. Karo mentions 44 examples. The subjects depicted are usually very conventional, and sometimes seem quite meaningless; but sometimes, as on the neck of our vase, there seem to be two scenes from one event.

510. Attic black-figured amphora. H. 16\frac{1}{2} in.

On neck palmette pattern, bar pattern: lotus under handles: beneath design, line of meander, beneath which, three pairs of lions and boars facing one another.

Obv. Judgment of Paris:—Hermes, accompanied by dog, holding caduceus, leading Hera and Athena (armed) into the presence of Paris (bearded) who holds sceptre.

Rec. Bearded Dionysus r.; holding vine-spray and wine-cup. On either side of him a naked Satyr carrying a nymph, who holds crotales.

Details in white and red. Obverse figured in Gerhard's Auswahl Vasebilder, iii. Pl. CLXXII. Notable features in the scene of the Judgment of Paris are (1) that only two of the Goddesses are present, (2) that the dog of Paris accompanies Hermes, not his master. The whole subject is treated by Miss Harrison in J.H.S. vii. pp. 196-219.

This vase has been lately taken to pieces and cleaned. The results on the obverse are not very serious, though the middle part of Hermes, the head of the dog, and the lower part of Athena have disappeared. But it will be seen from the cut that much of the drawing of the reverse has gone, leaving only enough to reconstruct the type.

Oldfield Collection.
511. B.-F. Stamnos. H. 12\textfrac{1}{4} in.

_Obv._ In the midst Apollo r. in clitharoedic costume, playing on lyre. Meeting him Leto and Artemis accompanied by a fawn. Further to r. Hephaestus in long drapery, red-bearded, ivy-wreathed, carrying axe. Behind, Apollo, Demeter, and Persephone r. carrying torches, and Dionysus, red-bearded and ivy-wreathed, holding vine-branches and accompanied by goat behind Dionysus, nymph r.

_Rev._ From l. to r.: naked athlete, athlete holding spears, discobolus, trainer draped, holding branch, naked runner. All the men bearded.

Above each handle an eagle carrying a serpent, and below a man crouching, holding halteres.

Oldfield Collection.

This vase was seen by Gerhard, and is published in his _Antiker Vasenbilder_, Pl. XXXIX. It has been a good deal repainted, in parts since the drawing of Gerhard. It has recently been cleaned and the restorations removed. The cut will show how much of the group of the reverse is genuine. The obverse has not seriously suffered. The goat of the obverse group never had any legs.

Three duties on the obverse are unmistakable. Apollo, Dionysus, Hephaestus. With regard to the female figures one may hesitate whether they are goddesses or mere nymphs, but the attributes, fawn or doe and
torches, seem decisive in favour of the former attribution. Thus we have an Apolline triad, a Dionysiac triad, and Hephaestus and a nymph as flanking figures. Gerhard suggests that the subject of the group is the return of Cura; but his arguments are fanciful.

The group of the reverse is a good illustration of the contests of the pentathlon. Taking the figures from right to left, we have a leaper (crouching), a runner (the staff put in his hand in Gerhard's plate does not exist), a trainer, a discus thrower, a spear thrower, a wrestler. The order thus corresponds to that of the line which sums up the contests of the pentathlon, ἀλμα, ποδοκεινο, δίσκος, ἄκοντα, πάλην.

The stamnos is an extremely rare form in black-figured Attic vases.


Field bounded on either side by three palmettes. A warrior kneeling bearing on his shoulder the corpse of a dead comrade. In the field scattered letters and marks without meaning. Beard of warrior and some other parts red. From Thebes, 1805.

513. (Pl. VII.) Attic black-figured lekythos, rounded at foot; on shoulder, palmettes. White ground. H. 11¾ in.

 THESEUS seizing the Minotaur, and plunging a sword into his body; behind Theseus, a tree on which is hung his garment; behind the Minotaur, a man standing, with chlamys over his arm, looking back. (Black paint only.)

From Gela.


Oblong field. Flanking the scene, on either side, a palace, represented by a Doric column, whence issues an ox. In the midst a square shed, on the top of which is an ox, while two emerge from it; above, two ravens in a tree.

From Gela. Bought, 1896.

This vase, which seems to represent a cattle shed near a palace, is interesting when compared with the Cacus vase (Ashmolean Catalogue, No. 211: J.H.S. xiii. p. 70). In both, cattle appear issuing from a shed or entering it. But the likeness in the shed itself is not close, and much in the Cacus vase remains unexplained.

We may best begin the series of red-figured vases with a few kylikes of early type.


Exterior (r.-l.), obverse, between two eyes, a young discobolus (upper part modern) holding fillet and discus; reverse, between two eyes, lower part of a similar figure.
516. **Kylix**: severe style. Diam. 13½ in.

**Exterior**: *Obverse*. Three naked youths wreathed, running; the one to the left holds a lyre; his name is \( \text{\AE} \); the other two are *ASXION* and *LAMPO*. *Reverse*. Youth reclining on cushion holding wine-cup, with attendant; goat behind him. Letters in field HO 1 SA.


Presented by Mr. E. P. Warren.

Interior: Ἑ ὋΝ ΚΑΙΣ ὈΛΟΣ. Armourer sitting on low stool, finishing with file a helmet which he holds in the l. hand. Behind, melting-pot on furnace; in front, low anvil; above, row of files and knives.

Face, trunk, and arms of armourer and lower part of furnace modern.

Bought at the Bougnignon sale, 1901.

The design on both exterior and interior consists in the repetition, five times over, of a group consisting of a youth, with himation wrapped round his body, conversing with another whose head also is covered with the himation. Inscription on exterior, six times repeated, KALOS. Vase shattered and in parts repainted.

520. Cup, r-f. severe. Diam. 7 in.

Exterior. Obv. Naked youth r., head to l., leading by the reins two horses, and holding staff in r. hand.
Rev. Two naked youths crouching, one on each side of a crater, both ivy-crowned. He on the r. dips oenochoe into crater; he on the l. holds skyphos (black) and kylix.

Pourtalès Cat. No. 191; Pl. 34.

Oldfield Collection.

521. Stamnos, r.-f. severe. H. 14½ in.
Line of maulators beneath subjects.

Heracles and Negroes. (Busiris type.)

Heracles clad in chiton and lion's skin, bow and quiver slung from his shoulder, rushing upon Negro clad only in waist cloth, whom he holds by the throat with l. hand, brandishing a club in r. The Negro is forced down on an altar, on the front of which are a knife and blood: he extends his r. hand in supplication to Heracles. In the field are seven other Negroes, some wearing waist cloth, some chiton, in various attitudes of fear and flight: one holds a sacrificial tray, one an unlighted torch. Falling in field, a one-handed pot.

Inner markings in yellow: original sketch lines visible. The drawing is very characteristic and bold: the heads of the Negroes (one ¾ face) strongly drawn: the hair represented sometimes by a mass of black, sometimes by detached dots.

Published in the Ann. d. Inst. 1865, Tav. d'Agg. PQ, p. 300.

Oldfield Collection.

Dr. Helbig, who publishes the vase in the Annali, suggests that this is the same vase which belonged to the Prince of Camino, and was found at Vulci. The drawing for the Plate PQ was found among the papers of E. Braun, and was reproduced in half scale. It is fairly correct. Of course a skilled artist now could produce something closer to the original, and, as the drawing is very remarkable, this would be well worth doing. As, however, the liberal amount of illustrations allotted to the present paper was exhausted,
I have satisfied myself with reproducing by photography, in the original size, two of the Negroes' busts.

322. (Pl. VIII.) Stamnos: fine period. H. 18 in.
Decoration as in plate.

Obverse: Theseus (ΘΕΣΙ) and Rhoeas (ΡΟΗΑ) fight back to back against two Amazons: one, Melusa (ΜΕΛΟΣΑ), on foot, strikes with an axe at Theseus—she is clad in Phrygian dress; the other, on horseback, clad in cuirass and helmet, strikes with a lance at Rhoeas, who strikes back with a spear. Theseus is armed as a hoplite, Rhoeas as a pelasg.

Reverse: KAVOS. Bearded men, young man, and woman in conversation. From Gela in Sicily.

Given by Mr. Evans, 1895.
This is one of a class of Amazon vases notable for fine drawing. The subject of the various Amazonomachies in art is slightly treated in Roscher's *Lexikon*, i. 276, and more fully by Klugmann, *Die Amazonen in der alt. Litt. u. Kunst*. Klugmann (p. 47) mentions four vases closely resembling ours in character, (1) at St. Petersburg, mentioned below; (2) at Paris, De Luyne's *Vases*, Pl. 43; (3) Pourtales vases, Pl. 85, erroneously stated to be in the British Museum; (4) in the British Museum.

E. 456: Gerhard, *Abh. Vaseub. iii.*, Pl. 163, to which others, such as British Museum E. 157, etc., might be added. The class of vases is of distinctly Attic character, and there may be something in Klugmann's suggestion that they show the influences of Micon's Amazonomachy in the Stoa Poikile at Athens. These vases represent the contests of Theseus and the Amazonian invaders of Attica: the Amazons are usually on horseback and the Greeks on foot, and the dress of the Amazons is usually of the barbarous Phrygian type. The name Melina, as that of an Amazon, occurs on the red-figured vase in the Hermitage at St. Petersburg, where she is on horseback, opposed to Phorbas and Theseus. Steplani observes that we must compare the
Homeric phrase τολέμου μεμηλωσ, and supply τολέμου after μέλους. But perhaps a better suggestion is given us by the epithet τασιμέλους applied to Hera by Nonnus (Dionys., v. 128). Melosa is also the name written over a female figure, who should be Leito, whom Apollo is defending from an attack by Tityos, on a red-figured amphora. It is also known as

the name of a nymph. For the name Rhoeascus in connexion with the exploit of Theseus against the Amazons I have found no precedent; the companions of Theseus are usually Peirithous and Phorbas. Possibly Ῥόκος may be a careless copy of Ῥόκας. Rhoeascus is, however, known as the name of a

---

9 *Anm. e Rer. d. Ind.*, 1856, II. X.
Centaur (see Pape's Lexicon, &c.) : and the myths and art representations of Amazons and Centaurs are closely mixed up.


_Obv._ Three women all clad in sleeved chiton with overdress, and all wearing wreaths of woollen fillets mixed with ivy or other leaves. One carries a two-handled drinking-cup, the second ladies wine from a stamnos which stands on a table studded with ivy-sprays into a drinking-cup, the third plays the flutes.

_Rev._ Three women: one, clad in sleeved chiton with overdress, and wearing wreath (red), carries a drinking-cup; the second, clad in sleeveless chiton and overdress, with woollen fillet on head, carries thyrsus and drinking-cup; the third, clad and wreathed as the first, raises her head as if singing.

Found at Gela; bought 1896.


_Obv._ In the midst Apollo, clad in himation, laureate, holding lyre (red cord); behind him, woman clad in sleeved chiton and overdress, wearing woollen fillet and wreath (red), carrying flutes; before him, woman clad in chiton only, wreathed as last, carrying flutes.

_Revers._ Female figure, clad in sleeveless chiton, with overfall, and himation, a broad band and a wreath (red) on her head, seated on rock. A woman, clad in chiton and overdress, hair bound with cord (red), approaches her, carrying drinking-cup; to left, another woman, similarly clad, carries flutes.

Found at Gela. Presented by Mr. Fortnum.

Numbers 523 and 524 belong to a special class of Attic stamna, of which other examples are the British Museum vase E 451, on which a sacrifice to Dionysus Dendrites is represented, and the Ashmolean vase, No. 292, where a sacrifice to Demeter or Persephone is taking place.

Both the vases seem to represent, in highly generalized or idealized form, some sacrifice at an Attic festival. The fact that the votaries are female I do not take to be a realistic trait showing that these sacrifices were in the hands of women; for Greek artists often introduce women to represent not actual human agents, but impersonations of action. Thus in the well-known vase of Polygnotus in the British Museum, women are occupied with the sacrifice of a bull, a task evidently not feminine; on the chariot coins of Sicily the driver is sometimes feminine; and so forth.

Interpreting the vase-paintings in this broad fashion, we may see in No. 523 a festival of Dionysiac character (as indicated by the thyrsus and ivy) of which a prominent feature was the lading of wine into cups. The woman with the flutes and the singing woman seem to show that musical
contests or performances were part of the festival. All these features point to the Anthesteraea. We have, of course, nothing to do here with the original meaning of the Anthesteraea, but only with the manner in which it was celebrated at Athens in the fifth century. In the drinking vessels which appear so prominently on the vase, into which wine is being ladled, I should see the χοῖροι or cups which gave their name to one of the days of the festival. Certainly the drinking of new wine was one of the prominent features of the Anthesteraea. It is noteworthy that the large vessel out of which the wine is ladled is a stamnos of the same form as our vase. This suggests that the use of such vessels for mixing wine at the Attic festivals was the reason why this particular form was chosen for memorial-pictures.

M. Saglio in his Dictionary takes another view of the form of the χοῖροι. He cites (ξ. ν.) the observation of Crates quoted by Athenaeus* that the χοῖροι had in historic Greece the form of oenochoeae. But it appears clearly from several authorities that the χοῖροι were vessels to drink from, and the Greeks drank from cups and not from wine-jugs or decanters. Crates, moreover, who lived after B.C. 200, is not a very good authority for old Athenian usages.

* XL. p. 495.  A. Mommsen, Feed der Stadt Athen, p. 384 and foll.
The other vase, No. 524, is more difficult. The figure of Apollo on the obverse is not to be mistaken, the long hair and the lyre are conclusive. We should expect to find Artemis on the reverse, and in fact the seated figure is not impossibly an Artemis; the fashion of her chiton, with a short overfall falling on the breast, and the broad band in her hair which appears to be of metal rather than stuff, would suit the attribution. She seems to be receiving an offering in a vessel, which is without visible handles, and may contain some liquid other than wine, which would not be a suitable offering to Artemis, perhaps milk or honey. The only other hint offered by the vase is given by the lyre of Apollo and the flutes held by three of the women, which seem to point to some kind of musical performances. The Thargelia was the Athenian festival of Apollo and Artemis; and as at that festival there were choruses of men and boys, it seems not unlikely that it may be the particular festival intended in the vase. As I have already observed, the fact that it is women and not men who hold the musical instruments is no real objection; the drawing only furnishes a good illustration of the ideality of Greek painting.

In the case of many of the female votaries on these vases, the wreaths worn are remarkable, and may possibly furnish a useful clue. They are
made up of woollen fillets and the leaves of various plants, sometimes ivy. They appear to be usual accompaniments of sacrifice; but even on the vases of this class they are by no means invariable, simple wreaths sometimes taking their place.

525. Attic amphora with representation of the birth of Pandora.

This vase I have figured and discussed in this Journal, vol. xxi. p. 1, Pl. I.

526. B-C amphora; fine not severe; twisted handles. H. 18¾ in.

Palmette patterns on neck: lines of egg pattern and bar pattern: lines of maenander pattern under devices.
Ode. Oedipus beardless, wearing pænasus and chlamys, seated r. on rock: holds in r. two spears. He looks up at the Sphinx, who stands facing him on a rock indicated by thinner varnish. Behind Oedipus is a comrade wearing chlamys and holding staff.

Rev. Winged female figure r. clad in chiton and overdress, holding in both hands a fillet: facing her a bearded man clad in himation and holding sceptre.

Hamilton Gray Cat. (1888), No. 32; Overbeck, Herosiche Bildwerke, i. 13. Oldfield Collection.

This vase has now been carefully cleaned. Part of the figure of the comrade of Oedipus has disappeared, and there are breaks in the outline of Oedipus and the Sphinx which are in the engraving filled in with dotted lines.

I should be disposed to see in the reverse type not Victory rewarding a competitor, but Eos approaching Tithonus. Eos and Tithonus occur together on a Nolan vase in the Ashmolean; there they are more clearly characterized, since Eos rushes forward with arms outstretched, and Tithonus is bald and evidently an old man. If the present vase does represent the Dawn and her lover, there is certainly some contamination derived from scenes in which Nike figures.

* J.H.S. xiii. 187.
The group of Oedipus and the Sphinx requires not much comment. On our vase the Sphinx does not appear, as she sometimes does, seated on a pillar, and undistinguishable from the figure of a tomb, but is represented as a living creature on a rock, with a rather formidable panther-like body. The typography of the subject is given by Höfer in Roscher's Lexikon, p. 719.

(To be continued.)

Percy Gardner.
SOME *LATE MINOAN* VASES FOUND IN GREECE.

[Plates XI.-XIV.]

The progress of excavations in Crete has made it possible to distinguish with some degree of certainty the native from the imported objects found on Mycenaean sites in Greece. The purpose of this paper is to make known some fine examples of *Late Minoan* art found at Vaphio in Lacconia, Phylakopi in Melos, and Mycenae itself, and to show on what grounds they are to be regarded as of Cretan workmanship.

The drawings, excepting Pl. XII., which is by M. Gilliéron, are the work of Mr. Halvor Bagge. The restoration of the large jar from Vaphio (Pl. XI.) is principally due to the ingenuity of Mr. J. H. Marshall, who devoted some months in 1901 to a study of the Cnossian Palace Style and in particular of the designs found on large amphorae of this class, and drew out a number of reconstructions of vases found at Cnossus and on the mainland of Greece. These reconstructions, among them earlier versions of Plates XI. and XIII. and a third which has since been published in these pages by Mr. Mackenzie (J.H.S. xxiii. (1903), p. 192), were exhibited by Mr. Marshall at a meeting of the British School at Athens in March 1901, and were to have been published by him. Unfortunately his acceptance, a few months later, of an important post under the Indian Government made it impossible for him to carry further the studies he had so brilliantly begun, or even to put together the results of his past researches. Both Mr. Marshall and I are much indebted to Professor Tsountas, the discoverer of the Vaphio Tomb and of the tomb at Mycenae which yielded the objects figured on Plates XIII. and XIV., for permission to study and publish this important new material, and to Dr. Evans who has given us most generous aid and allowed us to make use of unpublished finds from the Palace of Cnossus.

§ 1. *Vases with Marine Designs from Vaphio and Phylakopi.*

Early in 1900 the work of piecing together the fragments of what we have since learned to call *Palace-Style* pottery from Phylakopi led me to look for similar designs in the Athens collection, and incidentally to examine the trays of broken pottery from the Vaphio Tomb. Among them there were many which exhibited a puzzling combination of rockwork, spray-pattern,
and large flowers. In the following winter Mr. J. H. Marshall undertook to work out the design, with the result shown in Pl. XI.

The painter who wished to break up the surface of one of these monster jars had two courses open to him—to divide it horizontally into parallel friezes or vertically into panels. We have instances of both methods; but the latter ultimately prevailed and proved the bane of Late Minoan vase-painting. It became usual to subdivide the surface by long seam-like bands descending from the handles and to cover the panels with ornaments bearing no relation to one another; and this fashion lasted far into the Cretan Geometric period. The painter of the vase before us has hit upon a compromise, that of combining vertical and horizontal divisions, giving a sinuous course to the former and an oblique direction to all but one of the latter. In this connection it must be pointed out that the design shown in the reconstruction requires for its proper completion a four-handled vase; since there are four oblique friezes, and in each panel one comes to an end at the top and one at the bottom, it is evident that there must have been four panels and consequently four handles.¹

The neck, the panel-divisions, and the alternate friezes are decorated with conventional rockwork patterns, bordered by single or double strips of the favourite Late Minoan spray, which also decorates the upper surface of the rim. The alternation of these closely-worked bands, resembling rich embroidery, with the wider spacing of the flower-frieze is undeniably effective, but it is clear that mechanical repetition has dulled the painter's perception of the beauty of jagged rocks and their honeycombed surfaces. To see these patterns at their best one must turn to a vase on which the Minoan picture of the marine wonderland is given with something of the original spirit.

Plate XII.⁶ represents the upper part of a large ewer from Phylakopi.² Of the lower part no fragments were found; probably it was pear-shaped. The neck, rising abruptly from the spreading shoulder, bears the same ornament of white spaces reserved within a dark ground as that of the amphora just described. Below the neck begins a magnificent design of rockwork which descends in four great masses, branching and jutting out in smaller promontories, down the shoulder of the vase. The space between two of them forms a miniature cove within which a nautilus riles in shelter, while outside, in deep water as it were, swims a great octopus. The scene was no doubt bordered below, as it is above, by a garland of fantastic rocks. In this marine connection there cannot be much doubt as to the meaning of the design on the neck. When (as on an unpublished vase of this period) a similar rosette with irregular radial divisions fills the eye of a spiral, it certainly stands for the flower so often found in the same position. There, and more clearly still on the neck of the Vaphio amphora (Pl. XI.), where the surface which they clothe has a margin

¹ The butterfly-like creature which alternates with the ornaments on Plates XI. and XII. does not seem to me to be justified by the fragment which suggested it. In all other points I agree with the editors.
² A smaller illustration of it is given in Excavations at Phylakopi, Pl. XXXI. 1.
of indented rock, these flower-like forms may be read as sea-anemones. As to the technique, both Mr. Marshall and Mr. Mackenzie\(^4\) have pointed out that patterns of this kind, formed by reserving patches of pale ground-colour within a field of dark glaze-paint, are but one step removed from the white-on-black of Middle Minoan ceramics. The combination of buff and black furnished a less brilliant contrast, but had the compensating advantage of greater durability.\(^5\)

The cruciform rock-mass surrounding the neck of the Phylakopi ewer is treated in two different ways—the surface is either covered with small overlapping cells, or with a bold network filled in with sprinkled dots. Both methods are combined in the panel-divisions of the Vaphio amphora, while the oblique friezes are covered with continuous cellwork. Except for the introduction of nautilus within the rocky tracts on the Vaphio jar, the conventions of the two vases are the same; but the freer and finer style of the ewer shows that it was painted before these marine designs had lost their freshness, while the patchwork arrangement of the marine elements on Pl. XI seems to prove the contrary for the amphora. The laborious repetition of these rockwork patterns must have become intolerably irksome. Pl. XII\(a\) represents a marine vase of this period, also from Phylakopi, on which they are altogether omitted, the only rocks represented being black knobs decorated with waving tufts of seaweed.

§ 2.—The Cretan Origin of these Vases.

These three vases are important additions to that remarkable group of marine designs which until lately was best known by three pieces found at various times in Egypt—the famous aiguière in the Château Borely at Marseille;\(^6\) a bridge-spouted jug in the New York Museum;\(^7\) and a shallow pyxis in the British Museum\(^8\) which, as Mr. Walters has pointed out, is almost identical in design with the New York jug.\(^9\) Within the last few years the number has been increased by a dozen at least of fine examples from excavations in Eastern Crete, in particular Mr. Hogarth’s exquisite ‘filler’ with shell-decoration from Zakro;\(^{10}\) a series of similar fillers from Palaikastro;\(^{11}\) a vase from the latter site in the form of a flattened gourd, and a three-handled Bügelkanne from Miss Boyd’s excavations at Gournia. Numerous fragments, in particular the top of a three-handled Bügelkanne, and part of a nautilus design closely related to that of the two vases found in Egypt, occurred at Phylakopi.

This distribution points to Crete as the place of manufacture. The

---

\(^{4}\) _J.H.S._ xxiii, 190.

\(^{5}\) A good instance of a similar pattern is the old technique is a large jar found in Thera but certainly imported from Crete, the neck of which is decorated with continuous clusters of white nautiluses (now in great part obliterated) on a dark ground. It is in the collection of the French School at Athens.

\(^{6}\) Perrot and Chipiez, iv. Fig. 438.

\(^{7}\) _P. and C._ vi. Fig. 430. _A.I.A._ vi. 437.

\(^{8}\) _P. and C._ Fig. 485.

\(^{9}\) _J.H.S._ xvii. 42.

\(^{10}\) _J.H.S._ xxii. Pl. XII.

\(^{11}\) _B.S.A._ ix. p. 311.
Egyptian finds confirm what we already know of intercourse between Crete and Egypt; and on the other side the Mycenaean civilisation of the Euritas valley is more likely to have depended for its luxuries on Crete than on Mycenae, where, by the way, these marine designs are but scantily represented. I have published elsewhere a vase from Eastern Crete which exactly matches the design of the painted goblet from Vaphio; and more recently Mr. Dawkins has sent me a drawing of a potsherd found at Palaikastro which repeats the division into vertical and oblique zones of rockwork characteristic of the Vaphio amphora. Almost every archaeologist who has seen the relief-work on the steatite vases found at Phaestus has recognised in it an argument for the Cretan origin of the Vaphio gold cups. Mr. Evans long ago suggested that these steatite reliefs were meant to be platted with gold; and during last season's excavations at Palaikastro Mr. Currey actually discovered a fragment of a steatite rhyton with a representation of a charging boar, to which a particle of gold-leaf still adhered—a remarkable fulfilment of an acute prediction. Motives for Cretan trade with Laconia existed in the famous green porphyry of Cnossus near the modern Levkotzova—a store of large blocks from these quarries has recently come to light in the Palace at Cnossus—and in the purple-shell for which the Laconian Gulf was famous in later days. The presence of the palm in the hunting-scene on the gold cup has been used as an argument for a supposed Syrian centre of Mycenaean art, but is really another argument in favour of Crete, since the palm grows wild there to this day; the grove of palms which descends to the sea-shore near Irtanos is well known to travellers in the Sitia province.

§ 3.—The Meaning of the Marine Designs.

Any attempt to estimate the significance of this School of Marine Design must take account not only of painted vases but of the whole range of Minoan art and industry. As early as the Middle Minoan Age there is apparent in the art of Cnossus a naturalistic movement which by the close of the first Late Minoan sub-period has attained a high degree of perfection in the faience reliefs found with the figures of the Snake-Goddess. The same deposit contained flying-fish, shells, and rockwork, modelled in glazed earthenware, and evidently the débris of an elaborate scapiece. In the ensuing or second Late Minoan period the wall-paintings at Cnossus and Phylakopi display the triumph of this new style of marine design, and we can recognise its influence in many of the minor arts—in the class of pottery under discussion; in certain engraved gems and gem-impressions; in the exquisite steatite casket from Mycenae with its almost Japanese carving of an octopus among rocks (which may be matched by a fragment from Cnossus); in the numerous pieces of goldsmith's work of which Mycenaean tombs have been so prolific; and in the innumerable cheaper trinkets of glass-paste, representing cuttlefish or nautilus
or triton shell. And it may be that it had an equal vogue in wood-
carving, embroidery, and other handicrafts which have left no material
traces.

Yet these designs were only one phase of an art which had a wonderfully
comprehensive outlook over the whole natural world. Each year of excava-
tion brings fresh proofs of its versatility. So extensive was its range of
subjects, including man and beast, bird and butterfly, trees and flowers, and
even the beginnings of landscape, that the special popularity of these marine
designs and their enduring influence in ceramic tradition seem to demand an
explanation.

This explanation is to be found not so much in their intrinsic beauty as
in the local conditions under which they were produced. The sea was the
highway of the populous unfortified settlements which fringed the shores of
prehistoric Crete. The ruling class derived its wealth from trade oversea,
and then, as now, the sea provided a good part of the food of the poor. The
modern inhabitant of the Cretan coast or the islands of the Archipelago
may be no sailor, but he is generally half a fisherman, for whom familiarity
with the sea and its fruits does not necessarily involve possession of a boat.
He works with line or spear or basket-trap from the rocks, catches the cuttle-
fish with a primitive pine-bark lure that might have been made in the South
Seas, and esteems its flesh a delicacy. The triton is a rarer prize; its contents
are eaten and the shell furnishes a trumpet for the village field-guard. It
is an open question whether the shells represented on Minoan vases (such
as Pl. Ra) are meant for murex or triton. Even in the more careful draw-
ings recently discovered in Eastern Crete, the artist seems to have combined
the spiky surface of the one with the elongated proportions of the other. It
is clear, however, that the Minoan Cretans had anticipated the Phoenicians
in the manufacture of purple dye. Last year Mr. Currell and I found a
bank of pounded purple-shell (murex trunculus) associated with Middle
Minoan vases on the island of Kourophiisi (ancient Leuke) off the south-east
coast of Crete, and during the past season we have come across two similar
deposits in the neighbouring ruins of Palaikastro, in either case associated
with Middle Minoan pottery. Again, when we remember that these very
waters used to be famous for their sponges, and are still visited every summer
by a host of caques from Kythnos and other centres of sponge-diving, we
are tempted to guess that sponges as well as purple-juice were among the
wares shipped from Crete to her markets in the East. One of the painted
‘fillers’ from Palaikastro shows us the murex-shells clustered on the rocks,
from which, no doubt, they were collected by divers in the fashion described
by Pliny, and the flying-fish picture from Phylakopi has unmistakable
sponges on the sea-floor. Then, as now, on Aegean benches the diver was a
hero. We have a far-away reflection of the glamour that surrounded his
doings in that old Minoan story of the marine underworld which tells how
Theseus at the challenge of Minos descended to the palace of Amphitrite
and brought him back his ring.
At ports, where sailors and fishermen and divers for sponge and purple went and came, it was natural for an imaginative race to acquire that sense of the magic and mystery of the sea, that curiosity about the life in its depths, which found expression in those ceramic pictures.

§ 4.—The Palace-Style Amphoras from a Tomb at Mycenæ.

Professor Tsountas, who took a lively interest in Mr. Marshall’s work on the Vaphio fragments, had recently discovered remains of two large jars of similar size and form in the dromos of a chamber-tomb at Mycenæ. With great generosity he suggested that Mr. Marshall should study and publish these vases and the other objects found with them. Restored drawings were made by Mr. Bagge under Mr. Marshall’s direction: the more complete vase is here published for the first time (Pl. XIII.); the other was used by Mr. Mackenzie to illustrate his paper on The Pottery of Knossos (J.H.S. xxiii. 192).

I need not repeat the careful description which Mr. Mackenzie has given (loc. p. 194) of the characteristics of the great jars found in the Palace at Cnossus. The two vases from Mycenæ resemble them so closely in the ruddy colouring and gritty texture of their clay, in their warm buff slip, and glaze-paint varying from red to black, that, apart from similarity of design, it is safe to declare that they must have been painted at Cnossus. In the case of the Vaphio amphora there are differences which point rather to some other Cretan site.

The design of the vase published by Mr. Mackenzie can be paralleled in every detail by fragments found in the Palace; indeed Mr. Marshall’s restoration is largely based on evidence supplied by Cnossian fragments. To find a repetition of the splendid scroll-pattern of Pl. XIII. we must go to Phaestus, where it reappears on a small vase which the Italian excavators have not yet published. The most curious feature of the design is the substitution, for the leaves or fronds along one side of the spray, of a series of little crested volutes. These same volutes appear on either side of certain figures in the flower-frieze of Pl. XI., of which I have deferred mention until now. These figures seem to be meaningless combinations of elements current in the design of the time; it should be noticed that the lower half is identical with that of a figure in the field of the gold ring found in the Vaphio Tomb, consisting of a kind of ankh combined with a double axe. The same double-axe combination appears on two fragments of Palace-Style

18 Raschylides (ed. Kenyon), xvi. 81.
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ware found at Phylakopi and on a vase from Miss Boyd's excavations at Gournia in Eastern Crete.

The same tomb yielded a quantity of minor antiquities, some of which furnish fresh links not only with Crete but with Egypt, in particular a series of vases of steatite and alabaster and some inlay-tablets of coloured faience. Before discussing them, it will be convenient to describe the tomb and enumerate its contents.

The tomb, a square rock-cut chamber approached by a short dromos, lies between the so-called Treasuries of Atreus and Clytaemnestra and near the carriage-road leading up to the Lion Gate. The entrance to the chamber had been walled up and the fragments of the two large jars were found in the dromos outside the blocked doorway; they might therefore be of later date than the objects found inside, since the example of the Menidi tomb shows that the cult of the dead, consisting chiefly in the deposition of offerings in the dromos, sometimes continued for centuries; but on grounds of style it is impossible to suppose that these amphorae, which so closely resemble those in use at Cnossus shortly before the fall of the Palace, can be much posterior— it would be easier to regard them as anterior—to the offerings found within, which present several points of contact with finds made in the Palace of Cnossus and in the Shaft-graves. It is likely that they are approximately contemporary with the interment.

The contents of the tomb had been crushed by the fall of the roof, and there are indications, particularly the presence of a sword-hilt (4908) without its blade, that it had been superficially plundered. Professor Tsountas noted both here and in other Mycenaean tombs which he has opened that some of the trinkets were associated with small heaps of charcoal as though some of the offerings, perhaps the robes to which these ornaments were attached, had been burned within the tomb—a suggestion parallel to the burned deposits in the supposed 'graves of foreigners' at Gurob in the Fayoum. He has never found bones mixed with the charcoal or any other indication that the body had been burned.

The following objects were found in the tomb. I give the order and numbering of the Museum inventory:

4902. Eleven butterflies or sea-horses of thin gold (Fig. 1c), pierced with thread-holes. The head and body are not unlike those of the little hippocamp (Hippocampus hippocastri) of the Mediterranean, which is still prized as a charm at Naples. The amplification of its fin into a butterfly-wing may be illustrated by the presence of such wings on several of the Zakro sealings (J.H.S. XXII, pp. 92, 93) as part of the equipment of composite monsters.

4903. Twelve gold pendants forming a necklace (Fig. 1d).

4904. Seventeen flowers of thin gold like Ferrol and Chipiez, vi. Fig. 508.

4905. Eight rosettes of thin gold; some have little gold rings attached by a wire of the same metal.

12 One is reproduced, upside-down, in Excavations at Phylakopi, II. XXX, 1.
13 See Pauwels, 1896, p. 192. Some of the objects enumerated below seem to have been
found in a second tomb adjoining the first, but they are not distinguished in the notes with which Professor Tsountas has so kindly furnished me.
4906. Two nautili stamped in gold leaf (Fig. 1q).
4907. Small staff of gold and bronze.
4908 and 4914. Sword-hilt and pommel of white faience.
4909. Eight bronze arrowheads.
4910. Four globular beads of amethyst and some of glass-paste.
4911. Three fragments of sphinxes of lepis tessellate.
4912. Inlay-tablets of pale grey faience with dark stripes (Fig. 3).
4913. Four small pieces of fine coin.
4914. (See 4908).
4915. Oblong jewel of thin gold plate, the upper surface decorated with champlevé enamel-work, now much perished, two parallel perforations below (Fig. 19).

4916. Gold hair or 'toggle' (like one from the Fourth Shaft-grave, Schuchhardt-Sellers Fig. 234).
4917. Pieces of thin gold plate, probably from a dagger-hilt, with chased spiral ornamentation.
4918. Pieces of gold leaf.
4919. Insignificant fragments of a silver vase.
4920. Beaked jug of alabaster (Pl. XIV, f).
4921. Flat-rimmed jar of steatite (Pl. XIV, c).
4922. Spherical jar of steatite (Pl. XIV, d).
4923. Squat jug of alabaster (Pl. XIV, e).
4924. Small lamp of steatite (Pl. XIV, a).
4925. Large lamp of steatite (Pl. XIV, b).

§ 5. The Stone Vases from the Mycenae Tomb.

We come to the six stone vases (Pl. XIV.). Cretan analogies show that they too were imported. The material of the two lamps a and b is a grey variety of Cretan steatite, and their form as well as their exquisite spiral ornamentation can be matched in the museum at Candia. Rare on the mainland, lamps of this form were fairly common at Phylakopi, where Cretan influence was strong. At Chersones, Phalakros, and other Minoan sites in

---

13 Executions at Phylakopi, p. 202; two such lamps of steatite and at least eight imitations in clay.
Crete, lamps not only of this form but of this material have been found in such numbers as to leave no doubt about the Cretan origin of those found at Mycenae and in Melos.

Of the two jars $e$ and $f$, which are worked in bluish-black Cretan steatite, the latter reproduces a familiar ceramic form which survived from the Middle into the Late Minoan period, and the former is a compromise between that and another well-established Cretan form, the cylindrical jar with side-handles and 'bridged spout,' an example of which in Cretan steatite was found in the Nauplia cemetery.\(^{14}\)

The two jugs $e$ and $f$ present a more complex problem. The oriental alabaster of which they are made is said not to occur in Greece or Crete, but is known to have been quarried on a large scale in Egypt and to have been worked into vases at almost all periods of Egyptian history. Though alike in material they differ in form, $e$ being as distinctly Egyptian in its lines as $f$ is Minoan. The former is an ordinary product of Egyptian industry; the latter was made for the Aegean market, probably in a Minoan workshop.

The general shape of $e$, a globular body surmounted by a cylindrical neck, is common to many Egyptian vases, of bronze and clay as well as alabaster, under the Eighteenth Dynasty. Fortunately it has one characteristic feature, the prolongation of the flat handle in a grooved collar which clasps the neck immediately below the lip, which fixes its period and its affinities. In the British Museum there are at least a dozen Egyptian vases of various shapes and sizes with this handle-attachment, four in serpentine, one in diorite, the remainder in alabaster.\(^{15}\) It is true that in origin this peculiar feature is not purely Egyptian—it seems to have been adopted from the Syrian "base-ring" flasks which were imported in large numbers into Egypt under the Eighteenth Dynasty.\(^{16}\) But the direction in which the alabaster copies diverge from the parent type leaves no doubt that they are native Egyptian products. Thus a specimen in the Berlin Museum,\(^{17}\) which by the kindness of Dr. Schäfer I am allowed to reproduce here (Fig. 2), has a base in the form of the common Egyptian ring-stand, carved in one piece with it—an adaptation not likely to have originated outside Egypt. Moreover this handle-attachment is found in Egyptian green-glazed ware and in glass.\(^{18}\)

\(^{14}\) The spat of the Nauplia vase was made in a separate piece and is now missing, but the dowel-holes for affixing it can be seen.

\(^{15}\) Fourth Egyptian Room, Nos. 4638, 4639, 4640, 4641, 4799, 4794, 4279, 26289, 24, 417, 25, 402, 36, 386, 36, 404, 36, 465. For information about them I am indebted to Mr. G. E. Hall. Another is in the Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge.

\(^{16}\) Dr. J. L. Myres conjectures that the ware had a Levantine prototype, presumably somewhere in Syria; see J.H.S. xvii. 181, and Cyprus Museum Catalogue, p. 37. Note that it reached Egypt earlier than Cyprus, where it appears almost simultaneously with Mycenaean ware of advanced type—not much earlier than Amonophis III.

\(^{17}\) No. 3910, from the Erasmian Collection. Others of this type are in the British Museum and in Prof. Petrie's collection at University College.

\(^{18}\) Green-glazed ware No. 21, 219, glass No. 22, 818, in the British Museum.
The class to which it belongs is discussed by Mr. J. L. Myres in El-Arəb, pp. 72-75. He concludes that they were made (1) probably in Egypt, (2) in a fabric recently introduced from the Palestinian area, (3) under the influence of Aegean models and artistic and ceramic conventions.

John Garstang, El-Arəb, Tomb E. 178, Pl. XIX, XXI, and p. 97.

El-Arəb, D. 119, Pl. LV. 66, and pp. 92, 102.
Quite recently a group of Egyptian alabastra, including one slender flask with the peculiar handle-attachment seen on c, has come to light in a great royal tomb discovered by Mr. Evans on a hill-top near Caossos. With them were magnificent painted amphorae somewhat more advanced in style than those published in the present paper.

The other vase from the Mycenaean tomb, f, looks like a clever copy in alabaster of the silver flagon found in the Fourth Shaft-grave, which also contained that remarkable alabaster vase with three handles, evidently copied from a metal prototype. A fragment of a vase like f, also in alabaster, showing the ring at the base of the neck and the spring of the handle, was found at Caossos in 1900. The S-shaped handle and ring on the shoulder are seen on Egyptian representations of Keltian vases, and particularly on one large white amphora which Mr. Hall is probably right in interpreting as of silver. Since such vases were imported into Egypt it is quite possible that the native alabaster-workers copied them, just as centuries later they copied the shapes of imported Hellenic hydriae. But Egyptian craftsmen were not as a rule good copyists, and there is a whole series of alabaster vases of true Minoan design, found in Crete and on the mainland, which were certainly made for the Minoan market by Minoan workmen. Such are the alabaster triton-shells found in the Palace at Caossos and in a tomb near Phaestus—in the latter case associated with plain cylindrical jars of the same material which may be of genuine Egyptian workmanship; and such too the fine alabaster vases carved with shields and other Minoan ornaments which were found in the Throne-room.

We must suppose that the traders who brought back the finished Egyptian vases also imported masses of raw alabaster to be worked up by the skilled lapidaries of Crete.

§ 6.—The Facieae Inlays.

The Mycenaean tomb also contained a number of broken tablets of faience (Fig. 3) with a pale green surface on which are dark purplish-brown stripes of varying width. They must have decorated some small article such as the lid of a box. Probably the pieces shaped like a and c of Fig. 3 were arranged in groups of four with their apices in contact, forming an eight-pointed star, thus . The pieces shaped like b are all fragmentary; they may

---

37 Schliemann, Mycena, p. 243. Cf. also Excavations at Phikale, p. 185, pl. XXVII S.
38 The reproduction in metal by M. Gilliéron is successful and convincing.
40 In the Berlin Museum there is a little alabaster Bippelklos, found in Egypt and presumably made there.
41 The Minoan pottery copied this form in clay. One example found at Phaestus has the wave-markings of the alabaster imitated in paint.
42 The B.S.A. vi. 41. The alabaster goblet found in the First Shaft-grave and its companion from their probably reproduce a Minoan metal-form.
have formed the border. The pieces here figured are the only ones that are approximately whole. They are bevelled off towards the back, in order to give the mastic or cement holding a better hold, and two of them have a character incised on the back, perhaps for the guidance of the workman.

The only other object of this kind from Mycenae is a large disc from the Fourth Shaft-grave. At Cnossus, on the other hand, the art of inlaying seems to have been practised during a long period and in a variety of materials, bone, ivory, and crystal as well as faience. In his excavation reports Mr. Evans has several times discussed these inlay-tablets, their materials, and the characters frequently found on their backs. At the beginning of the Late Minoan period there was an extensive manufacture at Cnossus of all kinds of ornaments and even of vessels and figurines in faience, and just as the faience disc from the Fourth Shaft-grave resembles those found in the Throne-room at Cnossus, so too the extraordinary faience knots found with it reappear at Cnossus—but in ivory, a material to some extent interchangeable with 'porcelain' in the art of the period. It is not impossible

\[\text{FIG. 3.—FAIENCE INLAYS FROM TOMB AT MYCENAE (1:1).}\]

that the art of making faience and of inlaying was acclimatised at Mycenae; but the rarity of such objects there and their abundance at Cnossus and the close resemblance of the Mycenaean to the Cnossian specimens, are in favour of their direct importation from Crete.

The presence of the incised marks points the same way. While we have abundant evidence of the use of geometrical signs in Crete and in Melos as well as in Egypt, they are still rare on the mainland. Of the few inscribed objects found there, several may be set aside on independent evidence as importations. Here are three definite instances:

(1) Handle and part of rim of a seal-less jar bearing three incised characters, found at Mycenae (Tsountas-Manatt, p. 269). Material and form are Crete, closely resembling Pl. XIV.d; consequently the inscription may have been engraved in Crete and proves nothing as to writing at Mycenae.


23 Schliemann, *Mycenae*, p. 242, where one knot is erroneously described as of alabaster.

(2) Marks scratched on the handles of certain pointed amphorae, four of which were found in the Menidi tomb (Lolling, Kappelgrath, etc.; Pl. IX, 1-4), and two subsequently at Mycenae. These jars, which are of a pale non-Mycenaean clay, were recognised by Prof. Petrie some years ago as belonging to a purely Egyptian class which may be dated to the end of the Eighteenth or the Nineteenth Dynasty. The marks seem to me to have been scratched after the clay was hard. They are probably records of quantity, value, or ownership, affixed at the port of shipment; it is not probable that they were made independently in Argolis and in Attica.

(3) An H-like mark repeated on each of the three handles of a pear-shaped jar found by Dr. Siaia in a tomb at Nauplia (Tsountas-Manatt, p. 269). It is decorated with ill-drawn figures of oxen in the style of the later vases from Enkomi in Cyprus and of others (seen at a dealer's) from Rhodes. This style is rare on the mainland, and the vase is likely to have been imported.

The faience and inlay industries of Cnossus were originally derived from Egypt. Mr. Evans has pointed out that the resemblance between the inlays of Cnossus and Egypt, particularly those of Tel-el-Yahudiyyeh, is confirmed by the presence of similar and in some cases identical marks on their backs. The inlays from Tel-el-Yahudiyyeh, of which there is a large collection in the British Museum, decorated a kiosk in the palace of Rameses II, and are therefore of considerably later date than those from Cnossus and Mycenae. Nevertheless the unusual shape of the inlays here published (Fig. 3 a and c) can be matched by specimens from this Egyptian site, and at least one of our marks, the Α, is among those which occur there. As Mr. Evans has said, there must have been a common stock of such signs used by inlayers and other craftsmen both in Egypt and in Crete, and it is probable that a numerical value was attached to some of them, that they thus acquired a fixed order, and that the existence of this selection from the host of signs current for various purposes in the Mediterranean ultimately contributed to the formation of the alphabet.

R. C. Bosanquet.

*One of this form from Tel-el-Yahudiyyeh is in the British Museum, another in the York Museum.*
DAMOPHON.

Mr. A. M. Daniel's article on the above subject (pp. 41 seq.) is so thorough and convincing that it hardly requires further support. But in view of the widespread acceptance of the attribution of the Lycosura statues to a late Roman date, I think a few words in further confirmation of his contention are not out of place.

In spite of the almost unanimous voice-faces in the opinion of archaeologists since Dr. Doerpfel expressed his doubts as to the Greek character of the buildings at Lycosura, my own view (expressed in the Athenaeum, March 22nd, 1890, and at a public meeting of the American School at Athens, January 6th, 1891) that Damophon's work belongs to the first half of the fourth century B.C. has not been shaken. Of course we must all remember that we have here to deal with the question of probability and not of certainty. Yet within these limits it appears to me that the balance of evidence strongly inclines towards the fourth century B.C.

There is little to add to Mr. Daniel's excellent analysis and comparison of style. Taking merely the treatment of the eyes and brow and the lids in these heads, the material which we have at our disposal, now, would make it almost certain that they could not have been worked later than the fourth century; they certainly do not manifest the characteristic treatment which we find in the second century B.C., or in Hadrianic work. If, moreover, we remember the choice of subjects which this sculptor makes (a point, to my mind, of extreme importance in judging the date of a Greek artist), and if we note how he chooses almost exclusively gods, among whom Asclepius is foremost, remembering further that Asclepius seems to have come into such prominence in the first half of the fourth century, we shall find it hard on these grounds to believe that Damophon is a sculptor of the second century B.C. or of the Hadrianic period.

Another peculiarity of technical treatment seems to me most significant; though the eyebrows and eyelids are treated in the same manner in all three heads, the orb itself is completely worked in the head of Demeter; while in those of Anytus and Artemis it is hollowed out to receive the insertion of some foreign matter. The hair of Artemis is completely modelled in the marble, while that of Demeter was supplemented by the insertion of bronze ornaments. This uncertainty of technique, or rather, this searching after a fixed method for dealing with such statues, seems to me to find its best explanation in the hypothesis that the artist marks the transition from the
gold and ivory or bronze technique in temple statues of the Phidian period
to the pure marble technique of the age of Scopas and Praxiteles. And
this hypothesis gains in probability when we remember the fact, upon which
Brunn long ago laid stress, that Damophon, to whom, honours are paid by
the Eleans, fitted together with the utmost accuracy the image of Zeus at
Olympia when the ivory in that image had cracked' (Pausanias, iv. 31. 6).
He thus bears a distinct relation to the gold and ivory technique of the fifth
century, while, on the other hand, he himself uses the acrolithic technique
(marble and gilt wood) and finally marble alone. This succession in the use
of materials points to the first half of the fourth century B.C. and not to the
Roman period.

But the strongest argument in favour of the earlier date of this artist is
derived from the fact that his chief works were to be found at Megalopolis
and Messene, which were both founded, or refounded, by Epaminondas about
the year 369 B.C. New Megalopolis went under after the Macedonian
period, and it is equally unlikely that Messene should in later ages have been
in a condition to order as many works by Damophon as Pausanias thinks fit
to mention. In the enumeration which Pausanias makes (ibid.) of the
statues by Damophon at Messene he mentions the image of the city of
Thebes and the statue of Epaminondas; and though he goes on to say that
the marble images are the works of Damophon, . . . . the statue of
Epaminondas is of iron and is the work of some other artist, the statue of
Thebes remains for Damophon; and from the context it is unlikely that
centuries elapsed between the creation of the other works and of the statue
of Epaminondas. Thus the Theban supremacy under Epaminondas is
distinctly indicated as the period when Damophon lived. Had I space, I
should like to enlarge upon the probability, for which there is strong evidence,
that this Theban supremacy coincided with the predominance of such myth-
ological figures as Asclepius and Artemis, which hold so large a proportion
among the statues made by Damophon.

CHARLES WALDSTEIN.

1 For the foundation of Megalopolis, see Niese, Hermes, 1898, Beiträge zur Gesch. Arkadiens,
pp. 327 seq. See also Bury, J.H.S. 1898, pp. 13 seq.
ANTIQUE RINGS PIERCED WITH GOLD NAILS.

Among the silver rings in the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities in the British Museum are seven which have a stud or nail of gold driven through the bezel. The intaglio designs on these rings are as follows:

(1) Two sphinxes confronted. (2) Ox-head and bird placed opposite one another on oblong bezel. (3) Recumbent lion to r., looking back over its shoulder. Cf. Furtwängler, Beschreibung der griech. Steine im Arch., No. 152. These three designs are archaic in style. (4) Woman seated to r., holding out dove on l. hand. Cf. a coin of Eryx (Gardner, Types of Greek Coins, Pl. VI. 3). On the ring a wreath takes the place of the standing Eros. (5) Design similar to last, but in reverse direction; no wreath.

Silver ring in Brit. Mus. and impression (2:1).

The last two rings are of good style, but poor execution (4th—3rd cent. B.C.). (6) Very much worn; a female figure can be made out. (7) A very curious design, which I am unable to explain. A jackal's head surmounts a vase-like object. Before the head is a curved, behind, a straight handle (7). See Figure.

1 For other examples, see Dalton, Cat. of Early Christian Antiquities, 233; Pollak, Klass. Ant. Goldschmuckkunst, Pl. xviii. 499. The latter's explanation of the presence of the nail—that it is to protect the design in relief—seems to me quite impossible; Archæologia, 44, Pt. 13, 8, p. 390.

2 The descriptions apply to impressions.

3 Furtwängler (Die Bronzen aus Olympia, 1187, 1187a, p. 187 n.) has apparently confused (1) and (2). In his Ant. Geogr. iii. p. 90 he has described them correctly, and rightly considers that the presence of the nail is a sign of superstitious belief.
The bezels of these rings are pierced by gold nails in every variety of position: (1) in the centre, (2) a little to r. of centre, (3) just below the lion's back, (4) at the top on the r. near the edge, (5) in the middle of the r. side, (6) by two nails placed symmetrically at the top and bottom of the elliptical bezel, (7) on the extreme edge, low down on the l. side. This variety of position would alone suffice to render untenable the theory that the gold stud was intended to adorn the silver ring. The object of the nails in the Homerica ἔκτετρων χρυσέως ἄλοιπος πετάμενον was of course decorative, but our rings by no means present a parallel. The haphazard way in which many of the nails are placed is certainly not calculated to improve the appearance of the design.

King (Antique Gems and Rings, p. 381 n.) notices the fact that the heads of many antique rings are thus traversed by studs of gold, but he does not attempt to offer any explanation.

It is clear, I think, that the nails must have had some definite meaning, whatever that meaning may have been. A purchaser of to-day would not be likely to accept a ring so 'adorned,' and there is no reason to think that a Greek purchaser would have done so either, had there not been causes to suppose that a distinct advantage would result from the wearing of such an object.

The best way of arriving at a solution of the problem is to examine analogous uses of nails, whether mentioned in literature or observable in actual objects of antiquity.

It will be found that nails are very frequently employed in connection with magical rites. In such cases the nail is believed either (a) to drive home, as it were, the force of the incantation, or (b) to be efficacious in curing or averting some evil.

(a) It is well known that magical inscriptions are often found on nails. Several such nails may be seen in the British Museum. Nails too are not infrequently seen driven through leaden tablets on which imprecations have been inscribed. Ovid describes how a bag on the day of the Feriae made use of a bronze needle in her magic rites:—

> quodque pice adstrinxit, quad non tricidit arma, obstumum maenae torret in igne caput.

The use of the word desigere, in the sense of 'to enchant,' also points to a belief in the magical power of nails.

(b) Still more frequent are instances of the employment of nails for the averting or cure of evil. The nail driven by the dictator into the wall of the cella of Minerva in the Capitoline temple of Jupiter is said to have stayed a

---

* H. i. 245 f.
* TheBritish Museum possesses such a tablet.
Cf. also Ep. Apx., 1908, p. 55; Miss Harrison, Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion, p. 141 ff.
* Post 2, 577 f.
* Cf. Rehbo, Popsie III, p. 88 n.
pestilence. Two curious passages in Pliny’s *Historia Naturalis* relative to the magical virtues of nails are worth quoting.

(1) *Clavum ferreum defigere in quo loco primum, caput fixerit cornuem morbo comitiali absolutorium eius nali dicitur* (28. 63).

As a parallel to this may be cited a passage from Thomas Lupton’s *Second Book of Notable Things* (1660), p. 40: “Three Nails made in the Vigil of the Nativity of St. John Baptist, called Midsummer Eve, and driven in so deep that they cannot be seen, in the place where the party doth fall that have the falling sickness, and naming the said party’s name while it is doing, doth drive away the disease quite.”

(2) *Prodest ... praefixisse in limine eivlsos sepulcris clavos adversus nocturnas lympagationes* (34. 151.)

It is no doubt true that nails were employed in magic partly because of the iron or bronze of which they were composed; cf. Schol. on *Od*. xi. 48: *λοσί τις παρά ἀνθρώποις ἐστιν ύπόλυψις στι νεκρῶν καὶ εἰσερχόμενοι σπόρου φοβοῦσται.* But I do not think that there can be any doubt after a consideration of the above passages that nails were valued by dealers in magic on account of their piercing powers, apart from the material of which they were formed. It must be admitted that the use of gold nails, as seen in the case of our rings, cannot be exactly paralleled.

That rings themselves were held to possess magical properties is well known. Rings made from nails that had fastened together a cross were used as charms; cf. Luc. *Philoæad.* 17: *καὶ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἑταραττόμενον πρὸς αὐτὰ, εὖν ἐπὶ τοῦ θόους οὐδέν τε παράλογον ὤραν μοι δοκεῖ, καὶ σύν μᾶλλον ἐξ ὧν κοίτων τὸν ἐκτύλιον ὁ Ἀραγὸς έφοικα σιδήρου τοῦ ἐκ τῶν σταυρῶν πετσουράνων.* The *Δίκαμον*, in Aristophanes’ *Plutus*, says to the *Συκοφάντης*:

οὐδὲν προτιμῶ σοι φορῶ ἡμὰς πριάμενος 
τὸν δικτύλιον τοιδί παρ’ Ἑβδάμων δραχμής;

*In Berkshire,* says Brand, “there is a popular superstition that a ring made from a piece of silver collected at the communion is a cure for convulsions and fits of every kind.” Many other beliefs of a similar nature could be cited.

It is impossible to resist the conclusion that the practice of piercing

---

10 A nail nail found in the *Sanctuary of Aesculapius* in Paros bears the inscription *PYP.* Rubenianus, in *Athen. Misc.* xvi. p. 229, suggests that the nail was driven into the wall of the sanctuary as a protection against fire.
11 With this may be compared a cure for epilepsy mentioned by Brand, *op. cit.* p. 255.
12 *In Devonshire is a similar custom... The ring must be made of three nails or screws which have been used to fasten a coffin, and must be dug out of the churchyard.*
rings with a nail of gold must have been due to a desire to combine the magic properties of nails and rings. If a nail or a ring by itself had the power of averting the evil eye, much greater must have been the potency of the two together. Herein then, I think, is to be sought the explanation of what, at first sight, is rather a puzzling phenomenon.

A COUNTER-PROTEST.

DR. CHARLES WALDSTEIN, in his article entitled "The Bronze Statue from Cerigo and the Study of Style," which appeared in vol. xxiv. pp. 129-134 of this Journal, published a protest against the methods and results of my research.

If I reply to Dr. Waldstein's statements by a counter-protest, I do so only in deference to the high scientific position occupied by this Journal, the organ of a Society which has conferred on me the distinction of honorary membership. As to the general question of Dr. Waldstein's scientific work, on which the value of his critician depends, I have already expressed my opinion in my notice of his 'Argive Heraeum' written for the Berliner philologische Wochenschrift, July 1904.

As evidence supporting his view of my work Dr. Waldstein brings forward the assertion that I published in the 50th Winckelmannsprogramm an incorrect drawing of the 'Orestes' of the Naples group, and that my whole 'stylistic comparison,' including the hypothesis I suggested about Ageladas, was founded on the mistake in the drawing. Now it is true that the drawing referred to is not quite correct. It was prepared by Herr Max Lübke, as is expressly stated in the text, not from the original, and not from a cast (for there was no cast in Berlin), but from a photograph. Everybody knows how easily faults in proportion can creep into such reproductions. But with this drawing or its faults my remarks on style or my attribution of the type to Ageladas have absolutely no connexion. The sole object of the drawing, as I distinctly stated in that place, is to shew clearly how the general motif of the Ligurio bronze is related to the so-called Stephanos type. I laid great stress on the differences in detail, and therefore in proportion, between the bronze on the one hand and the various replicas of the 'Stephanos' type on the other. To suppose that the derivation of the plastic schema (common to the Ligurio bronze and the Stephanos-type) from Ageladas has any connexion with mistakes in the drawing is, to put it mildly, an instance of 'singular naiveté.' That my thesis is a necessary consequence from the classification of art tendencies in the fifth century B.C. which I have attempted, Dr. Waldstein will doubtless not admit, but I think that any one who has made a serious attempt to grapple with the problem will agree with me.

A. FURTWÄNGLER.

Munich.
AN IONIAN DEDICATION TO ISIS.

The inscription of which a facsimile is given below is incised on the base of a bronze statuette which has lately been acquired by the Cairo Museum. The statuette itself represents Isis seated on a throne suckling the child Horus. It is an ordinary Egyptian type and there is nothing Greek about the work except the inscription. Its provenance unfortunately is unknown.

\[\text{Inscription on Base of Statuette in Cairo Museum}\]

The letters run round the four sides of the plinth (as shown in the facsimile), those in front being bordered by two horizontal strokes. In the second line the surface is injured between the 7 and the 5, but nothing appears to be lost. What ἡματο means is not clear; one would naturally take the inscription to be a dedication, in which case the verb might be interpreted as 'offered in fulfillment of a vow'; possibly, however, the words refer to some particular incident, such as the rescue of the sacred image from an enemy. The alphabet is Ionian: so too are the proper names and the genitive-ending ἔστος. The best known Pythermos of whom there is any record is the Phocean ambassador who figures in a characteristic episode in Herodotus (i. 152). A Graeco-Egyptian inscription in the Alexandria Museum (Botti, Cat. p. 253) mentions another Neion, the father of a certain Pythogeiton: in this case the family came from Samos. The Pythermos of our inscription was no doubt an Ionian Greek resident in Egypt, perhaps an inhabitant of Naukratis or of the Hellenikon at Memphis. As regards the date of the work, the form of the letters points to the fifth century or the end of the sixth: similar lettering occurs on many of the less early fragments of dedicated pottery at Naukratis. At this period the Greeks in Egypt had probably begun to adopt the Egyptian gods, though without attempting as yet to alter the traditional types.

If scanned according to the archaic spelling, the sentence makes an almost regular verse: did the writer intend it to be metrical?

C. C. EDGAR.
NOTICES OF BOOKS.


Though published three years ago, this book has been only recently sent for review. It is an elaborate study of the mind of Euripides, not as poet or dramatist, but as thinker, as the leader of Greek thought away from the conventional anthropomorphic cult into wider and fresher fields of religion and ethics. The discussion of Euripides' theology is not particularly new or illuminating. It is summed up in the phrases, 'Euripides wholly rejected the gods of Greek popular belief', 'he casts aside the entire anthropomorphism of the Greek Olympus, and primarily on the grounds of reason and morals'. For Euripides, the divine essence manifested itself as a cosmic moral power 'immanent in the universe and working according to eternal laws.' More novel, because less often dealt with on such an extended a scale, is the discussion of his 'anthropology,' i.e., his psychology, ethics, and social and political philosophy, illustrated very copiously by translations from the dramas. Though there is plenty of literary feeling, literary form is painfully absent, and the volume, though not without interest, is heavy reading. It concludes with over 200 closely printed pages of notes and indices.


The papyrus here edited, as the first of a series of literary texts to be issued by the Berlin Museum, is a second-century roll of about 4 ft. 5 in. in length and 11½ in. in height, containing (according to its own subscription) the commentary of Didymus on the 94th Philippias of Demosthenes, i.e., according to our nomenclature, the third and fourth Philippias and the speeches on the Epistle of Philip and προτε χαιρει. The scholia are mainly historical in character; if, as would be expected from the other works of Didymus, he wrote grammatical and lexical notes on Demosthenes, they have been omitted, while the historical notes are evidently given unabridged. A noteworthy feature of them is the abundance of quotations from Philochorus, who is the main historical authority used; there are also citations from Theopompus and other writers. The text is printed (in a new type devised for the Berlin Academy, which many readers will find difficult) in two forms, one a simple transcript, for which Dr. Schubart is mainly responsible, the other a restored text, the work of Professor Diels. The introduction gives a full description of the papyrus and a valuable discussion of the character of Didymus' work; but the historical bearing of the statements contained in it is not examined. Short notes accompany the text, but no full commentary is attempted. Besides the historical values of the scholia (which contain some new facts, but none of special importance, unless it be the ascription of the speech on the Epistle of Philip to Anaximenes of Lampscus), the MS possesses considerable textual importance, the lemmata being given at length. The result on the whole is conservative, the text used by Didymus agreeing generally with that of our best MSS, and especially with Ξ,
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though it confirms the evidence of other papyri to the effect that a servile obedience to any one authority is unsound criticism.

Another Berlin papyrus, already published by Bliss in 1883, containing part of a lexicon to the oration against Aristocrates, is reprinted in this volume, as having likewise a Didymenean origin. Two specimen photographs of the Didymus MS. are appended. A complete facsimile is published separately (price 6 marks), and the text is reprinted in ordinary type as a volume in the Teubner series. The whole publication does great credit to its editors.


The fourth volume of the Oxyrhynchus papyri belonging to the Egypt Exploration Fund is the most interesting (with the possible exception of the first) yet issued by these indefatigable explorers and editors. For theologians it contains another fragment of a collection of Sayings attributed to our Lord, a scrap of a non-canonical gospel, and valuable texts of considerable portions of the books of Genesis and Hebrews. For classical scholars it has the greater part of a Haplography, probably by Pindar, addressed to Ascledas of Thessaly, with a few lines of another ode to the same person; eight columns of a new epitome of Livy (bk. 37-40 and 48-50), containing several new historical statements which need detailed examination by Roman historians ; part of an argument in the Διονυσιακά of Cratinus; a fragment of a history of Sicily; a further portion of the good Thucydides papyri published in part I.; and several other literary texts, known and unknown. Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt have been assisted in dealing with the classical texts by Professor Bliss, Mr. Ware Fowler, Professor Kornemann, Professor Reid, and others, and in the theological section by various theologians; and the results are eminently satisfactory, and are presented (as usual) in very convenient form. The non-literary texts are less numerous than usual and have fewer points of special interest; but the literary texts are not, as is so often the case, merely tantalising scraps, but are real additions to our knowledge of classical literature.


The above title gives some notion of the contents of these first instalments of the French official publication of the excavations at Delphi. In each case only the first fascicle has been issued. In the case of the Architecture this comprises sixteen out of forty promised plates; but two of these are treble and two double; among them are included the general plans and restorations of the site, and restorations of the Treasuries of the Athenians and Cithæans, of the Naxian column with its sphinx, of the Acroëion column with the three Caryatids mounted on the top of it—an arrangement since doubted—and the trophy of Aemilius Paullus. The sculpture volume, which consists of fifty plates, is far more complete, and contains reproductions of almost all the more important discoveries, including the architectural sculptures from the early temple of Apollo and from the Treasuries of the Cithæans, Athenians and Cithæans. There are also among others photographs of one of the early Argive statues, of the famous bronze charioteer of Agias, and the rest of the Thessalian statues dedicated with him. It is to be hoped, in view of their exceptional stylistic interest, that the other plates will include views of the head of the charioteer on a larger scale, such as that in the Monuments Plot, and of the head of Agias from the front, in addition to the profile here given. The first instalment.
of the bronze contains twelve out of a total of thirty plates; these contain for the most part early statuettes and decorative bronzes, such as griffins' heads, and human-headed birds from bowls. No text has as yet been issued; though it is promised for the current year. This, together with the smaller illustrations which it will contain, will no doubt give the authority for the various restorations which at present have to be taken on trust. The plates throughout are in heliogravure by Dujardin, and are of such excellence as to be fully worthy of his reputation.


An elaborate analysis of the portraits of Alexander the Great. Thirty-eight presumed portraits are classified under twenty-five types. The author starts from the inscribed term from Tivoli in the Louvre, in which he sees a copy of the head of the Alexander with the lance of Lysippus, He defends the authenticity of the greater part of the inscription on the term. The head in the British Museum he regards as a portrait, in the style of the sculpture of Alexander. Among the types identified are a young Alexander by Lysippus, an Alexander of Leochares, Alexander Halles by Chares, Alexander Zeus at Olympia, Alexander with the Aegis, Alexander as Hermes, as Ammon, and many others.

Der Weber-Laborde'sche Kopf, und die Giebelgruppen des Parthenon.


The author attempts to define with more precision than has hitherto been possible the position of the Laborde head on the Parthenon. His investigation is based on his observation of the fact that in certain early casts of the head there is a depression across the back (now filled up on the original with plaster) which may have been made for the fitting of the head under the projecting cornice of the pediment. His ultimate result appears to be that the head belonged to a figure of Artemis, standing, and holding a torch, in the right-hand half of the East pediment, immediately adjoining the extant figure known as J. Incidentally, he lays great stress (p. 37) on his belief that the left knee is incorrectly joined to the torso J in the Elgin Room. An examination of the original would satisfy him that the correctness of the fit is indisputable. Of the remainder of the Artemis only the left hand with a part of the torch is now preserved.


A catalogue of the sculptures, capable of being described as Greek, in the Museum of Cairo. The Introduction discusses the special character of Greek sculpture on Egyptian soil. Two hundred and seventeen objects are described, and one hundred and thirty-six of the most important are well illustrated in collotype plates. The collection contains little that is beautiful, but many curious instances of provincial Greek sculpture, strongly influenced by Egyptian models.

The author employs a peculiar system of enumeration. The objects were numbered as met with in the recesses of the Museum. The order of arrangement of the descriptions was necessarily revised, but the numbers first assigned to the sculptures, which should have
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been provisional, have been regarded as permanent. Hence the enumeration follows no order, and reference must be made to a special table, in order to find the text belonging to an illustration.


The growing importance of the Von Petrowicz collection has long been known to those interested in the Parthian coinage. Its proprietor has now placed all such under a deep obligation by the publication of this fine catalogue. More than 1000 coins are described, and about 400 are illustrated. A considerable proportion of these are unpublished. The book is admirably printed, and the plates are good. The text, which is the work of Ritter von Petrowicz himself, has been compiled with scholarly care, and with a fullness of knowledge that makes the book a notable contribution to the literature of the subject. There is no formal introduction, but all points of difficulty are discussed at length in notes interwoven with the descriptions. The author's arrangement does not differ very materially from that proposed many years ago by Gardner. While declining to accept the restitutions recently suggested by Wroth, he is thoroughly alive to the considerations by which these restitutions were prompted. But he offers another solution of the problem. Eliminating from the Parthian coinage proper all the pieces on which the king's head looks to the right, he assigns these to the princess of the little known Arsacid dynasty that held sway in Armenia before the days of Tigranes the Great. This proposal deserves to be carefully weighed. The hypothesis is one on which evidence as to provenance would throw valuable light.

The title of the book suggests that it is only a first instalment. Is it too much to hope that Ritter von Petrowicz will also publish his rich collection of Seleucid coins?


The second instalment of Mr. Sambon's Corpus has appeared with most commendable promptitude. The omission of any detailed description or discussion of the aes grave enables this part of the ground to be covered very rapidly. From the point of view of the general reader, the account of the coinage of the Social War will furnish the chief interest; it is the fullest treatment of the subject that has yet been attempted. The section dealing with Cumaes is probably the most important for the numismatist, attention being well drawn to the influence of Syracuse and Neapolitan types. Sambon, by the way, does not accept the current view that the issues of Cumaes came to an end circa 420 B.C. One may also note his theory as to the significance of Σ on the coins of Aessenia, Neapolis, Susa, and Compania.


The sub-title of this treatise, to which Dr. Th. Fischer supplies a preface, does not promise much consideration of the past; but in reality, since the conditions favourable to future colonisation are those which attracted the first colonists, there is a good deal of reference to Hellenic antiquity. The author, after defining what he means by 'Cyrenaika'—i.e.
something more than either the highland of Barca or the territory of ancient Cyrene—
goes on to show how favorably all the Libyan projection between the Syris and the Gulf of Sollum is situated in respect of the East Mediterranean basin, and how happily endowed. Consideration of the permanent geographical conditions leads to the conclusion that the Cyrenaica must look to the north, not the south; but that it cannot expect rival in importance either the Nile valley, or the Tripolitan-Tunisian region. In this latter fact lies the secret of the early decline of the great Greek colony which once flourished on its highest plateau. The antiquities of the district are not the author's concern, and he attempts no description of ancient sites, although he has to take account of ancient harbours. He has not himself visited the Cyrenaica, but he supplies a list both of those who have, and of those who have written about it, which would have been the better for a principle of classification.

**Kleinasien, Ein Neuland der Kunstgeschichte.** By Joseph Strzygowski.


This book owes its origin, live Mr. Anderson's *Studies Punica*, to international cooperation. At the outset is placed an English chapter by Mr. J. W. Crowfoot, formerly of the British School at Athens, dealing with Einbirkillise, the well known site, south of Isauria, which Prof. Bamméy and others identify doubtfully with Barato. Here, as the modern name implies, are numerous remains of Byzantine churches. To Mr. Crowfoot's study of these Prof. Strzygowski adds chapters on four types of early church to be seen in Asin Minor: (1) the Basilica proper; (2) the Octagon; (3) the Basilicae with cupola, such as the great church at Koja Kalass, described by Mr. Headlam in a *Supplementary Paper* of this *Journal*; (4) the Cruciform church with cupola. Thereafter he deals with the dates of the various types; and finally has a chapter on the significance of Asin Minor in the history of art, as lying between, and sharing characteristics of the East, Hellas, Rome, and Byzantium. The section of this last chapter which deals with the development of western art out of Byzantium is the least satisfactory in the book. Prof. Strzygowski seems more at home among purely architectural questions. The volume brings together much scattered material upon the later Roman and Byzantine antiquities of Asin Minor, and should inspire future explorers to verify its facts and search for new ones. No one ought to enter the country without at least having read Prof. Strzygowski's book—nor indeed without having it actually in his luggage, if the Ottoman custom authorities will allow it to pass.


This volume in the 'Regions of the World Series' includes, of course, the home of the Hellenic race and nearly all the area of its ultimate distribution. The limits set by the author to the Nearer East are, on the north the line of the Balkan, Black Sea, south shore, Caucasus, and Caspian south shore; on the south the point where the Nile ceases to be uninteruptedly navigable, i.e. the First Cataract, and the southern coast of Arabia; on the west, the Adriatic; and on the east the central desert of Persia. The first part of the book is taken up mainly with an attempt to envisage this region as on a relief map; but the result is much less clear and useful than an actual map would be. Then follow a slight chapter on Structure and a fuller one on Climates; and finally there is one on Physical Circumstance, which purports to show the constant geographical and scenic features which affect human life in the particular region. This chapter and that on Communications in Part II have the most bearing on the ancient history of the Nearer East. The larger portion of Part II is concerned with the modern distribution, grouping, and
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life of men in the region. An ingenious, if not quite convincing, attempt to trace the characteristics of the inhabitants of particular areas to their food and other products, may be recommended to students of antiquity; for these products are still in the main what they formerly were. The author, who has had as much experience of the antiquities as of the modern features of the Nearer East, keeps his eye constantly on the past while describing the present.

The second part of the book however is the only one really readable. Most of the first part will be superseded by a good relief map of the region.


This supplement contains additions to the inscriptions from Syra, Teos, Nisyros, Astypalaia, Anaphe, Thera and Tharsis, Phodegandria, Melos and Cumlos, as well as one (a dedication to Zeus) from Sounthassia or Teuthassa, which has not hitherto produced any epigraphic remains. Among the numerous excellent illustrations, which now make these volumes so much more trustworthy than the old Corpus, those showing the disposition of the inscriptions in the temple of Artemis at Perga in Thera are most noteworthy. There are the usual full indices, including three (grammatical and orthographical peculiarities, authors, and concordances with C.F.G. and other publications) which cover the whole volume.


This part of the invaluable 'G.D.I.' contains more than 250 inscriptions in Cretan dialect from more than 30 sites both in and out of Crete. There is the usual full bibliography and commentary; in the former, however, some omissions are noticeable. Thus, on the famous Gortys inscription (490); the Inscriptiones Juridiques Graecae of Dareste, Haussonnier, and Th. Reinaud is not referred to; on No. 5011, Hulten's and Svoronos' articles in the Amer. Jour. of Arch. 1897 and Journ. Internat. 1898 should have been mentioned; and a reference to Conway's elaborate study of the pre-Hellenic inscriptions of Crete in B.S.A. viii. should have appeared on p. 303.


This large volume of more than 800 pages is chiefly devoted to a study of the origin of gentile names among the Italian peoples. The main theory of the author is that the great majority of these were slightly differentiated praenomina, lengthened by patronymic, diminutive and other suffixes, or after the models of the names prevalent in neighbouring tribes.

The praenomen, he points out, is important in proportion to the importance of the individual at the time. At Rome, the family stood first, and the family name always tended to overshadow that which distinguished the members of a family from one another. Official and legal documents indeed refer to a Roman citizen by his praenomen conjunct with one of the other nomina down to the close of the Republic, but this was rather the survival of ancient custom, and of the total number of Roman citizens mentioned by Tacitus two-thirds are described only by nomen, cognomen, or both. Later in the Empire
members of the same family frequently received the same praenomen, and were distinguished only by different cognomina, these having now ceased to be hereditary. The first section of the book is devoted to the various changes undergone in the case of Italian names among the names of Italian tribes and other tribes, and the ways in which these influences reacted on the nomenclature of the peninsula itself. The most striking ones referred to are the Gallic suffixes of -tena, -sca, and the patronymic -tus; the Illyrian -scus and -svus, and the Belgian or N. German -inis. From the adjective -inaequus formed from this last are derived modern place names in -nich like Gürrnich (Curtinichis). The second and much the longest section is devoted to a study of Etruscan nomenclature. Although the author admits that the bulk of Etruscan names were probably borrowed from the praenomina of Latin tribes he attributes several peculiarities of Roman custom in this respect to the influence of Etruscan innovations. Thus the Etruscans seldom accurately differentiated the nomen and cognomen, both being often derived from the individual name, and representing the family name of the two parents, according to the present Spanish custom. To the influence of this survival of matriarchy Mr. Schultze is inclined to impute the hereditary nature of Roman cognomina. To Etruscan influences are ascribed endings in -ina, -ina, many in -torius which cannot well be referred to a noun in *tor* expressing the agent, and have many analogous Etruscan forms in -turi or -thria, and several aspirated names like Thalna, Graecus, Cethus. In Etruria too cognomina often usurp the place of the gentile name, having become earlier prevalent than in Rome, where they were not officially recognized before the age of Sulla.

The third section discusses the various suffixes used among the Latins themselves, the names derived from the names of divinities and the prevalence of praenomina and cognomina at different periods, especially among slaves and freedmen. It is throughout insisted that the later names were at first adjectival extensions of the praenomen, as indicated by Greek translations like Δαύιδος τὸς Ἀλιάτων.

The last section is devoted to Italian place names.

This valuable work includes great masses of material and most careful references, chiefly epigraphic. Its usefulness to the student might be enhanced if a full analysis were placed at the head of each sub-section, and some of the long catalogues, which frequently interrupt the argument, were relegated to appendices.

The following may also be noted:

S. ETLEN, Die Phaiakenepisode in der Odyssee. Christiania, 1894. Pp. 39. (An attempt to distribute Od. v.–viii. into the separate narratives of which, according to the writer, it was originally composed. It is not maintained, however, that it is possible to show the precise points of juncture.)

P. MAXOE, Essai sur la composition des comédies d’Aristophane. Paris, 1894. Pp. 181. (An analysis of the structure of each play, in order to deduce therefrom the standard type of an Aristophanic comedy, which suggests conclusions as to the origin of this class of literature.)

P. MAXOE, Aristophane, La Paix. Paris, 1894. Pp. 119. (The text is based solely upon V and R, with a preference for the former; the commentary is upon a moderate scale, and gives the editor’s views without mentioning rival interpretations.)

For other works received, see list of additions to the Library.
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I.—INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

A

ABDULLAH, Isaac, p. 36
Abashishkele (Palestine), winnowing-fork from, 248
Accon, Andromeda of, 110 f.
Aegina, Delphi, 215 f.
Arsas, in Ulia, dispute with Tarsus, 66
Achilles, portraits of, 90 f.
Achilles, portrait of, 81 f.
Aegeus, p. 33
Aegeus, temple at, 140
* Affected Tyrhenian vase at Oxford, 288
Agathon, portrait of, 86 f.
Aglaodias and the Ligurian bronze statuette, 131, 336
Agamemnon, betrothed to Andromeda, 101 f.
Agamemnon, Nestor's wife, 13 f., 19
Aidinis, inser. p. 23
Aketia in palestra-scenes, 179
Alabaster vessels from tomb at Mycenae, 324; Egyptian, 325 f.
Alemens, Dionysos of, 258 f. Hermes Propylæus, 259
Alcestis of Euripides, analogy with Andromeda of Sophocles, 108
Alicah, portraits of, 98
Alexander, son of Ptolemy VII. 166
Alexandria; coin of (Ant. Pius), found at Khamsit, 36
Alexikakos of Calamis, 205
Alkman, near Issus, grave-stones, 272 f., 275 f.
Almasum (near Derbe), grave-stones from, 278
Amazon and Thessal, on r.f. vase, 207
Amber beads at Torcello, 126
Amethyst beads from Mycenæ, 324
Amphiaras, oracle of, 285 f.
Amphitheatre at Cyzicus, 140
Anatolian names at Issa Nova, 291
Andromates, Heron of, 158 f.
Andromeda, 98 f.
Anthestera-scene on r.f. stamni, 315
Anthologia Palatina (App.), 297, 70 f.
Anytes, head of, by Damophon, 43 f.
Apollo, two heads of Choisuel-Gouffier type in R.M., 205 f.; Citharedeus with Leto and Artemis on b.f. vase, 308
Citharedeus, sacrifice to relief at Constantinople, 20; with Artemis, stile at Peramn, 21; sacrifice to, on r.f. stamni, 311, 313; Cretan, 20; Moscow, 20
Apologetus on the tomb of Phryllus, 72
Aqueduct of Cyzicus, 138
Aquila, see Coronus
Argos and the Plataean campaign, 150
Aristides in the Plataean campaign, 149
Aristophanes, description of Agathon, 87
Athena, vase, 219 (vulgar), 79
Armama, grave-stones from, 283
Armed deity, cultus-figure, on proto-Cor. lekythos, 205
Armourer finishing helmet, on r.f. kylix, 301
Artemis, head of, by Damophon, 42 f.; sacrifice to, on r.f. stamni, 311, 313; as nympha on Cor. vase, 237; on side from Eremita Kuth, 24; on side at Harmer, 20. See also Apollo.
Asmolean Museum: see Oxford.
Asine: see Corone
Astrologizantes, 134
Athens; cultus-figure on proto-Cor. lekythos, 200; at Judgment of Paris (b.f. vase), 209
Athenians in the Plataean campaign, 145 f.
Athenodorus of Tarsus, 60
Athens, routes to Plataea, from, 155 f.
— coins of, with Alexikakos of Calamis, 205; with head of Dionysus of Athens, 258
— Museum : sculptures from Lycosura, 41 f.
Athletes on b.f. vase at Oxford, 300, 302; statues of Choisuel-Gouffier type, 204 f.
Athribitic Nile, 17
Attic vases at Oxford, 294 f.
Augustus, dedication to, at Lyons, 123
Aurelius, use of praenomen in Asia Minor, 280 f.
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Aurelius (M.), in later. from Paphlagonia, 7.
Axe, double- , combined with 'ankh, in Cretan art, 322 f.

B

Bahr Nasrani district (Delta), mounds in, 15.
Bahr Sibins district (Delta), mounds in, 16.
Bahr Tirah district (Delta), mounds in, 16.
Bahia (Lycaonia) inscr., 118.
Bamyan (Delta), 14.
Banquet of religious society, reliefs with, 39 f.
Berlin Museum, Egyptian alabaster vase, 325; coin of Taurus, 63.
Bonnet vases at Oxford, 294.
Bologna, r.f. kylix at, 188; Egyptian slab at, 247 f.
Boun, portrait of Agathos at, 89.
Book, open, on Tarsan grave-stone, 288.
Bourguignac kylix, with Jumpers, 183, 192.
British Museum: Aeschines, 91; heads of Choiceul-Gouffer type, 203 f.; 'Sardamalos,' 284 f.; b.f., amphora (B 65), 183; b.f., kolbe (E 661), 177 f.; r.f. kylix (E 65), 190 f.; r.f. hydria (E 189), 165 f.; r.f. pelike (E 427), 184; r.f. oenochoe (E 661), 192 f.; lead halteres, 181 f.; silver rings pierced with gold nails, 232 f.; coins of Athens, 205; Demetrius II. 63; Myrtileus, 207.
Busiris, site of Paralos (Egypt), 18.
Bustee, Nile, 17 f.
Busiris-type; on r.f. stamnai at Oxford, 306.
Buto, 2 f., 19.
Butterflies (?), gold ornaments from Mycenae, 323.

C (see also K)

Cairo Museum: bronze statuette dedicated to Isis, 387.
Calami (Kapu Dagh), inscriptions from, 31 f.
Calami and the Choiceul-Gouffer type, 204 f.
Canis, winnowing-fork from, 247; scap, 283.
Candlestick (?), on Isuran tomb-stones, 286.
Carpets, styles of Lycaonia, 290.
Cassipea, 100 f.
Castalian gorgos at Delphi, 234 f.
Cattle-ashlar, on b.f. lekythos, 303.
Cephalonia, Mycenaean vases from, 126 f.
Cepheus, 100 f.
Cepheus-portraits, 'Sardamalos' attributed to, 258 f.
Cerigotto, the bronze status of, 187; charming figures from, 133 f.
Characters: see Script.
Chasm at Delphi, 314 f.
Chaos, scene from, on r.f. stamnai, 312.
Choiceul-Gouffer type; two heads related to, 203 f.
Christian Art (Early) of Isaura Nova, 200 f.; Christian symbols on Isuran monuments, 291.
Cilicia in time of Dion Chrysostom, 62 f.
Cithernon, ancient passes across, 135.
Clumps used at Lyceum, 47, 56.
Cleopatra, 119.
Clastina named, Mycenaean, 324.
Chassia, vases from, found at Mycenae, 322. See also Myrto.
Constantinople, Imperial Museum: sarcophagus of Sidonius, 274 f.
— Robert College: inscribed stele, 69.
Copper daedal of Dioskouros, 197.
Corinithian b.f. vase at Troecia, 198 f.; vases at Oxford, 291 f.
Cotnatus Aegina, governor of Galatia, 115.
Corone, fragment of Dioskouros' edict from, 196 f.
Cretus, Diomede of, 67.
Crete: vases from, found in Greece, 317 f. See also Candia.
Cross on Isuran tomb-stones, 270, 276.
Cultus-scenes on proto-Cor. lekythos, 286.
Cyzicus, coin of, 38; inscriptions from, 20 f., 39; topography of, 133.

D

Damosphon, 41 f., 330 f.
Delphos, 323.
Delphi, the Chasm at, 214 f.
Delfos, Nemesis of the, 1 f.
Demeter; head of, by Damophon, 43 f.; Eleusis, her temple near Plataea, 162 f.; with Porsephone etc. on b.f. vase, 300.
Demonitrus, coin of, 63.
Demetrias Phalerena, portrait of, 93.
Demos Kape (Cyzicus), 141.
Dionysus in Cilicia, 68.
Denarius, copper of Dioskouros, 197.
Dionysia (Kapu Dagh), inscriptions, 32.
Dioskouros' Edict, fragment of, 195 f.
Diodorus Siculit on the Delphic oracle, 218 f.
Dion Chrysostom, Tarsian Orations of, 58 f.
Dionysiac sacrifice on r.f. stamnai, 311.
Dionysos of Alcmeon, 358; so-called 'Sardamalos,' 255 f.; with other deities, on b.f. vase, 300; with satyrs, on b.f. vase, 299.
Diospolis Inferior, 41 f., 19.
Diospolis Nome, 2, 15.
Diskobelos on vases at Oxford, 303.
Dioskoi, bronze, with Jumpers, 184.
Doricha, 210 f.
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Dorita: see Isaura Nova
Drapery, sculptured, by Damophon, 41 f., 55; of the "Sand DBGplates" statue, 257 f.
Oursus Caesar, son of Germanicus, 28
Dumb-bell exercises, ancient, 182

E

Eagles, with outspread wings, on Lycomus
drapery, 96
Echecrum Diodotiani, fragment from Corone, 195 f.
Education in time of Dion Chrysostom, 58
Egerides (Kapu Dagh), inscr., 30
Egypt, late Minoan vases with marine
designs from, 319; Mycenaean pottery
from, 128; intercourse with Crete, 320;
names of the Delta, 1 f.
Egyptian alabaster vase from Mycenae,
325; from Corinth, 327; amphorae from
Mani, 329; harvest-scenes, 243 f.
El-Ajmarah, alabaster vases from, 328
Eleusis and the battle of Plataeae, 148
El Kab, tomb of Paheri, 244
Embroidery from Dorita, 239
Ennion, Andromeda of, 99 f.
Eos and Tithonus on r.f., amphoras, 315
Epaminondas, battle of, 181
Englel, stela of, 29
Ephesus (Bosasia), position of, 134
Eski Manyas, inscr. at, 27
Koren (near Dorita), tomb-stone from, 285
Kurtipes, Androclus of, 99 f.; on the
Delphic adyton, 233
Kastoria on the island of Phyllus, 72
Eye, Damophon's treatment of, 330

F

Faience inlays from Mycenae, 327
Fall, winning of, 241 f.
Festival, sacrifice at, on r.f., stamni, 311
Fish, Christian symbol, 207
Five, proverbial use of, 80
Florence: bronze head of Anchialus, 22 f.;
portrait of Demetrius Phalerus, 96 f.
Flute-player accompanying jumbar, 185
Funeral banquet stela at Englel, 26 f.; at
Pandora, 20.

G

Gargaphilus fountain, site of, 158 f.
Gela, vases from, at Oxford, 302, 307, 311
Gonoius at Cyzicus, 32
Giza, third pyramid of, 206 f.
Gold: mauls in rings, 322 f.; ornaments from
Mycenae, 323 f.; plated stentite vases,
330
Genes, inscr., 29
Greece, the three, relief at Kastoria, 29
Grain, winning of, 341 f.

Gymnastic exercises, 182 f.

H

Habian, inscr. of time of, from Lycomus,
48 f.; temple of, at Cyzicus, 139
Hair, treatment of, by Damophon, 42 f.,
338; in heads of Chiosent-Geudier type,
204
Haji Pavoni (near Manyas), inscriptions
from, 40
Halieres, 75, 181 f.
Hammaniti (Cyzicus) inscr., 39, 40
Hammer and anvil on Lycomus tomb-stones,
269 f., 283
Harakhi (Kapu Dagh), remains at, 29
Harbours of Cyzicus, 132
Hare-hunt on proto-Corinthian vases,
245 f.; on Phaeacian vase, 246
Harvest-scenes on Egyptian monuments,
245 f.; on Phaëton vase, 246
Hedgehog vase from El-Ajmarah, 326
Herculaneum in the Delta, 13
Hiles, number of, at battle of Plataeae, 152
Hephaestus and other deities on b.f., stamni,
300
Hera, at Judgment of Paris (b.f. vase), 299
Hermes and Negress on r.f., stamni at
Oxford, 300 f.; of Taymen, 63
Heraenum of Plataeae, 152
Hermes before Zeus, on b.f. vase, 298; at
Judgment of Paris, on b.f. vase, 299
Hesiod, on the campaign of Plataeae,
144 f.; on the Delphic adyton, 224; on
NicoTir and Rhodopes, 208 f.
Hercules, his order in the Delta, 2
Hippocampus, see Sea-horses
Hodja Binar, inscriptions from, 28
Horseman-type on Christian grave-stones,
273, 277
Hyamine (Bosasia), position of, 134

I

Iconium: see Konia
Igel: see Trèves
Incised marks on faience inlays from
Mycenae, 328
Inlays, faience, from Mycenae, 327; Corinth,
328
Ionian dedication to Isis, 237
Isaura Nova, early Christian Art of, 260 f.
Isis suckling Horus, statuette with Ionian
dedication, at Cairo, 337
"Island" of the battle of Plataeae, 160 f.
Istic Han, inscr. at, 26
Ithaka, Mycenaean vases from, 226

J

Judgment of Paris on Attic b.f. vase, 229
Jump, the Greek, 70 f., 179 f.; see also
Luper
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K (see also O)

KALOS-VASES in Aströmian Mus. 303 f.
Kapha Dagh, inscriptions from, 29 f.
Kara Semir, grave-stones from, 227, 228
Kasael Canal district (Delta), mound in, 10
Katatopo (Kapha Dagh), remains, 29
Kassakeui, stele with sacrifice to Zeus, 22
Khanziri, Kum, site of, 5 f., 19 ; inscriptions, 5 f.
Khlytyn Scrat, see Lystra
Konis, Idaean tomb-stone at, 288
Koumos Liman, inscr. 33
Koumis Wahal, 5 f.
Kurushunlu (Kapha Dagh), inscriptions, 35 f.

I.

LACDAEMONIANS and the campaign of
Plataea, 146 f.

Lacoeum, Creutz trade with, 320
Langada (Kapha Dagh), inscriptions, 30 f.
Lapis lazuli sphinxes from Mycenae, 324
Leiphi from the Parthenon compared with
Ceriboto figure, 133 f.
Leper with halteres on b.f. vase, 302. See
also Jump
Lesbidea, arca and gorge of Trophonius, 235
Leto, Artemis and Apollo Citharoeus on
b.f. vase, 290
Leyden, krater with jupiter, 194
Lithani, Arx, 373, 71
Liberal Peace of Praxiteles, 255 f.
Ligurio bronze statuette, 131, 336
Liknon, 361 f.
Lehneseke collection, Athenian coin in, 208
Lucian, Souni, 6 schol, 71
Lucullus of Tarra on Flayllus, 78
Lycozia, exploration in, 113 f.
Lycomus, sculptures from, 41 f. ; temple of,
47 f.
Lycurgus, statue of Aeschylius erected by,
81 f.
Lyssippos, portrait-head of school of, at
Florence, 97
Lystra, site and remains, 113 f.

M

MAGICAL use of nails, 332 f.; of rings, 334
Mahana, winning-fun from, 252 f.
Mailus and Taras, dispute between, 67
Mandras = Tehemandra f. 26
MEOBUS on Nisitucis and Rhodopes, 208 f.
Mentimenos and the battle of Platsea, 148
Mardonius' campaign of Platsea, 144 f.
Marine designs on late Minoan vases, 318 f.; significance of, 309 f.
Mazzorbo, Mycenaean vase from, 135
Medium in the campaign of Platsea, 148 f.

Megalopolis, Thesalians of, 34 f.; connec-
tion of Damophon with, 331
Megalopoli at the battle of Platsea, 157
Melissa, Amazon, on r.f. vase, 307 f.
Mentha: character incised on amphorae
from, 329
Menkaras, king of Yl Dynasty, 209
Menkaura, pyramid of, 208 f.
Mephisto is a War in Delphi, 215 f.
Micon's Amazonomachia, 300
Mitholich, inscriptions at, 24
Mithraeum, inscr. 33
Minoan vases from Greece, 317 f.
Minotauros, see Theseus
Mole of Cyrus, 157
Molossos, B., 162 f.
Marex or Triton shells on Minoan vases, 321
Mycenas, chamber-tomb containing Cretan
impottos, 333; Cretan ' Palace-style'
Amphorae from, 232 f.; objects with
cinsed characters from, 325
Mycenaean vases at Torcello, 129 f.; from S.
Italy, Sicily, Lucian Islands, 126 f.; from
Spain, Palestine, Egypt, Asia Minor, 129
Mycenians, see Mencis
Mythilene, KL, stater with head of Apollo,
205 f.

N

Nails inserted in silver rings, 332 f.; magi-
cal use of, 333 f.
Names in early Christian monuments from
Isaura Nova, 290
Naples, bust of Aeschines, 01 f. ; of Aes-
chylius, 82 f. ; Orestes and Electra, 129 f.
Napata, statue of Isis probably from,
237
Napula: Mycenaean jar with incised char-
acter, 322
Nautilus on Late Minoan vase from Phy-
lakopi, 318 ; gold ornament from My-
cean, 324
Negroes, Hercules and, on r.f. stamnos at
Oxford, 206 f.
Nereids on hippocamps, on reliefs, 56
Nestorowsk-Agoune, 14 f.
Neterkara, 211
Neuchâtel Museum, Mycenaean vases in, 126
Nike carrying thymisterion, on Lycozia drapery, 56
Nikotou-Singer, 13 f.
Nile, arm of the, 17
Ninkorta, 208 f.
Nikoriki Rhodopes, 208 f.
Nomes, Egyptian North Delta, 1 f.

O

Oases (Delta), 13
Oedipus on Late Minoan vase from Phy-
lakopi, 318
Oedipus and Sphynx on r.f. amphorae, 315
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Olympia, tiled pavement in palaestra, 74
Ofnaphe in Delphi, position of, 336, 332
Olive at Delphi, 214 f.
Oriental manners in Tarsus, 64; τραπέζια in Greek art and literature, 196
Ornament of early Christian monuments of Isaura Nova, 263 f.
Ourpus, oracle of Amphairius at, 235 f.
Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, vases added to, 293 f.

P

Pachyemoumouth, 2, 5, 18 f.
Paheri, tomb of, 244 f.
Palace and cattle-shed on b.f. lekythos, 303
Palestine, Mycenean pottery from, 128; winnowing-forks and shovels, 248
Pandaroma, inscriptions at, 20 f.
Panderman-Entelek road, inscr. from, 39
Paralos (Delta), 12
Paris, Judgment of, on Attic b.f. amphora, 280
Parthenos, Lapith from, compared with crowning figure from Ciregotta, 133 f.
Pastiteles, style of, 131 f.
Pathetic Nile, 17 f.
Pausanius and the battle of Platea, 151
Pentathion group on b.f. vase, 302
Petaimo, inscriptions from, 34
Perverse: see Demeter
Pisa and Andromeda, 100 f.; suit of P. at Tarsus, 63
Persian Wars, 144 f.
Phaestus, steatite vase from, 249
Pharnaxas Nile, 17.
Phdyllus, the Jump of, 70 f.
Phidian characteristics of the Sardana-palai statues, 356
Pheres and the Acropoleis, 108
Philosophers mentioned in inscr. from Cyzicus, 27
Philosophy in time of Dion Chrysostom, 58 f.
Philems, betrothed to Andromeda, 101 f.
Phrygona, 2 f., 19
Philometra Nome, 2, 4
Phylakopi, Late Minoan 4 vases from, 317 f.
Pick with sickle or pruning-knife on Ithan tomb-stones, 283; for rooting up corn (?),
on Phaestus vase, 250
Pinard, Nom. v. 19, scholium, 71
Pisana, battle of, 144 f.
Pitato, schol. on Cratylos, 413 A, 71; description of Agathon, 87
Platerach on the Delphic oracle, 229 f.
Plutarch, dedication to, 119
Polux iii. 151, 72
Polycehian canon, 131 f.
Polygnatous, Andromeda, vase reflecting his style, 105
PotniaThemis type on Cor. oenochoes, 297
Praemontium in third cent., 282
Praxiteles, Sardana-palai referred to, 255 f.

Prices in Diolestatia's house, 197 f.
Prot-Corinthian lekythos in Ashmolean Museum, 294 f.
Proseis, stele, Cyzicus, 35
Pruning-knife: see sickle
Prose, Dion Chrysostom, of, 58 f.
Pyramus in Tarsus, 68
Pythagoras, inscription, 34
Pytheas, 241 f.
Purple-shell fishery in Crete, 331
Pyramid of Nihoria-Rhadopis, 308 f.
Pyro of Hercules at Tarsus, 63
Pythagorean of Rhigium, style of, 306
Pythramos son of Neleus, dedication to Ias, 357
Pythia at Delphi, 214 f.

R

Rhodes-Naxos, 308 f.
Rhoeus and Theseus fighting Amazons, 307 f.
Rings pierced with gold nails, 332 f.; in magic, 334
Rock-work patterns on Late Minoan vases, 319 f.
Rods used in palaestra, 179, 186
Roman: Capitoline Museum: head by Damophon, 51 f.
Lateran: Herm carrying ikna, 264; Sophocles, 82
Vatican: Ascylyus, 82
Rosette, six-leaved, on Lyceum monument, 266, 270; eight-leaved, in Phidias, 270; gold, from Mycenae, 323
Runner on b.f. vase at Oxford, 302

S

Sacrifices by women on Attic stamni, 311
Saliaris solus, 179 f.
Samarlant or sanitar, 199
Sardana-palai, so-called, 255 f.
Sari-Kan, inscr., 23
Sari Kyza (Lyceum), inscr., 131
Satyr carrying nymphs, on b.f. vase, 226
Scoglio di Torno, Mycenaean vases from, 138
Scyllus (Beocia), position of, 153
Scoop for measuring corn from Candia, 251
Scopus influence in Damophon, 46, 51
Script: characters on fainence layals from Mycenae, 328; on other objects from Greece
Sea-anemones on Late Minoan vases, 319
Sea-horses, butterfly-winged, gold ornaments from Mycenae, 323
Sebennytis Nome, Lower, 2, 18 f.
Serapeum of Pachymemouloth, 8
Shaving in the fifth century, 88
Shell-ornament on Ithan tomb-stones, 372 f., 376
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Slowel, winnowing, 242 f.
Sicily, Myc. vases from, 126 f.
Sickle or grinding-knife and hammer or pick on Iaisuran tomb-stones, 269 f., 283
Sicyon, winnowing-fork used at, 247
Sibambaria (Lyceaonia), sarcophagi of, 274 f.
Sieve and iknon, 352 f.
Singh-Niketon, 13 f.
Sophocles, Anastacia, of, 20 f., portraits of, 52
Spain, Myc. pyxis from, 128
Spartans; see Lacedaemonians
Spear-thrower on b.f. vase at Oxford, 302
Sphinx, the great, identified with Rhodopsis
210- figure with lion’s tail and horse’s hoofs, on proto-Cor. lekythos 296; see also Delphi
Spring-board, 179 f.
Stamboul; see Constantinople
Statue relief vases, Cretan, 320; vessels from tomb at Mycenes, 324
Stephanus, statue by, 131 f., 326
Stone vases, Cretan, from Mycenes, 324
Strabo on the Delphi oracle, 317 f.
Strabo on the Delphi oracle, 317 f.
Suidas ταρ τά δρακάνθα, 72
Swan, female, figure holding, on Cor. oenochoes, 296 f.
Swastika on Asia-Minor grave-stones, 271, 279 f., 282 f.
Symmes Mus., Myc. vases in, 126 f.

T
Tanagra, vases from, 294
Taranto, Myc. vase from, 126
Tarsus or citizens of Dion Chrysostom, 58 f.
Tarus in the time of Dion Chrysostom, 62 f.; sarcophagi produced at, 275; coins of, 63
Tchammad Chiflik, inscr. etc. at, 26
Technical at Isaura Nova, 279
Tel-el-Yahudiyeh, inlays from, 329
Tell el-Balawinta, 11 f.
Tell el-Furat, 3
Tell es-Safi, Mycenean pottery from, 138
Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus, 139
Teramare, deposits, objects akin to Mycenesian from, 126
Thargelias-scene on r.f. stamnos, 313
Theatre at Cyzicus, 144
Thebes, b.f. lekythos from, 302
Thermopylae, relief with Nereids, etc. from, 56
Thermuthes Nile, 17
Thermuthis, 243 f.
Thesmos and Amazones on r.f. stamnos, 307 f.; and Minotaur on b.f. lekythos, 302
Thiasos relics, 36
Thribia, 22
Tida, site of Phraginis, 3 f.
Tissantes, pupil of Lyssippus, 87
Titans in Clodian mythology, 64

Tithomas; see Eon
Torella, Myc. vases at, 125 f.
Towers, hexagonal, at Cyzicus, 138 f.
Trade-courses in Myc. times, 126 f.
Tribes, athenian, with winnowing-basket from Igel, 251 f.
Tripoli, Delphi, 319 f.
Tripolis (Arcadia), winnowing-shovel from, 246
Trophy, or marine shells on Minous vases, 321
Trophonius, oracle of, 226
Tympanon, derived from leather sieve (?), 253 f.

U
Uerbad, inscr. at, 25
Ush Enykk (near Kouta), Myc. potsherds from, 128

V
Valeria, use of name in Asia Minor, 282
Vannus, 241 f.
Vaphio, Late Minoan vases from, 317 f.; gold cups of Crete origin, 320
Vine-branch on Iaisuran grave-stone, 288

W
Wages in Diecleitian’s time, 198 f.
Wahal, Koun, Roman portrait-head and Gr. inscr. at, 5 f.
Walls of Cyzicus, 135
Ward Collection, coin of Cyzicus, 38
Warrior bearing corpse on b.f. lekythos, 302; running on b. and r.f. kylix, 303
Weights for jumping, see Halteres.
Worl ornament on Iaisuran monuments, 273
Worls of Mycenean shape at Tereollis, 126
Winnowing-pan, 241 f.
Wrestler on b.f. vase at Oxford, 302

X
Xanthippos in the Platanean campaign, 149 f.

Y
Yenisei Kushunui (near Cyzicus) inscr., 36
Yeni Koub, proxenite stone with head of Persephone, 33

Z
Zeleas, inscr., 28
Zerdubia et, 23, 72
Zeus; enthroned, on b.f. vase, 288; sacrifice to (necia at Pandorama and Kazackeur), 21; Χαλθτος Χαλθτος, 21
Zellerus (Lyceonia) site and inscr., 114 f.
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αγαπητον = tabellio, 260
αικατερία, 199
Αμας, 207
αισθήσιμον, 253
Ανδρέας, 273
Ανδροκλής, 201
Ασίλων (επικο-ναμε), 303
Απόκος, 280
Ασιός, 117
Βασιλεία, 283
Βασίλιος, 283
Βασίλιος, 186
Βρυχοφόρο, 11
Βυσσάνθα, 199
Βυσσός, 201
Βυσσός, see Βυσσός
Βυσσός, 201
Βυσσός, 202
γάμπων of Delphi, 216 f., 223, 239 f.
γούφαμος, 198
Δέος, 33
Δέος, 283
διαματί (διαμάτης), 247
διάπανος, 23
διάφωνος, 22
διάφωνος, 23
διάφωνος, 23
διαφωνεία, 11
διαφωνεία, 199
διαφωνοεια, 199
Δία, διαφωνεία, 283.
έκκλησιαστής, 66
ένταστος—dedicated / 337
Έμπλος, 33
ήμπλος, 33
ήμπλος—συνάν, 287
ένταστος, τό, 70 f.
ένταστος, τό, 119
ήμπλος, 110
Ζευς, 286
ήμπλος in epitaphs of bishops, 272

θρει ρίμα, in epitaph at Isauro Nova, 267
θραπεται, 37
θραπεται, 37
θραπέα, see θραπάς
θυσαθοι, 280
θυσαθοι, 280
θυσαται (θραπέα, θραπάς), 246 f.
θραπάς, see θραπέα
θυσαται, 37

Τρισκά, 273
Τρισκά, 273
Τύχα—Τυχαρία, 262 f.
Κάλλος, 275.
καλλιγράφος, 200
καθεπετ, 179
καρπακλος, 201.
κατ in compounds in Homer, 229
καταβάλλεις = enter an asylum, 218 f.
καταρρίφτει την Βασίλιος, 207
Κατάνοον, 279
Κρατείτε (personal name), II = κράτειτο, 200

Λέγων (επικο-ναμε), 303
λέγων, 200
Λεγών, Πελιτά ένα, 288
Λυγημ, 255
Με— in Amatolian names, 283
μεσαίος στάτης, title of bishop, 206
Μιδακίτης, 283
Μεσαντής, see Apollo.
ΜΕΣΩΝΟΣ ΚΑΛΟΣ, 303
Μετά Πλακών, 35
μετά της of Delphi, 216; 223, 239 f.
Μια, 280

N 270, 270, 277, 285
Οάρ, 269
οικισμένος, 283
οικεῖ από Delphi, 201
Σιάνος, 281
Ορνής = Hortensius, 282
Ονομασία, 279
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Word</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ὁδειάλης</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁδείς ἀθάνατος</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁδόντωσ</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πάνω φίλος ἐν εἰπισθή, 266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πέπον, τοιόν τινος, 206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πάντα (πάντα), 281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πάντα φίλος ἐν εἰπισθή, 206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πέπως ἐν κομψία, προβηλικτικός ἐν τοῖς, 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πτέρες ἐν κομψία, προβηλικτικός ἐν τοῖς, 80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μεταπορος, 179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σάμπορος, 109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σκούριαρ, 199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>στρομάς, 251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Στρομάς, 272</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ικάμμος, 70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ζεςη, 282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπάθη, 190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>στορικός, 208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Στολις, 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σφαίρα, 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τιάζης, 270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τοῖς ἐπί, 201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τοῦ ἐπί, 201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τό, 279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τόλυμα = ἱλαβία, 201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἱλαβίας, 198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φραγαγής, εἰς Φίραγοις</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φραγάς, 242, 246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χαλασός, ἐν Zeus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΝΦ monogram, absent at Isaura Nova, 293</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III.—BOOKS NOTICED.

Amschlag, Sculpturen des Vatikanischen Museums, 170
Aristophanes, see Leewen; Mason
Aristotle, see Bluss; Kenyon
Belech, Griechische Geschichte, iii, 1, 177
Bluss, Aristoteles' Politia, 166
Bluss, Die kritischen Inschriften, (Collitz u. Bechtel, Gr. Dial. Inschr.), 343
Bormann and Neuwirth, Geschichte der Banknoten, 166
Bustell, Griechische Geschichte, iii, 2, 176
Cesana, Descriptive Atlas of the Campania Collection, 171
Collignon et Couve, Catalogue des Vases Points du Musee National d'Athènes, 170
Collitz u. Bechtel, see Bluss
Courtois, see Collignon
Crüaert, Memoria Graecae Heracleinensis, 167
Demosthenes, see Diels
Didymos, see Diels
Diels, Fragmente der Vorsokratiker, 167
Diels u. Schubart, Didymos' Kommentar zu Demosthenes, 338
Dittenberger, Origines Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae, 1, 175
Dorpfeld, see Wiegand
Edgar, Greek Sculpture, (Cairo Museum Catalogue), 349
Eitrem, Die Phaenomenalithe in der Odysse, 344
Enriqued, see Nestle
Furtwängler und Reichhold, Griechische Vasenmuster, 171
G. K. E., The Makers of Hellas, 168
Gillièron, see Wiegand
Graves, Antike Schrifttum, 173.
Gräfner and Hunt, Odyseus Papyri iv, 339
Hardie, Lectures on Classical Subjects, 168
Harrison, Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion, 174
Herodas, see Nairns
Hildebrand, Gymnasia als Gebiet künstlerischer Besiedlung, 341
Hiller de Gueydringen, Inscriptiones Cycladum procter Tenenn, 175
Inscriptiones Syriae, Teil, Nigri, etc., 343
Hirschfeld Festschrift, 173
Höck, Herodot und sein Geschichtswerk, 178
Hogarth, The Newer East, 342
Homolle, Familles de Delphes, 329
Hunt, see Grenfell
Kenyon, Aristoteles Regnum Hellenicum, 166
Leeuwen (van), Aristophanes' Comedies, 168
Linde, Oxyrhynchus, 177
Mason, Essay sur la Composition des Comédi d'Aristophane, 344
— Aristophane, La Paix, 344
Nairns, Mines of Herodas, 166
Nestle, Erganzungen der Dichter der gr. Aufklärung, 338
Neuwirth, see Bormann
Pernice, Ausgewählte Griechische Textkeim, 173
Petrovics, Sammlung Petrovics, 341
Plato, see Ritter
Reichhold, see Furtwängler
Reimach, Jezuik Chop, 174
Ritter, Platon's Dialoge, 167
Roloff, Probleme aus der griechischen Kriegeschichte, 177
Ruhlmann, Die Klassischen Götter, 179
Sambon, Les Monnaies antiques de l'Italie, 178, 341
Sandy, History of Classical Scholarship, 168
Sauer, Der Weber-Laborde'sche Kopf, 340
Schaffer, Giliein, 175
Schmidt, Schliemann's Sammlung, 169
Schneider, see Wiegand
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Schreiber, Studies über das Bildliche Agyptier, und der Grossen, 340
Schuhart, see Diels
Schulte, Zur Geschichte Lateinischer Eigennamen, 343
Strzygowski, Kleinasiien, 342
Usteri, Archäologie und Verhältnisse im griechischen Recht, 176

Walters, Catalogue of Terra-cottas in the British Museum, 172
Watzinger, see Wiegand
Wiegand, Dürferg, Gillieron, Watzinger u. Wüberg, Die Archäische Poro-Architekten der Akropolis in Athen, 169
Wüberg, see Wiegand
Winter, Typen der Figurlichen Terra-cottas, 171
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XI. That in the case of a book being kept beyond the stated time the borrower be liable to a fine of one shilling for each week after application has been made by the Librarian for its return, and if a book is lost the borrower be bound to replace it.
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Hunt, A. S., D.Litt. (Council), Queen's College, Oxford.
Hutchinson, Sir J. T., Chief Justice of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus.
Hutchinson, Miss W. M. L., Melrose, Grange Road, Cambridge.
Hutton, Miss C. A., 49, Drayton Gardens, S.W.
Image, Selwyn, 20, Fitzroy Street, W.C.
Jackson, Rev. Prebendary Blomfield, 29, Mecklenburg Square, W.C.
Jackson, Mrs. F. H., 74, Rutland Gate, S.W.
James, H. R., Bankstone, India.
James, Lionel, St. Peter's College, Radley, Abingdon.
Janvier, Mrs. Thomas A., c/o Brown, Shirley and Co., 123, Pall Mall, S.W.
Jasonid, O. J., Blondet Street, Limassol, Cyprus.
Jeans, Rev. G. L., Shrewsbury, Newport, Isle of Wight.


Jenner, Miss Lucy A., 23, Wernwick Gardens, Kensington, W.


Jex-Blake, Miss, Girton College, Cambridge.

Joachim, Miss M., 8, Broadway Buildings, Reading.

Johnson, Miss Lorna, Woodleigh, Altrincham.

Jonas, Maurice, 9, Bedford Square, W.C.

Jones, H. Stuart, Glany Mor, Sandford, Pembroke-shire.


Jones, William, 3, Summerhill Terraces, Berwick-on-Tweed.

Judge, Max, 7, Full Mall, S.W.

Kato, George, Abteilungs-Kunstmuseum, Bonn am Rhein.

Keene, Prof. Charles H., University Club, Dublin.

Keith, A. Berriedale, Colonial Office, Downing Street, S.W.

Kelly, Charles Arthur, 39, Cheyne Walk, Chelsea, S.W.

Kellie, J. S., LL.D., Glencoe House, Compton Gardens, Hampstead, N.W.


Kennedy, J., 12, Fregent Lane, Frimley Road, N.W.

Kensington, Miss Frances, 83, Gloucester Terrace, Hyde Park, W.

Kenyon, F. G., D.Litt. (Council), British Museum, W.C.

Keer, Prof. W. P., 95, Gover Street, W.C.

Kerr, Prof. Alexander, Madison, Wisconsin, U.S.A.

Keer, Dr. J., Colaeus, Chemists, London.

Kestenholz, Rev. P. W. H., 1, Albert Road, Clifton, Bristol.

Kleffner, Prof. John F., College Avenue, Lancaster, Pa., U.S.A.

King, J. E., Grammar School, Bedford.

King, Rev. Canon J. E., St. Peter’s Vicarage, Oxford.

King, Mrs. Wilson, 19, Highfield Road, Edgbaston, Birmingham.

Knowles, Sir James, K.C.V.O., Queen Anne’s Lodge, St. James Park, S.W.

Kohler, Olivia C., 29, Kensington Avenue, Queen’s Park, W.

Lane, Mrs. Charles T., Dunster, Peterborough.

Lang, Andrew, L.L.D., D.Litt., 1, Marlborough Road, Kensington, W.


Laughond-Davies, B. N., Cople Hill, Burgh Heath, Surrey.

Langton, Neville, 52, Harley Street, W.


Broomwood, G., W., H., Witley.

Lathbury, Miss, 19, Lingfield Road, Wimbledon, S.W.

La Touche, C. D., 33, Regent’s Park, Dublin.

Lardner, Miss de, 178, Earl’s Court Road, S.W.

Leaf, Herbert, The Green, Marthorough.

†Leach, Walter, Litt.D., D.Litt. (V.P.S), 6, St. Luke’s Place, Regent’s Park, N.W.

Lacey, Mrs. J., 18, Ovelton Gardens, S.W.

Leaper, Alexander, Warden of Trinity College, Melbourne.

Lee-Warner, Miss Evelyn, Lymwood, Gildersdale.

Legg, F. D., Grey’s Inn Square, W.C.

Leigh, Rev. A. Austen, Provost of King’s College, Cambridge.

Leigh, W. Austen, Harvfield, Hockhampton, S.W.

Lewis, Harry R., 5, Argell Road, Kensington, W.

Lewis, Miss M. B., 42, Shawbury Road, Ossett, Birkenhead.

†Lewis, Mrs. L. M., Castle-hill, Clissold Road, Cambridge.

Leycester, Mrs. Kate, 6, Cheyne Walk, S.W.

Lindley, Miss Julia, 79, Shooter’s Hill Road, Blackheath, S.E.


Lingen, Lady, 13, Wetherby Gardens, S.W.
Lister, Hon. Reginald, British Legation, Copenhagen.
Lloyd, Miss A. M., Ceylon, New Delhi, Calcutta.
Loch, James, 37, 38th Street, New York.
Longman, Miss Mary, 37, Norfolk Square, Hyde Park, W.
Lorimer, Miss H. L., Somerville College, Oxford.
Loring, William (Council), 2, Hare Court, Temple, E.C.
Lunn, Henry S., M.D., Oldfield House, Harrow-on-the-Hill.
Lunn, W. Holdsworth, 5, Endleigh Gardens, N.W.
Lyttelton, Hon. and Rev. E., Hatleybury College, Hertford.
Macan, R. W., University College, Oxford.
McAnally, H. W., W., War Office, Pall Mall, S.W.
McArthur, A. G., 28, Linden Gardens, W.
McDaniel, J. R., Mohawk College, Geneva, N.Y.
Macdonald, George (Council), The University, Glasgow.
Macdonald, Miss Louisa, Women's College, Sydney University, Sydney, N.S.W.
McDougall, Miss Eleanor, Westfield College, Hampstead, N.W.
McDowall, Miss Katherine Ada, 166, Holland Road, Kensington, W.
MacEwen, Rev. Prof. Alex. Robertson, 5, Doune Terrace, Edinburgh.
McIntyre, P. S., The University, St. Andrews.
MacIver, D. Randall, Waverley House, Clifton, Bristol.
Mackenzie, W. W. J., 150, Byres Road, Glasgow.
McKerrow, Miss, St. Leonard's School, St. Andrews, Fife, N.B.
Mackenzie, Duncan, 34, Via Monte Giordano, Rome.
Mackenzie, R. J., 12, Great Stuart Street, Edinburgh.
Mackerell, Charles E., 36, Balham Hill, S.W.
MacLehose, James J., 61, St. Vincent Street, Glasgow.
Macmillan, Mrs. Alexander, Braehead, Charsley, Skipton, Surrey.
*Macmillan, George A., D.Litt. (Hon. Sec.), St. Martin's Street, W.C.
Macmillan, Mrs. George A., 19, Earl's Terrace, Kensington, W.
Macmillan, Maurice, 32, Cadogan Place, S.W.
+Macmillan, W. E. F., 19, Earl's Terrace, Kensington, W.
Macnaughten, Hugh, Elgin College, Windsor.
Macnaughten, The Right Hon. Lord, 198, Queen's Gate, S.W.
Macrae, Rev. J. K., Provost of Queen's College, Oxford.
Mair, Prof. A. W., The University, Edinburgh.
+Mallin, F. B., Marlborough College, Wilts.
Mallet, P. W., 25, Highbury New Park, N.
Manatt, Prof. Irving, Brown University, Providence, R.I., U.S.A.
*Marindin, G. E. (Council), Chesterton, Bridgnorth, Salop.
Marquand, Prof. Allan, Princeton College, New Jersey, U.S.A.
Marsal, E., 3, Gray's Inn Place, W.C.
Marshall, Miss, For Cross, Uxbridge, Newman College, Staffs.
Marshall, Frederick, British Museum, W.C.
Marshall, John, Lewis House, Lewis.
Marshall, J. H., Benmore, Simla, India.
Marshall, Prof. T. W., University College of Wales, Aberystwyth.
Marshall, T., Highfield, Chapel Allerton, Leeds.
Martin, R. B., M.R.C., 10, Hill Street, W.
+Martyn, Edward, Talyllyn Castle, Arrochar, County Galway.
Massey, Lieut.-Col. P. H. H., H.M.V. Consulat, Sassimo, Asia Minor.
Matheson, F. E., New College, Oxford.
Mathews, C. E., J.P., 39, Waterloo Street, Birmingham.
Mayrargordo, Pandelt A., 74, Westbourne Terrace, Hyde Park, W.
Mayor, H. B., Clifton College, Bristol.
Mayor, Rev. Prof. Joseph B., Queen's Park, Kingston Hill, Surrey.
Mayor, R. J. G. (Councill), Board of Education, Whitehall, S.W.
Measures, A. E., King Edward VI School, Birmingham.
Merk, F. H., Christ's Hospital, West Horsham.
Merry, Rev. W. W., Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford.
Methuen, A. M. S., New Place, Haslemere.
Miers, Prof. H. A., F.R.S., Magdalen College, Oxford.
Michel, Prof. Ch., 42, Avenue Blunden, Liége, Belgium.
Miller, William, 19, Chelsea Gardens, Chelsea, S.W.
Millingen, Prof. Alexander van, Robert College, Constantinople.
Millington, Miss M. V., 1, St. Anne's Villas, Holland Park Avenue, W.
Milne, Miss, J., English House, Pretoria, S. Africa.
Minet, Miss Julia, 18, Sussex Square, Hyde Park, W.
Minns, Ellis H., Pembroke College, Cambridge.
Minshull, Miss E. T., 14, Chelsea Embankment, S.W.
Mitchell, Mrs. C. W., Jesmond Towers, Newcastle-on-Tyne.
Mocatta, F. D., 9, Connaught Place, Edgware Road, W.
Moline, Miss I. V., 172, Church Street, Stoke Newington, N.
Mond, Mrs. Frida, The Popley, 20, Avenue Road, Regent's Park, N.W.
Monson, His Excellency the Right Hon. Sir E. L., G.C.B., G.C.M.G., H.B.M.
Moore, B. F., 75, Holland Road, Kensington, W.
Morgan, Miss, 64, St. Saviour's, Ramsgate, Ramsgate, W.
Morice, Rev. F. D., Mount-Horn, Woking.
*Morley, The Right Hon. the Earl of, 31, Prince's Gardens, S.W.
*Morshede, E. D. A., 39, Trinity Square, Southwark, S.E.
Mount, Rev. C. B., 14, Northam Road, Oxford.
Moxon, Rev. T. Allen, 106, Goldsmith Street, Nottingham.
Mozley, H. W., The White House, Haslemere.
Murray, G. G. A. (Councill), Barford, Churt, Farnham.
*Myers, Ernest (Councill), Bradfield, Chipstead.
*Myres, J. Linton, Christ Church, Oxford.
*Nairn, Rev. J. Arbuthnot, Merchant Taylor's School, E.C.
Nash, Mrs. Vaughan, 42, Wellesley, Hampstead.
Newton, The Rev. John, 6, Belgrave Square, S.W.
Nichols, Morton C., Metropolitan Club, Fifth Avenue, New York, U.S.A.
Nunck, Prof. Ferdinand, Nienhuisweg 18, Kiel.
*Northampton, The Most Hon. the Marquess of, 51, Lennox Gardens, S.W.
Oakesmith, John, D.Litt. (Lond.), 99, Albert Bridge Road, Battersea Park, S.W.
Odgers, Rev. J. Edw., D.D., 135, Woodstock Road, Oxford.
Ogilvy, Miss Allison, 22, Prince Edward's Mansions, Pembroke Square, W.
Oman, Rev. A. P., The University, Edinburgh.
Osgood, Hamilton, M.D., 8, Mount Vernon Place, Boston, U.S.A.
Owen, Rev. E. C. Everard, The Knoll, Harrow-on-the-Hill.
Page, T. E., Charterhouse, Gaulming.
Pallis, Alexander, Tatlow, Aigligh Drive, Liverpool.
*Parry, Rev. O. H., Englefield, Cranmore Road, Cambridge.
Parry, Rev. R. St. J., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Paton, James Morton, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., U.S.A.
Paton, W. R., Maison Camus, Place Mars, Viroflay, Seine-et-Oise, France.
Paton, J. Lewis, Grammar School, Manchester.
Payne-Smith, Rev. W. H., Montpelier Road, Rugby.
Pears, Edwin, 2, Rue de la Banque, Constantinople.
Peckover, Alexander, Wisbech, Cambs.
Peckover, Miss Alexandria, Bank House, Wisbech.
Peers, C. R., 56, Grosvenor Road, S.W.
Pelce, John, Litt.D., Master of Christ's College, Cambridge.
Fellham, Hon. Mrs. Arthur, 15, Duke Street, Manchester Square, W.
Fellham, Professor H. F. (W.P.), President of Trinity College, Oxford.
Penrose, Miss Emily (Council), Royal Holloway College, Englefield Green, S.D., Surrey.
*Percival, F. W., 2, Southwark Place, Hyde Park Square, W.
Perkins, O. T., Wellington College, Berks.
Perry, Prof. Edward Delam, Columbia University, New York City, U.S.A.
Pestel, Miss Laura, Oak House, Bradford.
Phillips, Mrs. Herbert, Sutton Oaks, Muswellfield.
Phillimore, Prof. W. S., The University, Glasgow.
Phillipson, Hamlet S., The County School, Baltimore, Maryland, U.S.A.
Pinchery, A. B., The Orchard, Bathford, Somerset.
Plater, Rev. Charles, S.J., St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst, Blackburn.
*Platt, Prof. Arthur, 5, Chester Terrace, N.W.
Pogson-Smith, W. G., St. John's College, Oxford.
Pollard, A. T., City of London School, Victoria Embankment, E.C.
Pollock, Sir Frederick, Bart., 48, Great Cumberland Place, W.
Poppe, Mrs. G. H., 65, Brompton Road, Oxford.
Powell, Sir F. S., Bart., M.P., 1, Cambridge Square, Hyde Park, W.
Powell, John J., St. John's College, Oxford.
Precce, Sir William H., Gothic Lodge, Winchombe Common, S.W.
Prentice, A., 2, Camden Place, Wey, Weymouth.
Price, Miss Mabel, Charlton, Headington, Oxford.
Prickard, A. O., New College, Oxford.
Proctor, Mrs. A., The Lodge, Waltham Cross.
Prothero, Henry, 13, Frome-Meades, Cheltenham.
*Pryor, Francis R., Woodfield, Hatfield, Herts.
Quaritch, Miss, 34, Belzize Grove, Hampstead, N.
Quitha, Mrs. Annie A., Giza Museum, Egypt.
Rackham, H., 4, Grenge Terrace, Cambridge.
Radielli, W. W., Fonthill, East Grinstead, Sussex.
*Raleigh, Miss Katharine, A., Beaulieu, Landseer, Bucks.
*Ralli, Eudell, 17, Belgrave Square, S.W.
*Ralli, Mrs. Stephen A., St. Catherine's Lodge, Hove, Sussex.
Ramsay, A. B., Eton College, Windsor.
Ramsay, Prof. G. G., The University, Glasgow.
*Ramsay, Prof. W. M., D.C.L., Litt.D. (V.P.), The University, Aberdon.
Ransome, Miss C. L., 2112, Jefferson Avenue, Toledo, Ohio, U.S.A.
Rawlin, F. H., Eton College, Windsor.
Rawnsley, W. F., Longridge Hall, Ambleside.
Reade, Essex E., 22, Bolton Street, Marylebone, W.
Reece, Miss Dora, 26, Russell House, Montpelier, Pitt Street, Kensington, W.
Reid, Prof. J. S., Litt.D., Corpus College, Cambridge.
*Rendall, Montague, The College, Winchester.
Richards, Miss A. C., M., 23, Corbett Road, Cardiff.
Richards, Rev. V. C. [Councell], Oriel College, Oxford.
Richards, E., Kingswood School, Bath.
Richmond, O. L., King's College, Cambridge.
Ridgeway, Prof. W. (Council), Fox Ditton, Cambridge.
Ridley, Sir Edward, 48, Lennox Gardens, S.W.
Rigg, Herbert A., 17, Queen's Gate Place, S.W.
Riley, W. E., County Hall, Spring Gardens, S.W.
Robb, Mrs., 49, Radland Gate, S.W.
Roberts, Rev. E. S., Master of Cesis College, Cambridge.
Roberts, J., Slingsby, 13, Old Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
Roberts, Principal T. F., Sherborne House, Aberystwith.
Roberts, Professor W. Rhys, The University, Leeds.
Roberts, Miss Hilda, 57, Harrington Gardens, W.
Robinson, Charles Newton, 11, John Street, Mayfair, W.
Robinson, Edward, Director of Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.
Robinson, G. G., Hill Side, Goudling.
Robinson, T. B., Askfield, Ruby, Place, Bed ford.
Robinson, W. S., Courthold, West Hill, Putney Heath.
Rodd, Sir Rennell, K.C.M.G., 17, Stratford Place, W.
Rogers, Benjamin Buckley, Eastwood, Stourbridge, Hille, Twickenham.
Rome, W., Crewe House Place, Burnham-on-Crouch.
†Rosebery, The Right Hon. the Earl of K.G., 15, Berkeley Square, W.
Rosenau-Loehn, The Baroness, Palazzo Bindangovi, Assisi, Italy.
Ross, W. D., Oriel College, Oxford.
Rotton, Sir J. F., Lockwood, Frith Hill, Goudling, Surrey.
Roum, Lient-Colonel, Wresstead House, Norwich.
Ruben, Paul, 39, Laxham Gardens, Kensington, W.
Rubie, Rev. Alfred E., The Royal Naval School, Eltham, S.E.
Rückers, Miss S. C., 4, Vaunbrugh Terrace, Blackheath, S.E.
Rückers, Principal Sir A. W., D.Sc., F.R.S., 19, Gladhow Gardens, S. Kensington, S.W.
Runtz, Ernest, 11, Walbrook, E.C.
Rastafael, R. de, 20, Down Street, Piccadilly, W.
Samson, Arthur, 6, Rue de Port Mahon, Paris.
Saabhom, F. B., Concord, Mass., U.S.A.
†Sandys, J. E., Litt.D. (V.P.), St. John's College, Cambridge.
†Sandys, Mrs., Merston House, Cambridge.
†Sassay, Rev. Prof. A. H., L.L.D. (V.P.), 8, Clalmer's Crescent, Edinburgh.
†Scharranga, A. P., 18, Birkstone Gardens, Kensington, S.W.
Schulz, R. Weir, 6, Mountville Place, W.
Schuster, Ernest, 12, Harrington Gardens, S.W.
Sclatoudi, Stephano, Athens, Greece.
Scull, Miss Sarah A., Smythport, M. Keen Co., Pt., U.S.A.
Seager, Richard B., of Baring Bros & Co., Ltd., 37, Bishopsgate Street Within, E.C.
Secker, W. H., Argyll School, Newton-le-Willows, R.S.O., Yorke.
Seebhoom, Hagh, The Hermology, Hitchin.
Selman, E. J., King's, Great Berkhamsted, Herts.
†Selwyn, Rev. R. C., D.D., School House, Uppingham.
Shadwell, C. L., D.C.L., Oriel College, Oxford.
Sharpe, Miss Catharine, Stonecroft, Bliestre, Herts.
Sherwell, John W., Saddler's Hall, Cheshalde, E.C.
Shewam, Alexander, Sedg, St. Andrews, Elfe.
Shipley, H. S., St. Helen's Cottage, Coalville, Leicester.
Shove, Miss E., 25, St. Mark's Crescent, Regent's Park, N.W.
Sidgwick, Arthur, Corpus Christi College, Oxford.
Sikes, Edward Ernest (Counci), St. John's College, Cambridge.
Silcox, Miss, High School for Girls, West Dulwich, S.E.
Simpson Percy, St. Olave's Grammar School, Tower Bridge, S.E.
Simpson, Professor, 5, Brunnsuch Place, Regent's Park, N.W.
Sing, J. M., S. Edward's School, Oxford.
Skirne, Rev. J. H., Tothoe Stoke Rectory, Alresford, Hants.
Slater, E. V., Eton College, Windsor.
Slater, Howard, Waikato, New Zealand.
Sloane, Miss Eleanor, 13, Wellesford Road, Leicester.
Smith, A. Hamilton (Counci), 22, Endleigh Street, W.C.
Smith, Cecil, L.L.D. (V.P.), 18, Earl's Terrace, Kensington, W.
Smith, Prof. Goldwin, The Grange, Toronto, Canada.
Smith, H. Babington, C.S.I., 29, Hyde Park Gate, S.W.
Smith, R. Elsey, 7, Gordon Street, Gordon Square, W.C.
Smith, Reginald J., K.C., 11, Hyde Park Street, W.
Smith, S. C. Kaines, Koorinya, Kingwood, Hants.
Smith-Pearse, Rev. T. N. H., The College, Epsom.
Snow, T. C., St. John's College, Oxford.
Somerset, Arthur, Castle Goring, Worthing.
Sonnenschein, Prof. E. A., 7, Barnsbury Road, Birmingham.
Sowells, F., The Rowtery, Thetford, Norfolk.
Spieres, R. Plené, 21, Bernard Street, Russell Square, W.C.
Spilsbury, A. J., City of London School, Victoria Embankment, E.C.
Stanford, C. Thomas, 3, Ennismore Gardens, S.W.
Stannus, Hugh, 34, York House, Highbury Crescent, N.
Stanton, Charles H., Field Place, Stroud, Gloucestershire.
Statham, H. Heathcote, 49, Gower Street, W.C.
Stiwell, Miss F. Malton, 44, Westbourne Park Villas, W.
Steel, Charles G., Barby Road, Rugby.
Steele, D., 23, Homer Street, Athens.
Steele, D., 2, Via Pico della Mirandola, Florence.
Stevenson, Miss E. C., 13, Randolph Crescent, Edinburgh.
Stevenson, Miss E. F., Etham Court, Etham, Kent.
Stevenson, F. S., M.P., 5, Ennismore Gardens, S.W.
Stewart, Prof. J. A., Christ Church, Oxford.
Stogdon, Rev. Edgar, Harrow, N.W.
Stogdon, J., Harrow, N.W.
Stone, Rev. E. D., Abingdon.
Stone, E. W., Eton College, Windsor.
Surr, Rev. Vernon F., Brunnsuch Rectory, Liphook, Hants.
Strachan-Davidson, J. L., Balliol College, Oxford.
Stretton, Gilbert W., The College, Dulwich, S.E.
Strong, Mrs. S. Arthur, L.L.D. (Counci), 73, Greenvale Road, S.W.
S校区s, John, C.B., Dover House, Whitehall, S.W.
Surr, Watson, 37, Old Broad Street, E.C.
Sutton, Leonard, Hillside, Reading.
Taft, C. W. A., 79, Canton Road, Edinburgh.
Tarbell, Prof. F. B., University of Chicago, Chicago, III., U.S.A.
Tarn, W. W., 7, New Square, Lincoln\'s Inn, W.C.
Talham, H. F. W., Eton College, Windsor.
Tatton, R. G., 60, Leinster Square, W.
Taylor, Miss Margaret, Royal Holloway College, Egham.
Thackery, H. St. John, Board of Education, Whitehall, S.W.
Thompson, W. H., The Nes, Roman Road, Linthorpe, Middlesbrough.
*Thompson, Miss Anna Boynton, Thayer Academy, South Braintree, Mass., U.S.A.
*Thompson, Sir E. M., K.C.B., D.C.L. (V.P.), British Museum, W.C.
Thompson, F. E. (Councill), 16, Primrose Hill Road, N.W.
Thompson, Sir Herbert, Bart., 35, Winpole Street, W.
Thursofield, J. F., Fryth, Great Berkhamstead.
Tilley, Arthur, King\'s College, Cambridge.
*Tod, Marcus N., Sans Souci, The Park, Highgate, N.
*Truell, H. P., F.R.C.S., Clonmannan, Ashford, Co. Wicklow.
*Tuckett, F. F., Frensham, near Bristol.
Tudor, Dr. Emil, Helsingors, Finland.
*Turnbull, Mrs. Peverill, Sandybrook Hall, Ashburton.
Tylor, C. H., Rossall School, Fleetwood.
Tyrell, Prof. R. Y., Litt.D., D.C.L., LL.D. (V.P.), Trinity College, Dublin.
Underhill, G. E., Magdalen College, Oxford.
Upcott, Rev. A. W., Christ\'s Hospital, West Horsham.
Upcott, L. E., The College, Marlborough.
*Valeri, Octavius, 2, Kensington Park Gardens, W.
*Vaughan, E. L., Eton College, Windsor.
Vernall, Mrs. A. W., Selwyn Gardens, Cambridge.
Vii de Marco, Marchesa di, Palazzo Orsini, Monte Savello, Rome.
Vlasco, Michel P., 12, Allée des Capucins, Marseilles.
Vlasco, T. A., Bouvainville, Saffron Park, Liverpool.
Wace, A. J. B., Calverton House, Stony Stratford.
*Wackernagel, Prof. Jacob, The University, Göttingen, Germany.
Wads, Charles St. Clair, Tuff\'s College, Mott, U.S.A.
*Wagner, Henry, 13, Half Moon Street, W.
*Waldstein, Prof. Charles, Ph.D., Litt.D., L.H.D. (V.P.), King\'s College, Cambridge.
Walmsley, Mrs. Neville, Sotteridge, Horsnabridge, South Devon.
Walker, Miss D. L., Roydon Lodge, Hadleigh, Lots.
Walker, Rev. E. M., Queen\'s College, Oxford.
Walthers, Henry Beauchamp (Councill), British Museum, W.C.
Ward, Arnold S., 25, Grosvenor Place, S.W.
Ward, John, Lismorvale, Belfast.
Ward, T. H., 25, Grosvenor Place, S.W.
Warr, Mrs., 16, Earl\'s Terrace, Kensington, W.
*Warre, Rev. Edmund, D.D., Eton College, Windsor.
Warren, Mrs. Fiske, 8, Mount Vernon Place, Boston, U.S.A.
Warren, T. H., President of Magdalen College, Oxford.
Waterfield, Rev. R., Montpellier Lodge, Cheltenham.
Waterhouse, Edwin, Fledmores, near Darlington.
Waterhouse, Miss M. E., 70, Edge Lane, Liverpool.
Watson, Mrs., Borrowfield, Co. Durham.
+Weber, F. P., M.D., 19, Harley Street, W.
Wöber, Sir Hermann, M.D., 10, Grevinor Street, W.
Webster, Erwin Wentworth, Wadham College, Oxford.
Weld, N., King's College, Cambridge.
Weir, Miss Ethel, 4, Frogmal, Hampstead, N.W.
Weld-Blundell, Herbert, 100, Holywell, Oxford.
+Welford, The Right Rev. Bishop, Little Clusters, Westminster, S.W.
Wells, C. M., Eton College, Windsor.
Wells, J., Wadham College, Oxford.
Wells, K. Douglas, 171, Queen's Gate, S.W.
Welsh, Miss M., Bisrons, Fleet, Hants.
Westlake, Prof. J., L.L.D., The River House, Chelsea Embankment, S.W.
Whately, A. J., 4, Southwick Crescent, Hyde Park, W.
Wheeler, Benjamin Ide, President of the University of California, Berkeley, Cal., U.S.A.
Wheeler, Prof. James R., Ph.D., Columbia College, New York City, U.S.A.
White, Hon. Mrs. A. D., Villa Chial, Alastin, Italy.
White, J. N., Rockland, Waterford.
White, Miss R. E., Newnham College, Cambridge.
+Whitehead, R. R., Woodstock, Usher Co., N.Y., U.S.A.
Whitworth, A. W., Eton College, Windsor.
Wilkins, Prof. A. S., L.L.D., L.R.I. (Council), The Queen's College, Manchester.
Wilkins, Rev. George, 56, Trinity College, Dublin.
Wilkinson, Herbert, 10, Orme Square, W.
Williams, A. Moray, Redlands School, Petersfield, Hants.
Williams, T. Hudson, University College, Bangor.
Wills, J. Arming, 6, Marloes Road, Kensington, W.
Wilson, Donald, Waverley, Beverley Road, Hull.
Wilson, Captain H. C. R., Crofton Hall, Crofton, near Wakefield.
Wilson, Miss, Laleham, Eadhorne.
+Manchester, the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of, D.D., Furnham Castle, Surrey.
Windley, Rev. H. C., St. Chad's, Bensham, Gateshead-on-Tyne.
Winkworth, Mrs., Holly Lodge, Compton Hill, W.
Wiseman, Rev. Henry John, Senior Reviser, Hornsby.
Woodhouse, Prof. W. J., The University, Sydney, N.S.W.
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SESSION 1903-1904.

The First General Meeting was held on November 3rd, when Mr. E. Norman Gardiner read a paper which was illustrated by lantern slides on 'Athletic Scenes in Greek Art representing the Armed Race,' the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford being in the chair. This interesting paper was practically a section of Mr. Gardiner's longer article, 'Notes on the Greek Footrace' which appeared subsequently in the Journal (J.H.S. xxxii. p. 261). Among the points brought out were the concurrence of the vase paintings with the evidence furnished by the excavations at Olympia, Delphi, and Epidaurus; the methods of starting and turning; and the semi-humorous character of the armed footrace at lesser local festivals. In the discussion which followed the paper, Professor Percy Gardner, Professor Ernest Gardner, and the lecturer took part.

A special General Meeting was held at Burlington House on November 24th, 1904, when Dr. Evans gave an account of his most recent excavations in Crete. Professor Butcher occupied the chair, and Dr. Evans lectured to a large and interested audience.

As the result of the last season's excavations we are now able not only to recognise an earlier and a later Palace at Knossos, but to distinguish successive periods in the development of each. Taking the earlier Palace first, over the twenty-five feet of neolithic deposits lies a stratum belonging to an early civilisation, over which in their turn have been found traces of a far more highly developed mode of life showing points of contact with the twelfth dynasty of Egypt and belonging to the middle of the third millennium before our era. The magnificent polychrome vases of the 'Middle Minoan' period belong to this epoch.

Of the later Palace the most recent elements may be dated approximately at 1500 B.C., but a remarkable series of discoveries has shown that approximately three hundred years before this date, and probably at the time of some great disturbance within the Palace, portions of certain
magazines and a whole series of stone receptacles with their contents had been purposely closed by building paved floors above them.

Several of these repositories belonging to this penultimate Period contained quantities of gold-foil and remains of cypress wood chests that had been inlaid with plaques of crystal and faience and doubtless once contained treasure. The two most spacious and important of these repositories were filled with relics of a sanctuary including faience figures of a Snake Goddess and Votaries, exquisite inlays and reliefs of the same material, tablets showing a new intermediate form of script and clay sealings that had belonged to priestly documents now perished. It was remarkable that several of these bore religious symbols in the shape either of a plain cross or of a Cruc gamma or 'Swastika.' But the great surprise of the excavation was the discovery of what seems to have been the central object of cult in the shape of a marble cross of orthodox Greek shape. Dr. Evans referred to other pre-Christian survivals of this symbol which seemed to fit on to this Minoan Cult. In the same way the Minoan idea of the dove as divine intermediary had also showed itself very persistent. These remains belonged to what appeared to have been an extensive sanctuary in the West Wing of the Palace including the pillars incised with the double axes. It was becoming more and more probable that the early rulers of Knossos were Priest Kings like those of Anatolia, —a conclusion altogether in harmony with the tradition that made Minos the Cretan Moses and 'companion' of Zeus.

Other interesting finds of the last season were passed in review. The theatre brought to light near the N.W. angle of the Palace might actually represent the traditional Choros of Ariadne, indeed a wall painting from a neighbouring part of the Palace showed brilliantly attired women dancing in a walled enclosure.

A dépendance of the Palace on the N.E., also recently excavated, showed a marvellously preserved royal Villa with flights of stairs and remains of upper storeys, the principal hall of which afforded an extraordinary anticipation of the later basilica.

The Second General Meeting was held on February 23rd, the Provost of Oriel in the chair.

Dr. L. R. Farnell read a paper on the early Apolline cults of Lycia and Attica, and the light which they throw on questions of ethnography. He began by explaining that the only derivation of the epithet Αὐκεία possible on etymological grounds was its formation from Αὐξαύ, a wolf. Descending from the north, the worship of the wolf-god reached Attica and the Peloponnese, whence in very early times (before the fourteenth century B.C., if the Ruka of Rameses II. are Hellenic Lykoi) Hellenic settlers following a route, which included both Crete and Rhodes, landed in S.W. Asia Minor. They brought with them the worship of the wolf-god; they called the temenos of his temple Αὐκεία, and themselves and their
territory Αἴγιον and Ύστηλα. In the second portion of his paper, Dr. Farnell discussed the early Attic cults of Apollo. Although in Athens in later times the worship of Apollo Patroos became the test of political enfranchisement, Apollo was not a primitive Attic deity. His worship was an Ionian importation reaching Attica through the instrumentality of the Ionians of the Tetrapolis, who, probably in Mycenaean times, had colonised Delos and later won predominance in Athens.

In the discussion which followed Professor E. A. Gardner, Sir Henry Howorth, Mr. A. G. Bather, and Mr. G. F. Hill, took part.

Before the meeting terminated Mr. A. H. Smith exhibited lantern slides of the Hermes after Alcamenes recently discovered by the German excavators at Pergamon. A short discussion followed on the effect which this discovery must have on our ideas of the style of Alcamenes.

The Third General Meeting was held on May 3rd, Mr. Talfourd Ely in the chair.

Professor W. Ridgeway read a paper on the origin of the Greek drama, in which he combated successively most of the accepted beliefs that have grown up round this perennially interesting topic. He first deprecated the idea that the drama was originally a Dorian institution. On linguistic grounds there was nothing essentially Doric in the choruses of the Attic drama, and it was, he contended, unlikely that the Athenians would borrow for sacred purposes the dialect of a people whom they would not allow to worship in their temples. His next point was that scholars were in error in attributing the origin of the drama to the worship of Dionysus, who was, he demonstrated, somewhat of a parvenu in Attic religious belief. The dances associated with his cult belonged to the Pangean district in Thrace, but in Greece proper, long before his southward journey, there were mimetic dances, particularly at Sikyon and Tegea, held not in worship of Dionysus, but in honour of the dead. In this connection, Professor Ridgeway maintained that the θυρέα was not, as generally believed, the altar of Dionysus, but the funeral mound of the illustrious dead. The only drama proper to Dionysus was the Satyric, which arose when in later times there was superadded to a trilogy in honour of a dead hero a drama connected with the worship of Dionysus, in which his fellow countrymen and votaries the Satyri formed the chorus.

In conclusion, Professor Ridgeway justified the famous Heratian line on Thespis by the theory that the poet was implying the detachment of what had been hitherto a local religious usage from its particular shrine and its adoption into a great form of literature, which became henceforward independent of local association and capable of representation anywhere.

In the subsequent discussion, Professor Ernest Gardner, Professor Gilbert Murray, and Sir Henry Howorth took part. Professor Ridgeway in his reply admitted the part played by the worship of Dionysus in the
development of the drama, but pointed out that his paper was mainly concerned with its origin.

The Annual Meeting was held at Burlington House on Tuesday, June 28th, 1904, the President, Sir Richard Jebb, M.P., occupying the chair.

The Hon. Secretary (Mr. George Macmillan) read the following report on behalf of the Council:

The progress of the Society during the past year has been good in all departments, though not specially eventful.

Four General Meetings have been held, and have been well attended. In November Dr. Arthur Evans gave an account, illustrated by lantern slides, of his last season's work at Knossos. In January Professor W. M. Ramsay laid before the Society a new scheme of exploration in Asia Minor. In February Dr. L. R. Farnell read a paper on some local cults in Attica, and in May Professor Ridgeway read a paper on 'The Origin of Greek Tragedy,' which aroused great interest, and led to a good discussion.

A further grant of £100 has been made to the Cretan Exploration Fund. Dr. Evans has continued his work at Knossos, and has opened a series of tombs with interesting contents; and among them one of such importance as seems to justify a royal attribution. He has more recently come on a new range of buildings, attached to the Palace, which, from their contents, he believes to have been the magazines of the arsenal. Together with inscribed tablets related to the store of weapons, he has found a collection of the arrow-heads to which the tablets refer. At Palaikastro, where the excavations of the British School at Athens are also assisted by the Cretan Exploration Fund, have been found parts of a Doric inscription with a ritual hymn to Zeus, which seems to locate the sanctuary to the Dictaean Zeus at this spot. More fine pottery has been found, and also two ivory statuettes of exquisite workmanship. The British School has also been continuing its former excavations at Praesus, where sufficient architectural fragments have been found to suggest the restoration of the temple; and also an incomplete Eteocretan inscription. Other members of the School have been exploring in Laconia and Messenla, and in Melos, while Mr. Wace has catalogued the sculptures and Mr. Tod the inscriptions in the Museum at Sparta.

It was announced in the course of the year that a Joint Committee was being formed for establishing at Athens a memorial of the late Mr. Penrose. The Committee was to consist of representatives of the British School at Athens, and the Royal Institute of British Architects, and other leading scholars, English and foreign. Lady Evans and the Hon. Sec. were appointed to represent the Society on this Committee. It was ultimately decided to build a new Library, to bear Mr. Penrose's name, for the School at Athens, and the work is now in progress.
The Council have been occupied with the arrangements for the celebration of the 25th Anniversary of the foundation of the Society, which is to take place on July 5. Unfortunately, only a few of the foreign Honorary Members will be able to attend, but it is hoped that the attendance of ordinary members will be sufficient to mark the importance of the occasion. The Council decided, in connection with the celebration, to raise the number of foreign Honorary Members to forty, which will henceforth be regarded as the limit, and the following have been appointed to make up the number—

Professor Maxime Collignon, Professor Hermann Diels, Professor Theodor Gomperz, Professor B. L. Gildersleeve, Professor W. W. Goodwin, Dr. F. Imhoof-Blumer, Professor Georg Loeschcke, Signor Paolo Orsi, M. Georges Perrot, Professor Karl Robert, M. Valerios Stais, M. Ch. Tsountas, M. Henri Weil, Professor John Williams White, Professor T. D. Seymour.

A diploma for presentation to Honorary Members has been designed by a special Committee.

In the early part of 1904, Mr. Baker-Penoyre, the Librarian of the Society, who also holds the post of Secretary to the British Schools at Athens and Rome, being free of other engagements, offered his entire services to the three bodies. It has for some time past been felt by the Hon. Sec., Mr. Macmillan, that with the increasing pressure of other engagements, he could not much longer fulfil all the duties of the post. It did not seem likely that any other member could be found to take his place, and the Council have therefore decided, after full consideration, to nominate Mr. Baker-Penoyre as Secretary to the Society at a salary of £80 a year, in addition to the £60 a year which he was already receiving as Librarian. It is believed that in his new capacity Mr. Penoyre will be able to render very important service to the Society, and his appointment, which members are to-day invited to confirm, will enable Mr. Macmillan to retain his post as Hon. Secretary, while relieving him of its more arduous obligations. In order to meet the additional charge upon the Society's resources, it is proposed that as from January 1, 1905, the entrance fee shall be raised from one guinea to two guineas. Considering all the privileges now offered to members in the extension of the library, and of the photographic collection, and in view of the increasing demands made upon the Society for assistance in all fields of archaeological research, the additional entrance fee seems to be justified in any case, and the Council therefore trust that members will ratify their proposal.

The Council record, with regret, the death, last autumn, of Mr. William Risedley, who had faithfully filled the office of Assistant Secretary to the Society since 1880, and showed a constant devotion to its interests, which was heartily appreciated by members. Mr. Risedley had also assisted successive Hon. Treasurers with the accounts of the Society. On his
death it was thought best to divide his work, and Mr. George Garnett was appointed Assistant Treasurer, while for a time the post of Assistant Secretary was filled by Mr. Samuel Ludbrook. Now, however, that it is proposed to appoint Mr. Baker-Perney as Secretary to the Society Mr. Ludbrook's appointment comes to an end.

The volume on the Excavations of the British School at Athens, at Phylakepí, in the island of Melos, to which allusion has been made in previous Reports, has now been issued at the price of 20s. to members, and 30s. to the general public. The cost of the publication—about £450—is considerably more than was anticipated, but its archaeological importance cannot be doubted, and it is hoped that enough copies will be sold to members and others to ensure the Society against actual loss. The Council trust that members will realise the importance of standing by the Society in this undertaking in order to encourage similar enterprises in the future. The publication of the results of excavations is at least as helpful to archaeological research as the excavations themselves, and yet the Society is not in a position to undertake it entirely out of its ordinary revenue, and must therefore rely upon the willingness of its members to assist by purchasing such extra volumes at cost price.

The same remark applies to such enterprises as the issue of the facsimile of the Codex Venetus of Aristophanes, undertaken at the joint cost of the Society and of the Archaeological Institute of America. About 140 copies have now been disposed of, but there is still a deficit of about £220, and it is hoped that in the coming year this may be made good by a further sale of copies to members and libraries.

The unexpected though welcome increase in the membership of the Society last year has exhausted the stock of Volume XXII of the Journal of Hellenic Studies. Much as they regretted the additional expenditure at a time when the resources of the Society have been somewhat heavily taxed, the Council felt that they had no alternative but to reprint a hundred copies at a cost of about £120. Not only were some 25 copies due to members, but the inability to supply complete sets would have discouraged new libraries from subscribing and materially diminished the value of the existing stock. With Volume XXIV, 1250 copies of the Journal will be printed instead of 1100 as heretofore.

Finance.

The Cash Account submitted to the meeting shows the money actually received and expended during the financial year. Thus ordinary receipts during the year were £1350, against £1070 during the financial year 1902–3. The receipts from subscriptions, including arrears, amount to £872 against £659, and the receipts from libraries £147 against £202, Entrance fees to the value of £99 have been received. Life Subscriptions
amounting to £126, and for lantern slides and photographs £58; have also been received.

The ordinary expenditure for the year, including grants, amounts to £1217. Payments for rent and insurance stand as before. Salaries have risen from £68 to £88. Sundry printing, postage, and stationery show an increase of £50—£125 against £72. The cost of purchases for the Library amounts to £30 as against £89, but there is an additional item of £55 for printing the Catalogue. The lantern slides and photographs account shows £53 against £35. The net cost of the Journal Vol. XXIII amounts to £511 against £454. The usual grants of £100 and of £25 have been made respectively to the British Schools at Athens and Rome, and as already stated £100 to the Cretan Exploration Fund.

Outside the ordinary expenditure, further sums of £53 and of £61 have been paid respectively for the publication of the volume on Phylakopi and of the Aristophanes Facsimile. In the case of the Aristophanes the greater part of this outlay has arisen from the purchase of certain books which formed part of the consideration named by the authorities of the Marcian Library at Venice for permission to reproduce the MS. In regard to the 'Excavations at Phylakopi,' it should be added that the printing, paper, binding, and other incidental expenses, amounting to about £250, though recorded in the separate account, have not yet been met. On the other hand about £134 have been recovered by the sale of this volume to members and others, and £31 have been received during the year from further sales of the Aristophanes Facsimile. The balance at the Bank on May 31 was £243 19s., and the petty cash in hand was £16 6s. 3d.

The Council desire to call attention to the manner of presenting the accounts. It has been the custom hitherto to charge the accounts of each financial year (ending May 31) with the cost of the two numbers of the Journal issued in the spring and autumn of the preceding year. No account has been taken of the cost of the number issued in the current spring, nothing having been paid on it, though the liability has been incurred. In the same way other outstanding liabilities have not appeared in the accounts.

The Council are not entirely satisfied with this arrangement. They think that a more satisfactory plan would be to debit the financial year with the cost (paid or incurred) of the two numbers of the Journal actually issued in it, and so with all other charges paid or incurred during the year.

If this change is to be made, it will involve charging in the first year against the accumulated funds of the Society the number of the Journal hitherto in arrear. At the same time it will be necessary to credit the succeeding financial year, through a suspense account, with the unexpired portion (seven-twelfths) of the subscriptions, payable in the
preceding January. Such a dealing with the accounts will render possible the presentation of a proper Balance Sheet, showing the position of the Society on May 31 in each year. The Council propose to make the change next year, but do not wish to do it without giving previous notice.

They have, however, for their own information had accounts drawn up in the proposed form for the current year. After allowing for the third number of the Journal, and other outstanding liabilities, as explained above, and making a low valuation of stock of publications on hand, the Library, and other assets, the Society shows a surplus on May 31, 1901, of £1910 17s. 11d.

The Library.

The Library records show that 338 visits were paid to the Library in the course of the year, as against 250 for the year 1902-3, and 343 for the year 1901-2. In addition to books consulted in the Library, 311 volumes were borrowed, the figures for the preceding years being 211 and 247. This large increase of books borrowed is the satisfactory result of the issue of the Library Catalogue in print. Accessions to the Catalogue are now regularly printed in supplementary pages of the Journal.

141 works (157 volumes) have been added to the Library. Among accessions of special interest or importance are—

Choiseul-Gouffier, *Voyage pittoresque dans la Grèce*; Dörpfeld (W.), *Troja und Ilion*; Furtwängler (A.), *Die Antiken Gemmen*; Homolle (T.), *Fouilles de Delphes*; the Society's publication of the excavations of the British School at Athens at Phylakopi; and a quantity of monographs belonging to the late Dr. Murray, the generous and valued donation of Mrs. Murray.

The following periodicals have been added to the Library—

*Annales du service des Antiquités de l'Égypte* (with the *Catalogue-général des Antiquités Égyptiennes*); *Archiv für Religions-Wissenschaft*, *Gazette Archéologique*, and the publications of the New Palæographical Society.

The thanks of the Society are due to the Committee of the Burlington Fine Arts Club, the Delegates of the Clarendon Press, the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press, and the Trustees of the British Museum for the gift of books to the Library. The following authors have presented copies of their works:—Mrs. Burton Brown, Dr. R. Caton, Mr. J. M. Edmonds, Dr. E. Freshfield, Professor A. Furtwängler, Mr. G. F. Hill, M. A. Sambon, Mr. R. Phene Spiers, and Mr. John Ward. Miscellaneous donations of books have been received from Mr. G. F. Hill, Mr. A. P. Whately, the Hon. Secretary, the Hon. Librarian, and the Librarian.
The following publishers have presented books:—Messrs. Bertelsmann, Kohlhammer, Macmillan, Methuen, Weidmann.

While it is gratifying to record copious accessions to the Library, the plan adopted by the Librarian of keeping the books in subject order on shelves correspondingly labelled becomes, for reasons of space, increasingly difficult to follow, but the question of the accommodation of books in the Society's all too limited premises in Albemarle Street has the serious attention of the Council.

The Collections of Negatives, Photographs, and Slides.

The plan set forth in the last report, by which numbered photographic prints of uniform size, corresponding to the 6,000 negatives now in the Society's possession, are rendered easy of access in the Library, has been carried out with satisfactory results. This collection forms the basis of all the Society's work in this department, and by its means 465 photographic enlargements and 512 lantern slides were sold to members, and the large number of 1,224 slides lent during the course of the year. About 600 negatives and prints have been added to the collection, with a proportionate increase in the collection of slides. Expression was given in last year's Report to the need of a single and comprehensive catalogue, on a scientific plan, of all the slides in the Society's possession, including the valuable pre-Hellenic material collected and arranged by Mr. J. L. Myres, the hon. Keeper of the Collections, of which a separate catalogue appeared last year. The Council have now entrusted the Librarian with this important work, which will appear in the forthcoming volume of the Journal. Acknowledgment of the valuable donations he has received will be made in that issue.

It should be understood that the catalogue of slides will also serve to indicate the ground more completely covered by the Society's collection of negatives, which from their constant and rapid increase it has been found impossible to catalogue in detail.

A small selection of the photographic material now available for members will be on view at the Anniversary Meeting of next week. It represents probably the largest, and certainly the most economical collection of the kind in existence, and should prove at once a real help to all purposes of teaching and research, and a marked addition to the privileges of membership which the Society affords.

Conclusion.

Among members lost by death during the year, special mention is due to Dr. A. S. Murray, the Keeper of Greek and Roman Antiquities.
at the British Museum, who had long taken an active interest in the Society, first as a member of Council and latterly as a Vice-President. The death of Professor Ulrich Köhler, one of the original Honorary Members of the Society, should also be recorded.

During the past year 86 new members have been elected, while 45 have been lost by death or resignation. The present number of members is 863, and there are 152 subscribing Libraries.

On the whole the Society has decidedly improved its position during the year. The number of new members, though not so large as the Council had hoped might come in during this festival year, is still very encouraging. The loss of 46 members includes—besides deaths and actual resignations, and four subscribing members who have been transferred to the list of Honorary Members—a considerable number who were so far in arrear with their subscriptions that their removal from the list became necessary. It is hoped that the Anniversary Meeting of next week may, by drawing attention to the excellent work which has been done by the Society during its first twenty-five years, give a further stimulus to its growth, and thus enable it to meet more effectively the ever-increasing demands made upon its resources for the promotion of Hellenic Studies in every department.

In moving the adoption of the Report, the President said that in view of the Commemorative Meeting to be held that day week (the full report of which appears below) he would defer many of his remarks to the later occasion. He congratulated the Society on the work of the Session and referred in sympathetic terms to the loss the Society had sustained by the death of Dr. A. S. Murray, Sir Chas. Nicholson, and Canon Ainger.

Professor George Ramsay seconded the adoption of the Report, which was carried unanimously.

The former President and Vice-Presidents were re-elected, and Mr. Cecil Smith was elected Vice-President to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the late Dr. Murray. Mr. G. G. A. Murray and Mr. A. S. Hunt were elected to vacancies on the Council.

On the motion of the Hon. Treasurer, seconded by Mr. F. W. Pereival, it was unanimously resolved:—

"That all members elected on and after January 1st, 1905, be called upon to pay an entrance fee of two guineas."

A vote of thanks to the auditors was passed unanimously on the motion of Sir John Evans seconded by Mr. Arthur H. Smith.

A vote of thanks to the Chairman proposed by Professor Lewis Campbell closed the proceedings.
A comparison with the receipts and expenditure of the last ten years is furnished by the following tables:

### Analysis of Annual Receipts for the Years Ending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>31 May 1895</th>
<th>31 May 1896</th>
<th>31 May 1897</th>
<th>31 May 1898</th>
<th>31 May 1899</th>
<th>31 May 1900</th>
<th>31 May 1901</th>
<th>31 May 1902</th>
<th>31 May 1903</th>
<th>31 May 1904</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions: Current</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrears</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Compositions</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance Fees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividends</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Receipts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. D. G. Hogarth (Alexandria, Grant Refunded)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan and sale of Lantern Slides</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliches</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Receipts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalty on and Sales of Photographs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>910</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>1,294</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Analysis of Annual Expenditure for the Years Ending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>31 May 1895</th>
<th>31 May 1896</th>
<th>31 May 1897</th>
<th>31 May 1898</th>
<th>31 May 1899</th>
<th>31 May 1900</th>
<th>31 May 1901</th>
<th>31 May 1902</th>
<th>31 May 1903</th>
<th>31 May 1904</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Catalogue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry Printing, Postage, Stationery, etc.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Slides Account</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographs Account</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Journal (less sales)</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fausnits of the Codex Venetus of Aristophanes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Excavations at Phylakopi &quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission and Postage per Bank</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt Exploration Fund—1,100 copies of Mr. Hogarth's Report</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>955</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>1,432</td>
<td>1,335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LANTERN SLIDES AND PHOTOS ACCOUNT
**From June 1, 1903 to May 31, 1904**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Cost of Slides and Photographs for Sale</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Hire</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Reference Collection</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£70 19 0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### "EXCAVATIONS AT PHYLAKOP" ACCOUNT
**From June 1, 1903 to May 31, 1904**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expanded previous to June 1, 1903</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Printing 500 Copies, R. Clay &amp; Sons</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustrations</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospectuses, Advertising, &amp;c.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£460 15 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### "ARISTOPHANES FACSIMILE" ACCOUNT
**From June 1, 1903 to May 31, 1904**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Balance against at June 1, 1903</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Press, Purchase of Books</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Binding</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Packing Case</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£253 10 11</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*By Receipts from Sales*  
*By Sales, per Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 29 Copies*  
*Hellenic Society, 138 Copies*  
**Balance against at May 31, 1904**  
*By Sale of 5 Copies*  
**Balance against at May 31, 1904**  
*Balance*
**JOURNAL OF HELLENIC STUDIES** ACCOUNT. FROM JUNE 1, 1903 TO MAY 31, 1904.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Printing and Paper. Vol. XXIII., Parts I and II</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plates</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing and Engraving</td>
<td>74.14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Contributors</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper, &amp;c., for Vol. XXIV., Part I</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£638</strong></td>
<td><strong>2 4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.**—No account is taken in any of the above of the value of Stock.

**CASH ACCOUNT.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Balance in hand, June 1, 1903</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members' Subscriptions for 1903</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arrears</strong></td>
<td><strong>89</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>16  8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subscriptions for 1904</strong></td>
<td><strong>561</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£590</strong></td>
<td><strong>11 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Members' Entrance Fees</strong></td>
<td><strong>147</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life Compositions</strong></td>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donations</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividends on Investments</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9   10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lantern Slides and Photos Account</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3   4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Account</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>12  2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavations at Phylakopi Account</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>19  9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristophanes Facsimile Account</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4   0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions paid in Advance, &amp;c.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£1,718</strong></td>
<td><strong>8 10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Rent</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5   0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries—Librarian</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assistant Secretary</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>13 4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Boy (Albemarle Street)</td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library—Purchase and Binding</td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>7 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing Catalogue</td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td><strong>13 11</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6   6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Expenses</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7   1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Printing, Postage, and Stationery</td>
<td><strong>125</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lantern Slides and Photos Account</td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Account</td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavations at Phylakopi Account</td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristophanes Facsimile Account</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1   11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td><strong>225</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The British School at Athens</td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crete Exploration Fund</td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The British School at Rome</td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash at Bank</td>
<td><strong>243</strong></td>
<td><strong>19 0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in hand, Petty Cash</td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>15 24</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assist. Treasurer</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>5 24</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£1,718</strong></td>
<td><strong>8 10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have examined this account, compared it with the vouchers and bankers' book, and found it correct.

**DOUGLAS W. FRESHFIELD,** Hon. Treasurer.

**ARTHUR J. BUTLER,**

**GEORGE LILLIE CRAIK,** Auditors.

27th June, 1904.
MEETING
IN CELEBRATION OF THE
TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY
OF THE SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION OF HELLENIC STUDIES.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY THE PRESIDENT
SIR RICHARD C. JEBB, M.P.

We have come here to-day in order to commemorate the twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies. It was on the 16th of June, 1879, that the Inaugural Meeting was held. Of the 112 members who had then been enrolled, only 27 survive. But all who wish to read the story of our Society from its birth, will find it traced in the admirable narrative which has been prepared for this occasion by Mr. George Macmillan, who has been our Honorary Secretary from the beginning, and who indeed is one of a small group with whom the very idea of the Society originated. In addressing you to-day, it will be my endeavour briefly to indicate the general conditions under which our Society came into being; the aims which were set before it; and the principal aspects of the work which it has undertaken. But there is one thing which should be said at the outset. The success which our Society has gradually and steadily won has been due to the sustained interest taken in it, and the ungrudging work done for it, by a number of its members. Some of these have passed away; let us think of them also; let us associate their memories with that collective acknowledgment which we gratefully render to-day for long years of untiring and unselfish co-operation.

If one should attempt to characterise that moment in the British study of things Hellenic at which this Society arose, it might perhaps be described as a time when British scholars were beginning to feel that an exclusively literary study of Greek antiquity was no longer all-sufficing. That feeling implied no disparagement of the literary study, but only a desire that it should be supplemented. The claim of Archaeology, in the largest sense, was coming to be more generally recognised. Travel in
Greek lands was far less frequent then than it is now. But those who went thither brought back a clearer perception of the degree in which classical studies could be vitalised and widened by a first-hand acquaintance with the scenes and with the monuments of Hellenic history and life. Such was the moment at which the project of this Society took shape. And it was a fortunate circumstance that the man to whom the founders turned as to a leader, the man around whom their plans and efforts centred, was one singularly well-fitted to direct and to inspire the new movement.

Charles Newton was then in his 63rd year. Some two decades had passed since his discoveries at Cnidus, at Branchidae, and at Halicarnassus. Since 1861 he had been Keeper of Greek and Roman Antiquities at the British Museum, whose treasures he had so signally augmented,—especially by those sculptures from the Mausoleum which are for the art of Scopas almost what the Elgin marbles are for the school of Phidias. He was recognised as holding the foremost place among students of classical archaeology in this country, and his name was known everywhere. But Newton was never a specialist in the narrower sense. It was Greek antiquity as a whole that fascinated him. 'I am a historian first,' he said, 'and secondly an archaeologist.' The monuments interested him on the side of history even more than on that of mythology or of art. His early training had been under eminent masters of the Greek language and literature. At Shrewsbury he had been the pupil of Samuel Butler; at Christ Church, of his life-long friend Liddell; and there he had felt also the influence of Dean Gaisford. But, though he was well versed in the literature, it had no dominant charm for him; it was an aid to knowing antiquity, but only one of the aids. He used the literary documents along with the others; but perhaps nothing written by a master of poetry or of prose appealed to him quite so much as an inscription which seemed to bring him into close touch with the daily realities of ancient life. That faculty of keen observation which marked his later work was already noticed by an undergraduate contemporary, who described it as 'his intense and curious way of looking at things.' That was the phrase of John Ruskin. To-day, when we look back over 25 years, it will not be amiss to recall the words with which Newton began his address to the Inaugural Meeting of our Society on June 16, 1879:—

'I have been called upon to take the chair at this first meeting of the Society which professes to have for its object the Promotion of Hellenic Studies. Now by Hellenic Studies we do not mean merely the study of Greek texts, grammars, and lexicons. It is generally acknowledged that, besides the printed texts of the ancient Greek authors, and the commentaries of the scholiasts on these texts, many other sources of Hellenic Study are opening up every day. The monuments of the Greeks, their architecture, sculpture, and other material remains, deserve our study not less than the texts of the classics, and we must bear in mind that the history of the Hellenic language itself may be traced for at least twenty-five centuries, and that between the Greek speech of the present day, and the first utterances of the early Greek poets, there is a connection which, though not obvious to the common observer, may be as clearly demonstrated by science as the connection between the flora of the geologist and the living flora of the botanist to-day. In order to trace out this connection, we must not regard the language of the ancient Greeks
alone; we must study the Byzantine literature, as well as the Greek language still current in the mouths of the peasants, and we must also study their existing manners and customs. The space of time, therefore, over which our Hellenic studies may range, may be computed as about twenty-five centuries, or perhaps something more. After much consideration I have come to the conclusion that our proper geographical limitation is that which has been followed in the Corpus Inscriptionum Graecorum of Böckh. In that great work he includes Greek inscriptions wherever they may be found, not only in Hellas itself, but outside the Mediterranean, and beyond the Pillars of Hercules. And therefore I think that as we study Greek inscriptions wherever they are found, whether in Greece, Italy, Sicily, or elsewhere, so we may study the Greek monuments and language wherever these are to be met with.'

Charles Newton was almost invariably in the chair at our meetings during the earlier years of the Society. It would be difficult to overestimate the advantage which our Society, while it was still an experiment, derived from his guidance and from his prestige. I can certainly testify to the abiding impression left on my own mind by his devotion to his chosen studies. His manner was self-contained, and the reverse of demonstrative; no one was less rhetorical; a taste which was almost irritably fastidious made it difficult for him to open his mind to others if there was anything in his surroundings that jarred on him. His teaching, whether written or spoken, was mainly esoteric, addressed to the expert, or at least to the serious student, and, unlike most enthusiasts, he positively recoiled from exciting popular interest. But the enthusiasm was there,—a severe enthusiasm; a life of the imagination so inward, that he might have seemed unimaginative; a sacred fire, little seen, but never dying down,—nor ever blown about by any wavering of purpose, or by the breath of any common ambition. The root of his interest in our Society, for which he did so much, was his belief that it might be a valuable instrument for encouraging classical archaeology in England,—or, as he would rather have said, for encouraging the complete study of Greek antiquity. It was one of his chief satisfactions, in the last years of his life, that our Society had already done a good deal for this object, and had the hope of doing more.

Mention is due also to another notable personality connected with our earlier history. Naturally we had all wished that Newton should be our first President, but he declined, and the choice fell, at his suggestion, on Dr. Joseph Barber Lightfoot, Bishop of Durham, who held the post till his death in 1890. That great scholar, so well known by his editions of St. Paul's Epistles and by other works, had a keen interest in historical studies; at Cambridge he founded the history scholarships which bear his name. In 1884, on the only occasion when he was able to preside at our Annual Meeting, he suggested that the Society might promote the investigation of monastic and other libraries in the East. Much has since been done in that direction, largely by Greeks, who have many advantages for such a work; and it now seems to be thought improbable that anything of first-rate importance still lurks undiscovered in such libraries. Bishop Lightfoot also urged that our Society might usefully map out work to be undertaken by young scholars; a function, it may be observed, which has in some measure been performed by the British School at Athens. As
one who had the honour of Dr. Lightfoot's friendship—I had been his pupil
at College—I may add, from personal knowledge, that he took the warmest
interest in the growing prosperity of the Society, and in particular looked
with eager hope to the part which it had begun to bear in promoting
exploration.

In considering the results which immediately followed from the
foundation of the Society, there is one which I should be disposed to
place in the front; though it has long been so much a matter of course
that younger men may find it rather difficult to realise that things ever
were otherwise. I mean the influence of the Society in bringing Oxford
and Cambridge into closer touch with the British Museum. It has long
been the good fortune of the Museum to secure in its several departments
the services of young men who, coming thither with a good liberal
education, and often after a distinguished career at the University, develop
into experts of the first rank, men whose work as specialists is know at
every centre of research in the world. In this sense, the staff of the
Museum represents one aspect, at least, of a great University—an aspect
which is very prominent in the Continental, and especially in the German,
conception of what a University should be. Well, forty years ago the
majority of scholars at the English Universities were barely conscious of
this aspect of the British Museum. They thought of it chiefly or solely
as a great treasure-house. If they happened to be in London, with an
hour to spare, they might pay it a casual visit. But perhaps few of them
reflected, if they had ever known, that in various special departments of
learning, work was being done by scholars within those walls of a kind
compared with which much of the work done at our Universities was
comparatively elementary. The establishment of the Hellenic Society,
however, at once began to make a difference. From the very outset
down to this moment, officials of the Museum, experts of distinction in
their several provinces, have been among the most active members of the
Society, alike in the business of the Council, in the reading of papers, in
the discussions, and in the work of conducting the Journal. The list of
those who are now or were formerly on the staff of the Museum includes
Charles Newton, his successor Alexander Stuart Murray, whose loss we
have lately had to deplore, Sir Edward Maunde Thompson, Mr. Sidney
Colvin, Prof. Percy Gardner, Mr. Cecil Smith, Mr. Kenyon, Mr. Hamilton
Smith, Mr. H. B. Walters, and Mr. G. F. Hill. This close co-operation
between the scholars of the Museum and scholars elsewhere has been,
and is, invaluable: it has directly contributed, I venture to say, to raise
the British conception of what advanced study means.

There is another general result, flowing from the creation of this
Society, to which I would briefly refer; it might be regarded as in some
sort complementary to that just noticed. This is necessarily an age
of high specialisation in every department of study. In regard to the
studies of classical philology, there is some danger lest the inevitable
tendency to subdivision of labour should discourage the attempt to take
larger views. Some of the essential benefits which humane studies
should confer are apt to be missed, if the student, animated by a laudable wish to advance knowledge at some particular point, becomes absorbed in the details of technical treatment. It may fairly be claimed for the Hellenic Society that, while it promotes advanced work in special branches, it also tends to supply an offset to the disadvantages of high specialisation. By the largeness of its outlook, by its comprehensive aims, it invites its members to survey the field of Hellenic study as a whole. It provides a centre at which the expert in one branch of the vast subject meets experts in other branches—not as he might meet them in books, but in living intercourse. That such intercourse has a liberalising and a stimulating effect, cannot be questioned; and its value is enhanced by the conditions of advanced research in our day.

These, then, are two at least of the general results which have ensued on the foundation of our Society. Let me now say a few words as to the principal forms which its activities have taken.

General Meetings of the Society have been held, as a rule, four times a year, for the reading of papers and for discussion; in addition to these, an Annual Meeting has been held in June, at which the Council's report for the past year has been presented, and the officers for the coming year have been elected. Extra meetings have also been held on special occasions. The papers read at our Meetings have usually appeared afterwards in the *Journal.* Though the attendance has seldom been large, the discussions have often been of much value. And they have had one general characteristic, which deserves a word of notice. It has been the idea of the Society, from the first, to bring together, not only professional students and specialists, but all who take an intelligent interest in Hellenic things. And it has frequently occurred that interesting contributions have been made to our discussions by members whose point of view has not been that of the professional Hellenist, but who have been able to bring light from other fields of study and experience. This has been a real gain, and it is one which could not have been secured by any Society constituted on a narrower basis.

Then there is the *Journal of Hellenic Studies,* that continuous record of mature work produced by our members. At the Inaugural Meeting in 1879, Charles Newton, towards the close of his address, foreshadowed our *Journal.* Having directed our attention to the monastic libraries in the Levant,—the subject to which Lightfoot returned five years later,—he said:

> After that, we might follow up these researches by publishing some of the more remarkable documents which might thus be brought to light. And with a view to such publication we hope to issue periodically a journal, something on the plan of the *Annales* of the French Association pour l'aménagement des études grecques, which is yearly published in the form of a well-grown *Avo* volume. We cannot hope that our publication at the outset will emulate in bulk the French *Annales.* We must first ascertain what amount of annual subscriptions we can reckon on, and regulate the cost of our publications accordingly: but let us hope that, if such a journal is once begun, it
will be vigorously maintained and nourished, and not allowed to dwindle away into atrophy, as has been the fate of so many learned periodicals in this country, though undertaken under promising auspices."

The first volume of the Journal of Hellenic Studies was published in 1880; the twenty-third volume has recently appeared. Our Society has reason to be well satisfied with the position to which its organ has attained both at home and abroad. Few periodicals of the kind are more frequently cited in works dealing with classical archaeology. There are now no fewer than 150 Libraries which subscribe to it. Much of the material contained in it has been entirely new, consisting of papers giving the results of explorations which the Society has aided. The Journal has also given illustrations of previously unpublished vases or other works of art in the British Museum or elsewhere. Foreign scholars have in several instances been contributors to its pages. The Society owes a very special debt to those of its members who are, or have been, editors of the Journal.

Apart from the Journal, the Society has occasionally published special pieces of work under the title of Supplemental Papers. The first of these was the Report on the excavations at Megalopolis by members of the British School at Athens, brought out in 1892. The latest is the report on the excavations conducted by members of the same school at Phylacopi in the island of Melos. The Society has also contributed to palaeography by Facsimiles of two important manuscripts. The Facsimile of the Laurentian codex of Sophocles was brought out by us in 1885. That of the codex Venetus of Aristophanes appeared in 1903. It was undertaken by our Society in conjunction with the Archaeological Institute of America, whose late President, Prof. John Williams White, we are glad to have with us to-day.

Another province of the Society's activity has been the encouragement of exploration and discovery in the Hellenic lands. It may be observed in the first place, that a close connexion has always existed between our Society and the British School at Athens. Our Council was the body to which the first proposal for establishing such a School was addressed in 1882; but at the moment it was not thought advisable to move in the matter. About a year later, the project took a practical shape; and in October 1886, the British School at Athens was opened. Since that time the Society has been a regular contributor to the funds of the School, and has been represented on its Managing Committee. The successive Directors of the School—Mr. Penrose, Prof. Ernest Gardner, Mr. Cecil Smith, Mr. Hogarth, Mr. Bosanquet—have been Members of our Council, as the successive Honorary Secretaries of the School also have been. Accounts of the work done by the School have often been given by the Director at our meetings or published in our Journal. The School now publishes an Annual of its own; but this valuable periodical has not interfered with the prosperity of the Journal, which is still, of course, available, when desired, for communications relating to the work of the School.
In every respect the co-operation between the Society and the School has been cordial, intimate, and beneficial to both.

There is also another mode in which our Society has promoted discovery; viz., by helping to establish and to support special funds. Thus within the last twelve years we have been able to assist in this manner the work of distinguished explorers in Asia Minor, Cyprus, Crete, Samos, Egypt, Aetolia, and elsewhere. In return, the Society has more than once had the privilege of receiving the earliest account of new discoveries. A case of this kind has just occurred; and it is of such exceptional interest that I very gladly comply with a wish which has been conveyed to me from the discoverer that I should mention it to-day. On June 16, Mr. R. C. Bosanquet, the Director of the British School at Athens, wrote to Mr. Macmillan, sending him the principal fragments of a ritual hymn to the Dictaean Zeus, lately found at Palaiokastro in Eastern Crete; and two or three days ago Mr. Macmillan kindly sent me these fragments. Before speaking of the hymn, a word must be said of the shrine to whose cult it pertained. Mr. Bosanquet has found some remains of a temple of the Dictaean Zeus, which existed in classical times on the site of Palaiokastro. These remains consist of a fragment of cornice; two fragments of marble sculptures; and numerous fragments of votive offerings, ranging in date from the sixth (or perhaps seventh) century onwards. Among these are many miniature shields, and pieces of one large shield, resembling those found in the cave of Zeus on Ida. Shields were the attribute of the Cretan Curetes. The story was that these armed guardians and nurses, to whose care the infant Zeus was entrusted by his mother Rhea, danced around him in the mountain cave, making a noise by clashing their arms, so that the child’s cries might not betray his hiding-place to his father Cronus. This temple of the Dictaean temple is undoubtedly that mentioned in a well-known inscription published by Dittenberger (Syloge, vol. ii. No. 929). It contains the award given by arbitrators in a dispute between the town of Itanos, on the east coast of Crete, and the town of Hierapetra. The latter had destroyed Praisos, and annexed its lands, taking over, along with them, an old claim which was the subject of the dispute. The Praisians had claimed certain land as belonging to the temple of the Dictaean Zeus; the Itanians asserted that it was their own; and the Magnesian arbitrators decided in favour of Itanos. The identification of this temple-site, combined with the inscription, gives a clue to the topography of the region.

The hymn to Zeus was engraved on a slab of grey marble, 20 inches wide, and probably about 40 inches high. Parts of two copies exist, one cut on the face of the slab, and the other on the back. The copy which appears on the face is much the better, though it certainly is by no means free from mistakes. It is more compactly engraved than the other, and did not reach to the bottom of the slab. The copy on the back is incomplete. The first verses of the hymn are wanting in it, though lines had been ruled for them. The stonemason who engraved the back made blunders so many and so strange that it might be doubted whether he
knew Greek. It may have been because his work was so unintelligible that the authorities caused a second copy to be engraved by a more competent hand on the other side of the slab. Nevertheless the illiterate copy happens in one instance to correct an error in the better copy; and in some other cases it supplies gaps. As to the contents, I will briefly give such results as I obtain from a first inspection, but these must be taken as subject to revision in some details; and they may also be supplemented hereafter, for, in a letter which I received from him only a few hours ago, Mr. Bosanquet says that there is a hope of finding more fragments of the hymn next season. Some words in the fragments already found are obscure; but for the present I refrain from conjectures.

The hymn begins with an invocation of Zeus—Παν θεός κοιπε χαιρή μοι Κρόνιες, etc.—where the word κοιπε, in reference to Zeus, serves to suggest the Κοινης. The general sense of the following words (where some points are doubtful) is, 'Thou hast come to Dictæ' (the neighbouring mountain, with the sacred cave of Zeus). The last words of the invocation are—'approach and rejoice in the song.' The verses down to this point form a refrain, which is repeated after every stanza of the hymn. The stanzas seem to have been six in number, each being extremely short—only two or three verses. The first stanza is intact; in sense it fits on to μολή, 'song,' the last word of the refrain, and may be rendered,—'the song which we sound to thee, blended with the notes of harps and flutes and chant as we stand around thy well-fenced altar.' For the remaining stanzas, the fragments afford only occasional glimpses of the sense in a few words or phrases. The second stanza alluded to persons who at Dictæ had received the immortal child from Rhe'a, and there was a mention of their 'shields'; these were, of course, the Curetes. The third stanza is lost, save a corrupt word or words on the back of the slab. The fourth stanza spoke of justice (Δικαια) and 'Peace, friendly to prosperity' (ϕιλαλογεια, Ειρηνα); the fifth, of flocks, and the fruits of the earth. In the sixth, we hear of 'cities,' 'seaborne ships,' and Themis. Thus we can form at least a general idea of the contents. This short ritual hymn, after invoking Zeus, referred, as was obligatory, to the Curetes. Then it spoke of the blessings associated with, or hoped from, the presence of Zeus at his Dictæan shrine—blessings which, under his favour, are given by Peace, flocks thrive, the earth yields her fruits in season; ships brings merchandise to cities where Themis bears sway. The last words might recall Pindar's reference to Aegina, that prosperous seat of commerce, where, as he says, 'Themis, assessor of Zeus, is worshipped' (Ov. viii. 22). It may be observed that the liturgical character of the hymn is strongly marked by the fact that the prelude, which recurs after each stanza as a refrain, is at least as long as the stanza itself. One other remark I would add. Mr. Bosanquet asks tentatively whether the Curetes are the speakers; I think we must reply in the negative. In Crete, so far as we know, the Curetes were always the daimonic watchers over the infant god; their name was not, in the Cretan cult, transferred to priests of the Idaean or Dictæan Zeus. This point is
illustrated by the fragment of nineteen verses from a chorus in the *Cretes* of Euripides (No. 473 Nauck²). The speaker there is the leader of a chorus of priests, vowed to the mystic rites of the Idaean Zeus and of Dionysus Zagreus; he wears white robes; he must not be present at a birth or at a funeral; he must not eat flesh. He uplifts torches to the Mountain Mother (Rhea-Cybele); and he is the initiated votary of the *Cretes* (Κυριακόν βάτος ἰελήθην ὅσιατες). It was probably by a chorus of such priests that the newly-found hymn was sung at the altar of the Dictaean Zeus. The hymn itself may well be old; the characters on the slab are late. Besides the hymn to Zeus, Mr. Bosanquet has found an Eteocretan inscription engraved on a stele. It is mutilated; but there are parts of about twelve lines. The Greek characters form some strikingly non-Hellenic groups of syllables or words; some of which occur also in an Eteocretan text which Mr. Bosanquet found three years ago. I have just heard from him also that in Laconia Mr. Forster has identified the site of Thalami, and has found an inscription referring to the remarkable oracular cult of Ino-Pasiphae. Mr. Bosanquet hopes that they may be able to excavate there before long.

I have digressed for a little from the central subject of this address, you will, I trust, pardon the digression on the ground that it serves to exemplify some of those gains to our knowledge of Hellas which this Society has assisted in winning. Our past it will be conceded, has not been unfruitful. Have we a future? Well, we can at least say that the omens are favourable. Before the inaugural meeting in June, 1879, the number of members enrolled was, as I have said, 112. In the first year that number rose to 300. To-day it is 850. But that number will not satisfy anyone who considers all the advantages which such a Society as this offers to those who care for Greek things, whether they be professional students or teachers, or cultivated amateurs. One of these advantages, as to which I have hitherto said nothing, is so important that it demands a brief notice; I mean the Library. Such an adjunct was contemplated from our earliest days. Our first Library Committee was appointed in 1881; rules were framed in 1882, and thenceforward members could borrow books. But a new epoch in the history of our Library dates from 1896, when our present Honorary Librarian, Mr. Hamilton Smith, accepted the post. With him Mr. Baker Penoyre is now associated as official Librarian. Since 1897 an annual grant of £75 has been made to the Library. It now contains about 2,000 volumes bearing on Hellenic studies, with a complete printed catalogue. There can be few special libraries in this country, equally comprehensive and formed with equal care, from which books can be borrowed on such easy terms. Many of the drawings and plans used for the *Journal* have been deposited in the Library. There are also some 6,000 photographs, which have been carefully classified. A very large collection of lantern-slides, also classified, is at the disposal of members who can obtain the use of them on moderate terms for purposes of lecturing. So large has been the demand for these slides that, though
considerable sums have been spent on them, the department is practically self-supporting; and it has undoubtedly done good service to the study of classical archaeology throughout the country. I believe that if these and the other advantages which our Society offers were more widely known, we might confidently look for an increase in the number of our members—not rapid, perhaps, but steady. Our most recent experience, indeed, warrants such a hope.

Quite apart from any question as to the place which Greek ought to hold in our educational system, it may probably be said that the interest in Hellenic studies—regarded in that large and liberal sense which our Society has always advocated—was never keener or more intelligent than it is at the present day. Every year the Greek lands receive large numbers of cultivated visitors from this country, and of these there can be few who do not return with a quickened zest for those studies to which our Society is dedicated. The British Museum, with which we have such close ties, possesses a collection of classical antiquities in every kind not surpassed, if it be equalled, by any in the world. A central Society with such a record as ours may then reasonably look forward to an increasing number of adherents.

The retrospect to which this commemoration has invited us teaches that the distinctive character stamped on this Society at its foundation has also been the paramount cause of its prosperity. That character is largeness of conception, comprehensiveness of aim. The study of Hellas, ancient, medieval, and modern, embraces the widest range of interests, appeals to the most various tastes, calls into play the greatest diversity of mental faculties. It has been the idea and the endeavour of our Society, while promoting research in each part, at the same time to express and to illustrate the unity of the whole. In that idea, in that endeavour, it will persevere. May it continue to prosper and to grow. May it become, in the hands of our successors, an organ even more effectual for the advancement of those noble studies than it has been in the hands of those who saw its birth, who watched over its youth, and who to-day can rejoice in the vigour of its maturity.

I would ask leave to express, in the name of the Society, the peculiar gratification which it gives us to see our Honorary Members represented here on this occasion. In too many cases, indeed, those whom we had hoped to welcome have been prevented from coming by official duties or by reasons of health. But we are fortunate in the presence of two distinguished scholars from the United States whom we have had the honour of inscribing on our roll.

We welcome Prof. Gildersleeve, who has long adorned the Chair of Greek in the Johns Hopkins University, a scholar known throughout and beyond the English-speaking world by his edition of Pindar and by other valuable works. We welcome also Prof. John Williams White, who, besides filling with distinction a Chair of Greek at Harvard, has also been
President of the Archaeological Institute of America, which he represents at
our commemoration to-day. We trust that each of these our Honorary
Members will do us the favour of addressing us to-day. And first I invite
Professor Gildersleeve to speak.

PROFESSOR GILDERSLEEVE—

The announcement that I was expected to make one of the addresses
on this interesting and important occasion came to me as a surprise and
I have had no time to make adequate preparation for so conspicuous a
function. Still I cannot withhold my tribute, however poorly expressed,
from the work of the Society which has honoured me with its mem-
bership, my tribute of admiration for all that has been accomplished by these
lovers of Hellenic art in all its forms. Assuredly the work of this
Society is one of which the authors and the furtherers may justly be proud
and this day must be a day of supreme satisfaction to those who
initiated the movement and have survived to see the noble fruition.
True, every scholar must know in a general way the importance of the
undertaking and the magnitude of the results. Yet the review of what
has been accomplished in what is after all a short time in the history of
a learned society fills the heart of every Hellenist not only with admira-
tion but with hope; and in the present popular estimate of Hellenic
studies hope is not the last thing needed. Some brave hearts there are
that have lost hope but I am sure that no Hellenist can read the record
of these twenty-five years of faithful work, of splendid achievement, of
noble liberality without renewed confidence in the future of Hellenic
studies, without catching something of the fervent spirit that has gone
forth conquering and to conquer a larger place for Hellenism in the life of
the people.

The work of this society initiated as it was to counteract the effect
of too narrow a devotion to the letter has been from the beginning largely
archaeological, increasingly archaeological and it does not become one who
is no archaeologist to characterize what has been achieved on that side.
But this practical protest against the limitations of classical study has not
led to any severance of the archaeological from the literary and the
philological; and to me the great significance of these studies seems to
be the triumphant maintenance of the unity that at one time appeared
to be imperilled by the modern spirit of specialization. I believe in
specialization. I believe with one of my masters, Ritschl, that there is
nothing like a certain one-sidedness for breeding true enthusiasm. I
believe in the spiritual rights of minute research. But the special line of
work must send out its branches to every part of the system. It must
be a channel and not a blind ditch; and early in my youth—now more
than half a century ago—I fell under the domination of that great master
of Hellenic philology, Boeckh, who belonged to what may be called
the Kosmos period, the period when we believed in a science of antiquity
and not merely in a cycle of studies; and among the heroes of that
time it is a pleasure to recall the countenance of Welcker as it was lighted up by the vision of Hellenic beauty, which he taught us also to see. No true pupil of such men can ever lose that vision, no matter how arid the details with which he may have to do in his daily quest. The connexion between literature and art—so conspicuous in the Pergamene school of grammarians—ought ever to be kept in view and whatever danger there may be in pursuing the analogies of literary and plastic art, whatever danger there may be in the expression of literary criticism in terms of archaeology and archaeological criticism in terms of literature, that danger is naught in comparison with cold divorce.

But while the published work of the Society has been largely archaeological, many of the literary and philological articles of the Journal, vie in importance and interest with the archaeological, and as a lover of Pindar I was glad to note that your secretary laid especial stress on the admirable essay on Pindar, the masterly work of your President. No one can be a better judge of Pindar than he who has won high fame by his emulation of Pindaric art in Pindar's own language. But even the humber students of Pindar, the sacristans of the temple of song, those who love to study all the detail of the poet's wonderful art, will find in the Journal of Hellenic Studies much that will throw light on some of the recesses of the odes and will share my appreciation of the papers on the 'Cult of the Ass' and the 'Religious significance of the Bee'—I must trust my memory for the titles—the Ass and the Bee, which by the way stand for two perennial types of Pindaric commentators, the Ass which represents the ἄβρων ἄρθρων κυνοδαλωρ, the extravagant fancy at which Apollo may well be amused, and the Bee, which suggests not only the unwearyed search for honey but the portentous readiness to sting.

But time would fail me, if I should attempt to recall all the help that I have received personally from the literary and philological articles in the Journal of Hellenic Studies, if I should attempt to express all the gratitude I feel for the contributions that have been made by the Society to the apparatus of the interpreters of literary art.

My own lot has been cast among the pioneers of Hellenic Study in America. I look back on half a century of effort and compare the times of the crude beginnings, with the recent increase in the number of trained students, of special investigators. I can not shut my eyes to the fact that there is a serious diminution in the number of those who do what people are pleased to call studying Greek. But the cubic contents of Greek in America are much greater than they ever were. And in the last twenty-five years—a period coinciding with the life of the Hellenic Society—archaeological study, despite our remoteness from the scene of exploration, has kept pace with strictly philological study. How rapid the advance has been I have personal reasons to recall. It is nearly twenty-five years since I projected the American Journal of Philology—the first of a numerous brood of American journals devoted to philological

1 'Animal Worship in the Mycenaean Age,' by A. B. Cook, J.H.S. xiv. 81; 'The Bee in Greek Mythology,' by A. B. Cook, J.H.S. xv. 1.
studies—and conceiving philology in its widest sense I intended to make it a playground for archaeology as well. But the American Journal of Archaeology followed in so short a time that the hospitality freely extended seemed absurdly inadequate. However, the offer was for all that the expression of my faith in the unity of classical work, the faith in which I was bred, to which I hope to be true to the end. But there is one aspect of that unity on which I wish to dwell in closing. Americans of the older states feel their kindred with the dwellers in the old home, but in many American veins runs a mixed blood, an alien blood; and the training of American scholars has in the main been conducted by other than English teachers. Indeed, as matters stand to-day, our line of spiritual descent is German rather than English. For my own humble part, though a pupil of German masters, I have always striven to uphold the standard of a cosmopolitan culture; and I regret that so much that is valuable in English scholarship has lost its hold on men born to the same speech and influenced by the same historical traditions. In the domain of archaeology—a new domain—English and Americans meet on common ground and the Society of Hellenic Studies may serve not only to promote the cause of Hellenism among English-speaking peoples but also to bring about more and more cordial relations between those who are working to the same end on different sides of the water. The honour you have done American scholarship to-day is an earnest of that brotherly cooperation—that fraternal interdependence, which, I trust, characterize the work of the next quarter of a century, and may I not add in the faith of a Hellenist, all the centuries to come?

The next speaker was Mr. Gennadius, formerly Minister of Greece in London. In calling on him to address the meeting, the President referred to the active part which Mr. Gennadius had taken in the foundation of the Society, of which he is now an Honorary Member, and to the value of his sympathetic aid in the earlier years of its existence.

Mr. Gennadius—

It is particularly gratifying to be able to address you on this occasion, celebrating, as we now are, a career of success such as we did not anticipate, and could hardly have hoped for, when more than twenty-five years ago, in the summer of 1877, the idea of this Society was conceived in the chambers of the Greek Legation in Pall Mall. The rapidity of its growth, the excellence of its work, its present vigour and wide activity, the position to which it has attained among learned bodies, have exceeded by far the expectations we then formed, and now justify our hopes for the future.

This success is all the more notable as it synchronises with the recrudescence of efforts to circumscribe Greek studies in the University curriculum. And although such attempts are nothing new, having periodically occurred ever since the revival of letters, the attack is now reinforced by the prevalence of more alluring material considerations.
Without entering upon this vexed question, I would merely draw your attention to the fact that the value of Hellenic studies, the powerful influence which they exercise on civilization, their practical utility: no less than their captivating charm, have been amply demonstrated by the progress and the prosperity of this Society. And I venture to hope that it is not the outcome of any egotism of mine, as a Greek, if to this I add the belief that its success is also due, in a measure, to the whole-hearted appreciation and support which we received from Greeks everywhere, and from the Greek Government itself. But if we are now able to rejoice with just pride over the abundant harvest of twenty-five years' work, it is mainly because of our well-founded conviction, at the outset, that the most-highly cultured intellects in this country would be found eager to cooperate in the cultivation of Greek literature and archaeology, for their own sake.

We did not stop to make the prudential inquiry if it was likely to prove a materially profitable undertaking. On the contrary, several generous donors readily came to our assistance; and we, all of us, devoted our efforts to what is essentially a work of love. But more especially, I think I shall have all those who watched the progress of the Society with me in saying, that no one has given a more brilliant example of unremitting effort and unsparing labour, than my valued friend Mr. Macmillan, with whom I had the pleasure of being associated from the very outset. Without his truly Hellenic enthusiasm our progress would have been but slow, if, indeed, we had not remained stationary.

Well then, we have some grounds for satisfaction with an undertaking which, aiming at no material gain, has yielded such rich fruit. We believe that it has merited well of this great country in which Greek learning—for its own sake, and for the inestimable moral and intellectual advantages it brings with it—has been held in high esteem during thirteen consecutive centuries: from the time when the great Greek Archbishop of Canterbury, Theodore of Tarsus first planted it on English soil, to this day, when we claim as our President one of the foremost interpreters of that learning in Europe.

It may be affirmed, without exaggeration, that the spirit of freedom which has at all times inspired the Church in England, the conception of a liberty coordinate with law, which runs through the political history of this country, the peculiar charm of unaffected simplicity and unconscious grandeur which is so prominent in the best type of English literature—all this is due to the fact that your foremost churchmen, and statesmen, and men of letters baptized, and purified, and qualified themselves for their great task in the invigorating and inspiring waters of Greek learning. They schooled themselves in that language which, in the great words of Gibbon, 'gave a soul to the objects of sense, and a body to the abstractions of philosophy.' They grounded their political faith upon the history of a country in which the duties and rights of citizenship were first understood and practised. They formed their taste after the masterpieces of the human mind, which have been achieved once and for all time, never to be surpassed hardly ever to be equalled. In one word, they imbued
themselves with the culture of a people who first clearly conceived and defined that which constitutes a perfect gentleman—not a magnate, or a high official, or the titled, the rich, the powerful, but the καλὸς κυρίας.

And they were careful to derive the full benefit of such search after perfection by going to the very source, by securing it at first hand and unalloyed. If demonstration were needed of the oft-repeated fallacy, that all which is of any use or advantage in Greek may be had through translations, conclusive proof has lately been forthcoming from a quarter beyond doubt—from the unconscious avowal of one of the greatest minds of our time. No one who has experienced the stirring and ennobling effect of the Greek verse of Homer can have perused the strange observations of Herbert Spencer on the Iliad—to which he had access only through a translation—without a smile mingled with a sense of regret, on reflecting how much more perfect, how much more penetrating might have been the stupendous labours of the great English philosopher, if only he had been able to come into personal contact, so to say, with Plato and Aristotle, with whose teaching he appears to have thought he could well dispense. One is forcibly reminded of Dr. Arnold’s deeply suggestive, though humorously couched saying, that he felt sure he would have understood Coleridge’s philosophy better, if it were expressed in Attic Greek. Had Spencer been acquainted with Greek, his work would have been, in a way, more humane.

For it is this, above all, that Greek culture gives. It does not merely instruct and civilize; it humanizes. And those who, during the Renaissance, were enchanted and enthralled by the New Learning, justly styled the vehicle, which enabled them to emerge from material civilization to intellectual and ethical regeneration, Literes Humaniores—the Humanities.

All must admit the immense benefits which the development of natural science and mechanics have conferred upon the world. But undivided attention to material profit may threaten a community with the advent of a coarseness, all the more difficult to stave off, because it is so resourceful. Therefore they are not far wrong who think that a society entirely estranged from Greek culture must soon degenerate in intellectual power.

Of course, Greek being the choicest intellectual food, is fit only for those who are endowed with delicate and discriminating palates. But it is they who become the salt of the earth, when, at the outset of their career, they make the choice of Herakles; and, instead of the animal contentment of the legendary professor of Louvain, they elect what is most perfect, beautiful, and ennobling, by submitting to that intellectual discipline which, in its subtlety, is beyond all price, and which teaches the one great rule of Greek life—a life ἐν ἐσφραγῶν καὶ ἐσφραγῶν, in soberness of mind and in gracious enjoyment.

It is thus that the twenty-five years’ work of this Society, by promoting Hellenic studies, and by encouraging archaeological research, has contributed powerfully to the maintenance and spread of the best traditions of British scholarship. Its flourishing condition is the strongest evidence of the value and vitality of Greek literature, the best guarantee that the standard of culture in this country will not be lowered. It behoves those
who are proud to be members of such a body to see that they who come after us find the lamp burning, and have their onward path illuminated by the light that has no eave.

Professor John Williams White—

"I have just had the pleasure of reading a second time the interesting Introductory Address on 'Hellenic Studies' delivered by Mr. Newton at the Inaugural Meeting of this Society, held on June 16, 1879. I first read Mr. Newton's address twenty-five years ago, when it was published in Macmillan's Magazine. It sets forth admirably the principles which had already been briefly stated in that 'Rule' of this Society which declares the Society's objects, and it is a singularly catholic interpretation of the phrase 'Hellenic Studies.'

By this term we do not mean simply the study of Greek texts. The interpretation of the masterpieces of Greek literature must ever remain the chief interest of Hellenists, but besides this, and necessary indeed to the proper understanding of these texts, is the study of the monuments of the Greeks, their architecture, sculpture, fictile art,—all the visible, tangible forms to which their creative imagination gave expression. There is, in short, now a science properly named 'Classical Archaeology.' Nor should investigation be confined within narrow geographical limits. Exploration should be made of every region to which the restless spirit of the Greeks carried them, and there made settlement. The field of study, then, is not simply the mainland of Greece, but that larger Greek world which extended from Africa far into the North, and from the Orient to the Pillars of Hercules. Nor should the time over which our survey extends be limited by the term 'Classical.' The period covers more than thirty centuries—first from the earliest traces of Greek life in the Aegean Sea to the downfall of Paganism; then from the establishment of Christianity to the taking of Constantinople in 1453; and finally the Neo-Hellenic period. With reference to the language, we understand much better to-day than we did twenty-five years ago how important is the study of the Byzantine and Neo-Hellenic periods in the interpretation of the Classical Literature, and as to the monuments, a new world has been revealed during the past quarter of a century by the marvellous results of the excavations that are gradually giving definite form to the shadowy outlines of the prehistoric period.

Such is the catholic interpretation of the term Hellenic Studies, embodied in that rule of this Society which states its objects. You determined, moreover, that this study should not be pursued simply with the aid of existing materials; provision was made by which these materials were to be increased by the active efforts of members of this Society—new inscriptions were to be collected; search for manuscripts was to be made in the monasteries of the Levant, treasures of ancient art that had been lost were to be recovered. Exploration and excavation were to reveal new means through which might be secured a broader and truer understanding of Greek literature, institutions, and civilization.
The discrepancy between promise and performance, between the
confident hopes of youth and the achieved results of mature years, is
one of the melancholy facts of life, whether of individuals or of organi-
izations. But this Society has no reason to grieve. It stated its objects
broadly and comprehensively, but it has accomplished them in right good
measure. The clear evidence of this fact is recorded in your Journal.

Your first presiding officer expressed the hope that a Journal might
be established, and that it might be vigorously maintained and nourished,
and not allowed to dwindle away into atrophy. With great wisdom you
established your Journal at once, and Mr. Newton's hope has been
abundantly realized. An attentive reader of your Journal is impressed
by two facts: by the high quality and importance of the investigations
which it records, an excellence that has been steadily maintained from
the beginning, and by the number and value of its illustrations; and again, by
the wide range which these investigations have covered. Your contribu-
tors have left no field in the fair domain of Hellenic studies unexplored.
Literature, language, inscriptions, manuscripts, history, geography, topo-
graphy, antiquities, architecture, sculpture, vases, gems, coins,—all these
are themes which here have original and profitable discussion. It has been
said that the quality and importance of a scholar's contributions may be
gauged by the frequency with which he is quoted in the subsequent litera-
ture of his subject. I know, indeed, of a wager that has been laid that no
important book on a theme within the range of Classical Studies will
appear within the next five years in which a certain brilliant classical
scholar of the Continent will not be quoted! Judged by this standard
your Journal is of conspicuous excellence. These twenty-three volumes
and four supplementary papers are of great and permanent value.

It is not possible now to dwell on these investigations in detail. There
is one subject, however, on which I should like to say a word. You
propose as one of your objects to collect facsimiles, transcripts, and photograph of Greek manuscripts, and Bishop Lightfoot in 1884, repeating
a suggestion that had been made by Mr. Newton, urged the Society to undertake the investigation by competent scholars of monastic and other
libraries in the East.

As to the libraries, less has been accomplished than we could have wished, and much, I am sure, remains to be done. A Russian writer in
the Proceedings of the Palestine Association for 1899 expresses the opinion
with confidence that there are treasures in the Imperial Library in
Constantinople which the Turks have never allowed any unbeliever to see.
The political relations of England with Turkey and the influence that you
could gently exert on the Greek patriarchs make the task of investigating
the libraries of the Levant the appropriate work of Englishmen. Through-
out the world scholars would be grateful to this Society, if it should give
special training in Greek palaeography to competent young scholars at
your universities and in your School in Rome, and then should send them,
with proper credentials, into the East. What they might accomplish in
their reports is indicated by the work of the young Italian philologists during
the past fifteen years who have given such admirable detailed accounts of the Greek manuscripts in Italian libraries. Whether the monasteries in the East contain hitherto unknown manuscripts of Greek authors of the Classical period is uncertain, but one may be hopeful, just as the sands of Egypt have yielded unexpected treasures. You would render a rare service if thus you should discover and publish, let me say, a comedy of Menander! The results, even if they should not be of this magnitude, would still be important. That the facts should be made completely known is one of the still unsatisfied demands of our Science.

Your Society has employed the camera to advantage, and has gradually secured a large and useful collection of photographs and lantern-slides. Furthermore, in 1885, it reproduced in facsimile the celebrated manuscript of Sophocles preserved in the Laurentian Library. This was an important contribution to knowledge, welcome to all Classical scholars, but especially to those in America, for—alas!—we have no Greek manuscripts of Classical authors in America, and though we are perforce travellers, it is still a long way from Boston or New York to Florence. Again, in 1903, you united with the Archaeological Institute of America in reproducing, in facsimile, Bessian's manuscript of seven plays of Aristophanes now preserved in St. Mark's Library. I recall this fact with special pleasure, because it brought the Institute into close relations with the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies in accomplishing an important task. The whole edition of the facsimile of Sophocles was distributed long ago among the libraries of the world, and about two-thirds of the two hundred copies of the facsimile of Aristophanes have already been demanded. This clearly demonstrates that these undertakings were useful.

The art of photography has thus contributed to the needs of Classical scholars, but we have not yet realized, I think, how serviceable a handmaid of our studies it may become. You will permit me, I know, briefly to relate a few facts within my personal experience in order that I may more clearly prefer a suggestion. Scholars are now agreed that the authoritative interpretation of an author must rest upon a thorough personal knowledge of existing diplomatic materials. This is fundamental. We may not all become expert palaeographers, but we must know the manuscripts of our author, and we must know them at first hand. To acquire this knowledge is not an unpleasant task. One wanders to many cities of many men. The collating rooms are generally pleasant places, and the keepers of the manuscripts are learned and helpful. In my study of the manuscripts of Aristophanes I have worked in many libraries in Europe, and I have always been courteously received. Then, to take the book in hand, to make search for the facts which reveal its age and provenance, to study the handwriting, the material on which it is written, and the manner in which it is put together, and turning here and there to read it in places where one's previous study of other manuscripts has left one in uncertainty and doubt, all these are pleasant things to do. And the agreeable surprise of a happy discovery is always possible; and one never knows in making search among the treasures of a library, its manuscripts and its catalogues,
old and new, what fact of historical importance may be brought to light.

For example, in a noteworthy passage in the 'Aves' of Aristophanes the chief character of the play genially declares that he will not make known his plan for the amelioration of the sad condition of the Birds unless they enter into the compact with him that a certain Panactius once made with his wife, 'that μαχαιρωτός,' he calls him. Now Panactius, we know, was a cook, and to call a cook μαχαιρωτός was apparently a contradiction in terms. A μαχαιρωτός was a 'cutler' on a grand scale; he had a great establishment managed by slaves, and was himself a gentleman of leisure. So the word in this passage has proved to be a vox nulae to the modern editors, and the very last of them, a learned Dutchman, declares that Aristophanes could not have used it here, although he is unable to suggest the word the poet did use. The vulgate of the Alexandrine scholium on the passages gives no help, since it says merely that Aristophanes applies this epithet to Panactius as τὸν μαχαιραν ἐργαζόμενον. But the great Venice manuscript varies the reading of the note by a single letter, and has τὸν μαχαίραν ἐργαζόμενον. The cook Panactius, then, was a 'performer with knives,' and Aristophanes was punning.

Again, I had read through the 'Acharnenses' during the past winter in one of the Palatine manuscripts, and had come to the last verse of the play. But there appeared to be another verse, a line that looked as if it were part of the play, but it read μυκάλας ὑπομαρατός τιτάχθηκε ἔργος: That fixes the date of the manuscript, and, if I am not mistaken, adds a new scribe to our list.

Finally, among the treasures of the Vatican Library are the manuscripts that were brought to Rome from Urbino by the command of Alexander VII. They include two manuscripts of Aristophanes. But in an 'Indice Vecchius' of these books that is still preserved among the Latin manuscripts of this collection, and must have been made either in the time of the great Federigo or in that of his son, a third manuscript of Aristophanes is entered, a 'codex pulcherrimus' containing eleven plays. In the margin is a significant entry: habuit Petrus Florentinus Cartularius quern missit Florentiam stampandum. This manuscript must have been the Codex Ravennas, and the record fully confirms the brilliant suggestion made by Mr. W. G. Clark in the third volume of the Journal of Philology, that the Raveana manuscript was undoubtedly the source of the last two plays in the first Junitine edition of Aristophanes published early in 1516.

Such inspection of the manuscripts is pleasant, but it is preliminary to one's real work—the arduous labour of collation, a long and often difficult task. Those who have collated the manuscript of Aristophanes which the Society and the Institute have reproduced in facsimile will understand perfectly what I mean: the handwritings are bad, the script employs many abbreviations, the folio is often crowded, the scholia are apparently put upon the margin without regard to the order of the text. Bessarion himself found the book so perplexing that he had one of his table companions
copy it in a manuscript that is still preserved in St. Mark's library, and it is sufficiently apparent that some modern scholars who went to Venice in the last century to study the book, gave it up and used the copy, with all its errors. It requires strength and resolution to continue this work day after day under the conditions imposed by the place. The hours are short, and one is tempted to work too rapidly; the place is sometimes uncomfortable—the Vatican collating-room, for example, is so cold in January as to give one a new conception of the Roman Catholic doctrine of Purgatory—and the man who collates grows weary, in spite of himself, and like Homer may fall to nodding, with consequences that are disastrous.

Here photography lends a helping hand. The libraries, under restrictions that are not rigorous, permit any individual to have such parts of their manuscripts photographed as he may desire for his own use. It is thus feasible to secure reproductions in facsimile of all existing manuscript material, for example, of a Greek play, and a scholar has the sense of unusual command of materials, if within the four walls of his own library he has reproductions of manuscripts so widely separated as are Copenhagen and Rome, Venice and Paris. Comparison and repeated inspection of the manuscripts are now possible.

Two restrictions make this method somewhat difficult. It is irksome to be obliged to return to the library, when one has already sufficiently studied and noted the palaeographical features of the manuscript, in order merely to make search for a photographer, to give him his directions, and to see that he does his work properly; and furthermore, the probable amount of his bill may be deterrent. Happily the last consideration is about to lose its force, for some genius has recently discovered a process by which—through the use of a prism, that reverses the image—it is now possible to photograph directly upon the paper without the intervention of a negative. The process is simple, rapid, and inexpensive, and the result is very satisfactory. The process is sure to come into common use.

One of the declared objects of this Society is to collect facsimiles, transcripts, and photographs of manuscripts. Could you not enlarge this function, enter into relations with the libraries of Europe, and undertake to reproduce for your members, under conditions which could be easily established and simply stated, such parts of Greek manuscripts preserved in these libraries as they might desire? I know of no other organization that is so well circumstanced with reference both to geographical and to other considerations to accomplish this useful work as is the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies.

I am here to-day, Sir, by personal invitation and also as the representative of the Archaeological Institute of America. It is a pleasing coincidence that the Institute was founded on May 17, 1879. Thus the two Societies, whose objects are practically the same, were founded within a month one of the other. The Institute desires me to express to you its hearty congratulations on what you have accomplished in the promotion.
of Hellenic Studies, and its best and confident wishes for your future success. And it sends you an Address. This Address is expressed in elegant Latin, but I will not read it, for fear that my barbarous pronunciation of that language would not be intelligible to the members of your Society. But we hope that you will make this Address a part of your permanent records of this meeting.

But this is not all. The Institute does not send you greetings to-day simply as one learned Society might address another. 'Qui consanguinei idem sintunt, bis consanguinei sunt.' We do not forget that the ties which unite us are also those of blood and of a common language. We salute you as brothers. And we remember, and our pulses quicken as we remember, that during the past twenty-five years everywhere the bond has been drawn closer that unites men of the English-speaking race.

I cannot take my seat without saying a word that is personal to myself. I became a member of this Society in 1879. For twenty-five years I have served in the ranks, in the sense that I have been a diligent reader of your journal, for you will persist in holding all your meetings in London, and refuse to come occasionally to New York or Boston. I am told that after twenty-five years' service in the ranks, I am to be promoted, and hereafter am to be one of your Forty Immortals. I beg to express to your Society, Sir, through you, my profound appreciation of the great honour and distinction which it has conferred upon me.

Mr. Cecil Smith——

I feel that I owe an apology for appearing in the place of a speaker who would have been so much more fitted to address this Society, and the more so because I have only at the last moment been asked to take the place of Sir E. Maunde Thompson, who has been unfortunately prevented by illness from being present. The Hon. Secretary has asked me to speak as the representative of the British Museum, and I have much pleasure in testifying to the extreme cordiality of the relations which have always obtained between the Museum and the Society. I feel strongly that the mainspring of this good feeling had its origin first and foremost in Mr. George Macmillan, who for ten years combined in his person the Hon. Secretaryship both of the Hellenic Society and of the affiliated Institution—the British School at Athens. The fact that Mr. Macmillan has always, by his tact and courtesy, maintained excellent relations between these Institutions and the Museum, has always been the guarantee and safeguard of the existing harmony between them. It would be easy to talk of what the British Museum owes to the Hellenic Society. The advantage to Museum officials of the opportunities which it has given them of coming into closer touch with scholars, both English and Foreign, will be obvious to everyone; as well as the benefit, which every Museum official will appreciate, of securing a ready publication and discussion of the work in which they are engaged. Occasions have even arisen when a more material obligation has been incurred, as for instance when the Museum obtained important
acquisitions from the Cyprus Exploration Fund, an enterprise which was in a large measure due to the Hellenic Society; and many more instances might be quoted.

If we turn to the credit side on the other hand, it is more difficult to decide how much the Society owes to the British Museum. The Museum, it must be remembered, is a Government institution, and the English Government is notoriously parsimonious in its encouragement of scientific and literary undertakings. The keynote of the English character is individualism; if one looks back at the roll of great English names of those who were the pioneers of archaeological research, Goll, Leake, Cockerell, Fellows, and even in our own time Bent, the story is one of individual effort and enterprise, working independently and alone, often without even the recognition of their contemporaries. The Hellenic Society was formed, among other objects, to co-ordinate and organize these individual efforts, and to give them collectively the increased strength of unity. One cannot but wonder what the result would have been if these great Englishmen of the past had had a Society like this to fall back upon for encouragement and material aid; there can be little doubt that the splendid results which they achieved would have been even more brilliant and important than they were.

The English Government, unlike that of France and Germany, believes in individualism, and offers the individual the broad and liberal encouragement of leaving him discreetly alone. But if the Museum has unfortunately been unable to give the Society financial support, it at least has always provided it with members, among whom have ranked some of the most active and eminent on the list. I will only refer here to two, my predecessors in the office of Keeper of Greek and Roman antiquities, Newton—one of the links, now alas all gone, which bound the old School of Archaeology to the new, to whose broad sympathy and ripe enthusiasm the Society owes so much, and who was able, as perhaps none other in those early days, twenty-five years ago, to invest archaeology and those aims which the Society cherishes with wider prestige in the public eye—and Murray, who has recently been removed from our ranks while still in the plenitude of his activity, by a tragically sudden death which we all deplore. These two names represent at once the most eminent of the Museum coadjutors of the Society, and the two whom we have lost; but happily the relations, I hope I may say, between these bodies were never more cordial than now. Societies may come and go, but the Museum is and must remain the permanent and abiding centre of Greek archaeology in this country. I will only add the fervent wish that as long as the Museum endures the Hellenic Society may continue and flourish.

Prof. Percy Gardner—

I have been asked, as Editor of the journal of Hellenic Studies for many years after its establishment, to speak on this occasion, but there is the less need that I should long occupy your time, because two of the
matters which I should have wished to bring forward have been more ably treated by others. In Mr. Macmillan's excellent history of the Society you will find all the facts in regard to the earlier volumes of the Hellenic Journal, and I need not trouble you with comments on those facts. It was also in my mind to say a few words as to the relations of our Society to Sir C. Newton. For many years before it was founded Newton had stood almost alone as a champion of the study of Greek monuments; and the Society arose just in time to take from his shoulders a burden which was becoming too heavy for them. But our President has sketched with so skilful a hand the position and work of Newton, that I have nothing to say, unless I may add, as an appendix to what Mr. Cecil Smith has said as to the parsimony of English governments in the endowment of learning, that nothing in Sir C. Newton's career was more admirable than the way in which he extorted from successive governments the funds required for his great excavations. Such things can be done only by remarkable personalities.

My connexion with the Hellenic Journal lasted seventeen years, and I may be allowed to say that there is nothing in my life on which I look back with greater satisfaction. I do not grudge one hour which I have given to the Journal. No doubt as editor I made many mistakes, but the contributors were kind enough to believe that these were the results of ignorance rather than of malice, and with nearly all of them I remained on the best of terms.

There is an extraordinary interest in watching the start of a new Journal. Wind and wave often carry it in directions quite foreign to the intentions of the founders. In the Hellenic Journal will be found the record of much work which was scarcely anticipated by the Editors. Mr. Ramsay's work in Asia Minor, which has been continued by many of our members, was a new and fruitful departure. So is Mr. Evans' work at Cnossus. The Journal contains much good work in the field of really Hellenic literature, history, and art; yet perhaps its contributions to the Greek origins and the record of pre-Hellenic Greece have been even more remarkable. In a Darwinian age the search into origins has a strong attraction, and one cannot regret a tendency which has done so much to make known what one may call the prolegomena to Greek history and antiquities.

Mr. Smith has spoken of the help which this Society renders to the British Museum. May I say, as a representative of the University of Oxford, how great is the advantage which our Universities derive from this and other learned societies of London. London is the great home of the learned societies; they strengthen the Universities just where they are weak, in the direction of research, and especially research in the studies relating to man. At the present time there could scarcely be a more useful way of spending one's life than in furthering and organizing the learned societies. And since it is most important that their connexion with Oxford and Cambridge should be maintained and strengthened, I would venture on a practical suggestion. It is increasingly difficult for
Oxford and Cambridge men to find time to attend the constantly multiplying meetings of the societies to which they belong in London. Would it be possible to arrange that the Council meetings of all the historical and archaeological societies should be held on one day in the week? If so we could try to keep that day free for them.

My friend Mr. Macmillan has asked me if I have any suggestion to make as to the future of this Society. Though I am scarcely yet entitled to play the part of Nestor, I will put into a few words what seems to me a likely forecast of our future. The past twenty-five years have been, for Hellenic Studies, a time of remarkable discoveries. The classical excavations at Olympia, the Acropolis of Athens, Delphi, and on other sites scarcely less interesting have opened endless vistas, while the influx of papyri from Egypt has done much to give a new impulse to our study of Greek literature. Unless Herculaneum is attacked, in which case it is difficult to assign a limit to our hopes, it is very unlikely that the next twenty-five years will show us such a brilliant series of discoveries. To periods of discovery, periods of the organization of the results of discovery naturally succeed. The library of the Society has grown steadily, and the series of photographs and lantern slides has constantly increased to meet an increasing demand. Here certainly is a field which we can hold, and in which we can develop our activities. We can be more and more useful to students of ancient Hellenic life in all its phases.

And there can be no doubt that we are approaching a crisis. The learning of Greek is in most countries receding before the advance of such studies as seem to have a more immediate bearing on daily life. The stress will soon be on us in England. Let us meet it by trying to deepen and to widen Hellenic culture everywhere, and in particular in our Universities and Schools. It is largely for that purpose that our Society exists. And much is being done. At Cambridge the new arrangements for the Classical Tripos lay more emphasis on a broad culture. At Oxford there is less movement, partly because the excellence of the present classical training makes the teachers very nervous about change, for fear they should risk what they already possess. Yet on some sides that training is undoubtedly defective. Finally, in our schools there is some movement, conservative as is the English public school. And I have hope that America, whence in these days we borrow so many interesting inventions, intends to have the start of us in introducing into the public schools the rudiments of archaeology, and initiating a vigorous attempt to give reality and interest to the study of ancient life. It is in this very practical and educational direction that some of our energy must be expended in future years, though I hope that we shall not neglect that promotion and organization of research and discovery for which we have done much in the last quarter of a century, and which must of course always be our highest object.
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COLLECTION OF NEGATIVES, PHOTOGRAPHS, AND LANTERN SLIDES.

The Photographic Collection consists of the following sections:—

A Collection of Negatives from which Prints, Lantern Slides, and Enlargements (suitable for Class Rooms and Libraries) may be made as they are required.

A Reference Collection of Photographic Prints.

A Loan Collection of Lantern Slides.

The Collection of Negatives.—The Society now possesses some 4,000 negatives, either made for it or presented by generous donors, and now deposited with the Society's professional photographer, who is responsible for their safety. Members are entitled to have prints, slides, and enlargements made from them, all orders for which should be addressed to the Librarian, Hellenic Society, 22 Albemarle Street, W. They will be executed according to the scale of charges printed below, which has been arranged to cover the bare cost and working expenses of the Collections: these are not intended to make a pecuniary profit but to enhance the advantages attaching to membership of the Society. Members who possess suitable negatives, which they desire to make available for use by other students of Hellenic art and history, will be forwarding the Society's work if they will communicate with the Librarian. It often happens that lacunae in the Society's lists can be filled in this way without appreciable detriment to
the owner's collection. Among further developments contemplated are a
section on epigraphy and a more comprehensive treatment of the lesser arts.

Attention is drawn to the prices of enlargements (see p. 4) and the very
large choice of subjects available. Specimens of these were exhibited at the
meeting of the Classical Association at Oxford in June, and at the
Commemorative Meeting of the Society at Burlington House in July. The
fine series of enlargements (price 3s., unmounted, and 4s. 6d., mounted, to
members) from negatives by Messrs. Stillman, Leaf, Eley, Smith, and
Thatcher Clarke, can still be procured from the Autotype Co., 74 New Oxford
Street, W.C., but most of the subjects are now included in the Society's own
series. The accompanying catalogue of over 1,500 slides indicates the field
more fully covered by the collection of 4,000 negatives, a detailed catalogue
of which has been judged unnecessary. Members resident in London can
make themselves further acquainted with the resources of this collection
by consulting the prints taken from it (see below, Collection of Reference
Prints). Country members desiring to know what negatives the Society
has on any particular subject are invited to consult the Librarian.

The Reference Collection of Photographic Prints, from the negati-
tives described above, is now accessible for consultation in the Library. The
prints are now arranged in subject order in boxes, on substantial card mounts
of uniform size, with adequate labels and index-cards: they thus form inter alia
an illustrated catalogue of slides for the convenience of intending borrowers.
In the same way members may select the subjects of which they desire
enlargements.

The Loan Collection of Lantern Slides has been in working order for
some years, and has now been recatalogued on a system which allows for inde-
finite expansion. The opportunity has been taken to remove some 300 of the
older and poorer slides, and add about 500 from newer materials. The
catalogue, which now appears, embraces and supersedes the original catalogue
and its two supplements. As is now the case with accessions to the Library,
subsequent additions will be catalogued annually in the Journal.

Short classified lists of slides, selected from the main catalogue, have
been printed, which should prove useful for elementary lectures: these may
be had on application to the Librarian. They have the advantage that they
are, if ordered intact, be briefly quoted as the 'Greece,' 'Athens,' 'Parthenon,'
'Olympia,' 'Theatre,' or 'Sculpture' sets. For more advanced courses a
selection made by the lecturer from the main catalogue is necessarily more
satisfactory.

Acknowledgments.—The Council has recently tendered a hearty vote
of thanks to Mr. J. L. Myres, late hon. keeper of the photographic collections.
The system on which the new catalogue of slides is based is one of many advan-
tages which the collections have derived from his supervision during the past
seven years. Special acknowledgments are also due for large and valuable gift
of negatives which form the basis of the collection, to Miss Harrison, Mrs.
Strong, Mr. H. Awdry, Mr. L. Dyer, Dr. A. J. Evans, Professor Ernest Gardner,
Dr. W. Leaf, Mr. A. H. Smith, Mr. Elsey Smith, and successive directors
of the British School in Athens, and Editors of the Journal of Hellenic
Studies. The Librarian’s slides and negatives, which have previously been
loaned occasionally for the benefit of the Photographic Department, have
been made over to the Society and are incorporated in the new catalogue.

Smaller acquisitions of value have also been received from Principal
Bodington, Professor R. Burrows, Dr. R. Caton, Mr. J. Christie, Rev. W.
Compton, Rev. Prebendary Covington, Mr. J. Crace, Mr. R. O. de Gex,
Mr. D. G. Hogarth, Mr. J. H. Hopkinson, Mr. C. Gutch, Mr. H. Leaf, Mr.
W. Loring, Mr. J. G. Milne, Rev. T. A. Moxon, Mr. J. A. R. Munro, Professor
W. M. Ramsay, Mr. S. C. Kaines Smith, Mr. R. Phené Spiers, and Mr. Wrench.

Our thanks are also due to the following, who have been good enough to
give us their help: Mr. H. T. Ashby, Mr. Adam Brown, Miss Baker-Penoyre,
Mr. B. Cozens-Hardy, Rev. Prebendary Danger, Mr. C. A. Eves, Mr. G. A.
Floyd, Dr. Harvey Goldsmith, Mr. G. Goodhart, Rev. G. T. Handsford, Mr.
W. Kennedy, Mr. T. Kensington, Miss Lloyd, Mr. C. J. Mansford, Miss
Mongredien, Miss Murray, Professor Flinders Petrie, Mr. H. G. Rivière, Mr.
C. E. Stansfield, and Miss Wilkinson.

Valuable assistance has been received in the arrangement of various
subsections. Mr. G. F. Hill having undertaken the section on coins, Mr. A. H.
Smith the sculpture, Mr. H. B. Walters and Mr. J. H. Hopkinson the vases,
and Mr. H. Awdry some topographical points.
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PRICES FOR HIRE AND SALE.

REGULATIONS AND CHARGES FOR THE LOAN OF SLIDES.

1. The slides shall be lent only to members of the Society or, by courtesy, to members of the Teachers' Guild.

2. A charge of 2d. for the loan of each slide shall be made.

3. Those members who have presented negatives or slides to the Society shall have a right to the free loan of two slides per annum for every slide thus presented.

4. The slides may be retained for a period of four days, including dispatch and return.

5. If desired, slides will be packed and forwarded to any address in the United Kingdom at the risk and cost of borrowers.

6. A borrower is liable for a payment of 2s. 6d. for any slide broken while at his risk, but the Library Committee may reduce this penalty to the cost of replacement at their discretion.

PRICES OF PHOTOGRAPHS AND SLIDES FOR SALE.

Prices of Photographs (unmounted) made to order:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3½ in. × 3½ in.</td>
<td>0 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4½ in. × 3½ in. (quarter plate)</td>
<td>0 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 in. × 4 in.</td>
<td>0 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6½ in. × 4½ in. (half plate)</td>
<td>0 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8½ in. × 6½ in. (whole plate)</td>
<td>0 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 in. × 8 in.</td>
<td>0 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 in. × 10 in.</td>
<td>1 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 in. × 12 in.</td>
<td>1 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 in. × 15 in.</td>
<td>2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 in. × 16 in.</td>
<td>3 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 in. × 25 in.</td>
<td>5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 in. × 30 in.</td>
<td>6 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above are the prices of Bromide prints: ordinary silver prints can be had of some of the smaller sizes at slightly cheaper rates.

Prices of Lantern Slides made to order:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slides from negatives in the Society's possession</td>
<td>0 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slides for which a negative must be prepared</td>
<td>1 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B.—The above are the customary charges; but the right is reserved to charge at a higher rate in cases where for any reason the actual cost-price exceeds the customary charge.

Note.—It must be distinctly understood that the slides and photographs are supplied to members only, for their own use and not for purposes of reproduction or publication.

All applications should be made to:

THE LIBRARIAN,
Hellenic Society,
22, Albemarle Street, W.
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**Topography, Architecture, and Excavation**—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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<td>lxxxix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Further East</td>
<td>xci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyrene</td>
<td>xoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
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<tr>
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<tr>
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<td>xclii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>xcvii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attica</td>
<td>xci</td>
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<td>Peloponnesus</td>
<td>xcvii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magna Graecia</td>
<td>ciii</td>
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</tbody>
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**Prehellenic Antiquities**—

- Art of the Later Stone and Early Bronze Age... xcv
- 'Mycenaean' Art... cix
- Art of the Early Iron Age (including geometric and orientalizing vases) cvi

**Sculpture**—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Period: down to 480 B.C.</td>
<td>cix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Period: fifth and fourth centuries</td>
<td>exi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Period: Hellenistic Age and later</td>
<td>exvi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portraits (all periods)</td>
<td>exviii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bronzes**... exviii

**Terracottas**... exix
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<tr>
<th>Type</th>
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<tr>
<td>Black-figured Vases (classified according to subject)</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-figured Vases</td>
<td>cxxii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Athenian Lekythoi</td>
<td>cxxiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Stylistic Classification</td>
<td>cxxvii</td>
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Towns (alphabetical)............. cxxvi
Kings or Dynasts (alphabetical)...... cxxviii
Short Stylistic Classification......... cxxix

GEMS........................................ cxxx
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The following is a list of the principal contractions employed:

- *Baumeister.* Barmeister, Denkmäler.
- *B.M.* British Museum.
- *B.S.A.* Annual of the British School at Athens.
- *J.H.S.* Journal of Hellenic Studies.
- *Ohnefalsch Richter.* Ohnefalsch Richter, Kypros, the Bible, and Homer.
- *Mon. d. I.* Monumenti inediti dell' Instituto Archeologico.
- *Rayet and Collignon.* Rayet and Collignon, Hist. de la Céramique grecque.
- *Schuchhardt.* Schuchhardt, Schliemann's Excavations (Eng. Tr.).
- *Tsountas and Manatt.* Tsountas and Manatt. The Mycenaean Age. 1897.
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ASIA MINOR.

5708 Map of Asia Minor (Kiepert).
5709 " " " (physical; without names).

Sites, Views, &c.

5802 Amasia, view of the town and river Iris.
1066 Aspendos, the theatre. (Textor and Paullin, pl. 32.)
5756 Calycedons River, Byzantine bridge near Mat.
5827-31 Early monastery at Koja Kalamia. (Cf. J.H.S. Supp. II. figs. 1, 3, 4, 7.)
4699 Cnidos, Temple of Demeter.
5794 " " Ancient mole.
5783 " arch is a 5th-century building.
5812 Cossaeus.
5813 Comana Cappadocia.
5778 " " traces of the theatre.
5779 " " Church portal.
5786 Coropisus, early church at.
5789 Corycus, temple with inscribed stone.
4121 Cyzicus, general view looking E.
4149 " " the amphitheatre.
4186 " gate in N. wall near amphitheatre.
3743 Didyma, temple of Apollo, column base with fret pattern.
3744 " " " panelled base of column.
3745 " " " Gorgon's head capital.
3717 Ephesus, general view looking N. from Mount Prion.
3100 " " general view looking W. showing the aqueduct.
5502 " temple of Artemis, distant view of the site.
4028 " " during excavations showing sculptures &c. &c.
5128 " " view towards large mosque.
5128 " " theatre before excavations.
4055 " " stage buildings.
5503 " " relief of bulls' heads.
3135 " " gymnasium.
3126 " " Corinthian arch.
3112 " " 'gate of persecution.'
3135 " " prison of St. Paul.
3110 " " remains of 'tomb of St. Luke.'
3114 " " W. entrance of large mosque.
4888 Halicarnassus, the theatre.
4970 " " gateway on N. side.
4971 " " Hulhum, detail of interior wall showing coats of arms.
7100 " " general view of the interior.

See also the Section on the Monuments in the Sculpture series, p. cxxiv.
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3154 Hierapolis, from theatre looking W.
3755 Issos, type of built tomb.
3611 Isas River.
5799 " " " Tokat.
5900 " " " Turhal, (Gazira).
3779 Myra, theatre and plain.
3790 " " " cliff of tombs above theatre.
5771 Olba, Tower at Kasnajabur.
3772-3 " Temple of Zeus. (2 views.)
3774 " Colonnade.
3775 " " Gate of Forum.
3762 Patara, theatre, stage buildings.
3783 " " " E. side of auditorium.
738 Pergamum, Plan.
733 " " " Acropolis restored.
733 " " " altar of Zeus restored.
4646 " " " present state.
4672 " " " the theatre, general view.
3169 " " " W. gate.
3165 " " " Roman basilica.
3164 " " " view in the modern town.
3158 Philadelphia, from top of hill.
3147 Laodicea, the theatre.
3148 " " " the sanctuary.
3160 Sardis, temple of Cybele.
3161 " " " ruins of Christian Church.
3770 Selcukia (Cilicia), " Pirate" tower near.
3103 Smyrna, Church of St. Elia, St. Anne's Valley.
3107 " " " ancient aqueduct, St. Anne's Valley.
3798 Tarsus from Sea.
3504 Taurus district. Lake of Egridir.
5777 " " " Kandil Kayak, Roman milestone.
5809 " " " Karman, general view.
3510 " " " Castle of Karman.
3503 " " " Marash.
3511 " " " Gorge of Pyramus.
2357 Troy, Map of the Town. (Parrot and Chipiez, vi. fig. 63.)
472 " " " " " (Schliemann, Troy.)
2571 " " " Plan, (Dörpfeld, Troy, pl. 8.)
2559 " " " Plan of houses. (Parrot and Chipiez, vi. fig. 48.)
3601 " " " the mounds from the plain N. N.E.
3507 " 1st city, traces of.
3509 " " " 2nd city, great ramp.
3500 " " " walls of adobe.
5801 Troy, 6th city, walls of building on the S. side.
5602 " " " another view of preceding.
1495 " " " the great N.E. tower (with the walls and steps of the 8th city).
4982 " " " ascent to the palace.
1485 " " " 8th city, N.E. walls and stairway (with the tower of the 6th city).
5604 " " " 9th city, the Roman theatre, orchestra and auditorium from stage.
672 Xanthos, " Hapun-tomb" in situ.

Hittite Monuments.

5764 Stone from Boe (now in Constantinople).
5765 Stone at Kalibolu Valla.
5766 Obeliak from Isthmia (in Constantinople).
890 Lion at Arslan Tash.
881 Lion at Palanka Chilif.
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Statue at Palanka Chilik.
Relief from Arian Tope near Melitene (in Constantineple).
Rock Sculpture at Fratin.

Seljuk Monuments.

Tomb of Havnaha. Migdah.
Ilisu College. Siyaa.
Mosque of Khalikhoon II. at Divrik.
College at Karman (Lamnida).

FURTHER EAST.

Baalbek, octagonal temple ("Temple of Venus").
Smaller temple, detail of doorway.
Foyer court of great temple.
Dioecesas, temple near.
Euphrates at Khalilat.
Roman Bridge near Kuskha.
above Melitene.
Roman Bridge on Severus' Road to Melitene at Kemer.
near Kaban Maden.
below Sameesta.

CYRENE.

Cyrene, road from Apollonia on the first ascent.
the N.E. cemetery.
fountain of Apollo.
N.W. tower.

Map of Cyprus.

Amargetti, View from above Village of.
Aschafen, Gorge near.
Curium, Aeropolis and Site of Excavations, 1895.
Staff and Workmen, 1895.
Episcopi from W.
Kukha, Valley W. of.
Valley N.E. of, with village of Susin.
Village.
Threshing Floor.
Paphos excavations. Monoliths by the Sea.
S.W. Angle Blocks, S. Wing, Temple of Aphrodite.
Part of S. Wing.
S. Wing from S. Porch.
Digging in S. Wing.
Clearing S. Porch.
S. Porch, W. End.
S. Porch, S.E. Angle.
S. Porch from S.E. Angle.
N. Wall, W. End.
Cemola's N.W. Angle Block.
S. Chamber from E.
E. Entrance from N.
and Chambers from N.

Aschilia Balachatin.
Pulpit.
Reed, etc.

Byzantine and Gothic.
CATALOGUE OF SLIDES

1729 Bellapais, the Cloister.
1729 St. George, Castle of Knights Templars.
5756 Famagusta, Cathedral.
1384 • another View.
5287 • Front.
5708 • E. End.
5709 • S. Side.
1385 • Chantry Door.
1382 Nikosia, St. Sophia.
310 • Interior.
5754 • Dedicated Church.
5755 Leondarzi Voutio, Crusaders' Fortress from S.
1788 Limasol, St. Nicholas, C. Gatto.

CRETE.

For objects of art, worship, etc., from Crete, cf. "PHERELLENIC ANTIQUITIES" (pp. clw-clviii).

5300 Map of Crete (geographical.)
1432 Map of Sitia (eastern half of Crete.)
3238 Crosses: palace-plan 1801-2. (B.S.A. vii. frontispiece.)
3817 • General View from near Candia.
5902 • General View of Excavations from E.
3897 • View looking N. across Magazises and W. Court.
3811 • W. Court from S.W. Portico.
3899 • The S.W. Court from W. Court.
5514 • Stopped theatrical area.
3812 • Magazine with pithos.
5522 • • • • • •

4444 • • • • • •
3818 • • • • • • large pithos.
5211 • • Northern Portico and entrance to passage.
5310 • • E. Bastion, triple gate walls. (B.S.A. viii. p. 115, fig. 69.)
3814 • • Throne-Room: Antechamber from N. entrance.
3815 • • • • • • from Antechamber.
3816 • • • • • • the tank from N.W.
4944 • • • • • • in course of excavation.
3859 • • • • • • nearer view of the throne.
7300 • • • • • • another view of proceeding.
5260 • • Room of Stone bench. (B.S.A. viii. p. 79, fig. 44.)
5519 • • Wall with altars in distaff marks.
5309 • • Eastern part of 'Hall of double axes.' (B.S.A. viii. p. 43, fig. 22.)
5229 • • View from S.E. corner of 'Queen's' Megaron. (B.S.A. viii. p. 46, fig. 23.)
5217 • • quadruple staircase.
5314 • • View looking W. from upper E.W. corridor. (B.S.A. viii. p. 37, fig. 17.)
5316 • • View in lower E.W. corridor, looking E. (B.S.A. viii. p. 35, fig. 16.)
5522 • • terracotta drainage pipes.
5521 • • drainage systems.
5518 • • • • • •
5582 • • Mountains adjoining Ida from the Sea.
5383 • • Mt. Ida from the Sea.
1488 • • Roumphiou, bank of marble slabs.
1439 • • site of Canaiais house.
1401 • • Palace of excavations. (Cl. B.S.A. ix. pl. 6.)
6010 • • general view of site and Acrocorintha.
1453 • • sea above, near
1437 • • side street (A).
7098 • • Block E.
1456 • • • • • • view of streets ends.
1404 • • • • • • main street from N.W.
1438 • • • • • • continued.
TOPOGRAPHY, ARCHITECTURE, AND EXCAVATIONS.

AEGEAN ISLANDS.

Angiss, see Aegina, p. xcvii.

1788 Inca, general view towards Rhenea.
1953 " The lake of Lato and Mt. Cytharas.
2236 " Cave-temple of Apollo, rock-cut approach.
3263 " from without.
1443 " from within.
2543 " Hellanistic house.
4288 " mosaic, Ierace of sea-horses.
4327 " mosaic, aephrora, palm-branch, wreath.
4339 " Statue base with primitive Gorgon medallion.
4584 " the Colossus, upper half, side view.
2542 " back view.
4081 Males, Martia, the terrace (possibly station).
4089 " Phyliakoupi, general view from S.E.
2238 " from land side.
2237 " from S.W. angle.
4118 " from S.
2307 " panorama of upper part of site.
4096 " Tranthythia, Stadion, retaining wall.
4585 " Mosaic, general view, (J.H.S. xviii, pl. 4, 2.)
4627 " detail (birds).
2628 " obsidian on site.
3524 Nav central.
3556 " portico on hill.
3557 " The Colossus.
5554 Patmos, Panormos.
4681 Samos, view of harbour of Polybotrae from fortifications on Acropolis.
5553 " the N.E. Wall of Acropolis.
5595 " aqueduct of Polybotrae, interior.
514 Syros, acropolis and cemetery of Chalandaiz (Ep. Aegy. 1899, pl. 7.)
4637 " the sea.
5272 " arrangement of place recalling the seats in the sebos at Euboea.
3571-4 Views of the procession &c. at the festival of the Ammunistes.
3508-8 Thira : plans of houses. (Parrot and Chipiez vii. ligg. 29; 30.)
5545 " Bird's eye view during eruption (from a drawing after Lyell).
5549 " Entrance to Santorin (from a water-colour drawing).
5550 " Coast view of Santorin (from a water-colour drawing).

NORTHERN AND CENTRAL GREECE AND ADJACENT ISLANDS.

Sites on the Mainland.

1180 Aegosthena, N.W. entrance and tower.
6013 Chaerses, plan of the battlefield, showing immulus of the Macedonians.
5490 Delphi, Plan of the whole site restored. (Delphi, i. pl. 6.)
5489 " View of the whole site restored. (Delphi, ii. pl. 6.)
3481 " from Corinthian Plain.
328 " Corinthian Plane from Delphi.
3494 " View towards Hidkou.
578 " general view of precinct looking towards Pseia andia.
CATALOGUE OF SLIDES

Delphi, general view of sacred way near the Temple of Apollo.

Treasury of Athenians, Restoration of facade. (Delphi, ii, pl. 11, a.)

Treasury of Echidna, Restoration of facade. (Delphi, ii, pl. 11, b.)

Caryatides, upper portions. (Delphi, ii, pl. 20.)

Porch of Athenians, with the houses of old Castri above. present state.

the theatre, and acropolis.

the stadium looking W.

looking E.

supporting wall.

the eastern aphasis.

another view of the eastern aphasis.

the Cistalian spring.

Giza: Plan of the fortress. (Teomtse and Manatt, p. 376.)

Itea, general view of harbour.

Megara Town.

the Easter dactes.

Orchomenos: looking (Collignon, I, fig. 12.)

Parnassus, distant view from Itea.

Platea from N.

the plain from Kokla.

Scylla, and Cliffs.

another view.

Vale of Tepea.

Thermopylae, hot springs.

the Theban wall looking N.

junction of Sceritius and Areopas.

Metora, general view.

Monastery of Barlaam.

Monastery of Metonacrophos.


Courtyard.

The Churches.

N. wall of Church.

Pendentive of Church.

Cephalonia: View looking towards Ithaca from Samos.

Corcyra, the citadel from the harbour.

Enboca, Chalcis, view of the squadron.

Chalcis, Eurybia from N.

Ecrisia, the theatre. Passage leading from orchestra to skene.

Ithaca from Cephalonia.

Castle of Odysseus, from sea.

Castle of Odysseus, nearer view.

Vathy, general view from the Sea.

Vathy, entrance to the bay.

bay of Dextra from S.

Plan of Athens. (Harrison and Verrall, plate facing p. 1.)
General Views.

View from Parys towards Monument of Philipppos.

View towards Acropoli and Hymettus.

View towards Lykabettus.

View towards Theseum.

View towards Eleusis.

These slides form a panorama.

The Acropolis.

Plan of Acropolis.

Sections. (John and Michaelis.)

Propylaea Restored.

View from the Church of Bombardier.

View from S.W.

from S.W., with Frankish Tower.

from the W. front, taken during the demolition of the Frankish tower.

S. side, from a print of A.D. 1670. (Ath. Mitth. II. pl. 2.)

from S.E.

from the road S. of Zappelou.

from Lykabettus.

from N.E.

View in street N. of Acropolis showing Propylaea and Cave of Pan.

Acropolis and Theseum from N.W.

The Various Buildings and Monuments on the Acropolis.

Propylaea, Plan.

W. front.

another view.

N.W. Hall (Pinacotheca).

N.E. Hall (unfinished).

S.E. Hall (unfinished).

from interior of Acropolis.

from the Parthenon.

Capital by Muschlies.

Pyrithous Inscription.

Bastion of Odysseus.

Nike Apteros from N.E.

from S.E.

from Pinacotheca.

Pedestal of Agrippa, from Temple of Nike Apteros.

Parthenon. Plan.

Sectional view of E. end restored (Nimann).

Print. The Parthenon restored. (By G. R. Cookson.)

Print (A.D. 1837), Acropolis bombarded. (Gomme, Photography, pl. 37.)

Print. The explosion of A.D. 1837 (from Fainelli).

Print. W. end in 1749. (Vallin.)

Print. S.E. end in 1755. (Le Roy.)

Print. The W. end in 1817. (Williams, Views in Greece.)

Views (present day). From N.W.

from N.E.

from S.E.

Outer wall of cells and northern colonnade.

Interior, looking E., Hymettus in distance.

Interior, looking W.

Architectural details. Substructure, E. end of S. side, exposed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4546</td>
<td>Parthenon</td>
<td>Substructure now showing above ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td></td>
<td>Steps on N. side, showing curvature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4567</td>
<td></td>
<td>A capital (in B. M.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4572</td>
<td></td>
<td>A capital on the Acropolis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1301</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unfinished drum on the Acropolis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4577</td>
<td></td>
<td>A triglyph on the Acropolis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4674</td>
<td></td>
<td>A block of the architrave on the Acropolis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td></td>
<td>One of the &quot;setting-out marks.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Sculptures from the Parthenon, see Flandinos and the Parthenon (pp. 60, 61, 62) in the Sculpture志.

228 Erethous. Plan.
383 Print: (Stuart and Revett).
1710 and Pre-Persian Temple. View from top of Parthenon.
1392 from N. W.
1017 N. Porch, from N.E.
4381 Floor of N. Porch, showing opening.
1080 N. Door.
1934 Mouldings.
304 Porch of the Maidens from S.E.
4463 from S.W.
4542 Roof of Porch of the Maidens from inside and below.
4404 View taken during the Excavation on N. side.
616 Pre-Persian temple. Plan.
4543 " " Mycenaean column-base in.
1710 " " View from top of Parthenon:
4460 Ge Karpophoros Inscription,
4530 Temple to Zeus and Angusus, Relief from.
2947 Polygonal wall and Parthenon from N.W.
178 Walls, with Old Columns.

Buildings on the S. Side of the Acropolis.

131 Theatre of Dionysus. Plan.
1911 " " from Acropolis.
1448 " " from N.E.
1914 " " Auditerium from E.
1013 " " Stage from E.
3947 " " Stage with Old Orchestra.
4170 " " Old Orchestra circle from above.
4459 " " Stage buildings with the Two Temples.
1915 " " Principal Chairs, side view.
2066 " " Principal Chair, front view.
4404 " " Chair dedicated to M. Ulpian.
4554 " " One of the gangways.
4556 " " The altar in the temple.
3181 " " Pillars with Corinthian capitals near Acropolis wall.
898 " " " Monument of Thrasyllus (present state).
389 Print: (Stuart and Revett).

5470 Acheleion. Plan.
389 " general view, looking W.
4568 " looking W. in main building.
500 " Boundary Stone.
4557 " Greek and Byzantine blocks in.
1612 " Gate of Wall.
4559 " Corinthian capital near gate of well.
4472 " " Interior of Well-House (from sketches).
4550 Stea of Eumenes, junction with Odens of Heracles.
4535 Odens of Heracles, interior, looking S.W.
4548 " " stage buildings, looking W.
TOPOGRAPHY, ARCHITECTURE, AND EXCAVATIONS.

Buildings and Monuments other than those on the Acropolis.

1601 Olympium from Acropolis.
1609 " from S.E.
1414 " and Arch of Hadrian.
1667 " fallen-capitol.
1677 Remains of Roman bath in palace gardens.
1695 Choragic monument of Lysicrates.
1690 " " " another view.
1672 " " " restored.
1417 Bed of Bismas.
1695 Callirrhoe.
289 Pnyx, general view.
3411 " Remus.
4572 " retaining wall.
3434 Excavations W. of Acropolis, general view.
3466 " " altar of Dionysus. (Ath. Mitth., xxi. pl. 2, fig. 1.)
995 " " ancient Greek vineyard.
4451 Acropagus and Theseum.
4454 " from the gate of the Acropolis.
4463 " and Grotto of Eumenes.
4465 Nymphaum (= Observatory Hill.)
1916 Theseum, distant view from Prison of Scaredes.
4465 " nearer view.
4466 " another view.
4517 " details of the columns.
257 Dipylon, Street of tombs, view shewing the stele of Dicileos.
303 " " view shewing the stele of Pamphilus.
4575 " wall of Themistocles.
289 Tower of the Winds.
4578 Another view of the preceding.
414 Stoa of Hadrian, W. end.
4582 " E. end.
283 The Agora. Plan. (Harries and Warrill, p. 5.)
413 " gates with inscription to Athena Archgetia.

Byzantine and later Monuments.

4473 Small Metropolitan Church, E. end.
1642 " S. side.
1646 " W. end.
1640 " W. façade, detail of reliefs.
1523 Kapnikarea from the E.
2029 S. Theodore.
1421 Church of Hagios Soter on N. slope of Acropolis.
4583 Sometime mosque near Stoa of Hadrian.
5028 British School in Athens (taken in 1902.)
5377 " " Architect's drawing shewing new Penrose Library.
5170 " " view over Asamaton monastery.
1905 " " another view of preceding.

ATTICA.

Views and Sites including the Environs of Athens and Aegina.

3420 Aegina, distant view of the island from Old Phaestum.
720 " general view of Temple from W. after Copley Fielding (Wordsworth, Greece, p. 190).
1699 " distant view of the temple.
424 " Temple from S.W.
CATALOGUE OF SLIDES

1858: Aegina, Temple from S. E.
1629: ** from N. W.
5171: ** interior view showing the blocks grooved for lifting.
1794: Columns and the Cepheus.
353: Eleusis, plan.
1588: ** panorama taken from N. W. angle of Sekos. (1) looking S. E.
1684: ** ** ** ** (2) looking S. E. E.
1526: ** ** ** ** (3) looking E.
4409: ** the great Propylæa.
1526: ** Sekos, view of N. W. angle.
4526: ** another view of proceeding.
3140: ** Substructure.
1568: ** precints of Pluto from N.
1558: ** ** from S.
1744: ** details of Aegina Pelchen's Gate and Capitol.
1008: Hymettus from the American School at Athens.
1050: Icaria (Sko Diaous), the cave of Kapendous.
416: Lykaiontus from S. W.
5831: Marathon : the Soco, plain, and mountains looking N.
1016: ** from N. E., with Penteikena.
231: ** from Vana.
4475: ** from the S. road.
3145: ** from the Socrates.
5620: ** the Socrates.
4535: ** olive trees at Pikermi on the road to Marathon.
1553: Oropus, theatre from N. W.
1662: Penthikena.
673: ** from the church at Dele.
2094: ** the marble quarries.
1559: Phyle.
5425: ** E. Towns.
3458: ** Entrance.
1005: ** Fortress Walls.
1560: ** View over Attica from.
3417: Piraeus and neighborhood, Panorams 1.
5416: ** ** ** ** 2.
3413: ** ** ** ** 5.
4474: ** Zea, Piraeus, and Salamis.
1513: ** Circular fort at Ketovea.
3046: ** Munychia.
4229: ** Galley slips at Munychia.
5425: ** Phalæs from Munychia.
3421: ** Phalæs from the road to Athens.
3404: Salamis, Map of the straits.
518: ** View looking W. down the straits.
4557: ** View looking W. from Munychia hill.
5095: ** View looking W. centre of straits.
5065: ** View looking N. towards Eleusis from straits.
2964: ** Narrowest part of straits, at entrance of bay of Eleusis.
292: Sounion, general view of promontory from N. E.
1756: ** nearer view of temple.
4532: ** the temple from the S.
1529: Tatoi from Acropolea.

Byzantiae.

673: Deo, general view of church with Pentecostal behind. (H. S. A. Bev., pl. 34.)
676: ** detail of ciborium.
1529: Daphni, Court of the Convent.
4388: ** mosaic in dome of convent.
PELOPONNESUS.

Map of the Peloponnesus (geographical).

Views and Sites.

1224 Anna (Franco-Byz.), Site of Acrocorinthus.
4489 Corinth, general view looking E.
5716 Old Temple and Acrocorinthus looking E.
437 Old Temple from N.W.
438 Acrocorinthus.
4482 " " medieval fortifications.
4491 " view from, looking S.W., towards the mountains of the Peloponnesus.
429 " view from, looking W., along the coast.
5577 The American excavations, looking towards Acrocorinthus.
5578 The American excavations, the large fountain.
3257 The Canal, Eastern entrance, looking W.
3258 View in Canal, looking W.
1040 Ephialtes, Plan of Hiero.
3560 " distant view of site.
4489 Temple of Asclepius (restored section.)
4915 Ascleplenum, showing ascent to upper story.
1697 Tholos of Polydittus, present state.
1957 " capital from.
3375 " " lower head cornice from.
308 " Theatre, plan.
1954 " " distant view.
5884 " general view from E.
381 " W. parodois from E.
3499 " E. parodois from W.
3408 " orchestra and auditorium from stage.
1458 " stage and orchestra from auditorium.
4818 " detail of upper portion of seating.
5121 " stadium showing uprigh pillars at sphæra.
1518 " Cyclopean Bridge, near.
1066 Gytheum from the sea.
1916 Hymës (Achiladosampo).
1943 Lykaonia, Temple of Despouena.
4623 Mantinea, the plain looking N.
4633 " Skope looking N.
1958 " river Ophius, near.
1173 Megalopolis, general view from theatre across Therium.
1928 " " the theatre, general view of auditorium across stage.
1683 " " foundations of stage looking E.
1684 " " continuation of preceding.
1245 " excavations in progress.
1248 " holiday dress of Warkmen.
1246 " group of Priests.
1255 " " Peasant Women.
1254 " Market Place.
1250 " Greek Ploughs.
5150 Messene, View near Arcadian Gate, showing circular court between Gates.
5062 " loopholes in the tower on the E. Wall from without.
CATALOGUE OF SLIDES

Messene, the same loopholes from within.
5445 circle tower.
4351 (Ithome) Monastery on site of temple of Zeus Ithomatos: general view.
1499 Entrance to the Monastery.
478 Mycenae, ground plan (Schuchhardt).
8427 general view from E.
9061 general view from 'Treasury of Atreus.'
4800 Lion Gate.
1958 nearer view.
2065 from within.
3428 wall and tower below Lion Gate.
1681 postern in the N. wall of citadel, from without.
3295 the same postern from within.
1679 gallery leading down to well in N. wall.
3429 Palace, staircase.
3450 megaron and hearth.
2068 Circle and shaft-graves, general view.
4414 nearer view.
2067 from within.
5894 another view from within.
2869 ground plan of houses near 'circle.' (Perrot and Chipiez, vi. fig. 114.)
3908 'Treasury of Atreus' ground plan.
3909 longitudinal section.
2860 dromos and facade.
5718 nearer facade.
2865 restoration of facade. (Perrot and Chipiez, vi. pl. 6.)
884 restoration of capital. (Puchstein, Dos Leonische Cap., Fig. 42.)
1833 Mycenaean and Doric profiles compared. (J. H.S. vii. p. 193.)
1077 Interior.
3274 roof seen from inside and below.
2860 restoration of interior (Perrot and Chipiez, vii. pl. 7.)
1080 Miss. Schillemann's Treasury.
2062 doorway and interior.
1484 Lintel of roofless Treasury.

For objects of art from Mycenae, cf. 'Periklesio Antiquities,' pp. cix-cviii.

Xanthia, general view of, from Tripylos.
1942 from the sea.
1904 Harbour and Island.
435 modern town and fortress.

Olympia: Maps, Plans, and Sections.

2848 Map of Elis (Olympia, Mappe 1.).
2847 Olympia and neighbourhood. (Olympia, Mappe II.)
4488 after excavation showing all periods together. (Buesseler, pl. 26.)
2848 Hallianic period, ca. 300 B.C. (Olympia, Mappe III.)
2849 Roman period, ca. 200 A.D. (Olympia, Mappe IV.)
2850 Byzantine period in two cities. (Olympia, Mappe V., 3, 2.)
2850 Plan of Heraeum, Exostra, Meiron. (Olympia, Mappe VI. 1.)
2852 South Portico, Bouleterion, Temple of Zeus. (Olympia, Mappe VI. 2.)
2854 Echo Portico, Treasuries, Stadium. (Olympia, Mappe VI. 3.)
2878 Section: diagonally through Heraeaum, Palatium, Temple of Zeus. (Olympia, pl. 125.)
2878 diagonally through Leonidaeas and Temple of Zeus (at right angles to preceding) (Olympia, pl. 126.)
2878 the same continued: Temple of Zeus, Echo Portico, S.E. Building and House of Nero. (Olympia, pl. 127.)
2879 through the Treasuries, longitudinal and across. (Olympia, pl. 128.)
TOPOGRAPHY, ARCHITECTURE, AND EXCAVATIONS.

Temple of Zeus: ground plan.  (Ol. pl. 9.)
(ol. pl. 9.)
(a) east front; (b) cross section.  (Ol. pl. 10.)
Palaiot, ground plan.
Stadium: elevation; cross section; and plan of goal-line.  (Ol. pl. 47.)

Olympia: General Views.
Panorama (in three slides) from the S.
Panorama (in two slides) from Mt. Cronium.
Panorama (in one slide) from W.
General View before excavation (from a print).
From W., showing Cleoens.
From W.  (Ol. pl. 1.)
From S.E. Temple of Zeus in foreground.  (Ol. pl. 3a.)

Olympia: the Monuments in Detail.
Temple of Zeus, view from N.E. (near Heraeum).
View from N. (near Telamon).
View from S.E.
Another restoration.  (Ol. pl. 122.)
Interior, present state.  (Ol. pl. 29.)
Stairs at E. end.
Shattered column on S. side.
Site of the statue of Olympian Zeus.
Heraeum from S.
From E., from near Treasury Terrace.
From N.E. angle.
From N.W.
Column restored.  (Ol. pl. 21.)
Exedra and Heraeum; restored.  (Ol. pl. 122.)
East front and elevation; restored.  (Ol. pl. 51.)
Treasuries; retaining wall behind terrace.
West Gate of Altis: from N.E.  (Ol. pl. 65.)
Leontiskheum: terracotta ornament.  (Ol. Museum.)
Palaiot and Theokolos: general view.  (Ol. pl. 40.)
Philippus, Gymnasion, Heraeum, and Pyraenium restored.  (Ol. pl. 131.)
Philippus, present state.
Elevation restored.  (Ol. pl. 29.)
Heroum, present state.
Basis of Nike of Patroon.
Trijlyphed retaining wall of athen altar.
Base of *Zeus* near entrance to Stadium.
Stadium: entrance from Altis.  (Ol. pl. 4th.)
Goal-line at eastern end.
Nero's House.  (Ol. pl. 65.)
Byzantine Church: looking S.  (Ol. pl. 74.)
Interior.  (Ol. pl. 69.)

For the Sculptures from Olympia, cf. 'Sculptures from Olympia' and 'Prompta,' pp. xxii, xxiii.
Orchomenus, general view of Acropolis from S.
Patras, from the sea.
Continuation of No. 4498.
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2965 Pleiomenos, view of Lake Phaeno, showing the island. (J.H.S. xxii. p. 231, fig. 2)
1019 Thebes, Temple of Apollo from N.
1969 " " " " " from N.W.
1970 " " " " " scene view of the N. end.
1967 " " " " " from S.W., from below.
3069 " " " " " near view of the S. end.
1982 " " " " " interior.
1972 " " " " " another view of the interior.

Pylea and Sphacteria.

4565 Map of Pylea and surrounding, present state. (J.H.S. xvi. pl. 3.)
4487 Map to illustrate Mr. G. B. Grangé's theory of the operations. (J.H.S. xvi. pl. 2.)
4488 Plan of the Phalanx from on Sphacteria. (J.H.S. p. 124, fig. 10.)
3066 Bay of Navarino looking S., showing S. entrance to Bay.
4290 Panoramic view of S. wide camp in foreground.
3463 View looking N., cliffs scaled by Macedonians.
5715 Cliffs looking N., Panagia landing place in foreground.
3463 Landing place of Bybistes.
3063 Natural breastwork of rocks as landing place.
2869 Pylea from Sphacteria.
5970 Voidoselia from Pylea.

3019 Sycuros, the theatre.
4457 Sparta Tygeanum, S. View.
1967 " " " " N. View.
4292 Tyrins, ground plan.
2713 " " ground plan compared with Mycenae. (J.H.S. xx. p. 194.)
400 " " Megaron, ground plan (Schuchhardt).
387 " " Megaron restored.
3483 " " general view from N., showing N. wall, upper citadel. Naxos in background.
3489 " " " taken from Northern flanking tower.
4065 " " view from E. gateway.
4066 " " great E. gateway.
3844 " " N. wall and pylon, from without.
1679 " " the same pylon from within.
3462 " " Postern and staircase in W. Wall.
1678 " " S. Gallery looking E.
4510 " " other view.
3983 " " section of S. Gallery.
3296 " " masonry, detail from inside.
4007 " " detail of the masonry of the exterior of E. Wall.
1674 " " antae, from the great Propylaea, showing saw-marks.
4500 Vostitza, view in.
5701 " " Current Factory.

Byzantine.

4281 Mezounus (Theom.) Monastery, general view.
1499 " " " " entrance.
5726 Mistra, Church of Panagia, general view.
1694 " " " " the tower.
2698 Olympia, Byzantine Church, looking S. (OL. pl. 7a.)
2661 " " " " interior. (OL. pl. 8a.)
MAGNA GRAECIA.

Italy.

3440 Posidonia (Paestum), general view of temple of Poseidon from S.E. w th Basilica behind.
1044 Posidonia, Temple of Poseidon.
5729 another view of the Temple of Poseidon.
5182 view in colonnade, showing upper story.
6003-4 other views of the Temple of Poseidon.
5188 the Basilica, general view.
5185 near view showing columns of the colonnade.
6007-8 other views of the Basilica.
6009 the Temple of Ceres.

Sicily.

3137 Agrigentum, Temple of Castor and Pollux (partly reconstructed.)
5129 Temple of Concord.
4150 Temple of Concord, W. front.
4177 Temple of Juno, N. side.
3197 Segesta, distant view of the unfinished temple outside city.
4188 Solinum, Temple E., foundation for paving.
428 Syracuse, plan.
1482 general view from Euryalus.
2949 current piers way within Euryalus.
5276 last camp of the Athenians and mouth of harbour.
5972 Euryalus, N. cliffs, sheer without steps.
5973 S. cliffs, gentle slope with traces of Dimysius' city.
5191 quarries or Latomie.
1490 another view of preceding.
5974 Dascon, the marsh.
5192 columns of the Olympianum.
4284 theatre.
5948 amphitheatre.
5975 Cathedral, formerly Temple of Artemis.
5194 Gothic doorway.
5196 Syracuse, the theatre, stage building with Castello behind.
5286 the town, Castello and Mola.
3459 Cyclops rocks.

Displaced.

3586 Niames, Maison Carée.
PREHELLENIC ANTIQUITIES.

This section covers those objects of Prehellenic art, worship, etc., which have been, or are liable to be, rescued in Mysia.

For sites, architecture, and excavations see the topographical works (pp. xxi-xlii) under the headings Troy, Crete, Mycenae, Tylissos, etc.

Art of the Later Stone and early Bronze Ages.

2744 Neolithic salt with magical inscription. (Parret and Chipiez, vi, fig. 5.)
2743...figures from Cussens and Cyclopic figures for comparison, outlined drawing. (Nebel, 1903, 146.)
2742 Copper implements from Cyprus.
2741...from Central Europe for comparison. (Much, Kngöfönde, figs. 1-14.)
2742-4 Bronze Age pottery from Cyprus. (Uns. slides.)
2740 Bronze Age tomb from Cyprus, with Myceanian importations.
515 Syros and Siphnos: pottery, selected types. (Hyg. 1899, pl. 8.)
516...implements, etc. (Hyg. 1899, Pl. 10, 11.)
2742 Aegina: marble figures, Ashmolean Mus.
2743...marble vases, &c., Ashmolean Mus.

MYCENAEN ART.

For convenience of arrangement many earlier works of art are here included.

Vases.

Successive Classes of Vases from Phylakopi.

7940 Dark-faced pottery with moessed bases. (Cf. Phylakopi, pl. 4.)
7941 Pre-Mycenaean geometric pottery with designs in lustreous paint. (Cf. Phylakopi, pl. 7.)
7942 Pre-Mycenaean geometric beaked jars. (Cf. Phylakopi, plates 8, 9.)
5549 Mycenaean beaked jars. (Cf. Phylakopi, pl. 14.)
7950 Various early Mycenaen Vases. (Cf. Phylakopi, pl. 19.)
7953 Vase with flowers in black and red. (Phylakopi, pl. 23, 7.)
7953-6 Vase with flowers in black and red. (Phylakopi, pl. 23, 3.)
5651 Later local Mycenaean pottery. (Phylakopi, pl. 22, 4.)
5656 Imported Mycenaean pottery. (Phylakopi, pl. 91, 4.)

Other Pre-Mycenaean and Mycenaen Vases.

2734 Cossens: Kamaria Vases. (J.H.S. xxxi, pl. 6, 7.)
5247...Vases of earliest period of later palace. (B.S.A. viii, p. 91, fig. 91.)
5323...Large jar with Papyrus in relief. (Cf. B.S.A. ix, p. 130.)
1455 Palamakos: Kamaria Vases. (B.S.A. ix, p. 306, fig. 5.)
1482-4 Painted 'fillers.' (B.S.A. ix, p. 341.)
1487...Painted 'guard vase,' cuttlefish design.
1488...Painted jug with floral design.
PREHELLENIC ANTIQUITIES.

2703 Kamaraika pottery. (Marti
  (2) [A[., 1-3.]
2704 Selected types of early pottery from Troy. (Bammendorf, 2608-23.)
2705 Selected types of Mycenaean vases. (Bammendorf, 2609, 12.)
2711 Painted jug with marine subject. (H. H. S. viii. pl. 83.)
2712 Painted jug with marine subject. (H. H. S. viii. pl. 83.)
2713 Vases with naturalistic painting from Thera. (Petrot and Chipiez, vi. pl. 29.)
2714 Painted jug ; octopus design. (Marsilles Mme.)
2715 Conventionalised floral design on vase from shaft-grave. (Petrot and Chipiez, vi. pl. 21.)
2716 Later style ; 'Warrior Vase' from Mycenae. (Schuchhardt, fig. 284.)
2717 'Warrior Vase' rev. (cf. fig. 285.)
2718 'Warrior, horse, and dog' fragment from Tiryns.
2719 Sub-Mycenaean vases from Lapathus in Cyprus. (Osehenbach Richter, pl. 15. 1.)
2721 Tell-es-Safi in Phœnicia. (Palestine Exploration Fund, 1896, 324.)

Fresco Painting:
2733 Bull-taming scene ; Tiryns.
2734 Façade of a temple ; Cnosus. (J. H. S. xxi. pl. 5.)
2735 Restoration of preceding. (J. H. S. xxi. p. 192.)
2736 Canoepae ; Cnosus. (Monthly Rec. March 1901, p. 124, fig. 6.)
2737 Figure of a girl ; Cnosus. (B. S. A. viii. fig. 17.)
2738 Dolphins ; Cnosus.
2739 Flying fish ; Melos. (Philosophy, pl. 2.)
2740 Figures with arms' heads ; Mycenae. (J. H. S. xiv. p. 51.)
2741 Reconstitution of ceiling ; spirals. (J. H. S. xiv. pl. 12.)

Sculpture and Modelling:
2742 2 views of a statue from Cumaeus. (Teunehe, Muse. Napol., pl. 1.)
2743 Upper part of human figure in relief ; Cnosus. (B. S. A. vii. fig. 6.)
2744 Head of bull ; Cnosus. (Monthly Rec. 1901, 128, fig. 7.)
2745 Ivory figures and heads ; Cnosus. (B. S. A. viii. parts of pl. 2, 3.)
2746 Ivory heads with helmet, from a drawing ; Sparta. (Relief, H. M. 19, fig. 38, 39.)
2747 Stele from 'Shaft-grave' ; spirals, chariot and armed man. (Schuchhardt, fig. 146.)
2748 Carved disc of Sarcoph. ; Berlin.

Gems:
2749 Miscellaneous selection. (B. M. Cat. of Gems, pl. 1.)
2750 (Petrot and Chipiez, vi. pl. 16.)
2751 (cf. fig. 188.)
2752 Gems illustrating Mycenaean dress and worship.
2753 Male deity and liens. (J. H. S. xxi. p. 145.)
2754 Female deity with liens and male worshipper.
2755 Gems with animal figures. (J. H. S. xiv. 190-193.)
2756 Cretan seal-stones, prismatic, with photomagnetic signs.
2757 Designs on Cretan seal-stones and Egyptian scarabs compared. (Evans, J. H. S. xvi. p. 287.)

Gold:
2758 Gold Mask from 'Shaft-graves'. (Schul. Mops, fig. 474.)
2759 Diadems. (Schuchhardt, fig. 159.)
2760 Portion of a diadem. (Schuchhardt, fig. 148.)
2761 Gold intaglio, outline sketch of the spiral design on. (Cf. Schuchhardt, fig. 263.)
2762 Disc with octopus design. (Schuchhardt, fig. 196.)
2763 Design of wavy line. (Schuchhardt, fig. 189.)
2764 Four discs with designs of leaf, butterfly octopus and spiral. (Petrot and Chipiez, vi. fig. 549.)
CATALOGUE OF SLIDES

200 Engraved gold ring: group of female figures. [Schl. Mep. fig. 550.]
383 " Scenes of fighting and hunting. (Schl. Mep. figs. 334, 335.)
330 " " Pillar-worship scene. (J.H.S. xxi. p. 176.)
3522 " Gold cup with fluted ornament. (Schl. Mep. fig. 342.)
316 " with doves on handles, the "Cup of Nestor." (Schuchhardt, fig. 346.)
3161 " from Vaphio: bull-taming scene. (Gardner, fig. 1.)
3331 " interior of gold cup with spiral decoration, from Aegina. (J.H.S. xlii. p. 196.)
3306 Gold pendant from Aegina. (J.H.S. xlii. p. 197.)
8912 Small gold shrine and goddess. (Schl. Mep. fig. 323.)
210 Jewellery worn by Min. Schliemann.
3909 Gold ornaments of Mycenaean style found in second city of Troy. (Schuchhardt, p. 65.)
190 "Priam's Treasure," from Second City of Troy.

Silver.

578 Fragment of a silver bowl with siege scene. (Exp. Ascr., 1891, pl. 2. 2.)
1078 Silver sword's head. (Schl. Mep. fig. 327.)

Terracottas.

6206 Terracotta block: Chios. (B.S.A. viii. p. 99. fig. 56.)
3927 Terracotta * solea pastoriae*: Chios. (B.S.A. viii. p. 71. fig. 156.)
3924 Early shrine, painted terracotta pillars and doves: Chios. (B.S.A. viii. p. 29. fig. 14.)

Inlaid Daggers.

481 Lion-hunt scene. (Cl. Schuchhardt, fig. 227.)
640 " Cats hunting water birds. Obv. and rev. (Ath. Mitt., vii. 2.)
5801 Part of the obv. of above on a larger scale.

Miscellaneous Mycenaean Objects.

235 Design of frieze of glass paste and alabaster: Tiryns. (Collignon, fig. 25.)
5201 Small porphyry frieze of similar design: Cnosus. (B.S.A. vii. p. 55.)
3912 Tablets of porcelain mosaic (houses and towers): Cnosus. (B.S.A. viii. p. 15. fig. 8.)
5214 " " " (warriors, animals, etc.): Cnosus. (B.S.A. viii. p. 21. fig. 10.)
5906 Stone weight from Cnosus. (B.S.A. vii. p. 42.)
1460 Steatite lampstand from Palaikastro.
1155 Steatite lamp on stand from Palaikastro.
7030a " The straitte 'fisherman' lampstand. (Cl. Phylogra., pl. 22.)
3522 Draughtboard from Eukomion, from a drawing. (J.H.S. xvi. p. 239-260.)
5065 Gaming board from Cnosus. (B.S.A. vii. fig. 25.)
5607 Clay tablets with linear script. (B.S.A. vi. pl. 1.)
2709 Spearhead, knife, axe, from Mycenae. (Mon. Hel., pl. 7.)
455 " Axe-head from Mycenae. (Mon. Hel., pl. 7.)
2707 Swords from Mycenae. (Toumarios, Mon. Hel., pl. 7.)
3529 " Fibulae, etc. from tombs in lower town at Mycenae.
3706 " Fibulae from Mycenae. (Toumarios, Mon. Hel., pl. 7.)
1461 " Shells from houses at Palaikastro.

Egyptian Contact with Aegaean Civilisation.

3246 Nubian pots with spirals.
3245 Nubian pot: design of boat, groups of men, and stages.
2730 Aegaean vase (Karnares type) from Kalamis. (J.H.S. xi. pl. 14.)
3510 Designs from Cydon seal-stones and Egyptian scarabs compared. (J.H.S. xiv. 327.)
3526 Cartouches of King Khyan, from Cnosus. (B.S.A. vii. fig. 21.)
5185 Vase from Mycenae, with cartouches of Amenhetep III.
5186 Upper part of an apsis in relief, with cartouches of Amenhetep II.
2731 Egyptian statue from Cnosus. (Exp. Excav. Report, 1892-1900, p. 49 H.)
EARLY IRON AGE.

Vases of the Geometrical Period Classified under Local Styles.

705. Argolis - Tiryns: man, horse, and sled. (Schuchhardt, fig. 121.)

711. Treses. (Jahrb. 1889, p. 36, figs. 49, 57.)

725. Attica - large 'Dipyoun', crater, showing funeral procession. (Bammesier, 1971.)

749. Design from Dipyoun vase, beasts devouring a man. (Arch. Zeit. 1889, pl. 8.)

776. 'the same: side (a) only. (J.B. H. xxii. 674, fig. 1.)

779. Vase with panel and frieze in relief. (J.B. H. xxii. pl. 4.)

804. Crete - Anopolis. (Jahrb. 1890, p. 37, fig. 14.)

806. Anopolis. (Jahrb. 1890, p. 41, figs. 26, 27.)

808. Cnosos. (Jahrb. 1890, p. 32, fig. 21.)

809. Cnosos. (Jahrb. 1899, p. 41, figs. 29-31.)

809. Eteuria. (J.B. H. xxii. 579, fig. 2.)

810. Lassithi - Anyklaoon. (Jahrb. 1899, p. 31, figs. 41, 42.)

803. Melos. (Jahrb. 1899, p. 34, figs. 11, 12.)

801. Thera. (Jahrb. 1899, p. 31, figs. 6, 7.)

801. (J.B. H. xxii. p. 32, figs. 8, 9.)

Vases of the Orientalizing Period Classified under Local Styles.

9299. Aegina - griffin-headed vase, outline drawing. (Rayet and Collignon, fig. 28.)

9307. Hercule and Geryon, whole vase and design. (J.H.S. x. p. 176.)

9356. Early Attic - Warriors, etc. (Bammesier, 1979.)

8099. Early Attic vase with design of Siren. (J.B. H. xxii. 253, fig. 4.)

3557. Early Attic - Herakles and Nessos: Gorgona. (Iat. Dunk. 57.)


854. Design from the Macnilius lekythos. (J.B. H. xli. pl. 2.)

2700. 'orientalizing lekythos and praxe. (Rayet and Collignon, pl. 5.)

893. Votive tablets. (id. pl. 6.)

744. Cyrene - Acroos vase: sphinx-eye. (Rayet and Collignon, fig. 38.)

114. 'Calymna' and 'Pronoimata' vases. (Arch. Zeit. 1893, pl. 12.)

2885. Cyrene - "Pronoimata" vase. (Hollwig,Epochs,fig. 29.)

2894. Etruria. (J.B. H. xxii. 281, fig. 2.)

2871. Melos - boy's-son horses. (Rayet and Collignon, pl. 2.)

801. Warriors in combat. (Bammesier, 2085.)

902. Apollo and Artemis. (id. p. 32.)

474. Bearded head. (Bammesier, 240.)

872. Amphora. (J.B. H. xxii. p. 96.)

3378. Panel picture, Dinomys and Aratus (?). (J.B. H. xxii. pl. 5.)
CATALOGUE OF SLIDES

3877 Melos: spirally designed from Rhodian Vases. (J.H.S. xxii., p. 53, fig. 7.)
3878 " " spirally designed from Rhodian Vases. (J.H.S. xxii., p. 55, fig. 8.)
3879 " " small bowl with "Melian" decoration. (J.H.S. xxii., p. 71.)
3877 Naxos: Polycrates amphora. (Naxos, i, pl. 4.)
3856 " selected fragments. (Naxos, i, pl. 5.)
3857 Phanagoria: Hermaphrodite. (Rasch and Collignon, fig. 20.)
3777 Rhodes: plate: Gorgon. (J.H.S. vi., pl. 50.)
3566 " " Euphorbus, Museums, Hector. B.M.
3700 " " oenochoae, Louvre. (Rasch and Collignon, fig. 20.)
148 Uncertain: Aristomenes vase. (Mus. a. I. iv. a.)

Miscellaneous Works of Art (Geometrical and Orientalising) of the Early Iron Age.

1025 Boeotia: gold band: lotus ornament. (Ep. 'Aeg. 1892, pl. 12.)
2533 " " Cypr-Myrmasson vase handle: bulls, demons with vases. (Ostafabach Richter, civit. 8.)
2534 Cyprus: portions of iron sword from Tamarine. (id. cxxxvii. 7.)
2535 " " Grave-Phoenician shield boss from Astarte. (id. cxxxvii. 5.)
8112 Egypt: bronze bowl of eighteenth dynasty. photo from original. (Jahrb. 1898, pl. 2.)
706 " Phoenician Bowl: Cyprus: siege scene: drawing. (Heub. Eos., pl. 1.)
341 " " Francais: Egyptian subjects: drawing. (Mus. a. I. x. pl. 32, fig. 1.)
313 " " Cyprus: (Egyptian) photo and drawing. (Jahrb. 1898, figs. 7, 7a.)
340 " " Cyprus: griffins and lions, drawing. (Flemming-Garnou, Éléven, Phaen. pl. 4.)
769 Archaic Terracotta statuette with geometrical ornaments. (Perrot and Chipiez, vii. fig. 29.)
35 Arch. bronze from Olympia. Prism redeeming Hector. (Asp. E. Cartier, loc. cit., pl. 4.)
3532-3 " " " Hamilcar and Trion, compared with same subject on a.
3574 " " Myrmasson gem. (Garnou, figs. 2-3.)
3674 Painted marble fragments from Olympia. (PL. pl. 118.)
2675 Painted terracotta from Treasury of Gela, Olympia. (PL. pl. 117.)
SCULPTURE.

Note on the Section on Sculpture

* denotes that the photograph is taken direct from the original or from an adequate photographic reproduction.

+ denotes that the photograph is from a cast.

Where, for any reason, the photograph is from a drawing or engraving the fact is noted in the text.

In some cases doubtful attributions of works of art to particular sculptors have been adopted for convenience of cataloguing.

EARLY PERIOD—480 B.C.

Development of the Male Figure:

3228 Colossus* of Naxos, in situ.

4694 + * of Delos, in situ, upper half front view.

5545 + + + the same, back view.

2214 Early * Apollo.* Archais male head * in Ath. Nat. Mus. (CC. B.C. R. 1886, pl. 5.)

3615 + + + Apollo of Tera.* (Gardner, fig. 15.)

3618 + + + Cretan Female.* (Gardner, fig. 18.)

3620 + + + Apollo of Tera.* (Gardner, fig. 20.)

3619 + + + Apollo of Orchomene.* (Gardner, fig. 20.)

3624 + + + Apollo from Phoc* in Bocca. (Gardner, fig. 24.)

3625 + + + Apox from Phoc* showing Augustan influence. (Gardner, fig. 25.)

Development of the Female Figure:

3614 + Artemis* of Delos. + figure dedicated by Nausikaa. (Gardner, fig. 14.)

3611 + Hera* of Samos.* (Gardner, fig. 11.)

3623 + Niklos of Archermes.* (Gardner, fig. 13.)

728 Miscellaneous illustrations of the early type of Winged Nike.

5822 Hera of Samos, + Niklo of Archermes, + and dedication of Nausikaa.*

See also the series of female figures from the Acropolis below.

Archaic Statues from the Acropolis.

3 Porce pavement. Hermes and Triton (drawing). (Ath. Mitt. xxv. pl. 2.)

2077 + + Typhon.* (Gardner, fig. 27.)

310 + + Head of Typhon.*

A chronological arrangement of the Archaic female statues is here attempted.

5612 Archaic female statue + with fruit. (Gardner, fig. 12.)

634 + + + Two views. (Rhodosides, pl. 7, 8.)

1936 + + + (Cf. Collignon, I, fig. 178.)

3630 + + + in Doric Chiton, full face. (Gardner, fig. 30.)

4490 + + + + + + + profile view.

741 + + + + + with inser. of Antenor (outline drawing). (Ath. H. p. 141.)

3628 + + + (Gardner, fig. 28.)

628 + + + upper portion of preceding, profile view.
CATALOGUE OF SLIDES

3657 Archai female statue.* (Cf. Cellignon, I. fig. 171.)
3658 " " " " " " " " " " " " " " (Gardner, fig. 26.)
3657 " " " " " " " " " " " " " " (Gardiner, fig. 37.)
3660 " " " " " " " " " " " " " " Profile view of preceding.
3661 " " " " " " " " " " " " " " Head, two views. (Gardiner, fig. 31.)
3668 Head of an ephedros, three-quarter face to left. (Gardiner, fig. 28.)
1721 " " " " " " " " " " " " " " full face.
1720 " " " " " " " " " " " " " " three-quarter face to right.
513 Athena, central figure of the Pre-Persian Temple in the time of Pelias Bours.
3631 Figure carrying cail.* (Gardner, fig. 32.)
618 " " " " " " " " " " " " " " another view of preceding.
3629 " " " " " " " " " " " " " " Mourning* Athena. Relief. (Gardiner, fig. 79.)

Early Reliefs.

3633 Athena, Stèle of Aristion,* (Gardiner, fig. 38.)
98 " " " " " " " " " " " " " " Stèle of Aristion. " Stèle of Alcmen.*
1720 " " " " " " " " " " " " " " Warrior's Stèle and fragments.* from Ikaros.
3670 " " " " " " " " " " " " " " Monnig* Athena. * Relief. (Gardiner, fig. 79.)
4158 Cythnos, Remains of a hercula group of lions and bulls.* (B.S.A., viii. pl. 1, 2a.)
1006 " " " " " " " " " " " " " " Archaic relief of Hecules.* (B.S.A., viii. pl. 4.)
5494 Delphi, Metope Hecules and Cypres stag.* (Delphi, iv. pl. 41.)
5485 " " " " " " " " " " " " " " Hecules and Cycrius.* (Delphi, iv. pl. 62.)
5496 " " " " " " " " " " " " " " Dossiare* and Orphea.* Dossiare and Idas.* (Delphi, iv. pl. 4.)
719 " " " " " " " " " " " " " " Fragment of Relief.* Node Athlete. [A.
3693 Ephesus, Sculptured Column* from the early temple of Artemis. (Gardiner, fig. 10.)
3617 Phaestos Relief.* (Gardiner, fig. 77.)
3621 Selinus, Metope* from first Temple of Persians and Medes. (Gardiner, fig. 21.)
759 " " " " " " " " " " " " " " from first Temple. Hecules and Orphea.
3622 " " " " " " " " " " " " " " from second Temple. Europe on Bull. (Gardiner, fig. 22.)
128 Sparta, Archai sculptured base.* " Mandala and Alan.*
551 " " " " " " " " " " " " " " Funerary relief of seated figures.* (Ath. Mitt., ii. pl. 22.)
3619 " " " " " " " " " " " " " " (Gardiner, fig. 19.)
560 " " " " " " " " " " " " " " lower portion.
3616 Thess.: Relief to Apollo and Nymphe.* (Gardiner, fig. 30.)
3619 Xanthos, Happy Tomb, North Side.* B.M. 94, 2. (Gardiner, fig. 19.)
3619 Happy Tomb, West Side.* B.M. 94, 1. (Gardiner, fig. 19.)
670 " " " " " " " " " " " " " " Happy Tomb, South Side.* B.M. 94, 4.
472 " " " " " " " " " " " " " " View of the Happy Tomb in set.

Unclassed.

3608 Seated statue of Charon from Branchidae.* B.M. 14. (Gardiner, fig. 3.)

The Tyrannicides.

3634 Relief on chair at Brousa.* (Gardiner, fig. 34.)
3637 Group on the shield of Athena on a Panathenian Amphora.
3638 The two figures from Naples; one by side and taken from the front. (Gardiner, fig. 35.)
3636 Aristogiton.* The figure at Naples in profile with the Hellenistic head. (Gardiner, fig. 36.)
724 Head of Archai female statue* possibly by Antenos compared with Head of Harrodians.* (Johns, ii. pl. 10.)

Aeginetan Sculptures.

3640 Aegea. The W. Pediment, in Thorwaldsen's order, from a drawing. (Gardiner, fig. 49.)
3649 " " " " " " " " " " " " " " Central group. (Cf. Furtw., and Uticoda, Denkmaler, pl. 2.)
3641 " " " " " " " " " " " " " " E. Pediment. Figure heading forward.* (Gardiner, fig. 41.)
3642 " " " " " " " " " " " " " " Dying Warrior. (Gardiner, fig. 42.)
3643 " " " " " " " " " " " " " " Bronze Head* in Aeginetan style from the Acropolis. (Gardiner, fig. 43.)
SCULPTURE OF THE FINEST PERIOD.

Fifth Century.

Contemporaries of Phidias.

5753 " " Head of Hermea." (U.T. Math. 1904, pl. 19.)
4843 Calumia. Chiosen-Gouffier Apollo. B.M.
6667 " Apollo from the theatre at Athens." Chiosen-Gouffier type.
6860 Myrons. Dioskourides. Lambolotell copied. (Gardner, fig. 50.)
1351 " " 2 views of a figure of the same type.
1381 " " " Lateran. (Gardner, fig. 51.)
1406 " " " R.M. Vienna.
1390 " " " Munich.
6674 Polycleitus. Doryphoros. "Naples. (Gardner, fig. 74.)
6696 " " " Athens. Nat. Mus.
5675 " " " of Volos. B.M. (Gardner, fig. 75.)
1368 " " " Parian copy in B.M.
6695 " " " Madrid. (Parti. Meas. fig. 23.)
6735 " " " Hera." head of. (J.H.S. xxx, pl. 2.)
4476 " " " Amazon. (Gardner, fig. 76.)
6679 " " " Head from Herakles at Argos. (Gardner, fig. 79.)
315 " " " Statue of youthful Pan. (Leyden.)

Phidias and the Parthenon.

For views and architecture of the Parthenon and Acropolis (pp. xxv, xxvi) in the topographical notes.

756 Sectional restoration of E. end of Parthenon (Niemann), showing disposition of sculptures.
990 Diagram, showing position of sculptures.
4789 " " " (Mich. iii. 2, B.M. 306) middle style.
4789 " " " (Mich. iv. 32, B.M. 317) last style.
4789 " " " (Mich. iv. 3, B.M. 306) last style.
4789 " " " (Mich. iv. 3, B.M. 310) last style.
4789 " " " (Mich. iv. 27, B.M. 318) last style.
4789 " " " (Mich. iv. 28, B.M. 317) last style.
4359 East Pediment. (Carrey's drawing.) (Gardner, fig. 56.)
990 North end. (Carrey's drawing). (Schneider, Gericht der Athene, pl. 1.)
5817 North end. (Carrey's drawing).
5818 Saar's drawing. (Ath., Math. xvi, pl. 3.)
4799 View in Elgin Room.
7369 " " " Niko. (Gardner, fig. 84.)
3660 " " " The "Doves." (Gardner, fig. 84.)
4391 " " " Science and Love.
7429 " " " Horse of Schmus.
1181 South end. (Carrey's drawing).
4787 " " " View in Elgin Room.
7375 " " " "Demeter and Pyrsophone.
4396 " " " Horus of Helios, Thebes.
3661 " " " "Theas." (Gardner, fig. 81.)
301 " " " "Horses of Helios.
8599 West Pediment. (Carrey's drawing.) (Gardner, fig. 59.)
728 restored by Scherrun.
225 Central Fragments. (Ath. Math. xvi, pl. 3.)
4899 North end. (View in Elgin Room.)
5819 " " " (Carrey's drawing.)
### Catalogue of Slides

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slide No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4844.5</td>
<td>West Pediment: North end. Cercopes and daughter.†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4844.6</td>
<td>South end. (Carrey's drawing. Fissimile.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4844.7</td>
<td>De Labède Head† (Gardner, fig. 66.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4844.8</td>
<td>The Franks.† Photographed on site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4845</td>
<td>Diagram showing order of Partheniens procession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4845.1</td>
<td>East Friese. Herms to Areia.† (Mich. xiv. 24-27.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4845.2</td>
<td>Zeus, Herse, and Iris.† (Mich. xiv. 28-31.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4845.3</td>
<td>Head of Iris†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4845.4</td>
<td>Central group.† (Mich. xiv. 32-33.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4845.5</td>
<td>Athena and Hephaestus.† (Mich. xiv. 36-37.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4845.6</td>
<td>Poseidon, Dionysus, Demeter.† (Mich. xiv. 38-40.) (Gardner, fig. 65.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4845.7</td>
<td>Aphrodite, Eros, Eileithyia.† (Mich. xiv. 41-46.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4846.6</td>
<td>North Friese. Cattle.† (Mich. xiv. 56-59.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4846.7</td>
<td>Sheep†. (Mich. xiv. 58-59.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4846.8</td>
<td>Pitcher Carriers.† (Mich. xiv. 59-60.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4846.9</td>
<td>Chariot group.† (Mich. xix. 57-61.) (Mich. xiv. 13.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4846.10</td>
<td>Chariot group†. (Mich. xiv. 54-55.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4846.11</td>
<td>Horseman.† (Mich. xiv. 111-114.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4846.12</td>
<td>Horse. (Mich. xix. 115-118.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4846.13</td>
<td>(Gardner, fig. 64.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4847.2</td>
<td>Youth and horses.† (Mich. xiv. 190-194.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4847.3</td>
<td>West Friese. Horseman.† (Mich. xiv. 2, 3.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4847.4</td>
<td>Horseman. Youth.† (Mich. xiv. 11, 12.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4847.5</td>
<td>Horse and man.† (Mich. xiv. 13.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4847.6</td>
<td>Horse. Youth.† (Mich. xiv. 22-24.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4847.7</td>
<td>Athena Parthenos. The Parthenon copy.† Side view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4847.8</td>
<td>Front view (Gardner, fig. 32.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4847.9</td>
<td>The Lemnian copy.† (Gardner, fig. 53.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4847.10</td>
<td>Medallion. Head of Athenal Parthenos (Hermes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4847.11</td>
<td>Head of Parthenos on Athenian coin (obverse only).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4847.12</td>
<td>Other coins of Athens showing this type.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Works of Phidias

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slide No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4854</td>
<td>Olympian Zeus. Coin of Elia. Seated Zeus Nikèphoros. (Gardner, fig. 54.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4855</td>
<td>Head of Zeus. (Gardner, fig. 55.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4856.7</td>
<td>Leonid Athens†. Dresden statue with east of Bologna head. (Furt. Met.549. 1.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4858</td>
<td>Amazon.† after Phidias. (Gardner, fig. 77.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sculpture from Olympia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slide No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4848.1</td>
<td>Temple of Zeus. Metope. Heracles and Bull.† (Gardner, fig. 48.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4849.1</td>
<td>Hercules and Atlas.† (Gardner, fig. 49.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4860.1</td>
<td>Heracles and Argive Stable.†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4877.1</td>
<td>Athena from same metope.†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4877.2</td>
<td>Herakles and Nemesis lion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4877.3</td>
<td>Head of Athena from same metope.†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4877.4</td>
<td>Profile view of preceding.†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4844.5</td>
<td>Pediment restored. (Gardner, figs. 44, 45.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4844.6</td>
<td>E. Pediment: 8 restorations compared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4844.7</td>
<td>View in Museum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4844.8</td>
<td>Head of Cltemes.†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4844.9</td>
<td>Agei Seer.† (Gardner, fig. 47.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4845.1</td>
<td>W. Pediment. Apollo.† (Gardner, fig. 46.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4845.2</td>
<td>Head of Apollo, profile.†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCULPTURE.

1312 Temple of Zeus. W. Pellinier, Head of Pithos. (Cf. OI, pl. 27, 2.)
1318 Head of Lapith woman and Centaur. (Cf. OI, pl. 32.)
1340 Head of young Lapith attacked by Centaur. (Cf. OI, pl. 28, 2.)
1345 Figure in left angle. (OI, pl. 28, r.)
1341 A full face view of preceding.

For the Heroes of Phaestis, cf. Prec. below.

5957 Niké of Paestum, full face.
5960 ** ** three-quarter face.
5963 ** restored.
5964 ** base of the statue, as in.
3192 Head of Aphrodite (fourth century). (Cf. OI, pl. 54.)
3192 Bronze head of Nike (of Hellenistic age).

Massinissa's Fifth Century Sculpture.

5962 Bronze charioteer from Delphi.
6963 Head of the Delphi charioteer.
6984 Scanning maiden.
6987 Temple of Metopes from drawings. Theseus and Geryon. Theseus and Bull. (Gardner, figs. 49, 47.)
3444 Fragments from the sculptures at Rhodium. (Es. Ape. 1891, pl. 8.)
4829 Temple of Prigalies. General view of Metopes and frieze. S, side B.M.
3673 The frieze, S, side. Herakles club. B.M. (Gardner, fig. 72.)
5881 Standing discobolus.
4831 Temple of Niké of Athens. Frieze. B.M.
4856 Heliotrope. Victory with Bull.
4668 Victory tossing spear.
1728 Temple of Apollo at Delos. Bronze group. Alb. Nat. Mus. (Cf. Collignon II, fig. 9a.)
1771 Sculptured fragments.
3969 Cretan from Cretechon. B.M. 407. (Gardner, fig. 49.)
5197 Capital with female figures from Delphi. (Delphes, IV, pl. 49.)
4838 Nereid Monuments. View in Nereid room showing frieze and two Nereids.
4826 Slab from large frieze. (Cf. Collignon II, fig. 105.)
1740 Pithos of Cephissos. (Perseus.)
2628 Amazons. The Mattel figure. (Gardner, fig. 78.)

Fourth Century.

Praxiteles, Originals and Copies.

3682 Hermes. (Gardner, fig. 32.)
3683 Head of. (Gardner, fig. 33.)
376 ** another view.
348 ** Head of the infant Dionysus.†
3684 Cnidian Aphrodite.† Vatican copy without drapery. (Gardner, fig. 34.)
3194 The Berlin head; full face and profile.
3193 The Petworth head. (3 views.)
3193 ** Full face view of Petworth head. (Cf. Furt, Meist, pl. 17.)
3195 Young Satyr. (Gardner, fig. 35.)
3192 ** Monot in the Louvre.

Works conveniently considered under the name of Praxiteles.

351 Hermes from Andros.†
3681 The Erance and Phoebus of Cephissos.† (Gardner, fig. 31.)
4504 Aphrodite Proust. Bronze eustache. B.M.
3192 Head of Aphrodite* from Olympia. (Cf. OI, pl. 54.)
1505 Hypnos. Bronze head. B.M. (Murray, Bronze, pl. facing p. 72.)
767 ** 2 views of preceding.
CATALOGUE OF SLIDES

Hypnos, Status in Madrid from a drawing.

Apollo, two views of a head in the collection Barlow. (Helbig 40-46.)

Artemis, Statuette from Cyprus. Vienna (Kleine, Pl. 56, p. 311.)


Praxitelus, mutilation of Westmacott athlete.

The Abderites Head in B.M.

Kubulon, head of from Kleinas. (Garden, fig. 123.)

Marintino's head, slab of Apollo and Marsyas. (Garden, fig. 98.)

Slab of three Muses, one seated on a rock.

Slab of three Muses, one holding lyre in extended arm.

Scopas, presumably originals.

The heads from Tages. (Garden, fig. 89.)

The fragments from Tages.

Unhelmeted head.

Helmeted head.

Head of the horse.

Works conveniently considered under the name of Scopas.

Melagor, Vatican and Medici heads. Two views of each.

Head of an athlete, Athena. Nat. Mus.

Head of youthful Hermes, from Giovanano. B.M.

Head of a young Triton.

Themis. Head. Att. Nat. Mus. (Garden, fig. 101.)

Apollo Musagetes. B.M. 1795.

Head of Apollo. (Helbig, Collect. Borreyo, 19, 50.)

Marble bearded head, Palazzo Grimania, Romsnti, Venice.

Niobe and youngest daughter. (Garden, fig. 193.)

Niobid, Chiarmonti. (Garden, fig. 104.)

Son of Niobe. (Garden, fig. 105.)

Demeter of Cnidus. B.M. (Garden, fig. 99.)

Head of Demeter of Cnidus.

Temple of Diana, Ephesus. Sculptured drum. Aeolus. (Garden, fig. 102.)

The Mausoleum.

Oldfield's restoration of the Mausoleum. (P. Garden, Sculptured heads, fig. 76.)

Pallian's restoration. (P. Garden, Sculptured heads, fig. 78.)

Mausoleum. B.M. (Garden, fig. 96.)

Artemida. B.M.

The Amazons' heads. B.M. slab with Amazon turning round on her horse. (Garden, fig. 91.)

Helmeted warrior. (Cle Mitchell, Hist. of Sculpture, fig. 200.)

Two warriors attacking a fallen Amazon.

Youthful warrior kneeling defending himself with shield.

Head of preceding.

Head of an Amazon.

The Charites' heads. B.M. Chiarontini. (Garden, fig. 92.)

Upper half of preceding on larger scale.

Herakles' head from S. side of Mausoleum. B.M.

Lyrtippus.

Status of Hagias. (B.C.H., 1899, pl. 11.)

Profile view of the head. (Delphos, s. pl. 64.)

The Apoxymenos. (Garden, fig. 92.)

Heads of Apoxymenos (Vatican copy) and Alexander (Louvre copy) compared.

Head of Alexander. B.M. (Garden, fig. 107.)
SCULPTURE.

534 "Youthful head full face." A Replica of the head of the Lyceippas youth with tidal face in B.M.

535 Profile view of preceding. Sidonian Sarcofagos.

946 Alexander Sarcofagos. General view* showing the hunting scene.

7124 " " " " Figure of Alexander in the hunting scene.

7125 " " " " Head of Alexander in the hunting scene.

7126 " " " " General view** showing battle scene.

5706 " " " " Battle scene. (Gardner, fig. 104.)

5473 " " " " Left hand portion of preceding on larger scale. *

741 Sarcofagos of mourning women: Long side.

765 " " " " Second long side.*

Miscellaneous Fourth Century Sculptures.

2995 Aeschylus from Ephesius.* (Gardner, fig. 85.)

2987 Amazon from Ephesius. (Gardner, fig. 87.)

2706 Head of Aeschylus* from Malee. B.M. 555. (Gardner, fig. 106.)

4811 Dionysus* from Monument of Theseus. B.M. 432.

582 Head of a Foun.* Munich Gymn. No. 102. (Cl. Fort. Mediterr., fig. 155.)

84 Ptolemy from Calchas. B.M. 1303.

3433 Monumental lion* from Calchas. B.M. 1320.

62 Mourning figure from Therm. (SchurseColl. pl. 15.)

3896 Ganymede after Leochares.* (Gardner, fig. 88.)

3996 Heads by Damophon.* (Gardner, fig. 94.)

8097 Drapery by Damophon.* (Gardner, fig. 97.)

3498 Head of an old man.* (Tolbecus, iv. pl. 73.)

Fifth and Fourth Century Reliefs.

In the series of Attic Grave Reliefs in chronological order has been attempted.

3256 Grave Relief.* Man and Woman.

3257 " " " " of Menecrates and Mnesaria. (Comes, Grabreliefs, ii. pl. 59.)

3258 " " " " of Aristocles. (Comes, pl. 136.)

3259 " " " " of Nikai.

3260 " " " " Girl with doll, bird, and dog. (Comes, pl. 137.)

3261 " " " " seated goddess, woman.

3262 " " " " of Myrmion. (Comes, ii. pl. 176.)

3458 " " " " from the Pissene. (Comes, ii. pl. 211, no. 1955.)

3452 " " " " Beulonae. (Gardner, fig. 94.)

3476 " " " " (Comes, i. pl. 78.)

3483 " " " " of Pamphilus and Demetrias. (Comes, i. pl. 10.)

3484 " " " " Boy with lekythos, in situ.

3201 " " " " of Aristocles (s youth). (Arch. Zeit. 1871, p. 26, no. 50.

3202 " " " " of Phaidias. (Comes, ii. pl. 137.)

3203 " " " " of Aristocles. (Comes, ii. pl. 154.)

3204 " " " " of Hegeso. (Gardner, fig. 98.)

4572 " " " " The same as situ.

3206 " " " " Mother, nurse, children. (J.H.S. xiv. pl. 11.)

4575 " " " " of Selino. (Comes, i. pl. 75.)

3207 " " " " of Cordian. (Comes, i. pl. 96.)

3208 " " " " Funeral banquet, boat in foreground.

6939 Attic Marble Lekythos* of Aristokrates. (Comes, Grabreliefs, ii. no. 456.)

6940 " " " " of Myron and Meles. (Brinecker, Grisch. Grabrel., p. 12, L.)

6941 " " " " of Nikostreon. (Comes, i. pl. 90.)

345 " " " " Athlete balancing ball.
CATALOGUE OF SLIDES

5745 Votive Relief to Asclepius.* [Ann. d. J. 1873, pl. MX.]
55 " " " " [Ath. Mitt. XI. pl. 15.]
54 " " " [Ath. Mitt. XI. pl. 16.]
532 " " " [R.G.H. II. pl. 9.]
5888 " " " [Fitzwilliam Mus. Cambridge.]
5624 " " " [Fitzwilliam Mus. Cambridge.]
3671 Reliefs to Eustianus Achilles.* Dameter, Persephone, Triptolemus. (Gardner, fig. 71.)
1303 " " " Dameter, Persephone, Triptolemus. (Ath. Mitt. XX. pl. 8.)
3883 " " " Dameter and Persephone. (Ath. Mitt. XX. pl. 5.)
899 Votive relief* to Hera and Athena as headers of treaty between Samos and Athens.
[Col. Cat. iv. II. no. 49. Collignon, III. fig. 54.]
611 Votive relief* to Pan and Nymphs. (Salviati Coll. pl. 28.)
1764 Relief with votive wreath.

LATER SCULPTURE.

The School of Pergamon.

The Attalid Dedications.

3712 Fallen Giant* and Amaun.* [Gardner, fig. 112.]
3713 Fighting Perseus.* [Gardner, fig. 113.]
3711 'Dying Gladiator.'* [Gardner, fig. 111.]

The Altar of Eumenes.

3714 Zeus combattling with the Giants.* [Gardner, fig. 114.]
3715 Athena, Victory, Giant.* [Gardner, fig. 115.]
5906 Diouyrus.* [Col. Collignon, II. fig. 206.]
5900 Charicloe, harp.* [Col. Collignon, II. fig. 206.]
1068 Terras of a Giant.*
1069 Fragment of a Giant and serpent on the staircase wall.
1068 Zeus and Giants.*
988 Athens, Nike, Giant, &c.*
900 Parthenos, Bootes, Nyx.*
991 Heracle, Argo, Artemis.*
908 Selene, Helius.*
909 Phedias, Asteria.*

The School of Rhodes.

5718 Laconia.* [Gardner, fig. 116.]
5937 Laconia, head of.* [Col. Paris. and Uerlici, Diakonides, p. 115.]
971 " " " [The Farnese Bull.* [Gardner, fig. 117.]

Other works of the Pergamine Tradition.

925 'Paros and Arria.*'
4219 Head of Gaul.* R.M.
3290 Arreton.* Uffizi.
3718 Koronees Warrior.* [Gardner, fig. 118.]
771 Dying Alexander.*

The Gods in Hellenistic Art.

4719 Apollo Beliades.* [Gardner, fig. 120.]
91 " " " R.M.
865 " Belvedere, Apollo Paeon, the heads for comparison.
5721 Aphrodite of Melos.* [Gardner, fig. 121.]
887 " " " " side view.
SCULPTURE

3727 Aphrodite, "Venus Genetrix." Louvre. (Gardner, fig. 127.)
3724 " " Venus del Medici." Uffizi. (Gardner, fig. 124.)
1985 " " from Epidauros. (Cf. Collignon, II, fig. 242.)
769  " " Loutroisi-Figaro-Fontaine Museum.
89  "M. and Aphrodite." Uffizi.
920 Artemis of Versailles." (Gardner, fig. 120.)
242 Athena* from Epidauros.
723  Eros, Head of, from Paphlagonia. "J.H.S. ix, pl. 18.
927  Hera, Faunus: two views.
925 Heracles, Faunus." (Gardner, fig. 125.)
523  Hermes of Cythera: upper part before reconstruction. (Cf. J.H.S. xxxi, p. 206, fig. 3.)
545  " " lower fragments before reconstruction. (Cf. J.H.S. xxxi, p. 206, fig. 4.)
1121 " " " the completed figure. (Ep. Anc. 1902, pl. 1.)
3160 " " " the head. (p. 19.
3222 Nike of Samothrace." (Gardner, fig. 122.)
545  Pan." (Cf. Ath. Mitth. v, pl. 12.)
94  Parision* of M. Castellani Corb. R.M.
1226 Pheodon. (Lateran.)
443  Zeus." The Otricoli head.

Genre Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age.

90 Sibyls with young Dionysus.
1730 Satyr* from Landi, Ath. Nat. Mus. 239.
92 " Head of laughing Satyr.*
3350 Crouching figure of a boy* from Cythera. (Ul. J.H.S. xxxi; p. 208, fig. 3.)
3709 Boy struggling with gooses after Boeotus." (Gardner, fig. 106.)
4011 " Nursing goose; scythe figure.*
597 Silver statuette: Boy nursing goose." (J.H.S. vi, pl. 4.)
7127 Actor wearing a comic mask." R.M. Graeco-Roman basement.

Hellenistic and other Late Reliefs.

388 Walls and vine." (Scheibler, pl. 41.)
378  Dionysus visiting Iarion.* R.M. (Gardner, fig. 108.)
3299 Girl damning." (Rom. Arch. N.S. 1897, pl. 2.)
5225 " " " (Hephaistion, "Pompeian Labyrinth," p. 9, no. 3.)
1001 " Head of child.* R.M.
9290 " Bacchic Thiasos." R.M.
4554 " Apothecary of Homey.* R.M.
3442 Indo-Greek Relief* from Malakand Pass.
3445 " " " " " "

Miscellanea Hellenistica.

3120 " " After Eutychides. (Gardner, fig. 110.)
418  Seated female figure* from Cythera, in stone.
122  " Head of a sleeping Mermaid.* Athens.
5928 " Michan Rondanini. (Furtw. und Urlichs, "Ehrenhalber," pl. 13.)
748 " Nilt.* Vatican.
3728 " Orestes and Electra." (Gardner, fig. 123.)

Examples of Archaisms in Sculpture.

769  Spinario. Capitoline Museum.
7181 " Head of an athlete, full face." R.M. No. 43.
7182 " Profile view of preceding.
3280  Artemis.* Naples.
CATALOGUE OF SLIDES

22860   Athena Promachus.   Naples.
1137    Herm at Chatsworth.   (J.H.S. xxii. pl. 8.)
2726    Relief on vase by Scutides from a drawing.   [Gardner, fig. 126.]

PORTRAITS (ALL PERIODS).

5373    Aeschyus.†.   (Haigh, Greek Theatre.)
3707    Alexander, head of.   *B.M.   (Gardner, fig. 137.)
1366    *   *at Chatsworth.   (J.H.S. xxii. pl. 9.)
1367    *   *at Munich.
2730    Antinous.   *Relief.   [Gardner, fig. 130.]
1084    Aristotle.†.   (Bunmeister, fig. 135.)
1502    Euripides.†.
9054    Homer.†.   Scherwin.   (Cl. Furtw. and Uffichi, Denkmälder, pl. 48.)
2872    Ptolemaeus.   *   (Gardner, fig. 72.)
5656    Socrates.   Mus. Albani.   (Cl. Furtw. and Uffichi, Denkmälder, pl. 43.)
1401    Sophocles.†.   Lateran Museum.

2953    Agrippa.   Louvre.   (Cl. Furtw. and Uffichi, Denkmälder, pl. 49 s.)
3729    Julius Caesar.   *B.M.   (Gardner, fig. 129.)
773     Livia.   *   Head of.

See also the Series of Coin Portraits, pp. cxviii, cxix.

BRONZES.

Archaic.

1209    Ares.   *   Three views of a statuette.   Tübingen.   (J.A.G. 1886, pl. 6.)
3639    Ephialtes holding an apple.   *   Three views of a statuette.   Liguriae.   (Gardner, fig. 89.)
3643    Head from Aeropoleis in Aeginetan style.   (Gardner, fig. 43.)

Fifth Century.

2952    "The Delphian Charioteer."†.
3555    *   *   Head of.†.
764     Bronze fig.†.   B.M.   (J.H.S. vii. pl. 69.)
1018    Statuette of Marsyas†.   after Myron.   B.M.
5387    Male figure with chlamys†. from Cythera.   (Cl. J.H.S. xxxi. p. 205, fig. 2.)

Fourth Century.

2880    Nude male figure†. from Cythera.   (Cl. J.H.S. xxxi. p. 206, fig. 1.)
4869    "Aphrodite."   *   Castellani Head in B.M.
4323    "The "Idolino."
4904    Aphrodite Porousia.†.   Statuette.   B.M.   (Cl. Murray, Greek Bronzes, fig. 28.)
4055    Head of Hypnos.†.   B.M.   (Cl. Murray, Greek Bronzes, pl. 54, fig. 72.)
167     *   *   †two views.

Hellenistic.

2858    Hermes of Cythera.   *   upper part before restoration.   (Cl. J.H.S. xxxi. p. 206, fig. 3.)
3938    *   *   †lower fragments before restoration.   (Cl. J.H.S. xxxi. p. 206, fig. 1.)
TERRACOTTAS.

5118. Archaic bearded head* from Cyprus.
5130. Two archaic heads* from Cyprus.
5105. Group of toys and idols* from Cyprus.
1107. Female head* of fine style, from Taranto. (J.H.S. 1888, pl. 73. 1.)
1794. Head* from Paphos.
591. Tanagra statuette. The game of Epeoloeisum.
778. ... Dancing girl. (Burlington F.A.C. Cretaceous Art, No. 263.)
5889. ... Lausus conversing.* B.M.
789. ... Eos.* B.M. No. c. 287.
602. ... Eros and Psyche. (Scheuruff Coln.)
7141. Actors wearing comic masks.* B.M.
550. Panel. Discus and Icarioi.* (B.M. Terracottas, pl. 25.)
842. Bacchus in mystic basket.* B.M.
774. Grotesque group. Draught-players. (Bammelsteher.)

Note on the Section on Sculpture.

* denotes that the photograph is taken direct from the original or from an adequate photographic reproduction.

† denotes that the photograph is from a cast.

Where, for any reason, the photograph is from a drawing or engraving the fact is noted in the text.

In some cases doubtful attributions of works of art to particular sculptors have been adopted for convenience of cataloguing.
VASES.

For pre-Mycenaean, Mycenaean, Geometric, and Orientalising Vases, see the pre-Hellenic Section, pp. xvi, xvii, xvi.

Note.
* denotes a photographic view of the whole vase from the original.
† denotes a reproduction of the picture subject only from an adequate illustration.
The rest are mostly outline drawings retained in the Collection for the interest of the subject depicted, where other reproductions are not available.

BLACK-FigureD VASES.

Panathenaic Amphorae.

119 Group of Panathenaic Amphorae. (Rayet and Callignon, fig. 60.)
249 Athena Promachus.† Surgeon. R.M. B 130. (Cf. fig. 61.)
1076 Athena Promachus.† Lycia. (Cf. fig. 62.)
3287 † Tyrannicides on the shield of Athena.

The Francois Vase, by Cittas and Ergotimus. Florence.

959 General view of reversed. (Cf. Bammelster, pl. 74.)
106 General view of obverse. (Cf. fig. 74.)
3170 Top frieze. The Calydonian Boar.
1082 Phocion and Theseus frieze. Pelens, Chiron, etc.
1083 * * * * * * * * Muses, Hebe.
1084 * * * * * * * * Hermes, Zeus, Musae.
955 Troilus frieze, general view.
1086 * * * * * * Apollo, Hylas.
1087 * * * * * * Rhodias, Theseus.
1088 * * * * * * Theseus, Hermes, Athene.
957 * * * * * * Troilus.
958 * * * * * * Antenor, Priam.
959 * * * * * * Priam, Hector, and Polites.

Dieties.

144 Sacrifice to Athene.† (Rayet and Callignon, pl. 7.)
145 Athene and Bull at Altar.† (Gerh. A.F. 242.)
244 Athena and Poseidon,† from an amphora by Amasis. Paris, Cabinet des Médailles. (Rayet and Callignon, fig. 56.)
723 Dionysus, Ariadne, Clitarchus. Drawing of complete vase.
5889 Dionysus and Maenads.† Amphora by Amasis. Paris, Cabinet des Médailles.
5882 Triptolemoe, bearded.

Heroes.

958 Amphiarauus (above). Various contests (below).† Berlin, 1655. (Wien. Vor. 1889, pl. 16.)
959 The Dioscuri.† Amphora by Exekias. Vatican.
VASES.

574 Heracles as an infant brought by Hermes to Chiron. (Arch. Zeit., 1876, pl. 17.)
862 ** and Hydra. (Bauemister, 724.)
884 ** bringing up Cerberus. (Bauemister, 786.)
893 ** drawing wine of Phoebus. (Bauemister, 796.)
957 ** binding Cretian bull. (Bauemister, 797.)
1028 ** and Triton.1 (Bayet and Collignon, pl. 57.)
760 ** and Ceryx.1 From an amphora by Exekias. Louvre. (Goth, A. F., 107.)
5330 Apotheosis of Heracles.1 (Bayet and Collignon, pl. 8.)
17 Theseus, Minotaur, Ariadne and Chorus. (Goth, Arch. 1884, pl. 1.)

Trojan Cycle (non-Homeris).  

231 Atalanta and Polus wrestling. (Bauemister, 153.)
147 Polus, Thetis and Chiron (above), Ajax in conflict (below).1 Munich. (Goth, A. F., 227.)
184 Achilles brought to Chiron (above). Heracles and Leon (below).1
978 Polus bringing Achilles to Chiron.1 B. M. B 629. (J.H.S. iv. pl. 2.)
149 The choice of Paris.1 (Goth, A. F., 172.)
148 Hermes leading the 9 goddesses to Paris.1 (Goth, A. F., 171.)
5834 Achilles and Penthesilea (above).1 Memnon and Amphilochus (below).1 B. M. B 209.
(1 Fr. A. F., 302.)
327 Achilles and Penthesilea (above).1 Achilles and Memnon (below).
81 Achilles and Penthesilea (above).1 Bousan and Omphalos (below).1 From a vase by Exekias.
R. M. B 210. (Goth, A. F., 208.)
960 Achilles, Polyxena, Troilus.1 Hydra. B. M. B 504.
644 ** (above).1 Three horses (below).
326 Shade of Achilles (above).1 B. M. B 240. Tomb of Patroclos (below).1 Berlin.
330 Death of Apsyta.1 (Bauemister, 978.)
321 Ajax and Cassandra.1 (J.H.S. iv. pl. 40.)
322 Amous and Anchises. (Bauemister, 932.)
778 Death of Achilles.1 (Birch, Arc, Pottery, 1875, p. 198.)

The Iliad.  

960 Hector and Andromache.1 (Mon. d. J. 1855, pl. 20.)
971 Dragging of Hector. (Overbeck, Gattineri kritisch, Bildol. pl. 19, fig. 8.)
5688 The horse-playing draughts.1 Amophora by Exekias. Vatican.

The Odyssey.  

171 Odysseus and Rams.1 Krater.
170 Companions of Odysseus with Rams. (J.H.S. iv. p. 261.)
778 Ullulating Cyclops.1 From a Cymeine vase. (Birch, Arc, Pottery, 1875, p. 400.)
605 ** (above).1 From an Attic vase.
760 Odysseus and Circe.1 burlequed. (J.H.S. xiii. pl. 8.)
731 ** and Sirens.1 (J.H.S. xiii. pl. 1.)

Scenes from Daily Life.  

847 Achilles running. (Bauemister, 2500.)
850 Achilles jumping with hallowed.
826 Athlete with hallowed.
1098 Acrobat.1 (Schreiber, Atlus, pl. 24, 4.)
3211 Armed Footman.1 (Bauemister, 2489.)
146 Procession of Musicians.1
7164 Chorus dressed as birds, walking (J.H.S. pl. 14a.)
7775 ** dancing (J.H.S. pl. 14b.)
5022 Marriage procession, burlequed.1 Sphygus. (J.H.S. xxii., p. 137.)
141 Ships by Nicothene.1 (J.H.S. pl. 49.)
CATALOGUE OF SLIDES

RED-FIGURED.

293 Fragment showing red-figured technique.

Olympian Deities.

Assembly of gods. From a vase by Scopas. (Müller-Winckler, no. 210.)

Gigantomachy. From a cup by Aristophanes. (Gerhard, Trachten, ii.ogi, pl. 2, 3.)


Apollo and Artemis slaying the Niosides. Carter. Louvre.

Athens and Hecale.* Amphora. Vatican.

Athene, the birth of. B.M. E 419.

... seated with owl. Interior of cup by Durio. (Gerhard, Trachten, iii.ogi, pl. 13, but in Arch. Z. 1575, p. 88.)

... and Hephaestus. Fragment from Areopolis.

... receiving Erichthonius. (Mon. d. J. x. pl. 39.)


Dionysus. (Suberoset coll. pl. 25.)

Dionysiac dance.* (Suberoset coll. pl. 25.)

from a cup by Hippos. (Rayet and Collignon, fig. 30.)

Hermes, Apollo, and Calliope. (Bauernfeind, t.)

Cithorian Deities.

Persephone and Pluto. (Overbeck, Kniadsmith. Atlas, pl. 12, fig. 11.)

... the return of. (Strube-brunn, Bildertevon Rom, pl. 2.)

Mission of Triptolemos. By Hieron. B.M. E 140. (Mon. d. J. ix. pl. 43.)

... Vase in relief. (Bauernfeind, 529.)

The Underworld. (Bauernfeind, 20472.)

Tarentine vase at Karlsruhe. (Arch. Z. 1843, pl. 11.)

Miscellaneous: Mythology.

Erichthonius.* Figure on the upper part of a mask supported by a sphinx. B.M. E 788.

The making of Pandora.* B.M. D. 4.

Eos and Tithonus. By Hieron. (Mon. d. J. ii. pl. 43.)

Science riding, adapted from a vase. (Harmsen and Vérall, fig. 42.)

Tale of goddesses. (Mon. d. J. iv. pl. 18.)

Heracles myth. Alcmena on pyre.* by Python. B.M. F 140. (J.H.S. xi. pl. 6.)

... as a child. Amphitrityon, Alcmene, Alcmena. (Mon. d. J. xi. pl. 48, 2.)

... and Apollo standing for tripod.* by Aristocles. (Gerhard, Trachten, ii.ogi, pl. 39.)

... and Karystians, from a vase by Euphronios. (Kimm, Euphr. pl. 31.)

... and Geryon, from a vase by Euphronios.

... and Atalanta. Munich Amphora. (Bonghen, 723.)

... madness of. by Asztalos. (Mon. d. J. vi. pl. 18.)

Passers and Gorgons.* (Rev. St. Gr. 1578, pl. 2.)

Theseus myth. Augeas and Theseus.* (Gerth, A.P. 267.)

... Athens, Amphitrite,* from a cup by Euphronios. (Klein, Euphr. pl. 182.)

... at slightly restored. (J.H.S. viii. pl. 14.)


... the labours of.* by Charchylion.

... by Durio.* B.M. E 48. (Gerth, A.P. 284.)

1179 Theseus, the labours of.*
The Trojan Cycle (other than Homeric Poems):

- Pelops wrestling with Theseus. From a relief by Pithaion. (Gerhard, Teubner, pl. 39).
- Pentes and Thetis, from a polychrome vase from Cumae. R.M. E. 424.
- Judgment of Paris, by Euphrates. (Shokurov Coll., pl. 61).
- Leading away of Helen, by Heron. (Wied. Forl. Ser. A. pl. 5-6).
- Achilles and Penelope. (Klein, Euphr., p. 230).
- Achilles and Troilus, from a vase by Euphrates. (Klein, Euphr., p. 214).
-Eos and Thetis before Zeus. (Overbeck, Gallerie hurope, Bild. pl. 20, fig. 10).
- Eos and Memnon, from a relief by Duris. Louvre. (Wied. Forl. vi. pl. 7).
- Odysseus and Diomedes with Pallas. by Heron. (Mos. d. L. ii. pl. 22).
- Creuses slaying Agamemnon. Stimmess, Berlin. (Overbeck, Gallerie hurope, Bild. pl. 38, fig. 10).

The Iliad.

- Achilles and Briseis. (Gerh. A. F. pl. 9).
- The A. of the Briseis, by Heron. (Baumeister, 776).
- Paris and Helen. (Csanád kánya, 1881, pl. 3, fig. 4).
- Trojans arming. (Klein, Euphr., pl. 215).
- Warriors arming, by Duris. (Baumeister, 2267).
- Parting of Hector and Andromache. (Klein, Euphr., p. 211).
- Odysseus in tent of Achilles. (Baumeister, 781).
- Achilles and Diomedes, by Euphrates. (Klein, Euphr., p. 211).
- Odysseus, Diomedes, Dolon. (Overbeck, Gallerie, pl. 17, fig. 4). (R.M. F. 175).
- Patroclus enlaided, by Achilles. (Wied. Forl. Ser. C. pl. 3, fig. 2).
- Nestor bringing armour. (Hoydenmann, Nestor).
- Nestor with arms of Achilles. (Mos. d. L. i. ii. pl. 20).
- Priam taking leave of Hector. (Gerh. A. F. 288).
- Achilles and Hector, in combat. (Gerh. A. F. 202).
- Priam in tent of Achilles, from a relief by Heron. Vienna. (Baumeister, 794).
- Priam as supplicant to Achilles. (Gerh. A. F. 197).
- Redemption of Hector. (Mos. d. L. vii. pl. 11).
- Sacrifice of Trojans at pyre of Patroclus. (Mos. d. L. iii. pl. 32).

The Odyssey.

- The Trojan House. (Gerh. A. F. 220, 226).
- Himera. (Gerh. A. F. 169).
- Ilipseis. (Gerh. A. F. 169).
- Odysseus and Companions tied to rams. (J.H.S. iv. fig. 31, p. 262).
- Cretus of Odysseus and Circe.
- Penelope’s web.
- Odysseus and Antilles.
- Odysseus with bow.
- Odysseus slaying the suitors.

Scenes from Daily Life, &c.

- Palaces scene. (R.M. F. 6).
- (Gerh. A. F. iv. 277).
- (Klein, Euphr., p. 234).
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1097 The Pentathlon, various events.
1095 " Jumping. (Arch. Zeit. 1884, pl. 12.)
1099 " Running: the start.
1208 " Throwing the discus. (Klein, Figure, p. 225.)
1209 " Throwing the spear.
1206 " Boxing. B.M. No. E. 29.
1287 " " Binding on the ear. We.
1088 " " Crowning the Victors. (Schreiber, Atlas, p. 25.)
5836 The Hoplite Race: the start. (J.H.S. xxii. p. 270.)
5838 " " His turn reconstructed from various Vases. (J.H.S. xxiii. p. 279.)
5838 " " The race. (J.H.S. xxiii. p. 277.)
5802 " " The finish. (J.H.S. xxiii. p. 245.)
5803 " " The victor. (J.H.S. xxiii. p. 288.)
334 " Youths awarding. (Bammeister, fig. 229.)
986 " Youth awarding. * by Euphronius and Doidimos.
988 " " (Arch. Zeit. 1885, pl. 11.)
991 " " (Arch. Zeit. 1885, pl. 11.)
2716 " Hoplite awarding. (Reichel, Hans. Wegener, fig. 92.)
968 " " Marriage procession. (Stackelberg, Zeitschr. pl. 42.)
962 " " (id. continued.)
977 " School scenes, by Dura.* (Bayer and Collignon, fig. 72.)
110 " Youth pouring libation. (J.H.S. x. pl. 1.)
952 " " From a cup by Euphronius. (Huntington Fine Arts Coll. no. 8.)
7507 " Preparations for a satyric drama. (Bammeister, pl. 5, left hand portion.)
7505 " " (Bammeister, pl. 5, right hand portion.)
7118 " Chiron, butchering, from a Phrygian vase. * (Cf. Bammeister, fig. 908.)
738 " Comic Scene from a Vase by Asxa. (Millingen, Vases press, p. 46.)

WHITE ATHENIAN FUNERAL LEKYTHOI

234 " Interior of a Coffin showing the disposition of lekythoi round the body.
722 " Three views of the design on one Vase: (a) female mourner, (b) male mourner, (c) the tomb. (Cf. J.H.S. xix. pl. 2.)
1144 " The female mourner only from the preceding vase.*
789 " Lady with wreath. * (White Athenian Vases, pl. 4.)
790 " Protesilaos. * B.M. No. D. 62. (White Athenian Vases, pl. 7.)
791 " Hypnos and Thanatos. * B.M. No. D. 58. (White Athenian Vases, pl. 11.)
737 " Deposition of a woman by Hypnos and Thanatos. (Dumont and Chalpin, 1. pl. 27.)
504 " Three representations of Charon and his boat. * (Antikythea, pl. 20.)
926 " Charus and girl. * (Antikythea, pl. 28, fig. 3.)
8178 " Three figures and shade, at a tomb. * (Bayer & Collignon, fig. 87.)

SHORT STYLISTIC CATALOGUE OF VASES.

Note.
The vases catalogued above being in subject order, a short list is here appended in chronological order to illustrate the development of style in vase painting in the black-figured and red-figured periods. The full references are here omitted, but the artist's name, where known, is given in brackets.

BLACK-FIGURED VASES

Sixth Century.

150 Francois Vase (Clitus and Ergotimus.)
240 Athens Framenakis. * Burgon Vase.
### VASES.

**Circa 510–460 B.C.**

**Kyllike.**

| 748 | Discobolus. (*Dioskouroi*) |
| 142 | Athena and owl. (*Doris*) |
| 1956 | Eos and Memnon. (*Doris*) |
| 1324 | Achilles and Patroclus. (*Sosos*) |

*Vases of Various other Shapes.*

| 972 | Strife for the tripod. (*Achilles.*) |
| 1024 | Achilles and Briseis. (*Enestheus.*) |
| 5696 | Staminos. (*Dionysus Dendraeus.*) |

**Circa 460–425 B.C.**

**Sculptured Vases.**

| 746 | Thetis, Athena, Amphitrite. (*Eufronius.*) |
| 982 | Revellers. (*Eufronius.*) |
| 9922 | Bacchantes. (*Hieron.*) |

**Circa 425–400 B.C.**

**Red-figured Vases.**

| 973 | Gigantomachy. (* Aristophanes.*) |
| 2010 | Two lekythoi. |
| 791 | Sleep, death, and the dead. |

**Circa 400–350 B.C.**

| 136 | Pelops and Thetis. |
| 1053 | Paris and Helen. |

**Later Apulian Vases.**

| 1040 | Amphora. (*Hians.) |
| 832 | Alcamene on the pyre. (*Python.*) |

**Note.**

- * denotes a photographic view of the whole vase from the original.
- † denotes a reproduction of the picture subject only from an adequate illustration.

The rest are mostly outline drawings retained in the Collection for the interest of the subject depicted, where other reproductions are not available.
COINS.

Towns in Alphabetical Order.

5391 Abdera, R. (B.M. Guide, iii. B 3.)
5392 Abydos, R. (B.M. Cat. Towns, etc. p. 2. 16.)
5393 Acrathon, R. (B.M. Guide, ii. B 3.)
5395 Aegina, R. (B.M. Guide, i. B 28.)
5396 Aenos, R. showing primitive altar. (Gardner, fig. 7.)
5397 Astolia, R. (B.M. Guide, i. B 16.)
5398 Agriatonum, R. (Munich specimen.)
5399 Amphipolis, R. (B.M. Guide, iii. B 7.)
5400 Arete, R. (B.M. 1901, 6. 2.)
5401 Arachova, R. (Cf. B.M. Cat. Peloponnesus, pl. 32, (4.)
5402 Argos, R. (B.M. Guide, ii. B 33.)
5404 Athens, R. c. 407 B.C. (B.M. 1892, 6. 11. 23.)
5405 Athens, R. c. 290 B.C. (B.M. Cat. Athens, pl. 10, 2.)
5406 Athens, R. time of Sulla. (B.M. 1898, 4. 6. 1.)
5407 Athens, R. contest of Athens and Passion. (J.H.S. pl. 75, Z aiv.)
5408 Athens, R. Athens with shield and thunderbolt. (J.H.S. pl. 75, 3 aiv.)
5409 Athens, R. statue of Apollo at Delos. (Gardner, fig. 23.)
5410 Argos, R. Epaminondas. (B.M. Guide, iii. B 30.)
5411 Byzantium, R. (B.M. Guide, ii. B 3.)
5412 Camarinus, R. (B.M. Guide, ii. C 17.)
5413 Camirus, R. (B.M. Guide, i. A 19.)
5415 Carystus, R. (B.M. Cat. Central Greece, p. 103. 47.)
5416 Chalcis, R. (B.M. 1900, # 2.)
5417 Chalcis, R. (B.M. Guide, i. B 31.)
5418 Chamaepechis Tharacia, R. (B.M. Cat. Thracian, pl. 8.)
5419 Chios, R. (B.M. Cat. Zonies, p. 281. 36.)
5420 Corinth (Cyprius), R. Baalmelek I. (B.M. Cat. pl. 2. 11.)
5421 Cleoneumus, R. (B.M. Guide, iii. B 26.)
5422 Cnidus, R. (B.M. Guide, iii. A 32.)
5423 Cnidos, etc. R. (Cf. B.M. Cat. Caria, pl. 14, 7.)
5424 Cnossus, R. (B.M. Cat. Crete, etc. p. 38. 2.)
5425 Cosineus, R. (Cf. B.M. Cat. Crete, etc. pl. 3. 2.)
5426 Colophon, R. (B.M. Guide, ii. A 30.)
5428 Corinth, R. (Cf. B.M. Cat. Corinth, pl. 9. 19.)
5429 Aphrodisia, R. (Aphrodisia with shield, and Eros. (J.H.S. pl. 38, G. 6.)
5430 Aphrodisia in temple. (J.H.S. pl. 58, G. 6.)
5431 Cyrene, R. (B.M. Guide, ii. A 38.)
5432 Croton, R. (B.M. Guide, iii. C. 19.)
5433 Cunus, R. (B.M. Guide, ii. C. 2.)
5435 Cypros, R. Temple of Aphrodisia at Didyma (several examples). (Roman.
5436 Cythera, R. (B.M. 1891, 7. 4. 20.)
5437 Cyzicus, B. (B.M. Guide, i. A 12.)
COINS.

Delos, A. (B.M. 1896, 7, 2, 43.)
Delphi, A. (B.M. Guide, ill. b. 25.)
Dyrrachium, A. (Cf. B.M. Cat. Thessaly, etc., pl. 10, 13.)
Elias Spath, A. (B.M. Cat. Thessaly to Aeolus, p. 199, 4.)
Eleusis, A. (B.M. Cat. Athens, etc., p. 118, 12.)
E. Triptolemos in snake-chariot. (J.H.S. pl. 77, EE xx.)
Elias, A. (Cf. B.M. Cat. Peloponnesus, pl. 14, 2.)
, A. Olympic Zeus. (Gardiner, fig. 74.)
, A. Olympic Zeus. (Gardiner, fig. 55.)
Epiasus, A. (Cf. B.M. Cat. Ionic, pl. 9, 4, 10, 9.)
Epidauros-Dyrrachium, A. (B.M. Guide, vii, B 12.)
Epidauros, A. (B.M. 1891, 10, 5, 2.)
Eryx, A. (B.M. 1896, 6, 1, 7.)
Halon, A. (B.M. Cat. p. 49, 12.)
Hermione, A. (B.M. Cat. Peloponnesus, p. 160.)
Ledit, A. (B.M. Guide, ill. A 18.)
Lemnos, A. (B.M. Cat. Thessaly, etc., 7.)
Leucadia, A. (B.M. Cat. Thrace, etc., p. 193, 70.)
KL, selected Hecuba. (Cf. B.M. Cat. Troezen, etc., pl. 31-33.)
Mantinea, A. (B.M. Cat. Peloponnesus, 6.)
Messenia, A. (B.M. Guide, ill. C 1.)
Megara, A. (B.M. Cat. Athens, etc., p. 118, 4.)
Melo, A. (B.M. Cat. Crete and Aegean islands, p. 103, 1.)
Methyama, A. (B.M. Guide, ill. A 37.)
Miltiades, A. (B.M. Cat. Ionic, p. 192, 14.)
Myra, Imperial coins (Claudius and Gordianus) showing goddess of Myra.
Mytilene, A. (Cf. B.M. Cat. Troezen, etc., pl. 37, 30.)
Myrtis, A. (B.M. Cat. Thessaly, etc., p. 87.)
Onos, A. (B.M. Guide, ill. H 24.)
Orchomenus, Boeotia, A. (B.M. Cat. Central Greece, p. 24, 24.)
Ph basilas, A. (Cf. B.M. Cat. Ionic, pl. 23.)
Philae, A. (B.M. Cat. Central Greece, p. 15, 13.)
Pitacea, A. (B.M. Cat. Central Greece, p. 28, 4.)
P trimus, A. (B.M. Cat. Ionic, p. 230, 3.)
Proconnessos, A. (B.M. Guide, ill. A 28.)
Rhodes, A. (Cf. B.M. Cat. Italy, p. 375, 25.)
Rhodes, A. (Cf. B.M. Cat. Crete and Aegean islands, pl. 37, 3.)
Salamis, A. (B.M. Cat. Thessaly, etc., p. 116, 3.)
(Syria), A. (B.M. Cat. Cypri, pl. 11, 4.)
Samos, A. (Cf. B.M. Cat. Ionian, pl. 35, 3.)
Scotus, A. (B.M. Cat. Thessaly, etc., 12.)
Sicyon, A. (Cf. B.M. Cat. Peloponnesus, pl. 7, 17.)
Simon, A. (B.M. Cat. Pontus, Paphlagonia, etc., p. 57, 34.)
### CATALOGUE OF SLIDES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5409</td>
<td><strong>A</strong> Status of Apollo (Gardner, fig. 6.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5410</td>
<td>Syracuse, R. (B.M. Guide, ii. C. 34.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5411</td>
<td><strong>A</strong> Dionysus (Cl. B.M. Guide, iii. C. 28.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5412</td>
<td><strong>A</strong> Philistia (B.M. Guide, v. C. 28.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5413</td>
<td>Tarentum, R. (B.M. Guide, iii. C. 7.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5414</td>
<td><strong>A</strong> four varieties of the same type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5415</td>
<td>Teges, R. (B.M. Cat. Peloponnesus, p. 260, f.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5416</td>
<td>Tenea, R. (B.M. Guide, iv. B. 27.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5417</td>
<td>Thasos, R. (B.M. Guide, ii. B. 7.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5418</td>
<td><strong>A</strong> (Cl. B.M. Cat. Thracia, etc., p. 216, 2, 218, 29).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5419</td>
<td>Thessal, R. (Cl. B.M. Cat. Central Greece, pl. 13, 9.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5420</td>
<td>Thrace, R. (Cl. B.M. Guide, iii. C. 17.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5421</td>
<td>Tityus, R. (B.M. Cat. Peloponnesus, 3.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5422</td>
<td>Trachonis, R. (B.M. Cat. Peloponnesus, 3.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5423</td>
<td>Troad, R. (B.M. Cat. Peloponnesus, p. 166, 4.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5424</td>
<td>Troad, R. (B.M. Cat. Peloponnesus, p. 166, 4.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5425</td>
<td>Trebula, R. (Cl. B.M. Guide, iii. B. 34.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5426</td>
<td>Tragale, R. (B.M. Guide, i. C. 29.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Kings or Dynasts (Alphabetical)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5571</td>
<td>Alexander the Great, R, N. (Cl. B.M. Guide, iv. B. 8, 9.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5572</td>
<td>another specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For portraits of Alexander, see the engravings of Lysippus of Thrace below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5573</td>
<td>Alexander of Europe, R. (B.M. Guide, iii. B. 23.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5574</td>
<td>Antigonus Gonatas of Ptolemaics, R. (Cl. Hist. Num. p. 203, fig. 145.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5575</td>
<td>Antimachus of Thessa (B.M. Cat. Greek and Syriacus Kings, pl. 1, 1.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5576</td>
<td>Antiochus I of Syria, R. (Cl. B.M. Cat. Seleucid Kings, pl. 3.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5577</td>
<td>Archelaus I of Macedon, R. (Cl. B.M. Cat. Macedon, etc., p. 164, 4.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5578</td>
<td>Cynæus, N. (Cl. B.M. Guide, i. A. 16.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5579</td>
<td>Cynæus, N. (Cl. B.M. Guide, i. A. 16.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5580</td>
<td>Dareion, R. (Cl. B.M. Guide, iii. A. 1, 2.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5581</td>
<td>Demetrius Poliorcetes, R. (Cl. B.M. Guide, iv. B. 16, 17.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5582</td>
<td>another specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5583</td>
<td>another specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5584</td>
<td>Demetrius II of Syria, R. (Cl. B.M. Cat. Seleucid Kings, pl. 21, 2.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5585</td>
<td>Dionysus of Syracus, R. (Cl. B.M. Guide, ii. C. 29.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5586</td>
<td>Equinomastus, R. (B.M. Guide, iii. B. 26.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5587</td>
<td>Eumenes of Salamis, R. (B.M. Cat. Cyzicus, pl. 11, 17.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5588</td>
<td>Gomos of Syracus, R. (B.M. Guide, ii. C. 33.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5589</td>
<td>Iota of Nuxa (B.M. Guide, vii. C. 33.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5590</td>
<td>Lysimachus of Thrace, R. (B.M. Guide, iv. B. 26.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5591</td>
<td>another specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5592</td>
<td>another specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5593</td>
<td>another specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5594</td>
<td>Mithridates IV of Ptolemaics, R. (Cl. Hist. Num. p. 267, fig. 266.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5595</td>
<td>Mithridates VI the great, of Ptolemaics, R. (Cl. B.M. Guide, vii. A. 2.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5596</td>
<td>another specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5597</td>
<td>another specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5598</td>
<td>Perser of Macedon, R. (Cl. B.M. Guide, vi. B. 9.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5599</td>
<td>Perser of Macedon, R. (Cl. B.M. Guide, vi. B. 9.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5600</td>
<td>Peleus of Macedon, R. (Cl. B.M. Guide, vi. B. 9.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5601</td>
<td>Parmenion, R. (B.M. 1892, 7, 3, 4.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5602</td>
<td>Philip II of Macedon, R. (Cl. Hist. Num. p. 196, fig. 123.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5603</td>
<td>another specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5604</td>
<td>another specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5605</td>
<td>another specimen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5606</td>
<td><strong>A</strong> sester.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5607</td>
<td><strong>A</strong> sester.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5608</td>
<td><strong>A</strong> sester.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5609</td>
<td>Gallic barbarisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5610</td>
<td>Gallic barbarisation carried further</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5611</td>
<td><strong>British barbarisation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Notice:** The catalogues refer to various ancient sites and personalities, with references to specific pages and figures in the B.M. Guide for visual identification or further reference. The catalogue lists items such as coins, statues, and other artifacts, categorized by type and location.
COINS.  

5370a Philip V of Macedon, R. (Cf. Hist. Greek, p. 293, 8g. 148.)  
4341e Ptolomy Soter, N. (Cf. B.M. Cat. Ptolemaic, pl. 3, 5.)  
4536a Ptolemy Soter, R.  
4556a Seleucus I of Syria. (Cf. B.M. Guide, iv. A 18.)  
5420a Sennacherib of Thrace, R. (B.M. Guide, ill. B 5.)  
5421a Terms of Thrace, R. (B.M. Cat. Thraco, etc., p. 202, 1.)  
3575a Themistocles (stuck at Magnesia), R. (Bibliothèque Nationale.)  
5388a Tissaphernes, R. (B.M. Guide, iii. A 27.)

Style in Numismatic Art.

Note.

The coins above being arranged alphabetically without regard to their chronological sequence a short list is here appended to illustrate the development of style in numismatic art. References will be found in the larger series above.

Early Archaic Period:

5331 Cressus.
5390 Phocaea.
5318 Selected coins of Poseidon, Late, Orontes, Sardia.

Late Archaic Period:

5308 Acarnania.
5352 Gela.
5319 Eryx.
5356 Himera.
5319 Selected coins of Selinus, Athens, Lesbos.

Early Fine Period:

5308 Agrigentum.
5355 Crotos.
5310 Amphipolis.
5382 Naxos.
4522 Selected coins of Thasos, Larissa, Lesbos, Gortynia.

Late Fine Period:

5343 Elis.
5364 Heraclea.
5344 Ephesus.
5365 Hermione.
4524 Selected coins of Heraclea, Velia, Syracuse, Elis.

For the earlier and later decline of numismatic art the portrait coins of the kings and dynasts catalogued above are suitable; also the following:

5368 Cyme.
5368 Labblus.
5347 Ephesus.
5372 Magnesia.
5383 Syracuse.

4538 Reminiscences of statues on coins: selected coins of Amos, Argos, Rhodes, Demetrius Poliorcetes.
GEMS.

A short series arranged to illustrate the Development of Style in Gem Cutting.

For Myrmeconic Gems see the Probolistic Section, p. 25.

5695 Archaic Scultures: R.M. Cat. Nos. 271, Cepheus; 274, Achilles; 278, Poseidon and Medusa.

5685 Archaic Cypriotic sculptures: Athena with apple of the Gorgon. (Murray, Handbook, pl. facing p. 122, fig. 3.)


5697 Gems of the finest period: R.M. Cat. Nos. 466, Flying crane; 549, lotus flower pendant with design of Sirens and birds in pairs; 566, Lady reading.

5698 Later gems with earlier types: R.M. Cat. Nos. 579, Braided hair of Zeus; 729, Apollo after Cnemus; 726, Apollo Sarcoctomos.

5689 Graeco-Roman Gems: R.M. Cat. Nos. 1144, Nike; 1192, assembly of the gods; 1261, Heracles.

5690 Graeco-Roman Gems: Arms and Aphrodite.

5700 Portraits: R.M. Cat. Nos. 1618, Aristippos; 1526, Demetrius Poliorketes; 1626, Panaxia the younger.

MISCELLANEA.

517 Plan of Homeric house. (Jebb, Homer, p. 58.)

592 Homeric House, Plan. (P. Gardner.)

7161 Portrait of Dr. Schliemann (Schuchardt, Krestisepoke).

3804 The 'Chest of Kypselos': diagram. (Gardner, fig. 4;)

5541 The 'Chest of Kypselos' restored. Small scale. (J.H.S. xiv, pl. 7.)

470 Shield of Achilles, restoration. (Murray.)

3804 ... diagram. (Gardner, fig. 4.)

2717 'Bosanquin shield': early types. (Reichel, Hom. Waffen, figs. 13, 14, 15.)


2710 Graves: early example from Enkomoi. (Reichel, Hom. Waffen, figs. 30, 31.)

222 Athlete with halteres (outline drawing of bronze disc).

231 Halteres (drawing).

2133 Youive strigils. R.M.

399 Ladies playing knoekla-bowls: painted tablet. (Robert, Knobelspielespannen des Athenal)l.)

798 Painted architectural terracotta. (Le Bas (ed. Heinach), Archit. Ath. II, 1, 2.)

800 Silver vessels from Bosco Real.

1085 The battle of Issus. Mosaic. (Bammeister, p. 27.)

1082 Central portion of procession on larger scale.

1180 Pugilista: mosaic.

783 Ivory panel (Byzantine). S.K. Museum. (Johann, s. K. Persia, Kunstveronahalungen, 1887.)

3291 Ivory statuette, tragic actor, face in profile. (Cf. Mon. s. J. xi, 18.)

3292 Another view of preceding.

7139 Comic mask: two views. (Cf. Mon. s. J. xi, 32.)

7112 Simplified ground-plan of a Greek theatre.

1053 Radfield, the Greek theatre, view of the stage.

1054 Scene from the Agamemnon at Radfield.
NOTICE TO CONTRIBUTORS

THE Council of the Hellenic Society having decided that it is desirable for a common system of transliteration of Greek words to be adopted in the Journal of Hellenic Studies, the following scheme has been drawn up by the Acting Editorial Committee in conjunction with the Consultative Editorial Committee, and has received the approval of the Council.

In consideration of the literary traditions of English scholarship, the scheme is of the nature of a compromise, and in most cases considerable latitude of usage is to be allowed.

(1) All Greek proper names should be transliterated into the Latin alphabet according to the practice of educated Romans of the Augustan age. Thus ξ should be represented by κ, the vowels and diphthongs υ, αι, οι, ωι by γ, οι, οι, and αι respectively, final -ος and -οι by -us and -um, and -pos by -er.

But in the case of the diphthong ξι, it is felt that ιι is more suitable than ει or ιε, although in names like Λιονίδος, Αλεξάνδρια, where they are consecrated by usage, ει or ιε should be preserved; also words ending in -εως must be represented by -enum.

A certain amount of discretion must be allowed in using the ο terminations, especially where the Latin usage itself varies or prefers the ο form, as Delos. Similarly Latin usage should be followed as far as possible in -ε and -о terminations, e.g., Πρίας, Σάμος. In some of the more obscure names ending in -ος, as Αέας, -ερ should be avoided, as likely to lead to confusion. The Greek form -ος is to be preferred to -ε for names like Πον, Ηερεο, except in a name so common as Απόλλω, where it would be pedantic.

Names which have acquired a definite English form, such as Corinth, Athens, should of course not be otherwise represented. It is hardly necessary to point out that forms like Ηερεος, Μερευερ, Μινερεα, should not be used for Ηερεος, Ήερεος, and Αθηνα.
(2) Although names of the gods should be transliterated in the same way as other proper names, names of personifications and epithets such as Nike, Homoeia, Hypoikithos, should fall under § 4.

(3) In no case should accents, especially the circumflex, be written over vowels to show quantity.

(4) In the case of Greek words other than proper names, used as names of personifications or technical terms, the Greek form should be transliterated letter for letter, k being used for k, oh for χ, but γ and η being substituted for ν and ου, which are misleading in English, e.g., Nike, apoxyomenos, diadumenos, phyton.

This rule should not be rigidly enforced in the case of Greek words in common English use, such as degis, symposium. It is also necessary to preserve the use of ou for ου in a certain number of words in which it has become almost universal, such as boule, gerasia.

(5) The Acting Editorial Committee are authorised to correct all MSS. and proofs in accordance with this scheme, except in the case of a special protest from a contributor. All contributors, therefore, who object on principle to the system approved by the Council, are requested to inform the Editors of the fact when forwarding contributions to the Journal.

In addition to the above system of transliteration, contributors to the Journal of Hellenic Studies are requested, so far as possible, to adhere to the following conventions:

Quotations from Ancient and Modern Authorities.

Names of authors should not be underlined; titles of books, articles, periodicals or other collective publications should be underlined (for italics). If the title of an article is quoted as well as the publication in which it is contained, the latter should be bracketed. Thus:

Six, Jahrb. xviii. 1903, p. 34,
or—
Six, Protagoras (Jahrb. xviii. 1903), p. 34.

But as a rule the shorter form of citation is to be preferred.

The number of the edition, when necessary, should be indicated by a small figure above the line; e.g. Dittenh. Syll. 123.
Titles of Periodical and Collective Publications

The following abbreviations are suggested, as already in more or less general use. In other cases, no abbreviation which is not readily identified should be employed.

A. E.M. = Archäologisch-epigraphische Mittheilungen.
Ann. d. I. = Annali dell' Instituto.
Arch. Aus. = Archäologischer Anzeiger (Beiblatt zum Jahrbuch).
Baumeister = Baumeister, Denkmäler des klassischen Altertums.
Berl. Vase = Furtwängler, Beschreibung der Vasensammlung zu Berlin.
B.M.C. = British Museum Catalogue of Greek Coins.
B.M. Inscri. = Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum.
B.M. Vases = British Museum Catalogue of Vases, 1893, etc.
B.S.A. = Annual of the British School at Athens.
Bull. d. I. = Bullettino dell' Instituto.
Busolt = Busolt, Griechische Geschichte.
C.I.G. = Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum.
C.E.L. = Corpus Inscriptionum Latinaum.
C. Rev. = Classical Review.
Dar-Sagl = Darenberg-Saglio, Dictionnaire des Antiquités.
Dittenber. O.G.I. = Dittenberger, Orientalia Graecae Inscriptiones Sanctae.
Dittenber. Syll. = Dittenberger, Syllaoes Inscriptionum Graecarum.
G.D. = Collatio, Sammlung der Griechischen Dialekt-Inscriptions.
Gere. A.F. = Gerhard, Anserlesene Vasenbilder.
G.G.A. = Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen.
Head. H.N. = Head, Historia Numorum.
I.G. = Inscriptiones Graecae.
I.G. A. = Rohl, Inscriptiones Graecae antiquissimae.
Jahrbl. = Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts.
La Bas-Wadd. = La Bas-Waddington, Voyage Archéologique.
Michel = Michel, Recueil d'Inscriptions grecques.
Mon. d. I. = Monumenti dell' Instituto.

The attention of contributors is called to the fact that the titles of the volumes of the second issue of the Corpus of Greek Inscriptions, published by the Ptolemaic Academy, have now been changed, as follows:

I.G. 1. = Inscr. Athenae anae Euboeiae veteriores.
II. = asterius quae est liter. Eur. ann. et Augusti tempora.
III. = asterius Romanas.
IV. = Argolidae.
V. = Magaridae et Boeotiae.
IX. = Gracedae Septentrionalis.
XIV. = Italiae et Siciliae.
Transliteration of Inscriptions.

Square brackets to indicate additions, i.e., a lacuna filled by conjecture.

Curved brackets to indicate alterations, i.e., (1) the resolution of an abbreviation or symbol; (2) letters misrepresented by the engraver; (3) letters wrongly omitted by the engraver; (4) mistakes of the copyist.

Angular brackets to indicate omissions, i.e., to enclose superfluous letters appearing on the original.

Dots to represent an unfilled lacuna when the exact number of missing letters is known.

Dashes for the same purpose, when the number of missing letters is not known.

Uncertain letters should have dots under them.

Where the original has iota subscript, it should be reproduced in that form; otherwise it should be supplied as subscript.

The aspirate, if it appears in the original, should be represented by a special sign.*

Quotations from MSS. and Literary Texts.

The same conventions should be employed for this purpose as for inscriptions, with the following important exceptions:

Curved brackets to indicate only the resolution of an abbreviation or symbol.

Double square brackets to enclose superfluous letters appearing on the original.

Angular brackets to enclose letters supplying an omission in the original.

The Editors desire to impress upon contributors the necessity of clearly and accurately indicating accents and breathings, as the neglect of this precaution adds very considerably to the cost of production of the Journal.
LEYTHI IN THE ASHMOLEAN MUSEUM.
STATUE OF "SARDANAPALUS" IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM.
RECONSTRUCTION OF A VASE FROM FRAGMENTS FOUND IN THE TOMB AT VAPHIO.
Scale 1 : 6.
VASES WITH MARINE DESIGNS FROM PHYLAKOPI.
Scale 1:2.
VASE OF THE PALACE-STYLE FOUND IN A TOMB AT MYCENAE.
Scala 1 : 6.
STONE VESSELS FOUND IN A TOMB AT MYCENAE.

a-d, Steatite; e and f, Alabaster.