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RULES

OF THE

Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies.

1. The objects of this Society shall be as follows:—

1. To advance the study of Greek language, literature, and art, and to illustrate the history of the Greek race in the ancient, Byzantine and Neo-Hellenic periods, by the publication of memoirs and unedited documents or monuments in a Journal to be issued periodically.

II. To collect drawings, facsimiles, transcripts, plans, and photographs of Greek inscriptions, MSS., works of art, ancient sites and remains, and with this view to invite travellers to communicate to the Society notes or sketches of archaeological and topographical interest.

III. To organise means by which members of the Society may have increased facilities for visiting ancient sites and pursuing archaeological researches in countries which, at any time, have been the sites of Hellenic civilization.

2. The Society shall consist of a President, Vice-Presidents, a Council, a Treasurer, one or more Secretaries, and Ordinary Members. All officers of the Society shall be chosen from among its Members, and shall be ex officio members of the Council.

3. The President shall preside at all General, Ordinary, or Special Meetings of the Society, and of the Council or of any Committee at which he is present. In case of the absence of the President, one of the Vice-Presidents shall preside in his stead, and in the absence of the Vice-Presidents the Treasurer. In the absence of the Treasurer the Council or Committee shall appoint one of their Members to preside.

4. The funds and other property of the Society shall be administered and applied by the Council in such manner as they shall consider most conducive to the objects of the Society: in the Council shall also be vested the control of all publications issued by the Society, and the general management of all its affairs and concerns. The number of the Council shall not exceed fifty.
5. The Treasurer shall receive, on account of the Society, all subscriptions, donations, or other moneys accruing to the funds thereof, and shall make all payments ordered by the Council. All cheques shall be signed by the Treasurer and countersigned by the Secretary.

6. In the absence of the Treasurer the Council may direct that cheques may be signed by two members of Council and countersigned by the Secretary.

7. The Council shall meet as often as they may deem necessary for the despatch of business.

8. Due notice of every such Meeting shall be sent to each Member of the Council, by a summons signed by the Secretary.

9. Three Members of the Council, provided not more than one of the three present be a permanent officer of the Society, shall be a quorum.

10. All questions before the Council shall be determined by a majority of votes. The Chairman to have a casting vote.


12. The Secretary shall give notice in writing to each Member of the Council of the ordinary days of meeting of the Council, and shall have authority to summon a Special and Extraordinary Meeting of the Council on a requisition signed by at least four Members of the Council.

13. Two Auditors, not being Members of the Council, shall be elected by the Society in each year.

14. A General Meeting of the Society shall be held in London in June of each year, when the Reports of the Council and of the Auditors shall be read, the Council, Officers, and Auditors for the ensuing year elected, and any other business recommended by the Council discussed and determined. Meetings of the Society for the reading of papers may be held at such times as the Council may fix, due notice being given to Members.

15. The President, Vice-Presidents, Treasurer, Secretaries, and Council shall be elected by the Members of the Society at the Annual Meeting.

16. The President shall be elected by the Members of the Society at the Annual Meeting for a period of five years, and shall not be immediately eligible for re-election.

17. The Vice-Presidents shall be elected by the Members of the Society at the Annual Meeting for a period of one year, after which they shall be eligible for re-election.
18. One-third of the Council shall retire every year, but the Members so retiring shall be eligible for re-election at the Annual Meeting.

19. The Treasurer and Secretaries shall hold their offices during the pleasure of the Council.

20. The elections of the Officers, Council, and Auditors, at the Annual Meeting, shall be by a majority of the votes of those present. The Chairman of the Meeting shall have a casting vote. The mode in which the vote shall be taken shall be determined by the President and Council.

21. Every Member of the Society shall be summoned to the Annual Meeting by notice issued at least one month before it is held.

22. All motions made at the Annual Meeting shall be in writing and shall be signed by the mover and second. No motion shall be submitted, unless notice of it has been given to the Secretary at least three weeks before the Annual Meeting.

23. Upon any vacancy in the Presidency occurring between the Annual Elections, one of the Vice-Presidents shall be elected by the Council to officiate as President until the next Annual Meeting.

24. All vacancies among the other Officers of the Society occurring between the same dates shall in like manner be provisionally filled up by the Council until the next Annual Meeting.

25. The names of all candidates wishing to become Members of the Society shall be submitted to a Meeting of the Council, and at their next Meeting the Council shall proceed to the election of candidates so proposed: no such election to be valid unless the candidate receives the votes of the majority of those present.

26. The Annual Subscription of Members shall be one guinea, payable and due on the 1st of January each year; this annual subscription may be compounded for by a single payment of £15 15s., entitling compounders to be Members of the Society for life, without further payment. All Members elected on or after January 1, 1905, shall pay on election an entrance fee of two guineas.

27. The payment of the Annual Subscription, or of the Life Composition, entitles each Member to receive a copy of the ordinary publications of the Society.

28. When any Member of the Society shall be six months in arrear of his Annual Subscription, the Secretary or Treasurer shall remind him of the arrears due, and in case of non-payment thereof within six months after date of such notice, such defaulting Member shall cease to be a Member of the Society, unless the Council make an order to the contrary.
29. Members intending to leave the Society must send a formal notice of resignation to the Secretary on or before January 1; otherwise they will be held liable for the subscription for the current year.

30. If at any time there may appear cause for the expulsion of a Member of the Society, a Special Meeting of the Council shall be held to consider the case, and if at such Meeting at least two-thirds of the Members present shall concur in a resolution for the expulsion of such Member of the Society, the President shall submit the same for confirmation at a General Meeting of the Society specially summoned for this purpose, and if the decision of the Council be confirmed by a majority at the General Meeting, notice shall be given to that effect to the Member in question, who shall thereupon cease to be a Member of the Society.

31. The Council shall have power to nominate British or Foreign Honorary Members. The number of British Honorary Members shall not exceed ten.

32. The Council may, at their discretion, elect for a period not exceeding five years Student-Associates, who shall be admitted to certain privileges of the Society.

33. The names of Candidates wishing to become Student-Associates shall be submitted to the Council in the manner prescribed for the Election of Members. Every Candidate shall also satisfy the Council by means of a certificate from his teacher, who must be a person occupying a recognised position in an educational body and be a Member of the Society, that he is a bona fide Student in subjects germane to the purposes of the Society.

34. The Annual Subscription of a Student-Associate shall be one guinea, payable and due on the 1st of January in each year. In case of non-payment the procedure prescribed for the case of a defaulting Ordinary Member shall be followed.

35. Student-Associates shall receive the Society's ordinary publications, and shall be entitled to attend the General and Ordinary Meetings, and to read in the Library. They shall not be entitled to borrow books from the Library, or to make use of the Loan Collection of Lantern Slides, or to vote at the Society's Meetings.

36. A Student-Associate may at any time pay the Member's entrance fee of two guineas, and shall forthwith become an Ordinary Member.

37. Ladies shall be eligible as Ordinary Members or Student-Associates of the Society, and when elected shall be entitled to the same privileges as other Ordinary Members or Student-Associates.

38. No change shall be made in the Rules of the Society unless at least a fortnight before the Annual Meeting specific notice be given to every Member of the Society of the changes proposed.
RULES FOR THE USE OF THE LIBRARY
AT 22, ALBEMARLE STREET.

I. That the Library be administered by the Library Committee, which shall be composed of not less than four members, two of whom shall form a quorum.

II. That the custody and arrangement of the Library be in the hands of the Hon. Librarian and Librarian, subject to the control of the Committee, and in accordance with Regulations drawn up by the said Committee and approved by the Council.

III. That all books, periodicals, plans, photographs, &c., be received by the Hon. Librarian, Librarian or Secretary and reported to the Council at their next meeting.

IV. That every book or periodical sent to the Society be at once stamped with the Society's name.

V. That all the Society's books be entered in a Catalogue to be kept by the Librarian, and that in this Catalogue such books, &c., as are not to be lent out be specified.

VI. That, except on Christmas Day, Good Friday, and on Bank Holidays, the Library be accessible to Members on all week days from eleven A.M. to six P.M. (Saturdays, 11 A.M. to 2 P.M.), when either the Librarian, or in his absence some responsible person, shall be in attendance. Until further notice, however, the Library shall be closed for the vacation from July 20 to August 31 (inclusive).

VII. That the Society's books (with exceptions hereinafter to be specified) be lent to Members under the following conditions:

1. That the number of volumes lent at any one time to each Member shall not exceed three.

2. That the time during which such book or books may be kept shall not exceed one month.

3. That no books be sent beyond the limits of the United Kingdom.

VIII. That the manner in which books are lent shall be as follows:

1. That all requests for the loan of books be addressed to the Librarian.

2. That the Librarian shall record all such requests, and lend out the books in the order of application.

3. That in each case the name of the book and of the borrower be inscribed, with the date, in a special register to be kept by the Librarian.

4. That a book not be returned within the period specified, the Librarian may reclaim it.
(5) All expenses of carriage to and fro shall be borne by the borrower.
(6) All books are due for return to the Library before the summer vacation.

IX. That no book falling under the following categories be lent out under any circumstances:

1. Unbound books.
2. Detached plates, plans, photographs, and the like.
3. Books considered too valuable for transmission.
4. New books within one month of their coming into the Library.

X. That new books may be borrowed for one week only, if they have been more than one month and less than three months in the Library.

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.

XII. That the following be the Rules defining the position and privileges of Subscribing Libraries:

a. Subscribing Libraries are entitled to receive the publications of the Society on the same conditions as Members.
b. Subscribing Libraries, or the Librarians, are permitted to purchase photographs, lantern slides, etc., on the same conditions as Members.
c. Subscribing Libraries and the Librarians are not permitted to hire lantern slides.
d. A Librarian, if he so desires, may receive notices of meetings and may attend meetings, but is not entitled to vote on questions of private business.
e. A Librarian is permitted to read in the Society’s Library.
f. A Librarian is not permitted to borrow books, either for his own use, or for the use of a reader in the Library to which he is attached.

---

The Library Committee.

Mr. F. H. Marshall (Hon. Librarian).
Mr. J. G. C. Anderson.
Prof. W. C. F. Anderson.
Mr. Talfourd Ely, D.Lit.
Prof. Ernest A. Gardnee.
Mr. F. G. Kenyon, D.Lit.
Mr. George Macmillan, D.Litt.
Mr. A. H. Smith.
Mrs. S. Arthur Strong, LL.D., Lit.D.

Applications for books and letters relating to the Photographic Collections, and Lantern Slides, should be addressed to the Librarian (Mr. J. H. Baker-Penoyre), at 22, Albemarle Street, W.
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PROCEEDINGS.

SESSION 1907-8.

General Meetings of the Society were held on November 12th, February 18th, March 11th, and May 5th. Of these a full account appears in the Report submitted at the Annual Meeting.

The Annual Meeting was held on June 23rd, the President (Professor Percy Gardner) taking the chair. The Hon. Secretary (Mr. George A. Macmillan) presented the following

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COUNCIL.

Changes in the Officers and Council of the Society.—The Council has recently nominated two of its members for addition to the list of its Vice-Presidents, Prof. W. Ridgeway and Mr. D. G. Hogarth. Prof. Ridgeway's name has long been honoured in the sphere of prehistoric archaeology, and to his inspiration many students of archaeology and especially many members of our archaeological schools are much indebted. Mr. Hogarth has recently brought to a close, for a time, his important excavations on behalf of the British Museum on the site of ancient Ephesus, and he and the Trustees are to be congratulated on the speedy production of the fine volumes embodying his results. The too frequent delay in the production of important matter of this kind is perhaps one of the most serious drawbacks to archaeological study.

A vacant place in the list of the Society's honorary members has been offered to M. Salomon Reinach. Apart from M. Reinach's gifts of criticism and exposition it is probably not too much to say that there is no living writer on archaeology who has not benefited by his encyclopaedic knowledge and the use he has made of it in the compilation of his Répertoire, and the Society at large will feel that the name of its new honorary member adds lustre to its roll.

The Council have recently accepted the resignation of Mr. Arthur Hamilton Smith as Hon. Librarian of the Society. The Library has had the benefit of his skilled care and foresight for more than twelve years. The general plan and arrangement of the Library, the catalogue, the collection of forty volumes of pamphlets formerly belonging to the late Johann Overbeck, and now incorporated in the Society's Library, are some of many instances of Mr. Arthur Smith's successful labours to
enhance its value. The Council have the gratification to announce that a member of their body, Mr. F. H. Marshall, of the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities in the British Museum, has accepted the office vacated by Mr. Smith.

For the year 1907 the Council granted the Secretary and Librarian (Mr. Penoyre) leave of absence, during which time his duties were performed by Miss K. Raleigh, a member of the Society, to whose zeal and care the Council have recently expressed their indebtedness. Mr. Penoyre's leave was occupied in getting a closer acquaintance with the work of the British Schools in Athens and Rome, of which he is also Secretary, and in a prolonged stay in the Island of Thasos. For his investigations there the Council made a special grant and his results will appear in a subsequent number of the _Journal_. Incidentally the Society's collection of negatives and photographs has received considerable additions as part of the result of his sojourn in Greek lands.

Work of other Bodies.—Attention is drawn in the closing paragraph of this Report to the grants made by the Society to the Cretan Exploration Fund and the British Schools at Athens and Rome. Members of the Society will be glad to have news of the progress of the work of these bodies.

Dr. Evann's labours at Cnosus have again borne the fruit we are beginning to expect as a right from that marvellous site in his skilled hands. The following finds are reported, some of the results of a season's work in the vicinity of the Palace. In the large house to the west, now explored to its further limit, a magnificent steatite vase, shaped like a bull's head, with cut shell inlay about the nostrils; and eyeballs of painted crystal. To the north a hoard of bronze implements and utensils, interspersed with early vases which will serve to date the bronzes, and including a large and perfect tripod cauldron. To the south, under the Palace _debris_, a lower range of buildings, and below a staircase some silver bowls and a jug; also fine vases, one with papyrus ornament in relief. Work is also proceeding in the royal apartments east of the Palace.

The Council desire to congratulate the Director of the British School at Athens and his colleagues on the success which has marked the conduct of the difficult and important excavations at Sparta. News of the discovery at the Artemision of a temple dating back to the eighth century has recently come to hand. 'This early shrine,' writes the correspondent of the _Times_, 'which was constructed to contain a primitive wooden image of the goddess, was roofed with painted tiles and built with unbaked bricks set in a framework of wooden beams, all resting on a foundation of undressed stones and slabs. The stonework of the foundation is alone preserved, but it was found covered with _débris_ and bricks. In a side wall are sockets at regular intervals for the beams of the framework, and corresponding to them, in lines across the floor, are stone supports or bases for wooden pillars supporting the roof. The structure being partially concealed by the adja-
cent temple, its exact dimensions cannot be ascertained. It was divided lengthwise by a row or rows of wooden columns. It is symmetrically placed with the great eighth century altar discovered last year, from which it is separated by a paved area of cobblestones, apparently co-extensive with the earliest temenos, or sacred enclosure. Here an enormous number of votive offerings have been found. It is to be noted that the rich series of votive offerings, especially of ivories, which have been a special feature of the excavations on this site, go back to the same early period. The addition made by these finds to our knowledge of the so-called dark ages of early Greece is very considerable.

The British School at Rome is to be congratulated on the progress made in its magnum opus, the Catalogue of the Capitoline Museum. No more important work for the history of classical art could have been undertaken than the making of a definitive record of the items in Roman museums. From the very opulence of her artistic treasures, and the immense claims of the interest of the Middle Ages and of the Renaissance, Rome, the very core of the later classical world, has in some measure lacked the care in the enumeration of works of classical art which has been long enjoyed by less world-famous cities and museums. Dr. Amelung's volumes on the Vatican sculptures have made a beginning of the highest standard. The Roman School volume of the Capitoline Museum is within measurable distance of publication, and a strong hope is entertained that this will be followed in due course by similar volumes dealing with the other Municipal Museums in Rome. Apart from the catalogue, which is under the general editorship of Mr. H. Stuart Jones, the Director is forming plans for systematised research in the Western Aegean area, and important developments in the sphere of purely historical research in Italy are in contemplation.

The Council further desire to draw the attention of all members of the Society to the work about to be undertaken by a newly-formed body, the Byzantine Research and Publication Fund, working in association with the Committee of the British School at Athens. The following extract from their recently issued notice sets forth the end in view. "In the hope of increasing interest in this country, various well-wishers to Byzantine Archaeology have been approached with a view to the foundation of a Byzantine Research Fund. This Fund will be administered by an Executive Committee, which will include representatives of the British School at Athens and of the Hellenic Society. Its objects will be to survey Churches and other buildings and to produce drawings, plans and photographs of these buildings and of the mosaics, frescoes or sculptures which they contain; also to carry out excavations to determine the ground plans and other features of ruined buildings. The Committee will thus primarily endeavour to secure fresh records of Byzantine remains. It will, however, also devote a portion of the Fund to the publication of materials already collected and prepared." Since it is stated in the first rule of the Hellenic Society that the advancement of the study of the Byzantine
General Meetings.—On November 12th, Prof. Ronald M. Burrows gave an account of his excavations at Mycalessus in Boeotia. Mr. Burrows shewed extremely interesting illustrations of vases and other remains found in tombs, many of them of remarkable colouring. None were of later date than the Sixth Century B.C., and they harmonised exactly with the topographical data which fixed the site as the ancient Mycalessus.

At the same meeting Dr. B. P. Grenfell read a brief account of some Greek papyri found in Egypt. These included some of the writings of a historian whom Dr. Grenfell identified with the historian Theopompus of the Fourth Century B.C. The work gave an account of the constitution of Boeotia and of that portion of the Peloponnesian war which Thucydides did not live to narrate. The wealth of information, the impartiality, the historical insight of the writer entitled him to a very high place among Greek historians, not so high perhaps as Thucydides, but higher than Xenophon. It was impossible, however, to give much praise to his style, which is colourless and verbose, rather like that of Polybius. Another important discovery was a fragment of the lost Hyppsipyle of Euripides. There were also discovered portions of the Greek original of the Acts of Peter and of an unknown portion of the Acts of John.

At the Second General Meeting held on February 18th Mr. Cecil Smith shewed illustrations of two newly identified fragments of the Parthenon sculptures, one the back of the head of the Athena of the W. pediment, the other the head of a Lapith from one of the finest of the Metopes. It has long been the ambition of those in authority at the British Museum to make that institution’s sculptures, or copies of sculptures, from the Parthenon as complete as possible, for the benefit particularly of students. By the courtesy of the Greek Government that desire has now been all but satisfied, the Hellenic authorities having caused casts to be made of what the Museum needs. Some have still to be received, and when they arrive the institution will, for the first time, possess a collection which should satisfy any student, however exacting. [See pp. 46-48 of this volume.]

At the same meeting Mr. Louis Dyer read a paper on the stadium at Olympia in which he maintained that at Olympia there was no stadium in the final and complete shape worthy of the name till Macedonian times. When Xenophon in 364 B.C. spoke of the theatron there he was not using the word in the current sense of theatre, for at no time did there exist at Olympia a stone structure with semi-circular tiers of seats. Previous to 450 B.C. Olympic athletic contests, processions and sacrifices were viewed from a long terrace, and in that year a quadrilateral dromos, or running field, was added, with adjacent fields for spectators. The word theatron
was applied to these things in the vaguer and possibly local sense of a 'spectatorium.' When Prof. Frazer maintained that there was a theatre or stadium at Olympia he took no account of Xenophon's account of the battle there in 364 B.C., while Dr. Dorpfeld, who took a similar view of the word *theatron* in Xenophon's text, practically suggested that the writer was momentarily bereft of commonsense and his accustomed gift of the consistent and straightforward use of language. [See pp. 250-273 of this volume.]

Mr. Norman Gardiner next read a short paper in which he pointed out that the early connexion of the games with the altar was confirmed by various traditions. The concentration of all the interest, athletic and religious, around the altar before 430 B.C. explained (1) the crowding together of the treasuries on the terrace overlooking the altar; (2) the building of the tiers of steps below the treasuries, partly as a retaining wall, partly as a stand for spectators; (3) the extension of this stand by the building of the colonnade at right angles to it. The designation of these arrangements as a 'theatron' was justified by the close connexion of games and ceremonies with the altar. Similar provision for the spectators of religious rites was found at Eleusis, Oropus, and Sparta. Finally, the boundary wall of the altar offered no objection to this view. This wall was an arbitrary boundary which did not correspond either with the ancient boundary of the sacred grove, or with the natural boundaries of the sacred *tomeas*. The earliest portion of it was the eastern wall, which could not be earlier than the colonnade.

On March 11th, at the Third General Meeting, Miss Gertrude Lowthian Bell read an illustrated paper on 'The Early Christian Architecture of the Karadagh.' In pursuance of the idea that we should seek in Anatolia not the story of the conquest of barbarism by Hellas, but the interpenetration of Hellenic and Oriental civilizations in which the East proved the more abiding factor, Miss Bell sketched what she termed the indigenous Christian architecture of the Karadagh mountains. The remains, hitherto unknown, are enhanced by their good preservation and magnificent, if sombre, natural surroundings. Differences of constructional method and of type appear in regions close together. Such differences, as Mr. Phéné Spiers pointed out in the subsequent discussion, arise more naturally where the builder is left to find his own way to overcome difficulties on the spot, than when, as now, before the first sod is cut, the whole building is elaborately set out on paper by the architect. The main types of the Karadagh, as illustrated from Binbirkilisse, Sarigül, Hayyat Kilıara, and Siviri Hisar (the last-named church is in good preservation), were the basilica, the 'barn church,' and the cruciform in its various developments. The T-shaped cruciform church was in all probability a survival in plan of such Eastern rock-tombs as that at Palmyra, an exhaustive account of which forms the first section of Dr. Strzygowski's *Orient oder Rom*. The use of
burnt as opposed to adobe brick, the peculiar thickness of the mortar, and certain peculiarities in the treatment of the niche were probably Asian characteristics. In the discussion which followed, Mr. G. F. Hill, in expressing regret on the part of Sir William Ramsay at his inability to be present, read a letter from him emphasizing the exclusively ecclesiastical character of the remains in the Karadagh. "I could only," he wrote, "from my point of view as historian, urge that the Byzantine Church was the Soul of the Byzantine Empire, and the bond that held the Empire together.... I have often emphasized this in regard to modern facts, but I never fully realized its overpowering significance in Byzantine history till I saw it expressed in stone in the Thousand and One Churches. The only Byzantine art is the art of the churches in which this unity was built up in walls, and emblazoned in painted plaster and in mosaic. But how dignified and how eternal in their aspect are those churches, the creation of one remote fifth-rate country town!" Messrs. Phène Spiers, O. M. Dalton, G. Lethaby, H. Stannus, and Mrs. Cozens-Hardy also took part in the discussion.

On May 5th the last General Meeting of the Session was held, when Prof. Ernest Gardner read an illustrated paper on the "Trentham Statue" the life-sized figure of a Greek lady recently acquired by the British Museum from the Duke of Sutherland's collection. Professor Gardner's article will be found in the current volume of the Journal (pp. 138-147).

At the meeting Mr. Cecil Smith, who was in the chair, after emphasizing the debt the Museum and the country owed the Duke of Sutherland and Prof. Gardner for the help they had given towards the acquisition of the statue, argued for a later date of the statue than that just suggested. He thought it should be attributed to the close rather than the opening years of the fourth century, and that it came midway between the school which considered form at the expense of drapery, and that which spent its energies on drapery at the expense of form. He suggested that some at least of the qualities of simplicity of design and execution noticed in the head by Prof. Gardner might have been the work of the copyist, if, as he was inclined to think, the head was a copy dating perhaps from the Roman age. He saw no reason why, with a good, if partially ruined model to work from, a Roman copyist might not have achieved this admirable piece of work. The Anticythera statues were proof of the excellence to which Graeco-Roman copyists attained.

At the same meeting Mr. J. F. Baker-Penoyre showed slides of a relief of the fifth century B.C. which had recently been discovered in Thasos, and would, he hoped, be added in the near future to the Imperial Museum in Constantinople. The subject depicted was the often-repeated heroic banquet scene; but the period at which it was executed, the grace of the composition, and the excellence of its preservation made the relief one of the most attractive of its class yet discovered.
The Library.—So long ago as 1904 the Council, in presenting their Annual Report, emphasized the difficulty of maintaining the Society's library in an effective and easily accessible condition on account of the smallness of the premises. The acquisition of a smaller room as an office and packing room has made a sensible difference in the comfort of readers during the intervening years, but the Librarian now reports that it has been necessary to let the Library proper overflow into the annexe, and that the time is not far distant when that too will be completely filled. So long as a reasonable amount of ordered arrangement can be maintained, it is felt that the Society would be well advised to retain its present premises, which have certain advantages of position and have been its headquarters for 27 years; but the Council feel compelled to recognize that there is a limit when practical efficiency would be impaired by further overcrowding, and to bring to the notice of the Society at large that a change of quarters, involving the expense of moving and possibly of a higher annual rent, cannot now be long delayed.

The Council acknowledge with thanks gifts of books from the following bodies:—The Trustees of the British Museum; the University Press of the following Universities: California, Cambridge, Lille, Manchester, and Oxford; the Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek of Copenhagen; and the Imprimerie Nationale de Paris.

The following publishers have presented copies of recently published works:—Messrs. Baedeker, Batsford, Clark, Constable, Duckworth, Frowde, Gabalda, Leroux, Macmillan, Murray, Picard, Teubner, Unwin, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.


Miscellaneous donations of books have also been received from Prof. W. C. F. Anderson, Rev. H. Browne, Mr. T. Ely, Mr. F. W. Hasluck, Miss C. A. Hutton, Prof. R. Phéné Spiers, and the Librarian.

Among the more important acquisitions are the following:—Bernoulli (J. J.), Griechische Ikonographie, 2 vols.; Boeckh (A.), Die Staatsverwaltung der Athen, 3rd Edition, edited by M. Fraenkel, 2 vols.; British Museum, Department of Coins and Medals, Catalogue of the Imperial Byzantine Coins in the British Museum, by W. Wroth, 2 vols.; Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities, Excavations at Ephesos, by D. G. Hogarth and others, Text and Atlas; Cumont (F.), Textes et monuments figurés relatifs aux mystères de Mithra, 2 vols.; Holm (A.), Geschichte Siciliens in Alterthum, 3 vols.; Lermann (A.), Altgriechische Plastik; Meyer (E.), Geschichte des Alterthums; Winter (F.), Die Typen der figürlichen Terrakotten, 2 vols.
During the past year 300 visits have been paid by members to the Library as against 372 for 1905-6 and 277 for 1906-7. Besides those volumes consulted in the Library, 760 books have been borrowed, the figures for the preceding years being 396 (1906-7) and 415 (1905-6). 107 books (139 vols.) and 41 pamphlets have been added to the Library exclusive of the large number of periodicals obtained by purchase or exchange. The exchange list now reaches the large figure of 43, as against 38 in 1906-7. The additions comprise the following:—Bulletin de l'Institut archéologique Russe de Constantinople, Classical Philology, Glotta, Memnon, and the Memorie dell' Istituto di Bologna. The magnificent Catalogue général des Antiquités Égyptiennes du Musée du Caire, which has for long been one of the most generous exchanges accorded the Society, has now been bound in separate parts, each containing one class of antiquities, and is kept in alphabetical order on this principle.

Photographic Department.—The following table shows the work done in some branches of this important department of the Society’s work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Slides added to Collection</th>
<th>Slides burned</th>
<th>Slides sold to Members</th>
<th>Photos sold to Members</th>
<th>Profit available for extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1903-4</td>
<td>(Original Catalogue of 1,300 slides published.)</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>£1 11 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904-5</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>3,053</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>5 0 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905-6</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>2,941</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>13 7 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906-7</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>3 1 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907-8</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1,442</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>3 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above figures show the use that has been made of the collection of negatives stored at the Society’s photographers, with a corresponding set of reference photographs, similarly numbered, kept in subject order in an easily accessible form in the Library. The arrangement of this collection has been developed on the lines laid down by Prof. John Linton Myres so long ago as 1903, when he was honorary keeper of the photographic collections, and its successful working owes much to his skilled initiative. It is also
apparent that the Collection has paid for its upkeep and extension, and made an average annual profit of about £6 for the last five years.

In accordance with the policy of adding to the advantages of membership rather than of making a financial profit from the working of this department, it has been determined to add to the collections a section (also contemplated by Prof. Myres in his original scheme) of larger reference photographs of which the Society possesses no negatives. The chief difficulties of forming this section have been the initial cost and the difficulty of storage in limited premises in a really accessible manner. Both these difficulties have now been overcome, the former by the profits that have accrued during the past five years, the latter by a new system of mounting and storing. Two sections on Pompeian wall paintings and mosaics are already in working order, and others are rapidly being formed. The end in view is a complete series of good photographs of an adequate size for purposes of reference and study in an easily accessible form.

Up till this time the Librarian has been obliged to ask for negatives rather than for photographs with a view to building up the collection of negatives and lantern-slides. With the formation of the new collection of larger reference photographs, many donations that have not yet had the attention they deserve will be on view, and the opportunity arises of asking the generous support of members interested in this department of the Society's work for donations of miscellaneous photographs, preferably about 10 by 8 inches in size, which they may have accumulated in books or other form on their travels, and may be disposed of at the disposal of other members for reference. Under special circumstances the Society may be willing to purchase batches of photographs if our learned travellers will kindly bear the objects of this new collection in mind.

Much valued help has already been received from Mr. F. W. Hasluck and others in this way.

For gifts of negatives and other help kindly given to the photographic department during the past year, the Council desires to tender thanks to Miss Abrahams, Mr. H. Awdry, Mr. J. Baker-Peonyre, the Committee of the British School at Athens, Prof. R. C. Bosanquet, Mr. A. Brown, Rev. H. Browne, Prof. R. Burrows, Rev. W. Compton, Mr. R. O. de Gex, Mr. Norman Gardiner, Prof. Ernest Gardner, Sir William Geary, Mr. F. W. Hasluck, Mr. R. P. Jones, Dr. Keser, Miss D. Lowe, Mr. R. F. Martin, Miss K. Raleigh, Mr. H. Raven, Miss M. L. S. Smith, and Mr. J. Youall.

Finance.—An examination of the Financial Statement shows that the income for the year has exceeded that of last year by £36. The increase, it is noted, occurs mainly from the receipts for Entrance Fees and the Subscriptions from Libraries, the receipts from members’ subscriptions being about the same as for last year. The demands, however, on the Treasurer have been considerably greater than last year, and the outlay during the past session exceeded that of last year by nearly £180, with the result that the year’s expenditure proved to be more than the income by £32. Thus,
instead of an additional surplus balance being shown in the Balance Sheet, the amount now stands at £251 as against £283 at the corresponding period of last year.

Apart from some increase under the headings of Sundry Printing and Postage the difference has been in the Grants and in the amount spent on the Journal. A second Grant of £100 has been made to the British School at Athens towards the excavations in Laconia, while the reopening of the work in Crete by Dr. Arthur Evans has been recognised by a Grant of a similar amount. With regard to the increased outlay on the Journal the Council have felt that it is of the greatest importance that this branch of its work should be maintained on the level of the highest standard, and to secure this additional expenditure was unavoidable. The account shows that during the year £90 more has been spent on the production of the Journal, but against this has to be set the generous donation of £30 by Sir Frederick Cook towards the cost of the illustrations to the article recently issued on the collection at Doughty House, Richmond. It is satisfactory to note that the receipts for sales have been well maintained, the amount being £10 in excess of last year.

With regard to the other publications of the Society it will be seen that one copy of the Facsimile of the Codex Venetus of Aristophanes and eighteen copies of the volume on the Excavations at Phylakopi have been sold.

The Balance Sheet shows the Debts Payable by the Society on May 31 to be £437 as against £293 last year, an increase of £144, which is, however, set off on the other side by an available cash balance of £759, which is £146 more than at the same period of last year. Further donations to the Endowment Fund received during the year amount to £23. The amount outstanding for arrears of subscriptions due to the Society on May 31 is £140.

The total number of members on the roll is 939, exclusive of 37 honorary members, 10 student associates, and 182 subscribing libraries. On the same date last year the numbers were 918 ordinary members, 38 honorary members, 3 student associates, and 184 libraries. The Council report with satisfaction this sensible increase in the number of ordinary members and student associates during a year when losses by death and other causes have been exceptionally heavy.

The Council feel that on the whole the financial position of the Society may be regarded as satisfactory. During the year the special attention of members has been directed to the valuable help they may render by securing new members for the Society. The revenues at the disposal of the Council are very largely dependent on members' subscriptions, and as it is inevitable that from time to time the roll of members must suffer heavily by reason of deaths and other causes, the Council feel the great value of the support which every member may give by introducing others to the Society. The past year has been a notably heavy one in the losses the list of members has sustained, but in spite of this the Council are
able to report an increase in numbers. With the prospect of increasing claims on the funds for the effective prosecution of the work of the Society, the Council confidently rely on the active support of every member in this direction.

The Chairman then delivered his Annual Address. After detailing the internal progress of the Society, Professor Gardner drew attention to the formation in the last months of a Byzantine Research and Publication Fund, closely connected with the British School of Athens. From the first the Hellenic Society had insisted on the importance of the mediaeval history and monuments of Greece; and many articles in regard to them had appeared in the Society's *Journal*. That a fresh committee, including many members of the Society, had undertaken specially to organize work in this part of the field was a matter for nothing but satisfaction. Every year the Universities of Europe were paying more attention to the period of history which hitherto even the Greeks had neglected; and in which till recently the monumental work of Gibbon stood almost like an aqueduct in the Roman Campagna. An organization to carry further such work as that of Messrs. Schultz and Barnsley on the mediaeval churches of the East appeared at the right moment; while the recent publication of a great work on Byzantine coins by Mr. Wroth, of the British Museum, had brought method and order into another important branch of Byzantine remains.

Another direction in which more than one member of the Society had been working with success was the fuller cataloguing of the works of ancient art in private possession in England. The basis has been laid in Professor Michaelis's *great catalogue*; lately the collections at Woburn Abbey and Lansdowne House had been catalogued by Mr. Arthur Smith; Professor Furtwängler had called attention to the treasures of Chatsworth, and in the new volume of the *Journal* Mrs. Strong had catalogued the collection of Sir Frederick Cook. As the sources of supply of such monuments in the East began to wane, those already in the country increased in importance. They were becoming, although private property, a valuable possession of the nation. Since the exhibition at the Burlington Fine Arts Club, many of them were well known to students; but any means of still further utilizing their value for the good of lovers of art should be earnestly sought out.

Professor Gardner then enumerated the loss the Society and the learned world at large had sustained by the death of the following: Sir John Evans, Dr. James Adam, Dr. W. G. Rutherford, Professor Furtwängler, Dr. Walter Headlam, and Professor A. Kirchhoff. Among the excavations in progress the English excavations at Cnossus and at Sparta were perhaps the most interesting. The French School had been at work at Delos, the Germans at Leucas, Pergamon, and Miletus, the Austrians at Ephesus. Illustrations were then shown of a few works of sculpture, which have either been recently found or more openly exhibited and more fully discussed. The series of early male figures, formerly called Apollos, and certainly in some cases representing Apollo
had multiplied in late years into large groups, almost into regiments. Additions had been made to it in quite recent times by the discovery, at Sunium, of two colossal nude male figures of archaic type fairly complete. The better preserved of the two had now taken its place in the museum at Athens, and as it is eleven feet high, it overpeers all its rivals.

Further examination of the wall of Themistocles at Athens had had interesting results. Thucydides, as was well known, said that when that wall was built in haste, just after the retreat of Xerxes, the people worked in a body and built into it any material that came to hand, not even sparing buildings, public and private. The well-known fragment of an archaic tombstone, bearing the head of a discobolus, has been supposed to come out of this wall. The more recent and careful investigations of Dr. Noack had brought to light in the foundations several archaic monuments of the same age as the discobolus, monuments no doubt broken down by the Persian soldiers, and lying in ruins near the course of the wall. Among these was a tombstone, on which stood in relief the figure of a warrior holding a spear. Though the surface had suffered much injury, the profile was clearly to be traced; and in the case of one leg and the hand which held the spear, one could see all the delicacy of the careful conscientious sculptor which gave the promise fulfilled in later Athenian art. The winged figure underneath the deceased hero was like the Gorgons of early vases: traces of the pattern of the chiton which she wore might still be seen. To give her a name was not easy; but it would be safe to attribute to the figure some power of averting the evil eye, and protecting the tomb, though against the barbarian soldiery the protection was unavailing. The profile of the hero was closely like that of the discobolus already mentioned, only that the nose was less remarkable and characteristic.

Another figure from the same place was that of a sphinx, with long formal curls and large flat eyes. The remains of painting could be clearly traced on its body. This figure also doubtless decorated a tomb.

A few works from the Terme Museum, which have attracted much attention in the course of the year, were next considered. Among these was a new example of the Discobolus of Myron, or at least a large fragment of one, which added somewhat to our knowledge. Its shattered state might at first repel us; but every student of ancient art had to learn to look not at what was missing in a torso, but at what was supplied. In this case the position of the left arm was for the first time shown; and it would be seen that it differed from the ordinary restoration. Also the muscles of the chest were well preserved. It was not really Myronic, but like the anatomy of the example in the British Museum, considerably softened and refined, and the transition from one plane to another, which in the Vatican and Lancelotti copies is harsh, was here more skillfully managed.

A figure of one of the daughters of Niobe had been found on the same site at Rome, which had already produced two very interesting statues of the same marble and the same style which adorn the Ny Carlsberg gallery, and which several years ago were identified by Professor Furtwängler as belong-
ing to a group, probably a pedimental group, which represented the destruction of Niobe and her children by Apollo and Artemis. The great group at Florence representing the slaying of the Niobidæ had long been, so to speak, one of the wonders of the world. The newly acquired statues show that the same theme had been treated by earlier sculptors, probably of the middle of the fifth century B.C. One of them represents a son, lying prone and rigid, perhaps in the corner of the pediment. A second was regarded by Furtwängler as Niobe herself, in flight, holding her garment in both hands; but the figure was scarcely that of a matron, and more probably represented one of the daughters. The new addition to the group consists of a daughter fallen on her knee, wounded in the back by an arrow. It was not only the subject which aroused interest: the statues were from the point of view of art fascinating, combining delicacy in detail with something of the freshness of early art. If they were contemporary with the pediments of the Parthenon they showed how wide differences in that great age separated one Greek school from another, and raised the question whether there were not at the time in Greece other schools than those of Athens and Argos, almost as remarkable as they.

Few statues which have survived from antiquity have captivated the fancy of the lovers of ancient art so much as the girl from Antium, found a few years ago on the shore of the sea, acquired by Prince Chigi, and now purchased at a great price for the Terme Museum. It is a work of the early Hellenistic age: a girl, her hair tied in a knot above her forehead, and her chiton slipping from her beautiful shoulder, concentrates all her thought and attention upon a tray which she bears in her hands. This tray bears a curious burden, a scroll of manuscript, a wreath, and what seems to be the remains of a lion's foot. Dr. Altman had maintained that she was a priestess of Apollo, perhaps of the Apollo worshipped at Patara in Lycia. Herodotus tells us that in that city the temple of Apollo occasionally but not regularly gave oracles, and that when it did so, the priestess passed the night before her utterance alone in the temple. If this identification were correct, the scroll and the wreath would belong to this sacred function. The portraiture of the Hellenistic age, hitherto far too much neglected, was in many ways almost the finest art the world has seen. This statue, with its delicacy of treatment and the grace of its drapery, was a worthy addition to it.

Another graceful work of the same age, recently found at Rome, represented a subject already familiar to us in terracotta, but new in sculpture. A girl, as a penalty in a game of forfeits, had to bear on her back a successful competitor. Both the girls are unfortunately headless, but otherwise the group is fairly complete, though put together out of numberless fragments. It was found in the Piazza Dante, the site of the Horti Lamiani. It was of Greek marble, two-thirds of the size of life. While not a work of the highest art, it is remarkably fresh and pleasing, the vigour of the nude shoulders and arms contrasting with the pleasing softness of the drapery.

The most interesting of the sculptural discoveries of the year was the restoration by Mr. Guy Dickins of the great group by the sculptor
Damophon of Messene. In last year's *Annual of the School of Athens* Mr. Dickins proved most methodically that Damophon was a sculptor of the second century B.C., and that his works belonged to the brief St. Martin's Summer of Greek art which occupied the time between the victories of Flamininus and the disastrous ravages of Mummius. Proceeding with his investigation, Mr. Dickins set to work on the fragments of Damophon's group, some of them at Athens, and some still at Lycosura. It is in many ways a surprise to us, a group with obvious faults, yet retaining something of the Phidian age, especially in the case of the seated Mother and Daughter, who remind us of the Demeter and Persephone of the East Pediment of the Parthenon. Mr. Dickins's reconstruction had brought a great advance in the knowledge of the art of later Greece which it causes. We had now a fixed point of the greatest importance, marking the end of the artistic history of Greece Proper. After this sculpture remained active in Asia and at Rome, but in Greece it ceased, save for a little outburst in the age of Hadrian.

Professor Gardner concluded by moving the adoption of the Report, which was seconded by Professor T. G. Tucker, of Melbourne University (a recently elected member of the Society) and carried unanimously.

Mr. D. G. Hogarth then made an illustrated communication in which he discussed the bearing of his remarkable find of early Ionian antiquities, which he attributed mostly to the eighth century, on the site of the Artemision at Ephesus, on the difficult problem of the origin of Ionian civilization. At Miletus, in Cyprus, in Attica, in the Troad, and now at Ephesus had been found objects closely analogous and representing the end of the Aegean period, and to the Aegean civilization must be assigned a dominant share in the making of the art of Ionia. This element had, apparently, entered Asia Minor in company with an influence from the centre of Europe. Before this movement from the West to the East, Ionia had been dominated by the successive empires of Cappadocia, Lydia, and Phrygia; but during the later centuries of this eastern domination the influence from the Aegean was strong upon the seaboard. The influence of Mesopotamia was also distinctly to be traced in the Ephesian finds, which seemed to have little in common with the art of Egypt or Phoenicia.

The following motion was then submitted to the meeting and carried unanimously:—

That Mr. D. G. Hogarth and Prof. W. Ridgeway be elected Vice-Presidents of the Society;

That Mr. Talfourd Ely, Lady Evans, Mr. Ernest Myers, Rev. G. C. Richards, Mr. E. E. Sykes, Mr. M. N. Tod and Mr. H. B. Walters, retiring and being eligible for re-election, be re-elected on the Council;

That Mr. A. B. Cook, Mr. A. M. Daniel, Miss C. A. Hutton and Mr. E. D. A. Morshead be elected on the Council.

The proceedings terminated with a vote of thanks moved by Mr. Macmillan and seconded by Mr. A. H. Smith to the Society's auditors, Mr. A. J. Butler and Sir Frederick Pollock.
A comparison with the receipts and expenditure of the last ten years is furnished by the following tables:

**ANALYSIS OF RECEIPTS FOR THE YEARS ENDING:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
<th>31 May 1905</th>
<th>31 May 1906</th>
<th>31 May 1907</th>
<th>31 May 1908</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions, Current</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Compositions</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance Fees</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividends</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Exavations at Phylokopi,&quot; sales</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Facsimile Codex Venus,&quot; sales</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lantern Slides Account</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>813</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>1,202</td>
<td>1,399</td>
<td>1,414</td>
<td>1,529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Receipt less expenses.

**ANALYSIS OF EXPENDITURE FOR THE YEARS ENDING:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>
<th>31 May 1905</th>
<th>31 May 1906</th>
<th>31 May 1907</th>
<th>31 May 1908</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>88</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Catalogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry Printing, Postage, Stationery, etc.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and Postage, History of Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and Postage, Proceedings at Anniversary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lantern Slides Account</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Journal (less sales)</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Journal, Reprint of Vol. XXIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Facsimile of the Codex Venus of Aristophanes&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Excavations at Phylokopi&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission and Postage per Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation of Stocks of Publications</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>960</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1,433</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>1,292</td>
<td>1,749</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Expenses less sales.
### **JOURNAL OF HELLENIC STUDIES** ACCOUNT. From June 1, 1907, to May 31, 1908

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>De.</th>
<th>Cr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>To Printing and Paper. Vol. XXVII, Part II, and XXVIII, Part I.</strong></td>
<td>306 6 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plates</td>
<td>50 12 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing and Engraving</td>
<td>104 7 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing and Sundry Contributors</td>
<td>08 11 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packing, Addressing, and Carriage to Members</td>
<td>54 9 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry</td>
<td>3 8 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>393 14 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance to Income and Expenditure Account</strong></td>
<td>£393 14 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### **EXCAVATIONS AT PHYLAKOPTI** ACCOUNT. From June 1, 1907, to May 31, 1908

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column showing Financial Result from Date of Publication to May 31, 1908</th>
<th>Account for Current Year.</th>
<th>Column showing Financial Result from Date of Publication to May 31, 1908</th>
<th>Account for Current Year.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deficit Balance brought forward (excluding value of Stock)</strong></td>
<td>£195 4 1</td>
<td><strong>By Sale of 18 Copies during year</strong></td>
<td>£17 17 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance on Current Year Income and Expenditure Account</strong></td>
<td>£17 17 8</td>
<td><strong>Deficit Balance from Publication at May 31, 1908 (excluding value of Stock)</strong></td>
<td>£17 17 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>£195 4 1</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>£17 17 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**FACSIMILE OF THE CODEX VENETUS OF ARISTOPHANES** ACCOUNT. From June 1, 1907, to May 31, 1908.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column showing Financial Result from Date of Publication to May 31, 1908</th>
<th>Account for Current Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>To Deficit Balance brought forward (excluding Value of Stock)</strong></td>
<td>£ 108 10 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Half Share of Amount, for Copies sold by Hellenic Society, due to the American Archæological Institute</strong></td>
<td>£ 13 6 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance on current year to Income and Expenditure Account</strong></td>
<td>£ 115 8 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LANTERN SLIDES AND PHOTOGRAPHS ACCOUNT.** From June 1, 1907, to May 31, 1908.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column showing Financial Result from Date of Publication to May 31, 1908</th>
<th>Account for Current Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>To Slides and Photographs for Sale</strong></td>
<td>£ 38 8 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Slides for Hire</strong></td>
<td>£ 11 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Photographs for Reference Collection</strong></td>
<td>£ 11 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance to Income and Expenditure Account</strong></td>
<td>£ 38 8 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LIBRARY ACCOUNT.** From June 1, 1907, to May 31, 1908.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column showing Financial Result from Date of Publication to May 31, 1908</th>
<th>Account for Current Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>To Purchases</strong></td>
<td>£ 89 9 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Binding</strong></td>
<td>£ 11 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplement to Catalogue</strong></td>
<td>£ 11 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance to Income and Expenditure Account</strong></td>
<td>£ 89 9 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Income and Expenditure Account
From June 1, 1907, to May 31, 1908.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>½d.</th>
<th>¼d.</th>
<th>¼d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Rent</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian and Secretary</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Treasurer</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Boy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Expenses</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationery</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry Printing, Notes, List of Members</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British School at Athens</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; for Laosia</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; Rome</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cretan Exploration Fund</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Pennye (Theseus Exploration)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance from Literary Account</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance from &quot;Journal of Hellenic Studies&quot; Account</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation of Stocks</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>£148</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>½d.</th>
<th>¼d.</th>
<th>¼d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Members' Subscriptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion brought forward from last year</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received during current year—Arrears</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; 1907</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; 1908</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total By Members' Subscriptions</strong></td>
<td><strong>£152</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less ¼ of 1908 subscriptions forward to next year</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Members' Entrance Fees</strong></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Associates' Subscriptions</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Libraries Subscriptions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion brought forward from last year</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received during current year—1907</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; 1908</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Libraries Subscriptions</strong></td>
<td><strong>282</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less ¼ of 1908 subscriptions forward to next year</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life Compositions brought into Revenue Account</strong></td>
<td>188</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interest on Deposit Account</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dividends on Investments</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contributed towards Rent by British School at Athens and British School at Rome for use of Society's room</strong></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance from &quot;Excavations at Phylakopi&quot; Account</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; Facsimile Codex Venetus&quot; Account</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; Lantern Slides and Photographs Account</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance</strong></td>
<td><strong>£1243</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Income** | **£1491** | 3 | 8 | 5 |
### BALANCE SHEET: MAY 31, 1908.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liabilities</th>
<th>Assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>To Debts Payable</strong></td>
<td><strong>By Cash in Hand—Bank</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£137 7 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subscriptions current forward</strong></td>
<td><strong>on Deposit</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£600 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Endowment Fund</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assistant Treasurer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(includes legacy of £200 from the late Canon Adam Farrar)</td>
<td>18 7 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pitty Cash</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 16 7 ¼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life Compositions and Donations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total at June 1, 1907</td>
<td>759 11 10 ¾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received during year, 2 at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>£15 15 15</strong></td>
<td>149 9 3½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>£15 15 15</strong></td>
<td><strong>Investments (Life Compositions)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>180 3 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Life Member deceased</td>
<td><strong>(Endowment Fund)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 15 15</td>
<td>500 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excess of Assets over Liabilities at June 1, 1907</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283 17 6</td>
<td>1763 3 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Deficit Balance from Income and Expenditure Ac.</td>
<td><strong>Valuations of Stocks of Publications</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 12 0</td>
<td>595 2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Library</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>350 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**£3018 7 1**

Examinad and found correct.°

(Signed) FREDERICK FOLLOCK, Auditor.

° In the absence of Mr. A. J. Butler, who is abroad, the accounts have been audited by the Frederick Follock above.
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Aggelopoulos (E.L.) Προ Περακε και των λυκευν ατοι. 8vo. Athens. 1898.
Ahmed (Bey Kamal). Livre des perles enfouies et du mystère précieux. See Cairo, Supplementary publications of the Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte.
Allen (T. W.) Editor. See Homer, Odyssey.

Arnim (H. von) Editor. See Berlin Royal Museums, Berliner Klassikertexte.

History of the later Roman Commonwealth. 2 vols. Svo. 1845.


Baraize (E.) Plan des Nécropoles Thébaines. See Cairo, Supplementary publications of the Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte.

Barsanti (A.) Catalogue des Monuments et Inscriptions de l'Égypte Antique. See Cairo, Supplementary publications of the Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte.


V. Griechische Dichterfragmente.
   (1) Epische und elegische Fragmente.
   (2) Lyrische und dramatische Fragmente.

Bernoulli (J. J.)  Greekische Iconographie. 2 vols. 4to. Munich. 1901.


Biliotti (E.) and Cottret (A.)  'H ἐφορές Ὀρέσσ. 2 vols (in one). 8vo. [Rhodes] 1881.


Bouriant (U.)  Catalogue des Monuments et Inscriptions de l’Égypte Antique. See Cairo, Supplementary publications of the Service des Antiquités de l’Égypte.

British Museum.

   Department of Antiquities.


   Department of Coins and Medals.


   Bryant (J.)  A dissertation concerning the war of Troy. 4to. 1793.


   4to. and Fol. Sophia. In progress.


   Bury (J. B.)  Editor. See Gibbon (E.) Roman Empire.
Butcher (S. H.). See Classical Association of Ireland.

Buzantios (D. K.). Βασιλευκία ἡ Ἑκάττα κτάτας διαφορά τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσας. Κοινωνία εἰς πέντε προβάσεις. 8vo. Athens. [N.D.]


Cairo. Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes.
Bijoux et orfévreries. I. By E. Vernier. 4to. Cairo.

Cairo. Supplementary Publications of the Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte.
Excavations at Saqqara (1905–6). By J. E. Quibell. 4to. Cairo. 1907.
Fragments d'un Manuscrit de Méandre. Edited by G. Lefebre. 4to. Cairo. 1907.
Recueil des inscriptions grecques-chrétiennes. By G. Lefebre. 4to. Cairo. 1907.

Calderini (A.). La manomissione e la condizione dei libri in Grecia. 8vo. Milan. 1908.


Chandler (R. L.). The history of Ilium or Troy. 4to. 1892.

Chapot (V.). La colonne torse et le décor en hémice dans l'art antique. 8vo. Paris. 1907.

Charts, Catalogue of Admiralty. 8vo. 1907.

Chase (G. H.). Editor. See Loeb Collection.


Chrestobasiles (Ch.). Ἀρχαῖα Ἡπαμαθία. 8vo. Athens. 1906.

Classical Association of Ireland. Presidential address (by S. H. Butcher), with rules and list of members.

Classical Philology. 8vo. From I (1906). In progress.


Cole (W.) Select views of the remains of ancient monuments in Greece.


Cottret (A.) See Biliotti (E.) 'H σάρος τῶν Πάπων.


Curtis (C. D.) Translator. See Payne (E.) Ancient Italy.

Dallwitz (A.) Translator. See Le Chevalier (J. B.) Description of the Plain of Troy.

Dapper (D'O.) Description exacte des îles de l'Archipel.


Delbrück (H.) Geschichte der Kriegskunst. I, II (2), III.

Della Croce (J. C.) Παραπλήθες ἐνθώπων Μητρώθεως. Ed. M. I. Salibero.

Dobson (W. H.) British Cyprus.

Dobbs (A. E.) Philosophy and popular morals in Ancient Greece.


Egypt Exploration Fund Memoirs:

IV. Tanis II. See Petrie.

V. Goshen. See Naville.

VIII. Abusir. See Naville.

X. Festival Hall of Osorkon II. See Naville.
Emerson (J.)  Letters from the Aegean.  Svo. 1829.


Ewart (J. C.)  On skulls of horses from the Roman fort at Newstead, near Melrose.  [Royal Soc. of Edinbr. Trans. XLV.]
4to. Edinburgh, 1907.

Fellows (C.)  Travels and researches in Asia Minor, more particularly in Lycia.  Svo. 1852.


Finlay (G.)  History of Greece from its conquest by the Crusaders to its conquest by the Turks, and of the Empire of Trebizond (1204-1461).  Svo. Edinburgh and London. 1851.

Fontrier (A. M.)  Ετικον των εραλδίων Μικρής Μακεδονίας.  Svo. Athens. 1907.

Fothergill (J.)  Translator. See Loewy (E.)  The rendering of nature in early Greek art.

Fraenkel (M.)  Editor. See Boeckh (A.)  Die Stammesgeschichte der Athener.


Gell (W.)  Itinerary of the Muses.  Svo. 1827.

Itinerary of Greece.  Svo. 1827.


Gerspach.  La Mosquée.  Svo. Paris.  [N. D.]


Gladstone (W. E.)  Homer's chronology.  Svo. 1876.

Juventus mundi.  Svo. 1870.


Gomme (G. L.)  Index of Archaeological Papers, 1665-1890.  Svo. 1907.

Goodspeed (E. J.)  Tebtunis Papyri.  See Grenfell (B. P.).

Griffith (F. de) See Petrie (W. M. Flinders) Taunis.
Griffiths (J.) Travels in Europe, Asia Minor, and Arabia.
4to. 1805.

4to. Paris. 1907.

Hauvette (A.) Les Épigraphies de Callimaque.

Head (B. V.) Excavations at Ephesus. See British Museum.

8vo. Colorado. 1906.


Henderson (A. E.) Excavations at Ephesus. See British Museum.
Henderson (B. W.) Civil war and rebellion in the Roman Empire, A.D. 69-70.
8vo. 1908.

Hergt (G.) Die Nordlandsfahrt des Pythias.
8vo. Halle. 1893.

8vo. 1895.

8vo. 1908.

8vo. 1908.

Hewitt (J. F.) Primitive traditional history. 2 vols.
8vo. 1907.

Hill (G. F.) Adonis, Baal, and Astarte. [Church Quarterly Review, No. 131.]
8vo. 1908.


Die Makedonen, ihre Sprache und ihr Volkstum.
8vo. Göttingen. 1906.

Hogarth (D. G.) Excavations at Ephesus. See British Museum.
Holm (A.) Geschichte Siciliens im Alterthum. 3 vols.
8vo. Leipzig. 1870-1898.

Holmes (T. R.) Ancient Britain and the invasions of Julius Caesar.

Homer. Homerica. See Agar (T. L.)
8vo. 1906-2.

8vo. 1908.

Hughes (T. S.) Travels in Sicily, Greece, and Albania. 2 vols
4to. 1820.

Hunt (A. S.) T.E. Britannia Papyri. See Grenfell (B.P.)
Ilium of Troy, the history of. See Chandler (R.)


Jacoby (F.) See Marmor Parium.


Kalbfleisch (K.) *Editor.* See Berlin Royal Museums, Berliner Klassiker texte.


Kandeleros (T. Ch.) *Τερακός τῆς Γερμανίας,* 8vo. Patras. 1899.


Kerasopoulos (A. D.) *'Οθύρος τῶν Δελφῶν.* 8vo. Athens. 1908.


Labore (B. de) *Journey through Arabia Petraea.* 8vo. 1838.


Launspach (C. W. L.) State and family in early Rome. 8vo. 1908.

Leaf (W.) *Editor.* See Homer, the Iliad.

Le Chevalier (J. B.) *Description of the Plain of Troy.* Translated by A. Dalal. 4to. Edinburgh. 1791.

Lefebre (G.) *Fragment d'un manuscrit du Ménéandre. See Cairo, Supplementary publications of the Service des Antiquités de l'Egypte.* Recueil des inscriptions grecques-chrétiennes. See *Id.*


Legrand (E.) *Editor.* See Buondelmonti (C.) *Description des îles de l'Archipel.*
Leopold (I. H.) Editor. See Aurelius (M.), Imperator.
Lermann (W.) Altgriechische Phantik. 4to. Munich. 1907.
Loewy (E.) The rendering of nature in early Greek art. Translated by T. Fothergill. Svo. 1907.
Macmillan's Guides. Guide to Greece, the Archipelago, Constanti- nople, the coasts of Asia Minor, Crete, and Cyprus. Svo. 1908.
Mahaffy (J. P.) Rambles and studies in Greece. 5th edition. Svo. 1907.
Marden (P. S.) Greece and the Aegean Islands. Svo. 1907.
Γεωγραφία πολιτική και άρχαία τού νομού Άργολίδος και Καρδασίας. Svo. Athens. 1886.
Γεωγραφία πολιτική και άρχαία τού νομού Καβάλαντας. Svo. Athens. 1890.
Menander. See Robert (C.) Der neue Menander.

Meyer (E.) Geschichte des Althethums. 1 (I), III.-V.


Milliet (J. P.) La dynamis et les trois âmes, essai sur la psychologie neo-aristotelienne.
Svo. 1908.


Morgan (J. de) Catalogue des Monuments et Inscriptions de l'Egypte Antique. See Cairo, supplementary publications of the Service des Antiquités de l'Egypte.


Mueller (Ch.) Journey through Greece and the Ionian Islands.
Svo. 1822.

Murray (A. S.) See Petrie (W. M. Flinders) Tanis.


Svo. 1907.

Myres (J. L.) A contribution to the topography of N.W. Greece. See Church (C. M.).


Naville (E.) The festival-hall of Osorkon II. in the great temple of Bubastis. [Egypt Exploration Fund. 10th Memoir.]
4to. 1892.

—— Goshen and the shrine of Saft el Henen. [Egypt Exploration Fund. 5th Memoir.]
4to. 1887.

—— Bubastis. [Egypt Exploration Fund. 8th Memoir.]
4to. 1891.

I. The prehistoric Art of Greece in the Museum.
II. The Diskos-thrower. [Bull. Metrop. Mus. iii. 2.]

Newton (C. T.) and R. P. Pullan. A history of the discoveries at Halicarnassus, Cnidus, and Branchidae. 3 vols.
Svo. and Fol. 1861-3.

Nicolaides (I.) Editor. See Ηπαπέθανη.

Nicole (G.) Mediations et le style fleuri dans la céramique attique.
4to. Geneva. 1908.

Nilsson (M. P.) Studia de Dionysias Atticis.
Svo. Linden; 1900.

Norwood (G.) The riddle of the Bacchae.
Svo. Manchester. 1908.
Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek. Billedtavler til Kataloget over Antike Kunstværker. 4to. Copenhagen. 1907.


Τά ασίδοντα 36 ρία παραμíθεα τόν λαόν. Ed. M. Saliheros. 8vo. Athens. [N.D.]


Perry (W. C.) Sicily in fable, history, art, and song. 8vo. 1908.


I. Apologia, Crito, Phædo, Symposium.
II. Gorgias, Protagoras.
III. Politia.
IV. Phædrus, Menexenus, Lysias, Hippias Utterque, Io.
V. Laches, Charmides, Alecibiades, Cratylus.
VI. Euthydemos, Meno, Euthyphro [and Theages, Erastas, Hipparchus].
VII. Timæus, Critias.
VIII. Theaetetus, Sophista.
IX. Politicus, Menou, Philebus.
X. Loges, Epimonia.


Pullan (R.) See Newton (C. T.) Halicarnassus, Cnidus, and Branchidae.
Quibell (J. E.) Excavaluarts at Saqqara (1905-6). See Cairo, Supplementary publications of the Service des Antiquités de l’Égypte.


Rankin (E. M.) The rôle of the μουσικοί in the life of the ancient Greeks. 8vo. Chicago. 1907.


Reich (E.) Atlas Antiquæ. General history of Western nations. 2 vols. 8vo. 1908.


Ross (W. D.) Editor. See Aristotle.

Rustafjaell (R. de) Palaeolithic vessels of Egypt. 8vo. 1907.


Sakellarides (I. Th.) Editor. See Ἀσμάτα Ἰουλιανοῦ.

Saliberos (M. L.) Editor. See Alexander, Ἀσμάτα τοῦ Κλέοτρου, Della Croce, Ναυτικὴ Χώρας Παραμένοντι. Sindbad.

Sandars (H.) Pre-Roman bronze votive offerings from Despinaferros, Spain. [Archaeologia.] 4to. 1906.


Schliemann (E.) Οἰκωνομῖκος. 8vo. Athens. 1883.

Schoene (H.) Editor. See Berlin Royal Museums, Berliner Klassikertexte.

Schubart (W.) Editor. See Berlin Royal Museums, Berliner Klassikertexte.

Seller (A.) The Antiquities of Palmyra. 8vo. 1705.

Seymour (T. D.) See White (J. W.) Memorial address on Thomas Day Seymour.

Shoobridge (L.) See Waldstein (C.) Herculaneum.

Sieber (F. W.) Travels in the Island of Crete in the year 1817. 8vo. 1823.
Smith (A. H.) Excavations at Ephesus. See British Museum.
Smith (C. H.) Excavations at Ephesus. See British Museum.
A Greek Statue from Trentham. [Burlington Magazine, 1908.]
4to. 1908.
Smith (J. A.) Editor. See Aristotle.
Editor. See Valliamy (L.) Examples of classic ornament.
Staiss (V.) Marbes et bronzes du Musée National. See Athens, National Museum.
Stalbaum (G.) Editor. See Plato.
Stewart (B.) My experiences of the island of Cyprus. 8vo. 1906.
Strzygowski (J.) Kleinasien, ein Neuland der Kunstgeschichte. 8vo. Leipzig. 1903.
Swan (C.) Journal of a voyage principally among the islands of the Archipelago and in Asia Minor. 2 vols. 8vo. 1826.
Tennent (J. E.) History of modern Greece from its conquest by the Romans, n.c. 146, to the present time. 2 vols. 8vo. 1845.
Troump (E.) Quelques vieilles églises Byzantines de la Grèce moderne. 8vo. Marseille. 1896.
Tsountas (C.) Αἱ πρώτα ψεύδεις δερματικά Δομίνιον καὶ Σάθλου. 4to. Athens. 1903.
Vernier (E.) Bijoux et orfèvreries. See Cairo, Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes.
Verrall (A. W.) Editor. See Aeschylus.
Waldstein (C.) and L. Shoobridge. Herculanum: past, present, and future. 8vo. 1908.
White (J. W.) Thomas Day Seymour: Memorial address. 8vo. Yale. 1908.
White (J. W.) Empolic Metre in Greek Comedy. 8vo. Chicago. 1907.


Wood (M. H.) Plato's Psychology in its bearing on the development of the will. 8vo. Oxford. 1907.


COLLECTION OF NEGATIVES, PHOTOGRAPHS, AND LANTERN SLIDES.

FOURTH LIST OF ACCESSIONS TO THE CATALOGUE OF SLIDES
PUBLISHED IN VOL. XXIV. OF THE JOURNAL OF HELLENIC STUDIES.
(Subsequent accessions have been published annually.)

Members desiring information respecting this department of the Society's work are requested to apply to the Librarian, Hellenic Society, 22 Albemarle Street, W.

Copies of this Accession List may be had, price 3d.

NOTE.—The following list includes many slides of which inadequate particulars were given in the last list published.

TOPOGRAPHY, ARCHITECTURE AND EXCAVATIONS.

ASIA MINOR.

7942 Map of Asia Minor and adjoining eastern districts.
6227 Assos, remains of a Roman bridge over the...
6261 Assos (Tchavlychisaar), Roman bridge.
6282 " " " the Rhynadiacu.
1400 Cnidus, plan (Newton, Halicarnassus, etc., pl. 50).
1401 " means of Demeter, plan and section (id., pl. 53).
1402 " lion in situ (id., pl. 61. x.)
6233 Cysicus district, hill of St. Simon, near Artaki.
7548 Didyma, temple of Apollo, fallen block of the entablature.
1397 Halicarnassus, plan (Newton, Halicarnassus, etc., pl. 1).
1398 " plan of Budrum Castle (id., pl. 52.)
1399 " view of Budrum Castle (id., pl. 53.)
7646 " Budrum, general view from the sea.
2998 Magnesia ad Sipylum, imperial mosque.
6234 Marmara, corbelled gateway in Hellenic town above village.
3598 Nicomedia (Ismid), view in town.
2938 Philadelphia (Aiascoir), distant view of town from N. wall.
6254 Phocaea, the larger harbour.
2933 " loading salt in the lesser harbour.
6256 " houses on the peninsula.
Turkey in Europe.

4 Constantinople, plan. (Van Millingen, Byzanatine Constantinople, p. 19.)

Syria.

1062 Palmyra, triumphal arch showing keystone in danger. (Cf. Wood, Palmyra, pl. 26.)
1014 the greater stoa looking S.E. (Cf. id., pl. 35.)
1024 temple of the Sun, outer peristyle. (Cf. id., pl. 21.)
1020 smaller peristyle. (Cf. id., pl. 21.)
1031 tomb of tower type.

Crete.

1494 Cnossus, pillar showing double axe marks.

Aegean Islands.

7650 Cos, the Asklepieion, general view.
7651 the agora below the Asklepieion.
7662 another view.
7658 Rhodes, Lindus, the fortress from the harbour.
7660 view from.
7659 sixteenth-century house in the town.
7580 Thassos, Aliki and neighbourhood, map of.
2170 Byzantine capitals formed into stairway.
2188 marble quarries, ancient moorings for marble boats.
2489 Demir Chalhaks, marble quarries from the sea.
2548 Boulgaros, scene at Panagia.
2549 Kakarachi, the ancients the church.
2508 Limenas, city wall, rock-cut steps.
2117 apotropaion from wall of Parmenon.
2418 Parmenon inscription.
2119 masons' marks on wall of Parmenon.
2422 S.E. angle gateway from outside.
2570 plan of the Acropolis.
2420 Acropolis, S.W. angle.
2431 Hellenic sub-structure of N.W. tower.
2442 subterranean passage at W. end.
2149 temple basis, N.W. angle.
2452 entrance to ancient mines.
2578 shrine of Pan, plan and section.
2454 general view.
2455 caves of Pan.
2542 Mattath, view of village from W.
2457 Panagia, lower spring.
2437 Theologos, castle of Kremphokastro.
7544 Them, landing place.
6555 face of cliff, showing caves.
7557 coast view.
NORTHERN AND CENTRAL GREECE.

7018 Outline map of Greece and the Acropolis (Marais, Greece, frontispiece).
7020 Delphi, the site after excavation (Delphi, Albion, pl. 8).
7022 the theatre from S. angle, showing diasoura and retaining wall.
6162 view E. up the gorge towards Arachova.
6177 Cirrhean plain from Delphi.
6372 treasury of the Cnidians, as reconstructed in Louvre.
4288 Tempe, view of the valley.

Byzantine and Later.

2400 Cavalla, the great aqueduct.
2400 Meteora, general view.
2422 monastery of Hagia Triada.
7679 Salonika. Demetria, N. aisle.
2387 arcading of N. aisle.
2368 W. end from S. aisle.
2369 capital, 'windblown acanthus' type.
7677 capital, 'acanthus impost' type.
7678 memorial in N. aisle.
7676 inscription on the memorial in N. aisle.
7682 Sophia, exterior from W.
7681 the apse.
7686 mosaic of the apse.
6592 mosaic of the dome showing the entire scheme.
6529 "..."..."..."..."..."..."
6529 mosaics of the dome in four consecutive segments.
6585 mosaics of the dome central central figure.
6585 mosaic segment (Title slide No. 7634).
6585 mosaic and 'windblown acanthus' capitals.
7680 Turkish pulpit.

* From drawings sent by the Byzantine Research and Publication Fund. The rest are from the originals.

Island Sites.

6234 Euboea, Eniphus, view of the strait and bridge from the mainland.
6236 view of the strait from the mainland.
6150 view of the strait.
7255 Lefkada, the Venetian walls.
6228 the lighthouse.
4569 Ithaca, bay of Doria.

ATHENS.

7615 Acropolis, plan of, before the Persian war (Harrison, Primitive Athens, p. 12).
7610 (Jahn-Michaelis, Arch athenaeum, p. 7).
7643 Propylaea, from interior of Acropolis.
3612 Parthenon, W. door from interior.
6688 Olympos, base of fallen pillar.
ATTICA.

7644 Aegina, Temple, the S.E. angle.
2337 Oropus, the Amphitheatre, theatre and procession.
2338 ** ** ** chair in theatre.
2339 ** ** ** details of seats in aisles.
2341 ** ** ** semi-circular seats round altar.
4014 Rhinomus, stylobate of the temple of Nemesis.

PELOPONNESUS.

6178 Corinth, the American excavations, the entrance to the fourth century fountain.
6179 Olympia, Leoniacon: formerly reconstructed in the museum.
1885 Phigaleia (Bassae), Temple of Apollo, interior.

NOTE.—It has been found convenient to enumerate here all the slides (both topographical and those representing Museum objects) connected with the excavations of the British School at Athens and Sparta.

Maps.

6827 Map showing the whole extant of the walls.
6828 Map of the right bank of the Eurotas from the Arretemium to the modern bridge.

General Views.

4497 View looking towards Taygetos.
1067 ** ** ** **
1967 ** ** ** **

The Arretemium.

6806 Plan from the Expedition Scientifique with the sixth century temple added. (B.S.A. xii, p. 309).
6808 Plan of the excavation in 1906. (B.S.A. xii, pl. 8.)
6804 The cellar of the slide (6802) slightly altered.
6891 Section along trench A. (B.S.A. xii, pl. 8.)
6828 Plan of the excavation in 1907. (B.S.A. xiii, pl. 2.)
6829 Sections of the excavations, 1907. (B.S.A. xiii, pl. 3.)
6828 Part of the section of the excavations, 1907, on a larger scale. (B.S.A. xiii, pl. 3.)
6828 Plan showing the results of the excavations of 1908.
6834 Section showing the results of the excavations in 1908.
6891 General view from high ground on S. 1906.
6811 Bank of Eurotas before excavation.
6812 Workmen digging out ivories from early stratum.
2322 The area in process of excavation.
2327 ** ** **
2329 The temple, S.E. angle.
2322 ** ** ** stylkate.
6924 Bases of piers of outer colonnade of amphitheatre.
6989 Greek houses found under the Roman amphitheatre.
6700 The primitive temple.
6912 ** ** **
6911 ** ** **

Other Sites.

6908 Stereobate of supposed temple near modern bridge.
6929 ** ** ** after excavation.
6928 Roman fortification wall, best preserved portion.
6702 ** ** ** showing marble built in.
Museum Objects:

- * = from original.
- H = from drawing.

- Limestone reliefs, mostly figures of warriors.
- 6378 " " " " horses.
- 6379 " " " figures of animals.
- 6380 " " " mostly heraldic animals.
- 6381 " " " miscellaneous.
- 6382 " " " with included drawings.
- 6383 " " " sphinx and torches.
- 6384 Terracotta figurines, miscellaneous.
- 6385 " " " mostly portions of female figures.
- 6386 " " " " (B.S.A., xii, pl. 10.)
- 6387 Cavalla, the great " " (B.S.A., xii, pl. 11.)
- 6388 " " " " (B.S.A., xii, pl. 12.)
- 6389 " " " " (B.S.A., xii, p. 326.)
- 6390 " " " miscellaneous, profile view.
- 6391 Terracotta mask.
- 6392 " " " ".
- 6393 Two terracotta masks.
- 6394 " " .
- 6395 " " .
- 6396 Terracotta mask, with combat scenes in relief.
- 6397 " " " (B.S.A., xii, pl. 9.
- 6398 Interiors of a Cyrenean kylix, a Borsades and monkey.
- 6399 Exterior of the same kylix, a " (slide No. 1593).
- 6400 Cyrenean kylix " interior, cock's head.
- 6401 " " " portions of a.
- 6402 " " " fragments.
- 6403 " " " fragments.
- 6404 " " " post-Cyrenean.
- 6405 " " " inscribed.
- 6406 Panathenaic amphora " from the Chalkiokeus.
- 6407 " " " (B.S.A., xii, pl. 5.
- 6408 " Ivory tablet, " hero between two monsters.
- 6409 " " " (B.S.A., xii, p. 326.
- 6410 " " " relief " of a warship. (B.S.A., xii, pl. 4.)
- 6411 " " " tablet, record and mourners. (Cl. Burlington Magna, Oct. 1908, p. 68, fig. 3."
- 6412 " " " couch, seated figure and votarics. (Cl. id., p. 71, fig. 13.)
- 6413 " " " tablet, " two female figures.
- 6414 " " " tablets, " two chariot scenes.
- 6415 " " " " " warrior.
- 6416 " " " " centaur.
- 6417 " " " " zoonom figures.
- 6418 " " " " probably of Xanian figures.
- 6419 " " " " couchant animals.
- 6420 " " " seated figures, pecked (I) and seals.
- 6421 " " " seals and impressions.
- 6422 " " " spectacle fibulae.
- 6423 " " " combs.
- 6424 " " " Irvories, miscellaneous.
- 6425 " " " Irvories, miscellaneous.
- 6426 " " " Irvories, miscellaneous.
- 6427 " " " Irvories, miscellaneous.
- 6428 " Bone flutes and mouthpieces, and unidentified objects."
Tyrins, restored section of hall (J.H.S. vii, p. 145, fig. 4).

Byzantine and Later.

Geraki, church of St. Nicolaos.
Ligeurgo, church of St. Nicolaos.
Loukon, courtyard of monastery.
Magona, bridge over stream of.
Males, the cape from the sea.
Mistra, the Anaktosum.
view from the church of the Pountouesa.
Armenitika monastery, exterior.
Evangeliastria monastery, exterior.
Peribleptos monastery, detail of ikonostasis.
view from the Castello southwards over Eucleia valley.
bridge over the stream at.
Modon (Mathones), view of the walls on the sea-shore.
showing the standing column.
Mounivasta, the rock from the sea.
the lower town.
the town gate.

ITALY.

Ancona, the harbour with arch of Hadrian.

SICILY.

Agrigentum, temple of Juno, distant view.
W. end.
E. end.
temple of Hercules.
Segesta, the theatre, the auditorium.
the dixoma.
Selinus, Temple A, capital in centre of ruins.
B., S.W. angle.
C., capital in centre of ruins.
part of entablature as recomposed on the N. side.
D., capital at N.W. angle.
drum at E. end, showing plaster.
E., capital at W. end.
F., capital at W. end.
G., capital at E. end.
capital in centre of ruins.
influted drums on N. side.
Selinus, Temple G, drums on which the fluting has been begun.
blocks cut away to lighten structure.
arches in trench N. of Acropolis.
Syrmus, quarries or Latomia.
Theomma, theatre, inner and outer diazoma from S.
outer diazoma cut through, showing earlier foundations.
piers of outer wall of outer diazoma.
inner side of inner diazoma.
auditorium, rock-cut seats.
lower edge.
stage-buildings, the various levels from S.W.
N.W. angle on lowest level.
passage at right angles to main axis.
inner and outer scenes.

PREHELLENIC ANTIQUITIES.

Crossos, Kamarae vases. *(J.H.S. xxiii, pl. 5.)*
Pulainistro pottery, a selection from slides 1462-7. *(Cf. J.H.S. xxiv, p. cix.)*
large jar with palmietc decorations.*
Canirus statuette. *B.M. (profile view.)*

SCULPTURE.

*=from original or from photographic reproduction of original.
+=from cast.
*=from drawing.

EARLY RELIEFS.

Bruns, relief a chariotcr. *(Cf. Arch. Anz. 1905, p. 55.)*
Delphi, Cnidian treasury, Kybele slab. *(Delphi, iv, pl. 13, 14.)*
Apollo and Artemis slab.
Hera and Athena slab.
Hephaistos and Ares slab.

Sphinx *dedicated by the Naxians at Delphi. *(Delphi, iv, pl. 6.)*

AEGINETAN SCULPTURES.

The pediments restored. *(Pirtw. Aegina, pl. 104, 5.)*
from a model taken from below. *(id., pl. 106.)*
The W. pediment, the figures araistos. *(id., pl. 98.)*
The E. pediment, the figures araistos. *(id., pl. 95.)*
three heads, profile and full fuse. *(id., pl. 97.)*
the acroterion restored. *(id., pl. 107.)*

MISCELLANEOUS FIFTH AND FOURTH CENTURY SCULPTURES.

Parthenon, W. pediment. Tors of Athens *with portion of head added.*
Metope, Centaur and Lapith *with cast of Lapith’s head.*
The statue in the Medici Villa. *(Cf. Trigg. Gardens designs in Italy, pl. 93.)*
BYZANTINE SARCOPHAGI
(with analogous works):

7923 Berlin fragment. Christ and saints. (Strzygowski, Orient oder Rom., pl. 2.)

7929 British Museum fragment. Seated poet and muse. (J.H.S., xxvii, p. 110, fig. 3.)

7930 Bruss sarcophagus. Female figure. (Nuovo Bull. de Arch. Crist., 1898, p. 78.)

7931 Cook sarcophagus. Fragment A. (J.H.S., xxvii, p. 109, fig. 39.

7932 " Figure B. (id., pl. 5.)

7933 " Figures C, D. (id., pl. 6, 7.)

7934 " Figures E, F. (id., pl. 8, 9.)

7935 " Figure G. (id., pl. 10.)

7936 " Figures H, J. (id., pl. 11, 12.)

7940 Selafikh sarcophagus. Constantinople.

7925 Sidamara sarcophagus, end view. (Mon. et Mem., ix, pl. 19.)

7924 " side view. (id., pl. 17.)

7928 Smyrna fragment. Torsos of a youth. (J.H.S., xxvii, p. 103, fig. 3.)

7927 Five capitals from Byzantine sarcophagi illustrating development. (id., p. 108, fig. 9.)

7930 Niche, of the "shall-nichi" type. (id., p. 114, fig. 11.)

7931 Ivory throne of Maximian. (Ravenna. (id., pl. 116, fig. 12.)

7932 " diptych, St. Michael. (B.M. (id., p. 117, fig. 13.)

7933 Pompeian wall painting. Façade with three doors. (id., p. 119, fig. 14.)

7934 Reconstruction of Pompeian stage façade. (id., p. 120, fig. 15.)

7935 Reconstruction of Pompeian wall painting. (id., p. 121, fig. 16.)

BRONZES.

97 Mirror handle. Athlete. (B.M. (Cl. B.C.H., 1898, pl. 1.)

6688 Statue of an athlete. (profile view. (Renard, Forschungen in Ephesos, pl. 7.)

6686 " back view. (id., p. 8.)

3929 Dionysus, head of. (= the so-called Plato). Naples Museum.

TERRACOTTAS.

6683 Fragment of pithos. Combat scene in relief. (B.S.A., iii, pl. 9.)

7925 Herakles head. Three-quarter face, from Prassos. (Cl. B.S.A., viii, pl. 13.)

7923 " back view, from Prassos.

7924 Head of a lion. from Prassos.

5680 Replica of the diadumenos of Polycleitus. (Profile view.)
**VASES.**

* = photograph from original.
* = reproduction of the picture subject only from an adequate illustration.

**BLACK-FIGURED.**

4201 Dionysus in ship; scene of combat. Kylix by Keklaos. (Furtwängler and Reichhold, *Griechische Vasen Malerri, pl. 42."

4206 Phaestus, Cyprias and Harpies. Kylix. Wurzburg. (Furtw. u. Reich., pl. 41.)

4224 Malden at the fountain of Callirrhoe. (Furtw. u. Reich., pl. 51.)

4233 Victorious horseman. (Gerth., *A. R.," iv, 247.)

**RED-FIGURED.**

4210 Contest of Apollo and Heracles. Dionysus and thrasi. Amphora by Phinzias. Corinthe. (Furtw. u. Reich., pl. 91.)

4217 Bacchic thiasos. Kylix. Munich. (Furtw. u. Reich., pl. 59.)

4219 Hera; Mission of Triptolemos. Kylix. Munich. (Furtw. u. Reich., pl. 65.)

4225 Zeus and Hera, attending of. B.M. Cat. of Vases, ii, pl. 37.

4224 Andronyns. Hydra B.M. (Furtw. u. Reich., pl. 77.)

4224 Borus and Osthiyia. Amphora. Munich. (Furtw. u. Reich., pl. 84.)

4225 Cupros and Becithains. Amphora. Munich. Reverse of slide No. 4229. (Furtw. u. Reich., pl. 85.)

4226 Lapiths and Centaurs. Kylix. Munich. (Furtw. u. Reich., pl. 86.)

4228 Medea and Talus. Crater. Ruvv. (Furtw. u. Reich., pl. 88, 89.)

4229 Pelops and Hippodamus. Amphora. Arcaso. (Furtw. u. Reich., pl. 67.)

4229 Odipus and Sphinx. Kylix. Mus. Vat. (Bayet and Collignon, fig. 78.)

4229 Heracles feasting and Athena. Combination of B.P. and B.F. panels in the manner of Andochis. (Furtw. u. Reich., pl. 4.)

4229 Heracles and Acrisymn.; contest of Apollo and Heracles. Kylix by Phinzias. (Furtw. u. Reich., pl. 92.)

4229 Heracles and Antiope.; Krater by Euphronius. Louvre. (Furtw. u. Reich., pl. 92.)

4229 Eurythoeus. Kylix by Euphronius. (Furtw. u. Reich., pl. 29.)

4229 By Euphronius. (Furtw. u. Reich., pl. 22.)

4229 Theseus and Amphiloch. Kylix by Euphronius. (Furtw. u. Reich., pl. 5.)


4229 Exterior. Cremonyn and Sinh.

4229 Skirm and Keryyyn.

4229 Judgment of Paris. (Furtw. u. Reich., pl. 92.)

4229 Judgment of Paris; Bacchic thiasos. (Furtw. u. Reich., pl. 91.)

4229 Rape of Helen; Helen regained. Kylix. Hieron and Macron. Spinelli Coll. (Furtw. u. Reich., pl. 92.)

4229 Achilles and Penthesilea. Kylix. Munich. (Furtw. u. Reich., pl. 95.)

4229 Redemption of Hector. Cup. Vienna. (Furtw. u. Reich., pl. 84.)

4229 Triumphant. By Brygos. (Furtw. u. Reich., pl. 25.)


4229 Death of Atthis. Cerere.


4229 Alcee and Sappho. (Furtw. u. Reich., pl. 95.)

4229 Flute playing. Krater. Louvres. Reverse of slide No. 4218. (Furtw. u. Reich., pl. 93.)

4229 Tantal scene. Cup with cover. St. Petersburg. (Furtw. u. Reich., pl. 95.)

4229 Scenes of women's life. Three pyramids. B.M. Nos. E 778, 772, 774. (Furtw. u. Reich., pl. 57.)

4229 Girl at play. Aryanfllos.

**MISCELLANEA.**


The following slides, the first instalment of a large series dealing with Roman archaeology, have been included by the Council of the Hellenic Society at the request of the Managing Committee of the British School at Rome. The series will be continued either as a subsection of the Hellenic Catalogue or as an independent collection, but the numbers prefixed will remain unchanged:

ROME.

The Forum.

9001 Lapis Niger, general view.
9002 Inscribed stele found below the Lapis Niger.
9003 Well of Juturna.
9004 Temple of Castor and Pollux.
9005 House of the Vestals.
9006 Temple of Antoninus and Faustina.
9007 Column of Phocas.
9008 Rostra, Relief of Trajan founding an orphanage.
9010 " Relief of Trajan sacrificing debts to the Treasury.
9011 " Relief of animals garlanded for Snavetaurica.

Arch of Constantine

9013 Arch of Constantine, general view, looking S.
9014 " looking N.
9015 " medallion, Trajan preparing for hunt. (Papers of the British School at Rome; III, pl. xxii, 1.)
9016 " offering to Apollo. (id., III, pl. xxii, 8.)
9017 " hunting the bear. (id., III, pl. xxii, 9.)
9018 " offering to Diana. (id., III, pl. xxii, 4.)
9019 " hunting the bear. (id., III, pl. xxii, 3.)
9020 " offering to Silvanus. (id., III, pl. xxii, 2.)
9021 " after a lion hunt. (id., III, pl. xxii, 7.)
9022 " offering to Hercules. (id., III, pl. xxii, 3.)

6556 combines Nos. 9026, 9018, 9019, 9015.
6555 combines Nos. 9022, 9017, 9016, 9021.

9008 Arch of Constantine, relief. Trajanic battle scene. (id., IV, pl. xxviii.)

9014 Trajanic relief in Louvre. Victory over Dacia. (id., Ill, p. 229.)
9023 Arch of Constantine, relief. Marcus Aurelius going to war. (id., III, pl. xcvii, 5.)
9024 " offering to Campus Martius. (id., III, pl. xcvii, 8.)
9025 " speaking to the troops. (id., III, pl. xxvii, 3.)
9026 " prisoners before Emperor. (id., III, pl. xxvii.)
9027 " princes submitting to Emperor. (id., III, pl. xxvii, 2.)
9028 " victor. (id., III, pl. xxvii, 3.)
9029 " speaking to troops. (id., III, pl. xxvii, 10.)
9030 " founding charity. (id., III, pl. xxvii, 11.)

6557 combines Nos. 9028, 9024.
6558 combines Nos. 9026, 9025.
6559 combines Nos. 9027, 9028.
6560 combines Nos. 9029, 9030.
Arch of Constantine, reliefs. Aurelius in battle (id., III, pl. xxiii, 1) in triumph (id., III, pl. xxvi, 6) at a sacrifice (id., III, pl. xxvi, 7). (In these three reliefs the head of Aurelius has been preserved.)

Arch of Constantine, frieze. Constantine beheading Susa (Verona i). (id., IV, pl. xxxv, 2.)

Constantine vittoriosa at the Poas Milvius. (id., IV, pl. xxxv, 1.)

Constantine (or Diocletian) distributing Cangiatum. (id., IV, pl. xxxvi, 1.)

Constantine (or Diocletian) on rostra. (id., IV, pl. xxxvi, 2.)

Arch of Dolabella.

Drums.

Gallians.

the Argentarii.

Septimius Severus, from the forum.

from the Capitol.

Titus, general view showing candelabra slab.

candelabra slab.

candelabra slab.

biga slab.

biga slab.

Column of Marcus Aurelius.

Trajan, general view.

Colossus seen through arch of Titus.

from S. Francesco Romano.

The Palatine.

Palatine, house of Domitian.

Basilica.

smaller hall.

peristyle.

stadium.

Pavagium, steps seen through main gateway.

view inside.

architrave of.

entrance to one of the chambers.

interior of chamber with names of pupils scrawled on plaster.

mural decoration of one of the chambers.

The Walls.

Wall near Porta San Paolo.

Porta Maggiore.

Porta di Ottavia.

Mausoleum of Augustus exterior.

Tombs of Cecilia Metella.

Pyramid of C. Cestius and gate of San Paolo.

Miscellaneous Topographica.

Janus Quadrifrons.

Temple of Vesta and Fortuna Virilis.
9059 The Pantheon.
7666 Church of SS. Apoستoll, exterior.
7665 Palazzo Odessauchi, exterior.
7670 British School Library.
7672 British School Library.

The Ara Pacis.

7345 Ara Pacis, decorative slab. Uffizi. (Petersen, Ara Pacis, pl. 1.)
7348 *** Inner frieze, wreaths and pilasters. Villa Medici. (id., pl. 2.)
7342 *** Temple of Mars Ultor. Villa Medici. (id., pl. 3, slab, vii.)
6953 *** Telinus slab. Uffizi. (id., pl. 3, xi.)
7347 *** Temple of Mater Magna. Villa Medici. (id., pl. 3, xiii.)
7346 *** Processional slab. Louvre. (id., pl. 5, vi.)
6847 *** *** Uffizi. (id., pl. 6, xiv.)
6902 *** *** Uffizi. (id., pl. 6, xvi, xv.)
7239 *** *** Villa Medici. (id., pl. 9 [xviii], xvii.)
7340 *** Sacrificial scene. Villa Medici. Bonus Eventus head, Mus. Term. (id., pl. 7, i, li.)
7398 *** Head of Mars. Vienna. Sacrificial scene. Villa Medici. (id., pl. 7, xix.)
7395 *** Head of Mars. Vienna. (id., pl. 8, xix.)
7394 *** Processional slab and inferior decoration restored. (id., p. 28, fig. 13.)
7274 *** Wreath of fruits and flowers. (id., p. 43, fig. 35.)
7241 *** Sacrificial scene. Uffizi. (Papers of B.S.R., ii, p. 241.)

Roman Portraits.

7414 Claudio. Mus. Vat.
7410 Constantine the Great. Gall. Uffizi.
7408 ***
7417 Gallienus. Mus. Term.
7413 Germanicus. Mus. Prof. Lautar.
7423 Hadrian.
7412 Julia, daughter of Augustus. Gall. Uffizi.
7409 Maximus. Gall. Uffizi.
7415 Nero. Mus. Term.
7405 Sabina. Gall. Uffizi.
7400 Scipio. Gall. Uffizi.
7420 Sulla. Mus. Vat.
7421 Vespasian. Mus. Term.
7422 ***
7422 Funerary portrait of a lady. Mus. Lat.
7411 Head of girl from tomb of Sulpicius Plautianus. Mus. Term.

*= from a drawing.
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 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 κ should be represented by c, the vowels and diphthongs ο, αι, αυ, ου by y, ae, oe, and e respectively, final -ος and -αυ by -us and -am, and -πος by -er.

But in the case of the diphthong ει, it is felt that ει is more suitable than e or i, although in names like Iasidion, Alexandreia, where they are consacrated by usage, e or i should be preserved, also words ending in -αιω must be represented by -eme.

A certain amount of discretion must be allowed in using the -ο terminations, especially where the Latin usage itself varies or prefers the -o form, as Delos. Similarly Latin usage should be followed as far as possible in -o and -ο terminations, e.g., Priene, Smyrna. In some of the more obscure names ending in -πος, as Διαπός, -er should be avoided, as likely to lead to confusion. The Greek form -ος is to be preferred to -o for names like Dion, Hieron, except in a name so common as Apollo, 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 Herakles, Mercury, Minerva, should not be used for Hercules, Hermes, and Athene.
(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, Hesiod, Hyakinthos, should fall under § 4.

(3) In no case should accent marks, 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, κ being used for σ, χθ for χ, but γ and α being substituted for Ϝ and Ϡ, which are misleading in English, e.g., Nike, ἀργυρόμενα, κυδωνίας, χρυσός.

This rule should not be rigidly enforced in the case of Greek words in common English use, such as negis, συμπόσιον. It is also necessary to preserve the use of ώ for ω in a certain number of words in which it has become almost universal, such as ἰσχελα, περανώς.

(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, Jahrh., xviii. 1903, p. 34.

or—

Six, Prolegomena (Jahrh., 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.
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 Mitteilungen.
Ann. d. I. = Annali dell' Instituto.
Arch. Am. = Archäologischer Anzeiger (Beiblatt zum Jahrbuch).
Baumstier = Baumstier, Denkmäler des klassischen Altertums.
B.C.H. = Bulletin de Correspondence Hellénique.
Bez. Fax. = Furtwängler, Beschreibung der Vasensammlung zu Berlin.
B.M. Bronzes = British Museum Catalogue of Bronzes.
B.M.C. = British Museum Catalogue of Greek Coins.
B.M. Ins. = Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum.
B.M. Vase. = British Museum Catalogue of Vases, 1893, etc.
B.S.A. = Annual of the British School at Athens.
Bull. d. I. = Bulletino dell' Instituto.
Busolt = Busolt, Griechische Geschichte.
C.I.G. = Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum.
C.I.L. = Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum.
C.R. Rec. = Classical Review.
Dittenb. O.G.I. = Dittenberger, Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae.
Eph. 1 Dip. = Ephemeris Arqueológie.
G.D.I. = Collits, Sammlung der Griechischen Dialekt-Inscriptions.
G.G.A. = Göttingische Gedenktafel Anzeigen.
Head, H.N. = Head, Historia Numorum.
I.G. = Inscriptiones Graecae.
Jahrb. = Jahresschrifte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts.
Le Bas-Wadil. = Le Bas-Waddington, Voyage Archéologique.
Michel = Michel, Recueil d'Inscriptions grecques.
Mon. d. I. = Monumenti dell' Instituto.
Neue Jahrb. kl. Al. = Neue Jahrbücher für die klassische Altertum.

The attention of contributors is called to the fact that the titles of the volumes of the second series of the Corpus of Greek Inscriptions, published by the Prussian Academy, have now been changed, as follows:—

II. = 12 actatis quae est litera excl, ann. et Augusti tempore.
III. = 13 actatis Romanae.
IV. = 14 Argolidae.
V. = 15 Megardica et Boeotiae.
VI. = 16 Graeciae Septentrionalis.
VII. = 17 Italicæ 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*.
(1) ARCHAIC HEAD (ABOUT 460 B.C.)

(2) PHEIDIAN ATHENA.

COOK COLLECTION, RICHMOND.
(5) STATUE OF APOLLO. DETAIL,
(6) STATUE OF HERAKLES,

COOK COLLECTION, RICHMOND.

(7) STATUETTE OF ZEUS.
(28) Nymph holding Shell. Fragment.
Cook Collection, Richmond.

(29) Stele from Sicily. Fragment.
(32) DIGNYSIAC RELIEF. OBVERSE AND REVERSE.

COOK COLLECTION, RICHMOND.
(34) Young Augustus.

(35) Lady of the Julio-Claudian House.

(36) Roman Priestess. 2nd Century A.D.

(37) Lucius Verus.

COOK COLLECTION, RICHMOND.
(43) SARCOPHAGUS WITH HUNT OF CALYDONIAN BOAR. 2nd CENTURY A.D.

(44) SARCOPHAGUS WITH BATTLES OF GREEKS AND AMAZONS. 2nd CENTURY A.D.

COOK COLLECTION, RICHMOND.
(47) DIONYSOS AND MAINADS. FRAGMENT OF LATE (3rd CENTURY) SARCOPHAGUS.

(46)

(45)

TWO ROMAN SARCOPHAGI.

COOK COLLECTION, RICHMOND.
(66, 87) TWO INSCRIBED STELAI.

COOK COLLECTION, RICHMOND.
HEAD OF A GIRL.

COLLECTION OF MR. CHARLES NEWTON-ROBINSON.
RECENT ADDITIONS TO THE PARTHENON SCULPTURES.
FIGURE OF A MOURNING WOMAN
FIGURE OF A MOURNING WOMAN FROM TRENTHAM.
HEAD OF MOURNING WOMAN FROM TRENTHAM.
GRAECO-ROMAN LAMP IN THE COLLECTION OF
MR. T. WHITCOMBE GREENE.
The Society
for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies.

President—
PROFESSOR PERCY GARDNER, Litt.D.

Objects.—The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies was founded in 1879 for the following objects:

I. To advance the study of Greek language, literature, and art, and to illustrate the history of the Greek race in the ancient, Byzantine, and Neo-Hellenic periods, by the publication of memoirs and unprinted documents or monuments in a Journal to be issued periodically.

II. To collect drawings, facsimiles, transcripts, plans, and photographs of Greek inscriptions, MSS., works of art, ancient sites and remains, and with this view to invite travellers to communicate to the Society notes or sketches of archaeological and topographical interest.

III. To organise means by which members of the Society may have increased facilities for visiting ancient sites and pursuing archaeological researches in countries which, at any time, have been the sites of Hellenic civilisation.

The Journal.—In accordance with the first object the Journal of Hellenic Studies was issued in 1884, and has since been published in half-yearly parts, under the management of an Editorial Committee. The present Committee consists of PROFESSOR ERNEST GARDNER, MR. G. F. HILL, and MR. F. G. KENYON, with a Consultative Committee consisting of PROFESSOR BRAWER, MRS. SYDNEY COLVIN, PROFESSOR PERCY GARDNER, PROFESSOR HENRY JACKSON, and MR. R. M. DAWKINS (ex officio, as Director of the British School at Athens). The Journal is recognised not only in England but elsewhere as one of the leading organs of classical archaeology. Twenty-seven volumes and four supplements have now been issued. To enable the Journal to be carried on with the same efficiency, and, further, to enable the Society to fulfil the other objects for which it was created, and more especially to take in hand or to support the work of exploration in Hellenic countries and the publication of results, the Council appeal to all members to do what they can to enlarge the numbers of the Society, and invite all persons who desire to see England at least on a level with other countries in devotion to Greek studies, to offer themselves as candidates for election. With its present 906 members and 162 subscribing Libraries the margin of revenue left after
the publication in each year of two numbers of the Journal with adequate illustrations is not large enough to allow of more than occasional small grants for other purposes. If the numbers could be raised to 1,000 or more, there would remain every year a surplus which might be devoted with real effect to the prosecution of archaeological research in whatever direction might seem advisable, even as it is the Society has been able to give substantial help to the work of the British School at Athens, of the British School in Rome, of the Asia Minor, Cyprus, and Cretan Exploration Funds, as well as to some private explorers.

Meetings.—By an arrangement recently made with the Society of Antiquaries, the Society holds occasional meetings in that Society’s rooms in Burlington House, when papers are read and discussed, and any communications of importance can be made to members.

The Library.—The books and periodicals which have been acquired by the Society for the use of members are kept in the Society’s own Library at 22 Albermarle Street. During the past few years the Council have made considerable progress towards the formation of a good Reference Library of works dealing with every department of Greek art, language, and history. As the Library grows its usefulness grows also, and it is eminently desirable that the Society should be in a position to continue to devote from £75 to £100 a year to this object. The Library Catalogue published in 1903, price 3s. 6d., makes this collection accessible to country members, as books may be forwarded through the post. All subsequent accessions are catalogued annually in the Journal, and then added to the Catalogue. It should be added that the Librarian is within stated hours daily at the service of members when the Library is open.

Photographic Department.—Some years ago the Council began the collection of a series of photographs of Greek sites, scenery, and objects of art. It was a natural step from this beginning to have lantern slides made from these and other Greek subjects, which could be lent at a low rate to members for lecturing and teaching purposes. This branch of the Society’s work met with so much encouragement that in 1898 the Council accepted an offer from one of their body, Mr. J. Linton Myres, of Christ Church, Oxford, to undertake the organisation of a collection both of photographs and lantern slides which should be so far complete as to supply all the reasonable demands of lecturers and teachers. It need hardly be pointed out that this development has involved not only considerable labour on the part of the organiser, but also no small demand upon the Society’s funds. These collections are now in working order and a new and complete Catalogue of Slides giving particulars of the collections of photographs and negatives was published in the Journal for 1904. Accessions to the slide collection have since been catalogued annually in the Journal. It is obvious that the development of this side of the Society’s work has strengthened its special claim upon the support of all serious students of Greek art, archaeology, history, and literature, and particularly of members of the teaching profession, whether at the Universities or in Public Schools. The Catalogue of slides (price 1s., annual supplements 3d.)
each), can be obtained from the Librarian at 22 Albermarle Street, to whom also
should be addressed all applications from members desiring to borrow them.

Entrance Fees and Subscriptions.—The foregoing summary of the
objects and the work of the Society will serve to show that as time goes on the
demands made upon its resources are likely to increase rather than to diminish,
while some loss of revenue must occur year by year through the death or
resignation of members. It is therefore of the first importance that the supply
of candidates for membership should be constant and increasing. Applications
for membership, or for information about the Society, should be addressed to
the Secretary at 22 Albermarle Street, W.

The Annual Subscription of One Guinea entitles members to receive a copy of
the Journal of Hellenic Studies as published. The entrance fee due from new
members on election is two guineas. Back numbers of the Journal can be obtained
by new members on payment of the subscription for the years in which they
appeared. The Annual Subscription can be compounded for by a single payment
of £1.15.0 and the entrance fee of two guineas. The Life Subscription does
not entitle new members to the volumes issued previous to election, but the
privilege of obtaining all back volumes on payment of the subscription for the year
in which they were issued is a substantial one, as the volumes cannot be acquired
through other sources at a less cost than 30s nett.

Student Associates are admitted by the Council, at their discretion, for a period
not exceeding five years, to certain privileges of the Society, on payment of an
annual subscription of one guinea, without payment of entrance fee. They are
allowed to receive the Journal, to read in the Library, and to attend meetings;
but are not entitled to borrow books, or lantern slides, or to vote at meetings.
Every candidate must satisfy the Council by means of a certificate from his teacher,
who must be a person occupying a recognised position in an educational body and
a Member of the Society, that he or she is a bona fide Student in subjects germane to
the purposes of the Society.

Libraries may subscribe to the Journal of Hellenic Studies at the members’
subscription of one guinea per annum, without payment of the entrance fee of
two guineas. Librarians desiring to avail themselves of this privilege should
apply to the Secretary.

All subscriptions are payable to the account of the Hellenic Society, and
should be addressed to

THE HON. TREASURER OF THE HELLENIC SOCIETY,
C/o Messrs. Macmillan & Co.,
St. Martin's Street, W.C.

Bankers’ orders are supplied on application.

The affairs of the Society are administered by the Council, the present constit-
tution of which is shown on the following page.

London, January, 1908.
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ANTIQUES IN THE COLLECTION OF SIR FREDERICK COOK, BART. AT DOUGHTY HOUSE, RICHMOND.

[Plates I—XXIV.]

The monumental work of Professor Michaels, Ancient Marbles in Great Britain, must always remain the basis of any study among English collections of antiques. But since its publication in 1882 not a few collections have changed hands, others have been dispersed, while others, more fortunate, have been enlarged; in these various processes much that was unknown even to Michaels has come to light, and he himself soon supplemented his great work by two important papers printed in this Journal in 1884 and 1885. He prefaced the first of these supplementary papers with the following words:

'I cannot help thinking that there must be in Great Britain a good deal of hidden treasure... which would perhaps easier come to light if there were a place expressly destined to receive such communications... I have therefore ventured to propose to the Editors to open in this Journal a corner for storing up such supplements... As a first installment, I here offer some notes which may begin the series... May other lovers and students of the Classic art, especially in Great Britain, follow my example.'

Curiously enough, save for a few papers which have appeared at long and irregular intervals, this wish of the great Strassburg Professor has remained unfulfilled. It still remains a national reproach that our English

---

The following is a list of these papers:


- Vol. XIV. E. Severns. Greek Head in the Possession of T. Humphry Ward. (Plate V.)

- Vol. XVII. K. A. Gardiner. Head in the Possession of Philip Nelson, M.B. (Plate XI.)

- Vol. XIX. E. A. Gardiner. Head from the Disney Collection in the Possession of Philip Nelson, M.B. (Plate I.)

- Vol. XX. C. Rennert. Roman Sculptures at Cleveden. (Plates VII. XII.)

collections have till recently been explored almost wholly by foreign scholars. After Michaelis came Professor Furtwängler, who, in his Masterpieces of Greek Sculpture, made known works in private collections which have since become famous, such as the Petworth Athlete, the Lansdowne Heracles, and the Leconfield Aphrodite, that great original attributed to Praxiteles himself, not to speak of a number of statues and busts of less importance. Other results of Furtwängler's researches among English private collections are given in the first part of his great work on copies, Statuenkopien aus Alterthum, which, unfortunately for science, remains unfinished, and also in the paper which he wrote upon the antiques at Chatsworth (J.H.S. 1900).

These surveys of the English collections bore fruit in 1903, in the Exhibition of Greek Art organized by the Burlington Fine Arts Club. This event was a welcome sign of a reawakening interest on the part of the English themselves—owners and public alike—in the treasures of antique art in the country. Since then, at any rate, a more intelligent care has been bestowed on antiques, which are now once more valued almost as highly as pictures. When Professor Michaelis revisits the scene of his earlier labours he will find matters much improved. The names of owners are by no means yet inscribed in letters of gold on the roll of donors to the British Museum, but better still has been done. In many places trained curators are in charge of the collections, in place of the housekeepers at whose hands Professor Michaelis suffered so much, and the antiques are being rearranged, catalogued, and made more generally accessible to both students and public, without for that being dissociated from their historic surroundings.

The large Catalogue issued at the close of the 1903 Exhibition had marked a new departure, in that every single object described was also illustrated. The time has now come to apply the same principle to individual collections and to issue catalogues in which a complete series of illustrations, based on photographs, shall be given. The present paper on the well-known Cook collection at Richmond which was so largely represented in the Exhibition of 1903 is an attempt to show how this might be carried out under the auspices of the Hellenic Society. Sir Frederick Cook, in consenting to the publication of his antiques in this Journal, generously undertook to help the Society by defraying the photographic expenses and by contributing towards the cost of the numerous plates. It is my belief that many, if not all, owners of collections might be willing thus to follow Sir Frederick's lead and to meet the Society halfway in the proposed scheme for issuing at frequent intervals illustrated monographs similar in character to the present. I may add that a set of the photographs upon which the illustrations are based will in due course be accessible at the Library of the Hellenic Society. It is hoped that in this manner illustrated monographs such as are now proposed might fulfil a

3 Mr. Arthur Smith's catalogues of the collections at Lansdowne House, Woburn Abbey, and Brocklasha, are cases in point.
double object,—as scientific contributions to the Journal of Hellenic Studies, and as illustrated registers of photographs, somewhat on the plan of the Einzelausfehungen so ably edited by Dr. Paul Arndt. Such catalogues, moreover, can also become of the utmost value for that State registration of works of art in private collections which has lately been so persistently advocated. It has been suggested before that a well-established Society like the Hellenic should take the first steps towards securing registration of works of antique art in private hands.

The collection of pictures gathered together at Doughty House, Richmond, is justly esteemed one of the finest and most important in England. Where so many original masterpieces of the Renaissance and modern times must claim the first interest the antiques scattered about among them have in great measure been overlooked by any but professional archaeologists. Yet these antiques form a group of considerable interest. The Richmond collection,’ writes Michaelis, ‘was formed from purchases in Italy, France, and England, partly from old collections and at sales, partly from the results of the latest excavations, so that the cabinet, though not large, is various.’ (Ancient Marbles, Preface, p. 177.)

The collection is certainly representative, its works ranging from the early fifth century B.C. to Roman portraits and sarcophagi of the third century A.D., yet its main strength may be said to reside in the numerous and well-preserved examples of Hellenistic works and works from Asia Minor. Foremost among these are the stele of Archippus, Phila, and Epiktesis (Nos. 21–23) and the great Graeco-Syrian sarcophagi—perhaps the most important of all the antiques at Richmond—published in the last volume of this Journal by Professor Strzygowski, who took it as starting point for new researches into the origin and character of late Graeco-Asian art.

The history of the collection and of its acquisition by Sir Francis Cook, first baronet and father of the present owner, has been fully told by Michaelis, who has also given a very complete account of each work of art previous to its coming into the Richmond collection. On all these points, therefore, I shall limit myself to the briefest indications and refer to the abundant documentary evidence collected by Michaelis.

A few works of art are now described which were not at Richmond when the Ancient Marbles was compiled. The most remarkable of these is doubtless the Apollo (No. 5), considered by Furtwängler to be a copy of an original by Euphranor, while Dr. Waldstein, guided mainly by the beauty of the head, actually thought it an original by Praxiteles.

The objects noted by Michaelis as being at Cintra in Portugal, where Sir Frederick Cook is Viscounte de Monserrat, remain there. They were catalogued by Dr. W. Gurlitt in the Archäologische Zeitung, 1868, pp. 34 ff. The beautiful collection of bronzes (Michaelis, Richmond, Nos. 19–39), together with the gems, passed at the death of Sir Francis to his second son,

---

* A Sarcophagus of the Sidonanta Type in the Collection of Sir Frederick Cook at Richmond,* J.H.S. 1967, p. 49.
the late Mr. Wyndham Cook, and are now the property of Mrs. Wyndham Cook of 8, Cadogan Square. These bronzes and gems, which figured largely in the Burlington Fine Arts Club Exhibition of 1903, are now being catalogued by Mr. Cecil H. Smith.

I have attempted to make the catalogue more instructive and interesting by grouping the objects into periods. In a final section I have placed objects whose precise date or artistic provenance is difficult to discover.

My thanks on behalf of the Society are due to Sir Frederick Cook for the liberal support already alluded to. I have, moreover, received assistance in special points from Mrs. Eslaire, Mr. A. H. Smith, Dr. Amolung, Dr. Körber, and above all, from Professor Michaelis, who, with a kindness that has deeply touched me, has read the proofs of this article and generously given me the advantage of his immense experience and special knowledge. That he should have undertaken this labour, when he is not yet completely restored to health, is a welcome sign of his unflagging interest in the English collections.

I only regret that I have not done better justice to many of Professor Michaelis's suggestions. But this article, begun in 1903 and then laid aside for four years, has had to be hurriedly finished, that not too long an interval should divide it from Professor Strzygowski’s paper on the Gracco-Syrian Sarcofagus in this same collection.

§ 1. — Archie. First Half of Fifth Century B.C.

1 (= Michaelis 58). Female Head. Antique replica of a Peloponnesian work of about 480-460 B.C. (Plate 1.)

Height — 24 cm. Length of Face — 18 cm. Restored; broken, mouth, and chin: the modern bust has lately been removed. Replica: Lambourn House, Mich.

Fig. A.
The hair is rolled back from the temples into a massive hall-like knot at the nape. The long oval, the strongly marked chin and high skull are strikingly individual. The large prominent eyes lie in one plane, as in archaic works. The expression is almost sullen. This replica loses considerably from the absence of the neck, which was long and well shaped (cf. especially the Ephesus example). The general character recalls works of the Argive school such as the Ligorio bronze in Berlin (in which Furtwangler recognizes an original of the school of the Argive Hagelaidas) and the bronze head of a boy, also in Berlin (Furtwangler, Meisterwerke, Taf. 32, pp. 075 foll.). Helbig on the other hand, in discussing the Chiaramonti replica (Führer, No. 86) detects an affinity with the Olympia sculptures. The large number of replicas shows that the original was celebrated. Other heads closely akin in character are at Copenhagen (Arndt, Glypt. de Næ, Caelberg, Plates XXXI, XXXII, Fig. 20, and p. 49), in the Museo Torlonia (Arndt, op cit. Figs. 1, 22), and in the British Museum (Cat. 1704). Finally a statue in the Museum of Candia (phot. Maraghianis) with head very similar to the type under discussion affords a clear notion of what the figure was like to which the Richmond head belonged (Mariani, Bulletin, Commun. 1897, p. 183; cf. Amelung, Museums of Rome, p. 260).

§ 2.—The Pheidian Period.

2 (= Michaels 50). HELMETED HEAD OF ATHENA. (PLATE I.)

Total height: 0.43 cm. Length of face: 0.18 cm. Restored: front of the face, including nose, mouth, chin, and nearly the whole of both eyes, and a piece of hair on the left side. The curls that fall over the neck to the front are broken, as well as the hair that flows over the back from under the helmet. The helmet has lost the sphinx that formed the crest, and the griffins on either side are broken. Literature: B.F.A.C. (Cat. p. 257, No. 61, No. 62), Replicas: (1) the head of the Hope Athena at Dresden (Mich. Dresden, No. 29). Furtwangler, Masterpieces, pp. 75 ff. Jeanlin in Mém. des Musées, iii. 1896, pl. II, pp. 27 ff. Clara-Remouch, 226, 5): (2) the head, known only from a cast at Dresden, Masterpieces, Fig. 25 a, Fig. 25 b.

In spite of the many restorations and mutilations and of the bad condition of what surface remains, the head still bears witness to the grandeur of the original type, which has justly been referred to Phidias by Furtwangler (loc. cit.). Michaels overlooked the fact that this was a replica of the head of the Athena represented by the Hope statue, which differs in sundry particulars from the similar 'Athena Farnese' in Naples (Clarac-Reinach, 226, 7; Masterpieces, Fig. 26). The body of the griffins is sketched...
in relief on the helmet, instead of standing out in the round as in the Farnese statue. The eyelids of the Hope type are more delicate, the oval of the face longer and more refined. Furtwängler was persuaded that while the Hope type might be referred to Phidias himself, the Farnese Athena was the creation of his pupil Alcamenes. Without venturing on so bold an attribution or so decisive a distinction, we yet feel that the differences between the two types are not merely such as a copyist might introduce, but are the outcome of the artist’s own individual feelings.

§ 3.—Attic. The Second Half of Fifth Century.

3 ( = Michaelis 10). Stele of Timarete. (Plate II.)

Height: 0'93 cm. Literature: Conze, Griechische Grabreliefs, 382 and Tat. CLXXIII; H.E.A.C. Cat. 83, and Pl. XVI: for the inscr. CLXX, 7792. Marble; Pentelic. Breaches at the akrolithes. The slab itself has been broken right across, just below the girl’s head, and inserted again: the bird’s head and the drapery on the lower part of the child’s body have been robbed and become rather indistinct. Former owner: The chemist Dodd. Exhibited, H.E.A.C. in 1903.

The stele terminates in a pediment that projects somewhat beyond the relief itself. The bottom of the stele has been left rough for insertion into a plinth. The beautiful design with its fine sense of space and composition requires no explanation. Timarete, a girl who has died untimely, shows a bird to a little child crouching in front of her. The spirit and technique recall the finer Attic steilai of the period of the Parthenon frieze. In spite of the damages noted above, the preservation is good. As often in reliefs of this period, the child is absurdly small in proportion to the principal figure.

4 ( = Michaelis 11). Maenad with the Tympanon. (Plate II.)

Height: 0'94 cm. Marble; Pentelic. Breaks: the relief, which belongs to a similar basis, abounds with several similar figures, has been cut away close to the figure. Reprints: see Hauser, Die Neu-Attischen Reliefs, p. 7, t. 1 (verse of Amphora of Sothis in the Louvre); 8 (Amalgam; Fed. Cat. Mus. Chiusi), 182, 6, 9 (Madrid, see Winter, 30th Winckelmanisches, 41). Literature: Hauser, loc. cit. p. 18, No. 12; H.E.A.C. Cat. p. 13, No. 16, and Plate XVI. Exhibited, H.E.A.C. 1903.

The Bacchante, who holds the tympanon in her left hand ready to strike it with her right, is one of a well known group of types (Hauser’s Type 27) that occur repeatedly on the reliefs of the New Attic school. In the present instance the pose of the head, the movement of body and drapery, are rendered with a force and distinction of line not always found in this class of reliefs, where the types of earlier Attic art were too often repeated mechanically for mere ornamental purposes. The extraordinary elegance of the forms, the grand rushing movement, the sweeping curves of the lines, the clinging transparent draperies, show that the original belonged to the school which produced the famous Nike of Pauinias at Olympia and kindred
works (Ameinung, *Museums*, p. 22, p. 95, p. 214). The beautiful figure once formed part of a large composition comprising probably as many as eight Maenads grouped, it may be, round Dionysus and Ariadne. (See Winter, *loc. cit.* p. 112 f.; Ameinung, *Museums*, p. 214.) An imitation, on a much smaller scale, of part of the original design seems preserved on the lovely round altar in Lansdowne House (Husser, p. 11, No. 12; Michaelis, L. H., No. 58), from which, however, the figure now under discussion is absent. The series to which the present figure belonged was evidently on a much reduced scale, less than half the height, for instance, of the magnificent Maenad Chimairophonos from a similar cycle, in the Palazzo dei Conservatori (height, 1 m. 42, Ameinung, *Museums*, Fig. 116). Along the basis runs a delicate astragalos moulding.

§ 4.—Schools of the Fourth Century B.C.

5. (*not* in Michaelis). **Statue of Apollo.** (Plates III. and IV.)

Height 1 m. 74. *Antinous:* part of trunk and quiver (part antique), right hand with arrow and left forearm: the antique head has been broken and set on again. *Replica* : see Furtwangler, *Museums*, p. 224, note 4. Literature: Furtwangler, *loc. cit.* Former coll.: Shugborough and Stowe. From the words *Stowe* and *Antinous* inscribed in gilt letters on the modern base, it appears that the statue was once in the Stowe collection; it is probably identical with the *Antinous* (Stowe Cat. by H. E. Foster, p. 205) a very fine specimen of antique sculpture purchased at the Stowe sale by a Mr. J. Brewae of University Str. 9

This statue was first noted and described by Furtwangler (50th *Winkelmannsprogramm*, p. 152, note 92, cf. *Museums* loc. cit.) and connected by him with an original of the fourth century B.C. which, in contrast to the innovations of the Praxitelean and Scopasian schools, preserves or revives characteristics of old Argive art. In spite of the rounded modelling which clearly proclaims the manner of the fourth century, the great breadth of the shoulders as compared with the waist recalls the archaic canon familiarly connected with the name of Hagelaidas. Moreover, Furtwangler identifies the artist of the original with Empedranor, a native of Corinth, who seems to

---

9 U. Waldstein proposes to recognize in this Apollo a work of the Praxitelean school (see *Illustrated London News*, July, 1909).

10 Prof. Michaelis writes to me quoting a letter from the late Dr. A. S. Murray informing him of a marble statue of an Apollo sold at Christie's, 22 February, 1883, with a head much like that of Antinous, and restored in several places; it was formerly in the Shugborough collection, afterwards in the possession of Mr. Angerstein, with which [sic] it was sold and was bought by Mr. Cook, at Richmond. This is evidently the Apollo catalogued above. We must therefore suppose that at the dispersal of the Shugborough collection seen after 1882 (see Michaelis, *Ant. Marbles*, p. 125) the Apollo found its way to Stowe. The statue in the Shugborough collection with which it should probably be identified is, as Prof. Michaelis points out to me, the *Antinous* (*Ant. Marbles*, p. 79, n. 174)—but in the Stowe Coll. it received, as the modern lettering shows, the name of Antinous. This Stowe *Antinous* was, according to Foster's catalogue, purchased by a Mr. J. Brewae, from whose possession it never than has passed into that of Mr. W. Angerstein. In Christie's Catalogue of the Angerstein sale it figures as *an antique statue of Apollo*, on *statuary marble pedestal*. *Even Stowe,* (Lot 294, purchased for £19½ 5s.)
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Mit der Fülle der Erträgnisse des emsig durchforschten Bodens konnte jedoch die Erweiterung der zur Ansammlung derselben bestimmten Magazine nicht gleichen Schritt halten. Ungekannt und ungewürzt ist ein großer Teil der reichen Inschriftenausbeute in zahlreichen Bänden archäologischer Zeitschriften und in schwer zugänglichen Einzelpublikationen dem allgemeinen Gesichtskreise entzogen und hart der Inanspruchnahme einer umfassenden Sammlung epigraphischer Minuskulenteze. — Ein ähnliches Bild der Zersplitterung gewähren die auf eine Reihe besonderer Inschriftenklassen oder auf bestimmte Perioden der Schrift und der Sprache sich erstreckenden mannigfachen Einzeluntersuchungen. — Es fehlt der griechischen Epigraphik ein nach systematischen Gesichtspunkten angelegtes Hilfsbuch, dessen Aufgabe es sein müßte, auf dem weit verzweigten und fast unübersehbar gewordenen Gebiete der Disziplin als Führer und Wegweiser zu dienen.


 Diesem Unternehmen wird, den obigen Ausführungen entsprechend, einen doppelten Zweck verfolgen:


2. Es soll eine übersichtliche Darstellung der Entwicklgeschichte der griechischen Schrift und des epigraphischen Sprachgutes enthalten, formaler Indicen, die beide für eine genauere zeitliche Fixierung des sachlichen Inhalts nach nicht näher datierbaren Inschriften von höchster Bedeutung sind, und von denen letzteres in seinen wechselnden Gestaltungen ein getreues Abbild der veränderten politischen und sozialen Institutionen darbietet.

Dem dringenden Bedürfnisse entsprechend erscheint zuerst Band II. — In denselben sind von den nach Erscheinen der verschiedenen Bände des Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum bekannten gewordenen Urkunden nur die wichtigsten in geeignet scheinender Stelle verzeichnet worden, um im Anschluß an weitere Supplemente des Corpus ein Ergänzungshelf in der Anordnung der Supplemente folgen zu lassen. Sodann enthält er eine Darstellung der Geschichte der attischen Schrift von ihren Anfängen bis zu den jüngsten Vertretern des lapidaren Schrifttums (mit Tafel und vielen lithographischen Eindrücken) sowie eine Übersicht über die Abfaaungsweise der verschiedenen Inschriftenklassen hinsichtlich ihrer Einzeformen wie ihrer Gesamtkonzeption mit einer Auswahl von typischen Repräsentanten der jeweiligen Gruppen.
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Die Holmische Geschichte ist in einem anderen Geiste geschrieben als die von Grote oder Niebuhr, gleicht ihnen aber an Grobhartigkeit der Auffassung. Holms Buch zeichnet sich vornehmlich aus durch die festgehaltene Knappheit und übersichtliche Anordnung des Gegenstandes sowie durch die schlichte und anspruchlose Vortragsweise.
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Zweiter Teil, erste Abteilung: Sokrates und die Sokratiker, Plato und die alte Akademie. 4. Auflage 1888. 66 Bogen gr. 8°. M. 20.— geb. M. 22.50. (Fehlt noch einige Jahre.)
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Bisher erschienen:

Jahrgang XXXV (Bände 133—136) des Jahresberichts
über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft
begründet von C. Bursian, herausgegeben von W. Kroll
Preis jährlich M. 36.—, Subskriptionspreis M. 32.—
enthält folgendes:
Bericht über die Literatur zu den attischen Rednern aus den Jahren 1886—1904.
have worked mainly in Athens, and might therefore well combine Argive characteristics with the Attic manner. He flourished about 362 B.C. The subject is known to be Apollo from the attributes. In the replica at Lansdowne House, for instance (Michaelis, L. H. 32), which is one of the most complete, Apollo wears a laurel wreath which, though it may be the copyist's addition, shows that the original was believed to be an Apollo. In the present replica, a small part of the quiver is antique. The best known of the many replicas is the elegant but lifeless statue, perhaps of the Hadrianic period, in the Gabinetto delle Maschere of the Vatican (No. 443, Amelung, Museums p. 98; Furtwängler, op. cit. Fig. 153).

6 (= Michaelis 34). Statue of Heracles. (Plate V.)

Total height: 1.28; h. of pedestal: 0.09 cm. Restorations, etc., a piece in the middle of the club. The head, the r. arm from the elbow, and part of the legs are broken but antique. Replicas: Palazzo Scaia, Marine-Haun, p. 118. Former coll.: Lord Stratford de Redcliffe (1786-1880), identical with the statue sold at Christie's in 1878 for £110. Provenance: Constantinople. Literature: R. H. Hartwig, Hercules mit dem Pflüchern, p. 52.

Heracles is represented bearded and wears a wreath of broad leaves tied together at the back with a fillet, the ends of which are seen on either shoulder. The lion skin is thrown over his left arm, which holds a cornucopia; the r. hand rests on the club. The weight is borne by the r. leg; the l. leg is placed forward at ease. The pose recalls a whole series of statues of the Attic School, of which the Lansdowne Heracles (Furtwängler, Masterpieces, Fig. 125) is one of the best known. The soft forms of the present statue and the sinuous line of the torso suggest an Attic original of the fourth century, while the crisp hair and the deep-set eyes recall Scopas. For a kindred type from the Praxitelean School see Masterpieces, Fig. 145. The actual statue before us is of late probably Roman execution; the detail of the fruit and the somewhat sensational treatment of the lion skin are probably due to the copyist. For Heracles with the horn of plenty, which he carries as early as on a votive relief of the fourth century from Thebes, see Furtwängler op. Roscher 2187.

7 (= Michaelis 5). Statuette of Zeus or Asklepios. (Plate V.)

Height: 0.70 cm. Marble; Italian. Restorations: neck, right arm with shoulder, thunderbolt, pedestal with both feet and omphalos, fingers of left hand, and patches in the drapery. The head seems antique, but is of a different marble and does not belong to the statue. The ass is in great part modern. Former collection: Franz Pulzky.

8 In the dining-room, unfortunately still unpublished, except for Claric (= Claris-Heimach, 241, 1).
9 See Christie's Sale Catalogue, June 29, 1878, p. 8, Lot 50 c: An Antique Statue of Heracles, the head wreathed with vines leaves, holding a club in his right hand, in his left a cornucopia; the lion's skin on the trunk of a tree at his side, 4' 8" ft. 3 in. h. This figure which is in fine condition, represents a new and interesting type of Hercules (from Constantinople). This description and the height place the identity with the Cook statue beyond doubt.
The hand is planted on the hip in a manner familiar from statues of Asklepios, cf. Clarac-Reinach 366, 3 (Wilton House) and the examples in Répertoire ii, 32-36. The nobility of the pose and the throw of the drapery make the interpretation of Zeus possible. The modius, however, cannot be taken to indicate a Zeus Sarpis, since the head is foreign to the statue.

8 (not in Michaelis). Porphyry Bust of Sarapis, after Bryaxis. (Fig. 1. p. 3.)

Height: about 20 cm. Replicas: the 58 replicas of this type are enumerated by Amelung, Führer durch die Antiken in Florenz, p. 394-394.

The execution of the bust in porphyry seems to point to an Egyptian origin, and in effect it is an exact replica of the upper portion of the celebrated type of Sarapis known from so many examples, and referred with almost absolute certainty to the famous cultus statue of the Sarapeum at Alexandria, executed by the Attic sculptor Bryaxis, a contemporary of Scopas (Robert, art. Bryaxis in Pauly-Wissowa). The best known of these images is the bust in the Sala dei Busti of the Vatican (No. 298; Amelung, Museen p. 91). The famous bust in the Sala Rotonda (No. 549) is a somewhat later variant (Amelung, loc. cit. p. 194). The god, who was seated, was clad in a chiton which just fell over the right shoulder, leaving the arm bare; over the lower part of the body was thrown a heavy himation which was brought round across the back and fell over the left shoulder. The Sarapis of Bryaxis is the subject of an admirable paper by Amelung referred to above. To Dr. Amelung also I owe the identification of the present bust.

A graceful female (?) head of archaistic type (8a) has been curiously adjusted by a modern restorer to this bust of a male god.

9 (=Michaelis 42). Torso of a Satyr. (Plate VI.)

Height: about 90 cm. Marble: Greek. Bruchstücke: the chest has broken away.

This is a fragment of a replica of the famous Satyr of the Tribuna of the Uffizi, bearing time with his foot on the καστανέων or wooden double sole. From a Maenad on the lid of the Casali Sarcophagus (now in the Ny Carlsberg Museum at Copenhagen; Baumeister, Denkmäler, i. p. 442, fig. 492), who uses the καστανέων and at the same time plays the double flute, it would seem that the Satyr should be restored with the double flute and not, as in the Uffizi example, with castanets (see Amelung, Führer durch die Antiken in Florenz, p. 44). The original, which is not impossibly the example in the Uffizi, belongs to about the middle of the third century B.C.

10 (=Michaelis 43). Male Torso. (Plate VI.)

Height: 0.39. Marble: Greek.

On the left shoulder are traces of a tectia (?), of hair (?), or of a skin (?). Possibly a Heracles (tentatively suggested by Michaelis). The right arm was
lowered, the left extended and somewhat raised to rest on a pillar or other object. The motive points to the fourth century, but the hard exaggerated rendering of the muscles is characteristic of a later date.

11 (= Michaelis 2). **Statue of Aphrodite.** (Venus Mazarin. Plates VII. and VIII.)

Total height: 1 m. 80 cm. Restorations and breakings: half the knot of hair, pieces of each breast, part of the dolphin's tail, are missing. The head and the right arm holding the drapery are broken, but belong to the statue. In the back are the traces of gun-shots which struck the statue during the Revolution when the happy precaution had been taken to turn the face of the goddess to the wall. The statue is otherwise in admirable preservation. Three marks on the back of the dolphin show that an Eros probably stood here. Marble: fine so-called Parian. Former owner: Coll. Mazarin, Mus. du Beaujou (see the modern history of the statue consult Michaelis). Replica: the nearest is Claeys-Reinach, 325, 6.

There are numerous statues of a similar type (see Bermonli, *Aphrodite*, pp. 248 ff.), but none that can be exactly called a replica. All these statues with their slightly varying motive evidently derive from the Cnidian Aphrodite of Praxiteles, to which a new character is imparted by letting the drapery partially enfold the lower part of the body. The movement of the left arm and of the hand that grasps the drapery in front of the body is closely imitated from the nude statue; the other arm, which in the Cnidian statue would be lowered to drop the drapery on the vase, is somewhat raised and holds the other end of the drapery away from the body. It should be noted that the action of the arms of the Cnidian statue is reversed in the present example, as it is in the greater number of the standing Aphrodites of this type, e.g. the Capitoline, the Medicean, etc.

Lately the attempt has been made by S. Reinach to trace the similar statue of the Vatican Belvedere dedicated by Sallustia (Amelung, *Vat. Cat.* ii, p. 112, 42) back to a bronze Aphrodite by Praxiteles which, according to Pliny, xxxiv. 69, had stood in front of the *Tempellum Felicitatis* (*Rev. Arch.* 1904, pp. 376 ff. and Fig. 1), but Amelung (*ib.* has shown what are the objections to this theory.

12 (= Michaelis 6). **Small group of Dionysus Supporting Himself on Seilenus.** (Plate IX.)

Height: 0.70 m. Marble: Greek. Restorations: right arm of Dionysus (some of the broken parts may be antique); his feet; the pedestal (only a small part is antique); the nose of both figures. Replicas: Windsor, vol. xxvii, vol. 38, No. 22 (as Michaelis), Former collections: Grimani, Pejovszkey and Franz Pulasky. Literature: Claeys-Reinach, 129, 3; Amaldi, 1884, p. 81. (It has escaped both Reinach and Michaels that the Grimani-Pejovszkey groups and the Richmond example are identical.)

This type of group was formerly named 'Socrates and Alcibiades,' a favourite name for similar groups since the time of the Renaissance. The curious composition is a variant of groups of Dionysus and a Satyr such as

---

10 Andreas Fulvius, *Antiquitates Urbiniae* (1527) Alcibiadice amplexamini (note by Professor fol. XXXV, already mentions a Socrates seileus Michaelis.)
as the colossal Ludovisi group (Hellwig, Führer, 880), the Chiaramonti group (Hellwig, 112; Anm. 588) or the group in the Uffizi (Anm. Führer, 140)\textsuperscript{13} which derive from a Dionysus of the Praxitelean school, with his right hand brought over his head and his left arm supported on the trunk of a tree (cf. the Praxitelean Apollo Lykeios). Seilenus, whose head is of the usual bearded type with sunken nose, is completely clothed in the χιτών χαρίας, the shaggy coat of skins regularly worn by the Papposilenus of the Satyric drama. Cp. the group in Athens of Seilenus with the child Dionysus in Arndt-Bruckmann, Eintelaufnahmen, No. 643.

13 (= Michaelis 4). **Torso of Aphrodite.** (Plate IX.)

*Height: 0.93 m. Marble: Island, of a beautiful transparent quality. Provenance: Athens.*\textsuperscript{14}

The goddess was apparently represented with her right arm raised to her head, and the left arm lowered, but the motive is not clear. Copy of a fourth century type. Insignificant workmanship; the absence of proportion between the small upper body, the heavy hips and long thighs has been commented on by Michaelis.

14 (= Michaelis 41). **Statuette of Aphrodite.** (Plate IX.)

*Height: 0.92 m. Restoration and breakage: hand, fingers of right hand, the foot, and the pedestal, with the greater part of the dolphin; the legs are nailed (left knee new). The right arm has been broken off and put on again; the first and fourth fingers of the hand are broken; the left forearm which, according to Michaelis, belonged to the statue, has disappeared.*

The statue is insignificant both in type and workmanship. It is one of many variants which derive more or less remotely from the Capitoline and Medicean statues (cf. the 33 examples of Aphrodite with the dolphin enumerated by Bermond, *Aphrodite*, pp. 229–234).

15 (= Michaelis 47). **Double Bust of Dionysus and Alexander.** (Fig. 2)

*Height: 0.29 m. Marble: Greek. Restorations: tip of the nose of Dionysus; the other restorations referred to by Michaelis have been taken away. Provenance: Rome.*\textsuperscript{15}

This term must, I think, be identical with (and not merely similar to) as was suggested by Michaelis) the one published by Gerhard, *Antike Bildwerke*, Plate CCCXVIII (Text, p. 408: *Dionysos und Ares; dieser mit Flügelhelm, jener mit fließendem Bart und Wimperkränzung. In Rom gezeichnet*). The leaves of the wreath are not oak (Michaelis), but vine; the horns, however, seem to be absent in this example, but the reproduction in Gerhard is so poor that it is difficult to tell whether they actually existed in the bust or are merely a fancy of the draughtsman.

Lately M. S. Reinauch\textsuperscript{16} has interpreted the Gerhard herm as a double bust of Dionysus and Alexander, from the likeness of the beardless head to...
the beautiful portrait of Alexander in the Dattari collection at Cairo first described by O. Rubensohn. As the Dattari head, however, has the horns of Ammon on the helmet, M. Reinach surmised that the draughtsman who drew the Gerhard double bust had by a misunderstanding turned the horns into wings. In presence of the Richmond example and of its photographic reproduction we must admit that the draughtsman was correct, but as the beardless head unmistakably resembles the portraits of Alexander, M. Reinach is probably right in his alternative suggestion that the wings—

![Image](image_url)

**Fig. 3.—Double Terminal Bust of Dionysus and Alexander or Hermes.** (15)

which replace the Ammon horns so appropriate to Alexander—are a modification due to the ancient copyists.

The Dattari and Richmond 'Alexanders' have in common the great breadth of face, the impressively modelled brow and deeply sunk eyes. It is not certain, however, that the sculptor of what we may venture to call the Gerhard-Richmond head intended to give a portrait of the king; from his substituting the wings of Hermes for the horns of Ammon on the helmet it is very possible that he consciously transformed the portrait into an image of Hermes.11 The helmet is worn over a leather cap with broad cheek-pieces, apparently made of leather: thongs sewn together.

11 To my regret, insufficient photographs were taken of this interesting bust; I hope, however, to publish it again in different aspects.
The head of Dionysus goes back to a fine original created in the Scopasian or Lysippean schools.

It is true also that the beardless head seems to have the nose intact; but from its outline this nose must be modern, while the breakage and the rusty iron pin show plainly that a modern nose has been removed from the Richmond example. On the coupling of Alexander with Dionysus or the ' Libyan Bacchus,' see S. Reinach, op. cit. p. 6.

§ 5.—Greek Art in Asia Minor and Hellenistic Art.

16 (= Michaelis 40). Statue of Aphrodite crouching in the bath attended by Eros. (Plate X.)

Height: 1.15 cm. Length of face: 0.10 cm. Restored: right arm and left hand with wrist; the left foot (which the restorer has ineptly covered with a sandal), though the goddess is bathing; toes of the right foot. Nearly the whole of the eyes (the neck only is antique). The left leg of the Eros was once restored, but is now lost; the wings are modern, but their attachments are antique. The head is much damaged by exposure to the weather. The pedestal is modern. Marbles: coarse Parian. Literature: Cavaendorf, Karolova, vol. ii. No. 66; Cauer, 827, 14, 11 = Klein-Reinach, 338; Bormuilli, p. 216, No. 10; Wecker, Kunstmesse, p. 81. Replicas: list of the 29 examples cited by Bormuilli has been much increased, cf. Klein, Praktische, pp. 270 ff. Though this may be one of the commonest, exact replicas are rare. The Richmond example seems to repeat in every detail the form from Vienna, in the Louvre. Former owners: the sculptor, Bartolomeo Cavaceppi, Lord Anson (George, Baron Anson, the admiral, 1697-1762) at Shugborough Hall in Staffordshire.

A coarse but not inaccurate copy of an Aphrodite executed about the middle of the third century B.C. by Diodokas, a native of Bithynia. The best of the numerous copies seems to be the well-known one in the Louvre, though the head and both arms are lost. To the two main types of the crouching Aphrodite, with the variants noted by Bormuilli (Aphrodite, pp. 314 ff.), must be added a third with both arms raised to the head, a motive which by disclosing the breast recalls the Argive schools of the fifth century. The only satisfactory example known to me of this type with the upraised arms is the statue now at Windsor in the collection of H.M. the King, which I hope shortly to publish in this journal [Michaelis, Osborn, No. 5; Reinach, Repertoire ii. 371]. The more usual type, represented by the present statue, recalls a favourite motive of the Lysippean school by which one of the arms is brought across the breast, as for instance in the Apoxyomenos. Cf. Löwy, Lysipp und seine Stilung, p. 29. The lack of restraint in the treatment of the nude both in this and in the Paris example points to a Graeco-Asiatic rather than to a purely Greek school (cf. also G. Cullera, Saggi sull' arteellenistica e greco-romana), while the number of replicas and more or less exact imitations postulates a renowned original. Now when Pliny (xxxvi. 54) is enumerating the statues in the Temple of Jupiter adjoining the Porteurs

18 So too in the Melian Aphrodite, which
Mahler has lately traced back to the school of
Lysippus (Champion, Notices de l'Académie des
Lettres, 1905, p. 829).
19 Ansmann, Maximus, p. 96, excellently
analyses the type.
Octaviæ, he mentions three statues of Aphrodite. The first of these was by Philiskos. The other two Pliny describes as follows: *Venerem lavantem sse Doidalas stattem Polycharmum.* In the same Doidalas given by the best codex M. Th. Reinach has astutely recognized, on the evidence of inscriptions, the Bithynian Doidalas who flourished in the third century A.C. (see Robert art. ‘Doidalas’ in Pauly-Wissowa). It is therefore more than probable that the original of our replicas, which moreover appears on the coinage both of Bithynia and of Amisos in Pontus, is that of the Bithynian Doidalas (see S. Reinach in Pro Alcisa, Nov.-Dec. 1906, p. 69). This collection also possesses, as we shall see, a copy of the third Aphrodite noted by Pliny in the same passage.

17 (not in Michaelis). **Statuette of Aphrodite. (Plate X.)**

*Height: 35 cm., including pedestal. Restoration: both arms and both legs with the arm and the drapery; the head has been broken off and a new piece of neck inserted on the left side; but the head is antique and belongs to the body. Replicas: Bernoulli, Aphrodite, pp. 324–328; Reinach, Repertoire, i. 227, 324, 333; ii. 345, 349, 394, 399; iii. 187, 256, 237. Exact replicas, however, are rare, but the same motive runs through the whole series. Exhibited, B.F.A.C., 1903 (Cat. p. 15, No. 17).*

The motive has been explained as Aphrodite unloosening with her right hand the sandal of her left raised foot. The type must have been one of the most popular in antiquity. Bernoulli in 1873 gave a list of 36 statues and statuettes with similar pose; in 1887 M. S. Reinach brought the number up to 70 (Nécropole de Myrina, text to Pl. V) and made further additions in his *Repertoire* (i. e.). In a number of the bronze replicas, where the feet are generally preserved, the sandal is frequently absent, and the goddess is apparently imagined as standing in the water and washing her heel. In the marble statues, which have mostly lost legs and feet, it is difficult to tell whether this motive or that of the sandal was intended. In the present instance the roundness of the forms points to an original of a later date, in the manner of the Asia Minor or Alexandrian schools. There is much to commend M. S. Reinach’s identification of this type as the ‘standing’ Aphrodite of Polycharmos mentioned by Pliny, xxxvi. 34, as being, together with the Aphrodite of Doidalas, in the Temple of Jupiter adjoinin the Porticus Octaviæ. But, as noted above under No. 16, in discussing the Aphrodite of Doidalas, the Plimian passage is a much vexed one. The words *stantem Polycharmum* are vague and unsatisfactory, because, as M. Reinach points out, to qualify the statue of Polycharmos as ‘standing’ is inadequate, if not incomprehensible, since the majority of statues of Aphrodite are of a standing type. Therefore several editors of Pliny felt compelled to assume a lacuna between *stantem* and *Polycharmum,* which Reinach now proposes to fill up with the words *pole in uno;* this Aphrodite ‘standing on one foot,’ would

---

17 G. Sandre, Arch. 1907, i. p. 314. No. 250.
18 For instance the two examples in the Brit. Mus. from Paphos (No. 292) and Panambythis.  
19 S. Reinach, *La Vénus d’Alasea*, in *Proc. Min. from Paphos* (No. 292) and *Panambythis.*
then be the famous original of the numerous replicas noted above. If we may further suppose with Reinach that Polycharous, whose name does not occur outside the Plinian passage, was, like Doidalas, an Asiatic; his authorship of the type in question becomes probable.

18 (not in Michaelis). Statuette of Aphrodite. (Plate X.)

Total height: 74 cm. Restoration: the head and all the extremities, with the pedestal and base, only the torso being antique.

Insignificant replica of the same type as the preceding.

19 (=Michaelis 62). Draped Female Statue. (Plate XI.)

Height: 132 cm. Marble: Greek. Restoration and breakage: the statue is let into a modern plinth; the right foot, perhaps worked out of a separate piece of marble, is missing; the head and both the arms (originally worked out of a different piece of marble) are lost; the folds of the himation are a good deal chipped and worn in places.

The pose is at once elegant and dignified. The weight of the figure is thrown on to the left foot, and the right leg is placed somewhat to the side and at ease, thus imparting a trailing grace to the figure and throwing the heavy folds that fall between the feet into rich curving lines. The left arm, now lost, held one end of the cloak against the hip. The right arm appears to have been extended, probably so as to rest on a sceptre; the back of the statue is left curiously rough and unfinished, so that the figure must have been placed within a niche. The transparent drapery scarcely veils the elegant and slender forms. The manner in which the himation is caught round the neck into a band is characteristic of Pergamene sculpture (e.g. the Eos and numerous female figures on the great frieze of the giants from Pergamon); so too is the manner in which the vertical folds of this garment show beneath the diagonal folds of the himation. The high girding, close under the breast, and the way in which the folds at the upper edge of the himation are gathered into a heavy roll recall the Asiatic schools. I incline to regard the statue, which has considerable charm and freshness, as an original dating from the latter half of the third century B.C. Though we must admit with Michaelis that 'the execution is by no means very fine,' the statue has none of the dryness of a copy.

20 (not in Michaelis). Statue of Hygieia. (Plate XI.)


The technical treatment, the individuality of the somewhat heavy features, the fringed veil thrown over the head, show that we have here the portrait perhaps of a priestess, in the character of Hygieia. The left arm with the snake wound round it and holding the paten is a common motive in statues of Hygieia (cf. Répertoire, loc.). The high girding and the throw of the drapery suggest an affinity with works like the 'Themis' by Kallikrates,
found at Rhamnus in Attica (Athens, Nat. Mus., Cat. 263; Reinaech, Répertoire, ii. 244, 4). Such types derive from classical models, but they are dry and academic in feeling, and consequently difficult to date. They were adapted to portraits of priestesses and later to portraits of Roman ladies, far down into the Roman period. Prof. Michaelis points out to me that the figure seems connected stylistically with the series of female statues from Asia Minor, once in the Arundel collection, and now at Oxford (Michaelis, Oxford, 1–9).

21 (= Michaelis 67). **Funeral Stele of Archippos.** (Plate XII.)

*Height: 1'54 cm.; greatest breadth: 0'62 cm. Marble: yellowish grey. Excerpted from an epitaph that the left hand is broken.*

**Literature:** Masse, Grimmelshausen, p. 37; R.E.C.C. Cat. no. 58 and Plate XXXIX.; Jahrbuch des Arch. Inst. xx. p. 46; Fig. 10a. **Provenance:** Smyrna (?).

**Former collection:** Palazzo Grimani-Spade, Venice. **Exhibited:** Burlington Fine Arts Club, 1923.

Archippos, flanked by two servants of diminutive stature who lean up against the pillars which form the niche, is represented as beardless and wears chiton, cloak, and sandals. With his right hand he touches the wreath which has presumably been bestowed upon him for civic services. The inscription which is distributed between the laurel wreath beneath the pediment and the architrave runs: α ἅγιος Ἀρχίππος (O.I.G. vol. ii. 3224). On a tall sepulchral column of the Ionic order in the background stands a sepulchral urn with graceful handles. This stele, together with No. 22, belongs to a well-known class of sepulchral monuments from the south of Asia Minor and the neighbouring islands, which have lately been exhaustively discussed by Ernst Pfuhl (*Das Beiwerk auf einem ostgriechischen Grabreliefs* in Jahrbuch des Arch. Institutes, xx. 1905, pp. 47–96 and pp. 123–155). The architectural features are fairly constant. A low basis with top and bottom mouldings supports the actual niche which is formed by two columns and an architrave. Above this runs a broad band variously adorned with a wreath and one or two rosettes. Above this again comes the pediment. Pfuhl sees in this type of sepulchral monument a combination of the σαλέως or shrine of an earlier period with the high rosette stele of which there are numerous examples. The urn and columns show that here, as invariably in these Asia Minor steles, the dead is imagined to be standing near to, or actually within (see No. 22), his own sepulchral monument.

22 (= Michaelis 68). **Funeral Stele of Phila.** (Plate XII.)


This stele is almost the exact counterpart of the stele of Archippos; in the pediment, instead of a shield, is a quatrefoil rosette and the architrave has no dentils. Phila, a figure evidently influenced by a Praxitelean motive, sits completely wrapped in her veil, her right foot resting on a footstool, her
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left leg drawn back. In front of her a little maiden holds a large open casket, at her side a still smaller maiden holds a distaff. As Archippus stands by his sepulchral column and urn, so Phila sits within her own sepulchral chamber, indicated by a wall with a shelf upon which stands an open triptychon. Excellent example of an Asia Minor stele.

23 (=Michaelis 69). **Funeral Stele of Epiktēsis.** (Plate XII.)

*Height: 1.97 m.; greatest breadth: 0.83 m. Marble: Greek. Collection: same as two preceding numbers. Incription: C.I.G. vol. 1, 669.*

The stele, though its architecture differs from that of 21 and 22, evidently belongs to the same class of monument.

Epiktēsis, who stands fronting the spectator, with the usual little maiden holding the jewel-case at her side, is draped in a manner that at once recalls the central figure on the slab with three Muses standing of the Mantinean basis (J.H.S. 1907, p. 111, Fig. 9), cf. also the exquisite figure from an Attic stele, Athens, Cent. Mus., 1905, brought within the same Praxitelean series by Amelung, *Basis des Praxiteles aus Mantine*, p. 46, Fig. 23). This adherence to Praxitelean models is specially characteristic of art in the nearer Grecio-Orient, and has lately been shewn by Strzygowski to persist right down to the period of the Sidamara Sarcophagi (J.H.S. loc. cit. p. 112). Rough, summary work, especially in the drapery.

24 (=Michaelis 70). **Fragment of an Asia Minor Stele.** (Fig. 3.)

*Height: 0.93 m. Provenience: Asia Minor or the Greek Islands (?).*

A draped figure standing in the attitude of Epiktēsis on No. 23.

25 (=Michaelis 70). **Fragment of Sepulchral Relief.** (Plate XIII.)

*Height: 0.45 m.; greatest breadth: 0.37 m. Marble: Greek. Breakage: the top of the stele with the head of the figure and two-thirds of the right side have been broken away. Provenience: Sicily.*

A woman stands again in a Praxitelean attitude which is closely imitated from the prototype of such figures as the 'Matron from Herculaneum’ (J.H.S. 1907, p. 112, Fig. 110 — the resemblance was already noted by Michaelis). At her side, the attendant maiden, holding a fan in her left hand, and a basket in her right, is carved in very low relief. Though the stele is said to have come from Sicily, the style points in this case also to Asia Minor.

26 (=Michaelis 24). **Lower half of Statue of Nymph holding Shell.** (Plate XIII.)

*Height: 0.70 m. Marble: Greek.*

The nymph who held the shell in front of her with both hands, supporting it lightly on the knot into which her drapery is gathered, belongs to a familiar class of figures (see Reimach, *Ep. ii. 405*) though it cannot be claimed as the replica of any one of them. It comes nearest to the statue in the
Louvre, Reinach, Fig. 3 (loc. cit.), but is not identical. The drapery of the present copy is executed with decorative skill and the shell-like arrangement of the folds has meaning and charm. The work, however, is probably not earlier than the Roman period.

27 (not in Michaelis) **Boy with Duck or Goose.** (Plate XIV.)

Height: 33 cm. ; breadth: 58 cm. Marble: Italian fine-grained white marble (Aemelin). Provenance: unknown. Restorations: right arm from the shoulder, tip of the nose, a patch on the right ear, middle finger of the left hand, big toe of the left foot; right foot, almost the whole base (Aemelin). Literature: Vienna Jahreshbote, vi. 1903, p. 239 (R. Herzig, from a communication of Aemelin). Replicas: the twelve replicas are noted and described by Herzig (loc. cit.).

**Ernest Gardner** Statuette representing a boy and goose. *J.H.S.* vii. 1885, p. 4, Nos. 28 and 29.
The motive of the statue has long been familiar from the numerous replicas, the best of which seems to be the one discovered at Ephesus at the S.W. angle of the Roman agora during the Austrian excavations of the year 1896 (Herzog, loc. cit. Taf. 8; cf. Wace, J.H.S. xxiii. 1903, p. 348, Fig. 14, Fig. 17). Herzog's attempt to identify this group as the boy with the χρυσάλατης, or fox-goose, described by Herodas in the temple of Asklepios at Cos, has much in its favour. The subject of a boy with a goose or a duck was, it is true, specially popular, and must have been treated with variations by numberless artists (E. A. Gardner in J.H.S. vi. 1885, pp. 1 ff.). Yet the frequent repetition of the present motive shows that it derives from some famous original, while there is surely a special significance in the fact that

an excellent and life-like copy was found at Ephesus, which is comparatively near Cos (cf. Herzog, p. 215, n. 1). Herzog prefers to see in the group a mere genre subject, but I incline to interpret it—in accordance with a suggestion already put forward by F. Reinach (in connexion with the copy after Boethos of Chalcedon of a boy wrestling with a goose, likewise preserved in numerous replicas)—as the child Asklepios playing with the goose sacred to himself. However much the 'boy with the goose' may have been treated in later times merely as a genre subject, it seems more than probable that the motive originated in a child Asklepios. In the Renaissance, likewise, the child

For the χρυσάλατης, an Egyptian species of small goose, see Herzog, op. cit.

3) οἱ χρυσάλαται οὐ τὸ πάντα πτερίζονται, οὐκ οὖν ἀλλ' χρυσάλατον, ἀλλ' χρυσάλατης

Reinach, indeed, had proposed tentatively to identify the original of Boethos with the 'Asklepeia' suit of the same artist, known from two metrical inscriptions; but see C. Robert (Art. Boethos in Pauly-Wissowa, 604 f.) against the identification of the Cosan group with the boy strangling a goose.
St. John with the lamb is difficult to differentiate from a pure youth subject. The motive of the original groups has been well interpreted by Jahn, by Wolters and others (see the passages quoted by Herrzig, op. cit. p. 232). The following analysis from one of Furtwängler's earliest monographs (Der Herrmannsreiter und der Knabe mit der Gans, 1876, p. 70) is worth noting: the composition shows a small boy, who after the manner of children sits upon the ground; but he wants to get up and is unable to do so unaided; so he stretches out one arm and looks up entreatingly for help; at the same time, as he is so careful to keep his other hand firmly on his favourite goose, it seems as if someone had wanted to take his playmate from him, and thus caused the little fellow's excitement. The present group is merely decorative, but other replicas were doubtless intended for fountains, and the goose pressed by the boy sprouted water.

28 (not in Michaelis). Sepulchral or Votive Statuette of the Boy Senecio. (Plate XIV.)

Height: 63 cm. Marble: Greek.

The inscription on the plinth reads: Φωιεστος νησιν έν ου οικιωνος ιευς ίππος. It was doubtless intended for a senarius, but the scansion is spoilt by the intrusion of the name. In spite of the late Greek characters, Senecio, as his name shows, is a Roman and the statue, with its rather square and pinnacled forms, is Roman rather than Greek in character. Senecio, who presses a cock to his side and holds a little vase in the hand which he rests on a pillar at his right, seems to derive not so much from a Greek as from Etruscan models, such as the boy with a bird in the museum at Leyden. (Reinach, Répertoire, ii. 404, where a number of kindred figures are given.) The type, however, which occurs in many variants, is a common one, and like that of the ‘boy with the fox-goose’ probably originated in the schools of the period after Alexander. See the list of examples drawn up by E. Gardner in J.H.S. vi. 1885, ‘Statuette representing a boy and goose,’ p. 8. The eyes are inscribed in the manner of the Antonine period; hasty, superficial workmanship.

29 (Michaelis 45). Votive Statuette of a Boy. (Plate XIV.)

Height: 0·47 cm. Marble: Greek. Restored: the trunk, the pedestal and the lower part of the legs; part of the left arm and the whole of the right arm with a portion of the box; the nose; the hand suits the movement of the body and presumably belongs to the statue, but it has been broken off and clumsily reattached by means of plaster.

In spite of its bad condition the charm of the silhouette owing to the child's easy and natural pose is considerable. The composition seems decidedly Greek; the subject is difficult to make out, the 'deep square box', thought by Michaelis to contain 'probably articles of jewellery' (owing to the presence of what may be a ring) seems to me rather to be connected.
with some cultus ceremony—the little round objects resemble the tops of small vessels.  

30 (not in Michaelis). **Statue of a Boy holding an Urn.** Fountain figure.  (Fig. 4.)

*Height:* about life-size.  *Restorations:* right leg from below the knee; the left foot.  *Replote:* Clarac-Meunier, pl. 89, 2; from Cavaceppi (unless indeed this be the same figure as the present; Michaelis, however, identifies the Cavaceppi statue with one at St. Anne's Hill, Surrey).

![Statue of a Boy holding an Urn](image)

**Fig. 4.—Boy with Urn.** (30)

The statuette, which is of only slight importance, has been so much rubbed and worked over as to seem modern.  It falls within a familiar series.
of fountain figures, e.g. Vatican, Chiarum. (Amelung, Cat. No. 700 = Clarac-Reinach, 439, 2); Candelabri 117, 118; Munich Glypt. Furtwängler, Cat. 253; Ny Carlsberg 169.  

The type probably goes back to Hellenistic times, and is sometimes found adapted to relief sculpture in Sarcophagi (see Amelung, loc. cit.).

31 (not in Michaelis). **Fragment of a Hellenistic Relief.** (Plate XV.)

*Height: 28 cm., breadth: 34 cm. Marble; Greek. Condition: only the upper part of both figures is preserved; the bearded head of Seilenus and his left hand are much mutilated, the right arm—which probably held a kantharos—has been broken away altogether.

The relief which shows the drunken Seilenus, half reclining, half supported by a boiyish Satyr, falls within a well-known group of subjects representing Dionysus, Hercules, or Seilenus revelling (cf. Schreiber, *Hellenistische Reliefbilder*, 30, 42, 43, 45), but I have not found any exact replica. In spite of the mutilation the workmanship appears good and careful, and the satyr, treated in back view and straining with all his might to support the heavy figure of Seilenus, is rendered with great truth of observation.

§ 6.—*Augustan Art.*

32. (= Michaelis 82). **Relief Sculptured on Both Faces.** (Plate XVI.)

Present height: 92 cm., breadth: 92 cm.

The relief has at some time been broken into several pieces and put together roughly with plaster. The whole top is still missing. On the obverse three masks are carved in high relief. On the right a mask of Dionysus, with the broad Baccic *miter*, lies on a ‘low cista half opened’ (Michaelis). The mystic cista is here represented as a wicker basket, and resembles in this particular the iknon or mystic Vannus, the shovelled-shaped basket of Bacchus, upon which rests the mask of a Satyr in a similar Hellenistic relief (Schreiber, *Hellenistische Reliefbilder*, Plate 106). Facing this mask of Dionysus is a mask of Hercules wearing the lion skin, and with what appears to be another lion skin roughly indicated below. The connexion of Hercules with the stage (see Furtwängler, cf. Roscher, *Hercules*, col. 2191) is often emphasized by representation on monuments similar to the present, e.g. on a fragment from a sarcophagus in Berlin (Cat. Sculpt., 857), but this is the only instance at present known to me in which the masks of Dionysus and of Hercules are brought face to face. Between the two is the mask of a youthful Satyr with what appears to be a roughly indicated nebels below. The short nose, high cheek-bones, and half-open mouth are characteristic of the Satyr type; the head is treated with considerable refinement and goes back to some good fourth-century model.

---

* Munich 232 ( = Clarac-Reinach 417, 6) may also be compared.*
The scene sculptured in low relief on the reverse is peculiarly interesting. On the left a young Satyr, half kneeling on the ground, is seen steady ing with his right hand an ithyphallic image of Priapus, while on the right two winged Erotes are making great efforts to erect a similar much larger image which they are raising from the ground. On the left two Erotes are hoisting the huge figure up by means of cables, like masons attempting to raise a heavy weight. Each pulls one end of the cable; one, whose upper part is unfortunately broken off, hovers in the air; the other pushes with both his feet against the lower part of the shaft so as to get it into place. They are assisted by a third Eros on the right, who, with his right foot firmly planted against a rock and his left hand against a tree-trunk, in order to obtain purchase, has his back against the image which he thus helps to push up. This amusing scene could not be noted by Michaelis, as the reverse was almost wholly covered with plaster, which I chipped off with excellent result. Both sides of the relief are evidently connected, and the whole monument has to do with the Satyric drama and the cult of Dionysus.

33 (= Michaelis 60). Large Krater adorned with Victories and Dancing Girls. (Plate XVII)

*Height* : 0.90 m.; *diameter* : 0.90 m. *Restorations* : foot and projecting parts of the handle; the surface has been overworked, but the authenticity is above suspicion. *Literature* : Hauser, *Neu-Attische Reliefs*, p. 96, no. 18. *Manner* : Italian with grey stripes.

This large vase belongs to a group of works of the New Attic School, the most typical example of which is the celebrated Borghese Vase in the Louvre (Clarac-Reinsch, 28, Hauser, *op. cit.*, p. 84), but the present example lacks the usual elegance of form in this class of vase; its lower part, instead of the elegant fluting visible on the Borghese Vase, has a somewhat clumsy leaf decoration; the handles end on the body of the vase in vine-leaves, while under each handle are crossing thyrsi as on the cup from Hildesheim (Permee-Winter, *Der Hildesheimer Silbenfund*, Plate X.). The two Nikai on the front of the vase call for no further comment; the two dancing figures of the reverse exactly repeat the two figures from a triangular candelabrum basis in the Villa Albani (Helbig, *Katalog*, No. 380). The first dancer holds on the palm of her upraised left hand a dish of fruit and with her right lightly grasps the folds of her scarf. Immediately behind her advances a second dancer, holding her left hand to her head; the right arm, with open hand, is thrown back. Like so many of the figures of the New Attic reliefs, these dancers possibly go back to a fifth century type, perhaps to the *Satyrakes* Lawrence of Callimachus, mentioned by Pliny. (On this point see Furtwängler, *Masterpieces*, p. 493.)

The altar of rough stones with the piled-up fruit and the flame resembles the altar on a slab of the Ara Pacis, and the altar above on the right, in the

---

36 For a similar relief carved on both faces, see Museo Chiranesi. (Amelung, Cat. 106.)
37 Now reproduced in Arndt's *Kunstgartun*.
relief at Vienna of a lioness with her cubs. Though style and composition are distinctly Augustan, this particular example is probably a replica executed at a later date. The execution seems too summary and coarse for the First Century.

33a (not in Michaelis). Sculped Pilaster. (Fig. 5.)

Height: 135 cm.

The elegant and somewhat schematic decoration points to the Augustan age.

§ 7.—Roman Portraiture.

34 (Michaelis 8). Head of Young Augustus (B.C. 28–A.D. 14). (Plato XVIII.)

Total height: 0'415 m.; length of face: 0'19 m. Material: coarse-grained Parian. Restorations: patch near the right eye; the lip of the nose antique, but broken and set on; good preservation, but rubbed and slightly weathered over in modern times. Provenance: Paris. Literature: Bernoulli, Roma, Rom. ii. i p. 208, No. 19, and id. 229.

The bust, which I have examined repeatedly, seems to me above suspicion. Michaelis, who also does not seem to doubt its genuineness, questions the old identification as Caligula. It seems obvious, however, that the likeness is to Augustus as a young man. The resemblance to his current portraiture is obvious; for the slight indications of a moust-
tache and of a beard on the chin compare the Augustan portrait called, on very doubtful grounds, the youthful Julius Caesar (cast in the Ashmolean at Oxford). The expression is more direct and life-like, less idealized, less Greek than is usually the case in portraits of Augustus (see E. Strong, Roman Sculpture, p. 355). The shape of the bust, which is intact, is characteristic of the Julio-Claudian period (ib. p. 349). Bernoulli (op. cit. p. 320) calls the head 'der schöne Knabenkopf'; he seems to have no doubt of its genuineness, but questions the head being that of Caligula. He compares it with the portrait (unknown) on a beautiful cameo in the Brit. Mus. (Bernoulli, op. cit. Plate: XXXVI, 9).

35 (Michaelis 54). **Portrait of a Roman Lady.** (Plate XVIII.)


Head with closely waved hair, and a short fringe from ear to ear. Behind the ears the hair falls on to the neck in two long ringlets. The head, in which both Michaelis and Bernoulli see a decided likeness to the so-called Antonia of the Louvre (Bernoulli, ii. 1, Plate XIV.), is certainly the portrait of some lady of the Julio-Claudian house. The broad upper part of the face, with its high cheek bones and the sensitive but firm mouth reveal a strong individuality.

36 (Michaelis 52). **Portrait of a Roman Priestess.** (Plate XVIII.)

Height: 0·92 cm.; length of face: 0·18 cm.

The shape of the bust, which is absolutely intact, is characteristic of the Antonine period and first sets in with the portraits of Sabina, wife of Hadrian (117-138 A.D.), to whose portraits this head with its generalized, slightly idealized features, bears a certain distant resemblance. The hair is waved or crimped in a classical style and confined by a woolen knotted fillet, the veil is drawn over the back of the head. The pupils are plastically indicated.

37 (Michaelis 63). **Bust of Lucius Verus** (A.D. 161-169). (Plate XVIII.)


The bust, which reproduces an ordinary type, is absolutely intact, and is thus an excellent example of the typical bust shape of the Antonine age. The Emperor wears a cuirass, of which the shoulder-flap is elegantly decorated with the figure of a giant, whose legs end in serpents. In the centre is the usual head of Medusa, half-covered, however, by the folds of the military cloak. The bust was executed as pendant to that of Marcus Aurelius found on the same spot and now in the Louvre (Bernoulli, ii. 2, p. 170, No. 54).
38 (= Michaelis 9). **Portrait of a Roman Boy.** (Fig. 6, p. 3.)

*Height: 9:25 cm.; length of face: 9:10 cm. Restored: tip of the nose. Marble: Greek. Provenance (i).*

The pupils of the eye are indicated plastically; this and other characteristics point to the Antonine age. Cf. the head of a boy of the Antonine family, Berneulli, ii. 2, Pl. LV., and the portraits of the young Aelius Verus.

39 (= Michaelis 65). **Medallion Portrait of a Roman.** (3rd Cent. A.D.) (Fig. 7, p. 3.)

*Diameter: 9:40 cm. Restoration: the nose; almost the whole of both ears; the neck. Marble: Parian.*

The medallion, which is well preserved and from which the head stands out almost in the round, is a good example of an ‘*imago clipeata.*’ The pupils, which are indicated plastically by a bean-shaped segment, the drawing of the thin lips, the close curling beard and hair, all recall the portraiture of the period of the Severi and more especially of Caracallus (211-217 A.D.). It may be Greek work of the time.

§ 8.—**Sarcophagi.**

40 (= Michaelis 72). **Fragment of a Sarcophagus with Group of Two Erotes.** (Antonine Period.) (Plate XIX.)


The group preserved on this fragment is one repeated with more or less variation on a whole series of sarcophagi first commented upon by F. Matz, *Arch. Zeit.* 1872, p. 16 (cf. Strong, *Roman Sculpture*, p. 266). They may be dated about the period of Hadrian or the early Antonines (cf. Petersen, *Antonini*, 1860, p. 207). The notion, so repugnant to modern taste, of a drunken child, whether mortal or divine, supported by a companion who appears variously as winged or wingless, seems to have been particularly popular in the period of our sarcophagus. The chief examples are enumerated by Matz. The best of these, a sarcophagus in Athens, is now published for the first time on Plate XIX. for comparison with the Cook fragment. In the present fragment, as in the Athens sarcophagus, the child holds in his left hand a bunch of grapes, which led Stephani, and after him Petersen, to put forward an interpretation which is doubtless the correct one—namely, that these scenes represent the pleasures of future life under the image of Bacchanalian revelry. The group appears rendered with more delicacy and tenderness than usual on the plinth of a remarkable portrait of a girl of the early Antonine period, belonging to Mr. Newton-Robinson. For the sake of this group, this charming head is now published on Plate XXIV. The owner of

---

20 Prof. Bosanquet kindly had the sarcophagus photographed for this article.
the head had suggested that the 'Erotes' on the plinth might allude to the girl having attained the marriageable age, but if the explanation cited above be accepted, they simply mean that the girl is dead, and that this is her memorial bust.

Often the group seems to be introduced into sarcophagus decoration quite irrelevantly, as here, for instance, where the proportions and the whole movement of the group are entirely out of harmony with the Satyr on the right, who is much smaller in size and in lower relief.

41 (=Michaelis 76). Erotes at Play; Fragment from a Sarcophagus. (Plate XV.)

Height: 0.30 cm.; length: 0.37 cm. Much broken and restored on the left.

A winged Eros on the left lays a ball on the shoulder of his companion, who seems to crouch beneath the weight. On the right another Eros is busy carrying a basket of fruit (restored?). At this point the marble is broken off. Decorative work of about the period of Hadrian.

42 (=Michaelis 50). Fragment from the lid of a Sarcophagus. (Fig. 8.)

Height: 0.29 cm.; length: 1.17 cm.

The fragment, which comes from the front of a sarcophagus, represents Nereids riding on sea-panthers, that face one another heraldically. The relief is of a very slight, sketchy character, and reproduces a type popular in Alexandrian art.

43 (=Michaelis 57). Sarcophagus Front with the Calydonian Boar-Hunt. (Plate XX.)

Height: 0.35 cm.; length: 1.28 cm. Marble: Greek (?). Literature: C. Robert, Die attischen Sarcophagreliefs, ii. 356 and p. 329. Provenance: Naples. Breakages: left arm of wounded man; upper part of Atalanta's bow; left hand of Malignor; the spear shaft; the spear of the foremost Dioscuri; nose and left shoulder of Arionis; her right hand; part of the figure of Oineus has been sawn off, with a piece of the sarcophagus on the left side.
THE COOK COLLECTION

Both the subject and the rendering are well known from a series published by Robert (loc. cit.). In the centre, Meleager, to whose left, slightly in the background but nearest the bear, is seen Atalanta, spears the monster, who is seen issuing from his cave. Behind Meleager come the Dioscuri, Castor and Pollux, each wearing the conical cap, and immediately behind them again is the huntress Artemis, in the attitude of the 'Diane de Versailles.' On the extreme left (unfortunately the photograph is in deep shadow at this point) is the bearded Oineus, half of whose figure, together with the gate from which he emerges, has been seen away. Between Oineus and Artemis comes Orenus* shouldering his double axe and with his hound straining at the leash which Oreus once held in his right hand. Between the legs of Meleager a double axe in place of the hound often seen in other examples. Above the bear's cave a bearded man is seen hurling a stone. On the extreme right stands a wounded man touching the wound in his thigh. The landscape is indicated by a tree and a rush-like plant (beneath the bear), Atalanta's presence nearest the bear 'at the death,' so to speak, indicates the influence of Euripides. She is letting fly the arrow which she has just taken from her still open quiver. Her hair is waved into elegant rolls according to a fashion which came into vogue in the fourth century (see, for instance, the beautiful original head in the Glyptothek, Furtwängler, Cat. 210). This fashion of hair and the rolled drapery round the waist occur in fourth century types of Artemis (cf. the Warocqué Statuette, Aneling, Museum, frontispiece), here borrowed for Atalanta.

The excellent technique and animated composition point to the period of the Antonines—perhaps to the principate of Commodus. The Calydonian hunt is a favourite subject for the decoration of sarcophagi.

44 (= Michaelis 58). Sarcophagus Front with Battle of Greeks and Amazons. (Plate XX.)


The scene depicted is familiar from the series of sarcophagi with this subject reproduced by Robert (loc. cit.). In the centre, Achilles supports the dying form of Penthesilea. On each side, repeated with severe symmetry, is an animated group of an Amazon, who turns round with a lively movement of the whole body to defend herself against the bearded Greek who attacks her in the back. In each case the Amazon is attacked at the same time from the front by a younger mounted warrior armed with a long spear. At each angle stands a Victory, who, being placed obliquely, would were the sarcophagus entire, effect the transition from the front to the sides. The style of the workmanship points to the second century A.D., perhaps also from the principate of Commodus, when the subject of the Amazon was in great vogue.

* On the interpretation of this figure as Oreus, see Robert, op. cit. p. 274.
45 (= Michaelis 74). **Oval Sarcophagus of the Third Century.** (Plate XXI.)


The middle of the sarcophagus is taken up by the figure of the deceased, who is shown reclining in a posture borrowed from the sleeping Endymion visited by Selene, a common subject of Roman sarcophagi. The close-cropped hair rendered by pick-marks on a raised surface in the colouristic manner that sets in soon after the beginning of the third century gives us the approximate date of the sarcophagus. The Erôtes holding torches, who unveil the sleeping man, and those who flutter round carrying musical instruments or wreaths, or are seen on the ground busy with baskets of fruit, are typical of the art of the period. Above, on the extreme right an Eros stands by a little table placed under a tree and seems busily engaged making wreaths. The Eros asleep at the head of the deceased is probably symbolic of departed life. In the extreme left, below the two Erôtes with musical instruments, a grotto is indicated from which pears forth, as an animal, which from its long ears must be a hare. At either end is a laurel tree, with a lyre suspended in its branches, and fruit, flutes, and torches lying beside it. "Good sculpture, in almost perfect preservation." (M.)

46 (= Michaelis 73). **Sarcophagus with Bacchic Figures** (3rd century A.D.). (Plate XXI.)

*Height*: 0.68 cm.; *length*: 1.10 cm. *Made*: Italian (?). *Provenance*: (?). *Former Collection*: Coll. Liguri, Naples (communicated to me by Dr. G. Robert).

The centre of the composition is occupied by a medallion portrait, or "imago clipeata" of the dead man. The frontal position of the bust, the flatness of the planes, the sharp, linear treatment of the folds and the colouristic treatment of the hair by means of pick-marks on a raised surface, enable us from the portrait alone to date the sarcophagus about the middle of the third century A.D. The drapery of the portrait recalls the two magistrates in the Conservatori (E. Strong, *Rom. Sculpture*, Pl. 129) and the portrait at Chatsworth (ibid. Pl. 128). The medallion is supported heraldically at each side by a Centaur: each of these Centaurs is one of a pair drawing a chariot. In the chariot on the left is Dionysus accompanied by a Maenad blowing the flute; in the chariot on the right is Ariadne leaning on a thyrsus sceptre (?) and with her right hand holding the Dionysiac kantharos as if emptying it. She is accompanied by a Maenad striking the cymbals; under the chariot of Dionysus, his panther, under that of Ariadne, a small bearded and horned Pan. Under the bodies of the Centaurs on the left are two Erôtes, one of whom opens the mystic Dionysiac wicker cista and discloses the sacred snake (cf. the cista in Plate XVI). The corresponding Erôtes under the body of the Centaur on the right are emptying a wine skin into a large vase.

In the space beneath the medallion a curious group of an Eros, or small
boy, and of a tiny Pan facing one another in the attitude preparatory to wrestling. The boys or Erotes on each side of this central group are rightly interpreted by Michaelis as umpires. "Very good sculpture in excellent preservation." (M.)

47 (=Michaelis 75). **Fragment of Sarcophagus with Dionysiac revellers.** (3rd cent.) (Plate XXI).

*Height*: 0·28 cm.; *length*: 0·24 cm.; *Marble*: Italian (?). *Provenance*: (?).

**Description**: the fragment is broken away at both sides; the legs of the panthers are also broken away; the left hand and part of the arm of the Maenad on the left, part of the tree stem; two arms and hand of the Eros, lower part of the face of the Satyr on the right.

In the centre Dionysus is seen reclining on a low four-wheeled car drawn by two panthers, on the foremost of which rides an Eros holding a lyre. In the background, near the head of the second panther a Satyr moves rapidly forward; between him and Dionysus is a Maenad wielding a thyrsus. At the feet of Dionysus is seen another Maenad extending her arm towards the god and resting her hand on the stem of a great vine, which seems to mark off the centre of the composition. On the left of the vine is seen a fragment of another Satyr who grasps the stem. The relief is so high that the figures are almost detached from the ground; the hair of the figures, the vine-leaves, and other details are worked with the borer and are evidently intended to produce a striking impression of "light and dark" after the manner of the late third century A.D. The colouristic effect of this little fragment is admirable.
48 (=Michaelis 77). **Eros leaning on Inverted Torch.** (Fig. 9.)

**Height:** 0'45; **breadth:** 0'28.

Right end of a sarcophagus; the motive is symbolic of death. The style and technique are of the third century A.D.

49 (=Michaelis 78). **Eros Asleep.** Right corner of sarcophagus lid. (Fig. 10.)

**Height:** 0'33; **breadth:** 0'23.

The subject is similar to the preceding, but Eros is shown here supporting his right leg on a step or stone. On the right are his bow and quiver, which he has cast aside. Work of the third century A.D.

§ 9.—**Works of uncertain date.**

50 (=Michaelis 3). **Eros and Pan Vintaging.** (Plate XXII.)

**Height** of the whole group: 1'00 cm.; of the Eros: 0'80 cm.; of the antike pedestal: 0'06 cm.; **length of Attis:** 0'14 cm.; **height of the Pan:** 0'50 cm.; of the smaller Eros: 0'29 cm. **Marble:** fine-grained Greek. **Procurement:** Baglioli Roselli, near Groseto (Dennis, Elvire, 2nd ed., vol. ii. p. 228), after that Florence. **Repliques:** Whitehall and Rome, Coll. Osann, Luraghi (see Michaelis, Arch. Zeit., 1879, p. 172).

**Literature:** Reinach, Répertoire, ii. 71, 8, and 42. Condition: the body of the Eros much injured by action of damp; the vase has been broken in many places and put together mostly with the aid of metal pegs or thin metal point, which are much eaten away and which have caused serious corrosion. (Michaelis).

Eros, if it be he and not an ordinary mortal child, is represented wingless. He stands firmly on the sole of both feet and stretches up his arms to reach the bunches of grapes from a great vine that hangs over him. From behind the vine, a little goat-legged Pan comes forward and touches Eros with his right leg. The Pan supports on his head a basket into which a quite diminutive Eros, this time winged, is depositing a huge bunch of grapes. The branches and foliage of the vine, which are very intricate, are a clever imitation of nature, but it cannot be said that the effect of these leaves and fruit cut out in marble is agreeable. The workmanship of the leaves and fruit, however, with the tiny Erotes darting about amid the foliage, recalls work of the Antonine period, such as the pilaster in the Lateran, decorated with vine-leaves and clambering love-gods, first published by Wickhoff, *Roman Art*, Pl. XI; Riegl, *Spätvölkische Kunstindustrie*, p. 71; Strong, *Roman Sculpture*, p. 62. In the present group, as on the Lateran pilaster, although the artist is a master of deep cutting and of undercutting, he yet scarcely has any modelling, but replaces it by a kind of flattened relief which is intended, by contrast with the dark hollows, to call

---

1) The group reproduced. Reinach, Rép. ii. 71, 4, is evidently, as suggested by M. Reinach himself, the same as our Cook group.

2) Professor Michaelis kindly points out to the author that similar curious accessories, treated in similar style, adorn the prop of a statue of Dionysus or a Satyr in the Villa Albani (Helbig, No. 372; Chasse-Reinach, 377, 5).
forth a colouristic effect. I should therefore incline to date this group about the third century A.D. The statues, Reinach, Répertoire, ii. 448, 2, and the Borghese statue in the Louvre (Clarae-Reinach, 142, 6) are winged and cannot be looked upon as replicas, though the motives are similar. Compare also the Eros playing at ball of the Uffizi, Arndt, Einzelbriefe, 351; Reinach, Répertoire, ii. 429, 1; and the torso, ibid. ii. 448, 3.

51 (not in Michaelis). Head of an Athlete? in the Archaic Style. (Fig. 11.)

Height: 2.15 cm.; length of face: 0.17 cm. Marble: very much damaged by exposure or possibly by fire; the nose is broken, or rather worn away; the surface of the marble is entirely destroyed and the head has greatly suffered from neglect and maltreatment; yet the type is of considerable interest. Literature: B.F.A.C. Cat. p. 9, No. 3. Exhibits, B.F.A.C. 1903.

![Head of an Athlete? in the Archaic Style](image)

The preservation is so bad that it is difficult to decide whether the head is an original or a later (Roman?) copy. The structure of the head is almost square; the planes few and very flat; the eyes are kept as nearly as possible in the front plane of the face, as in the earliest period. The hair is parted down the centre of the head and is curiously rendered by streaked ridges. In front the ridges are closer and imitate sharply-defined waves. A long plait of hair encircles the head as in early statues of the so-called Apollo type.28

28 Prof. Michaelis writes: 'The photograph and, perhaps, the condition of the marble do not allow a certain judgment, but it appears to be evident that the type belongs to those ancient Apollo heads like that in the British Museum (see Marbeke, ix. 40, 4 = Catal. 150).'

H.S.—VOL. XXVIII.
52 (= Michaelis 44). **Draped Male Torso.** (Fig. 12.)

*Height*: 0.84 cm.

The flatness of the planes and the treatment of the drapery seem to show that this is a copy of a fifth century original. The man appears to hold a roll in his left hand, whilst his right grasps the end of the cloak which falls over the left shoulder. I know no precise replica of the type, though similar motives recur, as pointed out by Michaelis, in so-called statues of philosophers (cf. Clarac-Reinach, p. 512, 7, 8) and the Demosthenes of the Vatican and of Knole.

53 (= Michaelis 48). **Draped Male Torso.** (Fig. 13.)

*Height*: 0.76 cm. *Marble: Pavonazzetto. Restored* "hand" the leg; from below the drapery; the whole of the left hand with the sheaf of corn.

The figure is draped in a mantle in a way that recalls statues of Zeus, *cf. No. 7*. The right hand grasps the remains of a short sceptre; against the
left shoulder are traces of a palm-branch (misunderstood by the restorer as a corn-sheaf); it is possible, therefore, that we have here the votive statue of a βασιλεύς or umpire, holding the prize to be conferred.

54 (= Michaelis 71). Funeral Relief—Youth Draped in Cloak. (Fig. 14.)

Height: 0.23; breadth: 0.17 cm. Marble: Italian.

This is a slight imitation, presumably antique, of an Attic model of about the time of the Parthenon.

Fig. 13.—Draped Torso. (53)

55 (not in Michaelis). Statuette of a Seated Man. (Fig. 15.)

Height: 26 cm. Restored: both feet with the lower part of the drapery and most of the braid; the right arm from below the elbow with the hand and the roll. Head and neck (not reproduced here) appear to be modern. The knees are broken and somewhat rubbed. Literature: B.P.A.C. Cat. p. 86, No. 98. Exhibited, B.P.A.C. 1903.

The fragment is interesting only as reproducing a seated type differing from those already known. The drapery passes over the left shoulder, leaving the right shoulder and arm bare.
56 (not in Michaelis). **Shrine of Cybele.** (Fig. 16.)

This is a very rough insignificant imitation of the familiar image of Cybele enthroned, wearing the modius and with the lion lying right across her lap. Cf. Michaelis, Oxford, Ashmolean, Nos. 86, 131 and 159, also Brit. Mus. 783, 784 and Ny Carlsberg 237. The figure is carved within a little shrine or aedicula (*wałwóς*). In the right hand are traces of a patera, in the left, of the tympanon.

![Image of a sculpture](image)

**Fig. 14.—Fragment of a Relief—Imitation Attic. (154)**

57 (not in Michaelis). **Torsos of a Recumbent Female Figure.** (Fig. 17.)

Erechth; about 0.2 cm.

The fragment, which is of insignificant execution, belongs to the class of figures known as *ἀρσενάκτες*; cf. Pliny xxxv. 90, and Culleré, *Saggi sull’Arte Elenistica e Greco-Romana*, p. 137.

58 (not in Michaelis). **Group of Hermes and a Nymph.** (Fig. 18.)

The old restorations have been removed.

---

*On the other hand I can nowhere find Michaelis’ No. 7, ‘Statuette of Cybele.’*
The two figures sit on a rock, over which is spread a drapery; at their feet lies the caduceus of Hermes. Poor workmanship. For the motive of the similar groups Clarac-Reinach, 369, 2; 371, 1.

FIG. 15.—SEATED MAN. (55)

FIG. 16.—SHRINE OF KYBELE. (56)

59 (Michaelis 64). **Head of Hermes** (P). (Fig. 19.)

*Length of face: 0.15. Total height of antique part: 0.22. Restorations: the nose, almost all the beard, patches in the hair. The terminal bust, which is falsely inscribed MARV, is modern.*

Apparently a poor late replica of the Hermes Propylaos of Alcamenes which was set up on the Acropolis of Athens about 450 B.C.; an inscribed replica was found at Pergamum in 1904, see *Athen. Mitth. 1904*, Plates 18–21 and pp. 84 ff. for the list of replicas (Altmann).

FIG. 17.—TORSO OF AN ALCAMENES. (57)

60 (Michaelis 49). **Head of Dionysus**. (Fig. 19a.)

*Length of face: 0.17. Restorations: tip of nose and the whole bust with the long curls on it.*

Poor, late copy of an archaic type.
61 (= Michaelis 48). **Double Bust of Dionysus and Ariadne**

(Fig. 20.)

*Height*: 0.30. *Restored*: nose and mouth of Ariadne; nose of Dionysus.

---

**Fig. 18.** *Hermes and Nymph* (58)

The head of Dionysus reproduces an archaic type with tightly-curling hair and beard. The work is poor and practically impossible to date. The full face of the Dionysus head may be seen on Pl. XX. No. 44, against the sarcophagus of Greeks and Amazons.
62 (= Michaelis 55). **Head of a Girl.** (Fig. 21, p. 3.)

Length of bust: 9.4 cm. Restorations: nose and bust.

The girl is crowned with ivy leaves and berries, as though she were an
Ariadne or a young female Faun. On the right side of the forehead seems to be the trace of a horn. Very insignificant work.

63, 64 (not in Michaelis). **Two Masks.** (Figs. 21, 22.)

The mask on the left is of the ordinary tragic type, that on the right is a Selenesque mask, wearing the mitra with bunches of ivy leaves on either side. On the reverse (illustrated in Fig. 22 on a larger scale) is the figure dancing Satyr.

§ 10. *Sepulchral altars and reliefs.*

65 (= Michaelis 80). **Sepulchral Urn.** (Fig. 23.)

*Height: 42 cm.; length: 41 cm.*

The decoration of the ordinary type; at the corners rams’ heads, with an olive wreath suspended from their horns; below the rams’ heads, eagles; in the space between the tablet and the wreath, birds. The tablet had probably been left blank in antiquity and now displays a forged modern inscription; see Muratori, *Thes.* p. 1319, No. 8: ‘Romae in hortis Montal- timis; c schesis Ptolomeis.’
66 (=Michaelis 81). **Sepulchral Stele of Macrinus.** (Pl. XXIII.)


In the field above the inscription, a child is seen riding a horse at full gallop; he has just pierced with his spear a monster that issues from a cave on the right and at which a dog is barking furiously. Michaelis justly remarks on the inappropriateness of the subject to a child who died as the inscription informs us at the age of one.

67 (not in Michaelis). **Sepulchral Relief of Stratton.** (Plate XXIV.)

Height: 20 cm.

The base carries the following inscription arranged in five lines. The field above is simply decorated with three wreaths in relief.

\[
\text{Στράτων καὶ Εὐπρία ὀς Στράτωνος}
\text{τῶν σισταὶ ἐπὶ τὸν πατρὸς Στράτωνος}
\text{τῶν β’ ἔρωτον, μάρτυς, καὶ τοῦ καὶ}
\text{καὶ τοῦ μαρτυρῶν καὶ προσωποῦν τὸν,}
\text{κατὰ πάλιν μονάρχειν | τοῦ τοῦ δέκερον.}
\]

See Paton and Hicks, *Inscriptions of Cos*, No. 417, p. 297, where the stone is published with references to previous literature, and dated early in the first century B.C. The stone came from Kephalos. Though not mentioned by Michaelis in the *Ancient Marbles*, the inscription was published by him in *Arch. Zeitung*, xxii. p. 59.
68 (=Michaelis 13). Large Bowl-shaped Vase of red porphyry.

Diameter : 1 ft.

This splendid vase comes from the collection of the Duke of Modena.

N.B.—I have not succeeded in finding Michaelis 51, 'Head of Artemis'.

§ 11.—Modern Imitations of Antiques.

69. The collection further contains nine colossal busts of emperors executed in the later Renaissance, or in more modern times in imitation of Renaissance works. Six are noted by Michaelis under 63. Two, the Claudius (mentioned also by Bernoulli, ii. 1, p. 340) and the Vitellius (Bernoulli, ii. 2, p. 16, No. 32) are excellent decorative works.

70. The relief described by Michaelis under No. 12 has been proved to be a modern forgery, executed at Naples in the earlier part of the last century by the Neapolitan 'falsario' Monti; see H. L. Urlichs, *Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie*, 1890, p. 54, where he points out a replica of this relief as the work of the same forger.

§ 12.—Terracottas, Vases, etc.

The terracottas, vases, and other objects are reserved for future discussion. Meanwhile, however, the more important among these may be noted here in order to give a more complete impression of the character of the collection. I borrow, in the main, my own descriptions in the catalogue of the Burlington Fine Arts Club Exhibition, where most of the following objects were shown.

A.—Terracottas.

71 (= Michaelis 14). Girl Seated at Her Toilet.

She is dressed in a thin chiton, with a cloak suspended from her shoulders at the back, and thrown over her knees. The rolled coiffure often appears in heads from the middle of the fourth century. The hair is confined by a narrow ribbon; the arms are raised to the head on the left side, where the ends of the ribbon which the girl was tying has been broken off along with the whole of the left hand and the fingers of the right. The legs of the chair are also broken and the head has been broken off and replaced. Delicate workmanship of the fourth century. Exhibited at the Burlington Fine Arts Club in 1903 (Cat. p. 83, No. 67 and Plate LXXXV).

72. Heracles Slaying the Lernaean Hydra. (Fig. 24.)

This is one of three slabs with the Labours of Heracles (Michaelis, 15–17). They belong to the well-known class of 'Campana reliefs' which is so
magnificently represented in the British Museum and in the Louvre. These reliefs come mainly from Rome and its neighbourhood and may be referred roughly to the first century B.C.—A.D.

73. **Ten Small Terracotta Masks**, among which those of a horned river god, of a Seilenus, and the two masks of archaic Gorgons are of special excellence. These masks were used for the adornment of furniture. Exhibited in 1903 at the Burlington Fine Arts Club (*Cat.* p. 86, Nos. 89-99, and Plate LXXXVI.).

B.—*Vases,*

The collection, though somewhat mixed in character, contains the following choice examples.

74. **Kylix.** Black figures on red ground. Foot restored. Diameter, 30-7 cm. Exterior A and B: chariots amid an assemblage of warriors and women.

This Kylix was formerly adjusted to a foot bearing the signature of the painter Nikosthenes (*Klein, Meistersignaturen*, pp. 69, 70). Recently, however, the vase was cleaned at the British Museum and the foot found not to belong. Mentioned by Michaelis, p. 73, and *Arch. Zeit.* 1874, p. 61. Exhibited in 1903 at the Burlington Fine Arts Club, *Cat.* p. 95, No. 4 and Plate LXXXIX.
75. **Three Hydrias**, with black figures on red ground: 73, Dionysus and Ariadne in chariot; on the shoulder, Apollo playing the lyre. 73², Athena and Heracles in chariot; on shoulder, combat scene. 73³, Groups of bearded horsemen.

76. **Kylix**, with deep bowl and offset lip. Design in black and purple on red. Diameter, 21-9 cm.


77. **Kylix**, with red figures on black ground. Diameter, 23-3 cm.

1. Within a circle adorned with a band of macanders stands a *kratos* or judge of the palaistra, wrapped in a long cloak, holding his long staff. On the right a shaft, or goal, on a plinth; to the left a seat with a cushion on it.

   _A._ *Exterior.* A young man stands, to right, bending forward with both arms extended; on his left a helmet placed upon a shield. In front of him a gymnasiarch holding the two-pronged staff. Behind this figure advances, to the left, a nude youth with a shield on his left arm and a crested helmet in his right hand. Behind him again a goal.

   _B._ Similar scene to preceding. A gymnast holding a pole stands between two nude youths, each carrying a shield and a helmet. Probably both scenes represent the preparation for the armed foot race.

   This fine vase is put together out of many fragments. Exhibited at the Burlington Fine Arts Club in 1903 (*Cat.* p. 100, No. 17, and Plate XCII.).

78. **Calyx-Shaped Krater.** Diameter 39.5 cm.; height 35.8 cm.

   _A._ Triptolemus (to right) seated on his winged car, with his sceptre in his left, holding a bunch of wheat-sheaves in his right hand. In front of him Demeter with her torch, holding an *einochoe* for the parting libation. Behind Persephone with a long sceptre. Fine and careful drawing.

   _B._ Three women conversing. Execution coarser than that of the picture on the obverse.

   Below the picture at the height of the handles, a pattern consisting of three groups of macanders alternating with a framed oblique cross. Above, under the rim of the vase, a pattern of slanting palmettes. Exhibited in 1903 at the Burlington Fine Arts Club (*Cat.* p. 107, No. 41 and Plate XCV.).

79. **Calyx-Shaped Krater.** From Magna Graecia. Height 46.5 cm.; diameter 45.8 cm.

Red figures on black ground. Latter half of the fifth century. Vigorous drawing. Put together out of many fragments, but complete. Foot, handles,
and the rim are entirely black; at the top of the picture a band of slanting palmettes; at the bottom a band of groups of three meanders alternating with crosses within squares; where the handles join the vase a pattern of rays.

Oev. In the foreground Polyphemus drunk and asleep; to the right Odysseus wearing pileus and cloak holds a fire-brand, while two of his companions advance from the left bringing other burning firebrands to make the fire in which to harden the stake of olive wood which three other companions are pulling up in the centre of the picture. (Cf. the episode as told in Odyssey, ix. 320–323.) At the back of Polyphemus is a cup of the kantharos shape and an empty wine-skin (?) hanging from the bough of a small tree. The presence of the satyrs who are springing forward from the right suggests a connexion of this scene with the Satyr play; and it has been pointed out that in the 'Kyklops' of Euripides a chorus of satyrs was introduced. A noteworthy attempt at perspective appears in the vase, the figures being disposed in three different planes.

Rec. Two groups of two young men wrapped in long cloaks and engaged in conversation.

First published and described by F. Winter in Jährbuch des Archäol. Institute, 1891, Plate VI. pp. 271–274. For the district which produced these vases, which imitate Attic Kraters of the period between 440 and 430 B.C., see Furtwängler, Masterpieces, p. 109. Exhibited in 1903 at the Burlington Fine Arts Club (Cat. p. 109, No. 48, and Plate XCVII).

80. There are also a few large Apulian vases elaborately decorated with figurines, of the so-called Canosa type.

81. There remains to note a remarkable set of objects of the fourth-century B.C., from a tomb at Eski-Sagra in Northern Thrace, opened in 1879. These objects comprise several fine bronze vessels, pieces of bronze armour, and a fine gold breastplate (?) decorated with a series of tiny lions' heads and stars or rosettes in repoussé. Some silver goblets and black ware came from the same tomb. The Eski-Sagra excavation and the single objects discovered at the time are described and illustrated in a Russian monograph (Bulgarinian Excavation near Eski-Sagra, Saint Petersburg, 1880), which together with an English résumé of its contents, is placed near the objects from the tomb.

Eugène Strong.
RECENT ADDITIONS TO THE PARTHENON SCULPTURES.

[PLATE XXV.]

Members of the Society will remember that we have been endeavouring at the British Museum to make our collection of the Parthenon sculptures as complete as may be for purposes of study; our object has been to supplement the series of originals in the National Collection with casts of the marbles and fragments wherever these are known to exist. With this view, when I was last in Athens I went through the whole of that portion of the Frieze preserved in the Acropolis Museum, and subsequently Professor Bosanquet did the same with the Metopes and Pediments. Through the kind offices of Mr. Cavvadias, the Greek Government had casts made of all those which we needed, and generously presented them to the British Museum; so that I think we may say that we now possess a collection in which the sculptures of the Parthenon may be for the first time studied with reasonable completeness. The only series which is still wanting consists of those metopes still in position on the building which, chiefly because of their fragmentary condition, have never yet been moulded. The work of moulding these will necessarily involve considerable labour and difficulty; but even of these Mr. Cavvadias has promised me that he will have casts made for us as soon as the opportunity occurs. I may add that all the casts for which it has not been possible to assign the true position are now arranged in a room close by the Elgin Room, where they are at any time available for students.

The casts of the Frieze fragments reached us in 1905; and the first result of their acquisition was the addition of no less than 6 different pieces rejoined to their original places in the composition; these are noted in the latest edition of the Parthenon Guide, p. 149.

The casts of the Pediment and the Metope fragments arrived last Autumn; and from them, though we have so far obtained the rejoining of only two fragments, yet these alone are of sufficient interest to justify the labour and cost expended.

The first concerns the Athena of the West Pediment. It we look at Carrey's drawing made in 1674, it will be noticed that the figure of Athena was then fairly complete, with the exception of part of the left leg and the arms; and the head was entirely missing. Until now, what has been preserved to us consisted merely of the torso from the waist upward; the base
of the neck was recognised some time ago among the fragments of the Acropolis Museum and a cast is at present adjusted to the marble in the British Museum. Among the casts which recently arrived was a fragment giving the back portion of a helmeted head, which evidently belonged to a female figure, and from its scale could only be appropriate to a figure in the centre of the Pediment. This cast, when it reached us, had already been rejoined to the base of the neck of the Athena; the discovery of the attribution had therefore already been independently made. It was only after seeing Mr. Dawkins' report on Archaeology in Greece in the last volume of the Journal (p. 297) that we became aware that the join had been made by Dr. Prantl, but I have failed to find any publication of the paper in which the discovery is said to be reported.

Meanwhile, the illustration (Pl. XXV. a) shows what is now the appearance of our original with the new fragment attached. One effect is to make it certain that Carrey's drawing is correct and the pose of the torso as at present mounted in the Elgin Room entirely wrong: the whole needs tilting further to the left, so as to bring the two shoulders nearly horizontal.

About one-third of the head is split off nearly vertically from the crown downwards, and from the lower part at the back a triangular wedge is broken away, running inwards, but part of the left ear, with the neck below it, is preserved: the entire outline of the face below the ears can be traced. The helmet is of the form with frontal ridge and vertical neck-piece: a form which seems to come into Attic art about 450 B.C. Of the frontal only the extremity is preserved in the volute-shaped decoration above the ear. Of the neck-piece nothing is indicated on the marble, unless it be a faint vertical ridge below the ear: the reason for this is shown by the existence of the holes drilled, two in the lobe of the ear and three below; these are repeated in the case of the left ear also. They are evidently intended for the fastening of some object, probably locks of hair, which passing over the side of the neck would have concealed this part of the neck-piece and rendered its indication unnecessary. It is quite likely moreover that the whole of the helmet may have been further distinguished by the addition of colour.

It is somewhat strange that of all that Carrey shows of this figure much should still remain undiscovered, while a part which was already gone in 1674 should find its place after more than 200 years.

The other rejoin is, I believe, entirely new. It concerns the Metope No. 27 from the East half of the South side of the Parthenon (B.M. Sculpture No. 316). Carrey's drawing gives both the heads, the right leg, and part of the right forearm of the Lapith, so that it has suffered a good deal since his time. Here we have been fortunate in re-fixing the head of the Lapith; the actual adjustment is due to our foreman of masons, W. Pinker, who has done so much useful work of this kind on the sculptures of the Parthenon. The head as will be seen from the illustration (Pl. XXV. b) had an inclination towards the

1 Cf. B.M. Sculpture, No. 1572.
left shoulder; thus, while the left side is fairly well preserved, the right side has been exposed to the worst of the weathering; it has suffered too from human agency—a large part of the surface, including the right ear and the hair above and beside it, has been irretrievably damaged. For some purpose, which I cannot explain, the whole of this surface has been pitted with holes, to make which a circular drill was employed; there must have been more than 120 such holes made, in regular oblique rows from the top downward. The centre of this space has been split away together with the outer edge of the ear, and therefore it is difficult to suppose that this treatment of the head can represent anything in the design of the original artist.

For the rest, the surface of the hair seems to have been merely blocked out, with perhaps light tool marks to break the smoothness. It appears to have been dressed with a roll or plait horizontally above the neck, and a loop in front of the ear, in the well known type which is sometimes used for ephori of the first half of the fifth century B.C. The left-hand side is, as I have said, in almost perfect preservation; it shows that the style has something of the archaic feeling in the modelling; while the forms of the face generally are round and smooth, the forehead is contracted, and the vertical lines over the nose indicate the tenseness of the action. It is interesting to find this treatment in a Metope, which for composition and style has generally been regarded as one of the finest: it is an additional reason for satisfaction in the recovery of the missing head.

Cecil Smith.
THE THRONE OF ZEUS AT OLYMPIA.

The title of this paper may appear too wide, since its main object is to establish, if possible, the position of the paintings by Panaenus; but discussion of this one point necessarily involves consideration of certain others—themselves far from unimportant—and thus a more comprehensive designation is needed. It need hardly be said that no theory of reconstruction of the Throne as a whole is here attempted.

It may be convenient to state at the outset the evidence used, and to comment generally upon it. In the first place we have the literary evidence, the account by Pausanias: careful, detailed, and, in my opinion, the work of an eye-witness. Its great shortcoming is that it leaves undecided the

![Fig. 1 (2:1). (Florence.)](image)

relation of the parts and details to one another. Secondly, there is numismatic evidence, which is of high value. Besides the coin which shows the head of Zeus, there are three coins which show the statue as a whole (Figs. 1, 2, 3); one from the left front (Fig. 2); the others (Figs. 1 and 3) from the left and right sides respectively. These three alone are relevant to the present matter. All are coins of Hadrian, and therefore may be trusted to give a true copy and not a free reproduction of the original. This fact is important as we have no other evidence to systematise the
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account of Pausanias; but at the same time it must be remembered that minute detail, relief-work, and the like, cannot be reproduced on so small an object as a coin.

Two views are generally current at the present time as to the position of the paintings. (i) Mr. A. S. Murray relegates them to the intercolumnar screens of the cella, traces of which have been actually discovered. This view, which divorces the paintings from the throne altogether, has been accepted in the official publication on the German excavations at Olympia. (ii) But Professor E. A. Gardner in a paper on the same subject, 4 entirely demolishes Mr. Murray's position. I will only add here that the statements of Pausanias would be entirely misleading if the screens were placed at some distance from the statue. He states that it was impossible to go under the throne by reason of the screens (which Mr. Murray admits were furnished with doors); but would any modern guide-book to a cathedral say 'it is impossible to enter the choir because of the screens'? I think the parallel is a fair one. It is unnecessary to give a detailed account of Professor Gardner's theory; enough that there seem to be grave objections to his arrangement of the paintings in frames formed by the intersection of the κανονες and κιονες. The reconstruction here attempted is in many respects, though not altogether, a return to the older theory, e.g., as represented by Brunn.

We may now proceed to examine the parts of the throne which seem to bear upon the present inquiry. These are (i) The decoration of the κανονες, (ii) The position of the κιονες, (iii) The nature of the ἐρυματα.

I.—The κανονες.

Pausanias gives an account of the decoration of the cross-bars, which may be summarised as follows:—on the front bar were (originally) eight figures; on the side and back bars was represented a battle of Greeks and Amazons. We are told nothing directly as to the material or technique of these figures. However, we can confidently assume them to have been of gold and ivory. As to technique, we may note that Pausanias calls the figures upon the front bar ἐρυματα, which points to figures in the round and not in relief. 5 This point seems to be borne out by the second and third of the Elean coins mentioned (Figs. 2 and 3), which show upon the front cross-bar a small upstanding projection, evidently a human figure. Relief work, as has been noted, could hardly be shown upon a coin. Further, the argument may perhaps be strengthened by the incidental note of Pausanias that one of the eight figures upon the bar had disappeared. Doubtless we are to understand that it had been stolen. Now a figure in the round, fixed only at the feet, might be easily wrenched off by a thief, whereas a relief would be

5 But not necessarily (as I am reminded); figure of Dryops at Asha, which appears to have been a relief (see Corr. Numismatist p. 166).
6 E.g., Pausanias uses ἐρυμα in speaking of the
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less easily and less quickly detached. It may, then, be fairly claimed that there is cumulative evidence to show that these eight figures at least were in the round.

Some writers allow this much, but take for granted that the Amazon-battle was in relief. Brunn seems to be indefinite on this point. But, a priori, we should expect a uniform technique in what was really a continuous band of technique, just as normally a frieze would be of one technique. There are exceptions to this rule, but they may be put down to motives of economy, which certainly would not have been considered in the case of the Elean statue. Further, the poor effect of relief-work may be gauged from the restoration by Quatremère de Quincy. However, the best evidence on this point is furnished by the first of the Elean coins. Careful examination of a cast or of a good photographic reproduction of this coin shows four (or five?) serrated projections upon the cross-bar. Now just as the

eagle upon the sceptre is represented by a small knob, so, it is reasonable to suppose these projections represent groups in the battle-scene.

We may, perhaps, even take a recreative flight into speculation, and supposing the number of the projections upon each side-bar to be five, assume that we have on each side five groups of two figures each, while the back-bar, where presumably the battle would have been hottest, may have had three groups of three figures each, thus making up Pausanias' total of twenty-nine. However, this distribution is alike conjectural and inessential. We now come to the bearing of this point, which, it is hoped, has been substantiated, on the position of the paintings. If these really were figures in the round standing upon the cross-bars, it is impossible to suppose there were paintings in the spaces above the cross-bars. The panels would have been obscured by the figures; so that, if the foregoing point has been established, the paintings must be placed below the ἱστορία.

* Prof. F. Garliee was kind enough to examine the photographic reproduction of the coin in his "Types of Greek Coins" (PL. XV. No. 19) with me, and agreed that the projections were distinctly visible, although they hardly appear in the half-tone illustration here given (Fig. 1). The line reproduction in Höflicher's Olympia over-emphasises this feature.
II.—The κλοβες.

Professor E. Gardner, in the paper already referred to, holds that the panels were divided by the intersection of the καρνανα and κλοβε, on each side. If, therefore, we relegate the paintings to the space below the bar, we must rearrange the κλοβες, for in that case the supports would have interrupted both the paintings and the sculptures above them. We must ask then whether there is any adequate reason for this change. Now it has been often pointed out that a throne with eight visible legs would be the reverse of artistic, nor would the effect be bettered by making the extra legs (which indeed would probably be round, as their name, κλοβες, implies) serve as part of the frame-work for the paintings. To this purely aesthetic consideration we may add direct numismatic evidence. None of the three Elean coins shows any sign whatever of a visible support, though they show the cross-bar itself clearly enough. The inference therefore is that the 'supports' were actually invisible, and this is perhaps indirectly supported by Pausanias himself, when, after mentioning the existence of the 'supports,' he goes on immediately to say that it is impossible to go underneath the throne.

Where then, it may be asked, are the κλοβες to be placed? In answer to this it is pertinent to ask where support was most needed. Clearly, not at the sides which were comparatively light and adequately supported by the legs, but at the point where the real weight lay, the point where the heavy torso of Zeus weighed directly upon the seat of the throne. Here, then, we must place the supports according to the following diagram:

![Diagram of the throne supports]

But is it possible to reconcile this with Pausanias' phrase μεταξί τῶν ποδῶν? Certainly the most obvious meaning (were there nothing against it) would be 'intermediate between the legs of each side.' However, two other interpretations are possible, one or other of which I believe Pausanias intended.

(i) When he said μεταξί τῶν ποδῶν, he was using an inexact but approximate phrase, meaning that the supports were on a line with the central point of each side (μεταξί), but set back from it. (ii) The supports collectively might be said (accepting the arrangement in the diagram) to be between the legs also collectively regarded. Perhaps the second is the simpler and better of these alternatives.

Such, then, are the reasons for altering the position of the supports.
III.—The ἐπίμαρτα.

We have now to show how Pausanias was able to see the supports so hidden away, and to explain the nature of the barriers. We may assume on the authority of Professor Gardner's paper, and of the plain meaning of Pausanias, that the screens formed a part of the Throne itself. Their purpose was both to hide the unsightly props from view and to add to the solidity of the whole erection. To state the case briefly, the view here adopted is that the screens rose only to the height of the cross-bars, which projected, cornice-wise, beyond them. Naturally the coins can give no evidence on this point, and we are left to what we can elicit from Pausanias, and to arguments from probability and from aesthetic considerations.

Now Pausanias uses a notable phrase. The barriers he says are τριστόν τοῖχον πενταμήνα. As the screens were painted, he clearly does not mean that they showed courses of masonry, and there seems to be only one other possible interpretation of the phrase. The idea of a wall in its simplest terms is something long and low with an empty space above it. Now, if the screens had filled in each side completely, the lower part of the Throne would have given the appearance of a solid block; the idea of a wall would be quite inappropriate. If this interpretation is correct, we must think of the screens as reaching only to the cross-bars, on which stood the figures already discussed. Behind and above the figures was an open space.

Against this view of the screens it may be urged that such an open space would defeat the very purpose for which the screens were erected, to hide the supports. This objection, however, is not really valid. (i) As the visitor stood on the floor of the cela, his line of vision would be determined by the cross-bar and the figures upon it, so that in any case he could see no more than the bottom of the seat. It would be impossible to see through from side to side, and so be offended by a 'vista of scaffold-like poles.' (ii) The light of the cela could not have been bright, and consequently the interior of the Throne would have been in practical darkness. Further, the gleam of the chryselephantine figures upon the cross-bar against the darkness within would enhance the blackness of the background, while the mere mass of the figures and the charm of their workmanship would be sufficient to arrest the eyes of most visitors. Every great artist is also a practical psychologist. We see the same principle in mediaeval architecture, where a belfry window is designed to give light to the interior without revealing the unsightly framework within.

How then, it may be asked, did Pausanias see the supports if thus concealed? The answer is that Pausanias, like many another curious antiquary, made it his business to look into corners and dark places; and it was, no doubt by so doing that he succeeded in distinguishing the supports. And in this connexion we may add yet another consideration pointing to an

* Another instance of Phidias' knowledge of optical laws is supplied by the Lemnian Athena: cf. Furtwangler, *Masters and Trans.*
opening above the cross-bars. There must have been some means of access to the interior for purpose of the repairs which, as we know, were from time to time necessary. If there had been a door for the purpose, it is unlikely that Pausanias would not have mentioned it. The only alternative is to accept the theory of a space which was always open, a part of the design itself.

IV.—The Paintings.

There now remains the task of rearranging the paintings by Pausanias, in accordance with the conditions of which the existence has been demonstrated above. We have seen that they must find their place below the cross-bar, and in this position it is impossible to retain Professor E. Gardner's system, ingenious and attractive as it is. But there are independent reasons for rejecting the scheme of 'metope' and 'long' panels. (i) Pausanias gives no hint of any such arrangement: rather, his description seems to imply that the series was single and continuous. The argument from silence has a bad odour, but surely this is a case where it might well be used. (ii) If we suppose with Professor Gardner that there were two lower figures containing a 'caryatid' figure, we are forced to separate figures which obviously gain immeasurably by close association. Hellas and Salamis, for example, have added significance if brought close together, while Hippodameia and Sterope would in all probability be in much more intimate connexion than Professor Gardner's arrangement allows. (iii) There is a certain artificiality about the scheme we are criticising: it would be clear that paintings, so arranged, aimed simply at disguising masonry-work, whereas I believe a certain illusion (to be explained presently) was aimed at.

This last objection necessitates a statement and justification of the old arrangement which it is here proposed to re-adopt. In this we have three groups on each of three sides.

\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha & : 1. Atlas and Hercules. \\
2. Theseus and Perithous. \\
3. Hellas and Salamis.
\beta & : 1. Hercules and the Lion. \\
2. Ajax and Cassandra. \\
3. Hippodameia and Sterope.
\gamma & : 1. Prometheus and Hercules. \\
2. Penthesileia and Achilles. \\
3. The Hesperides.
\end{align*}
\]

It might fairly be argued that having seen that the paintings must be placed below the cross-bar, we are justified in adopting this, the only possible, arrangement. Nevertheless, further justification will not be superfluous.

(i) According to this scheme we get in panels 1 and 3 of each side, a pair of upright figures, at rest or only in gentle action (\(\beta\) 1 is not necessarily an exception), while in each panel 2 the action is more intense (in
the case of a 2 the figures would doubtless be in animated conversation). As has been already remarked, we here get a certain illusion which is destroyed by Professor Gardner's arrangement: the painted figures would actually appear to be standing or struggling beneath the throne of Zeus. By this arrangement we obtain a distinctly poetic conception, full of religious symbolism, and such as we might expect to find in the age of Phidias. Moreover, the dark blue of the background would in some measure at least disguise the screens themselves, making the figures appear as though they, like the figures upon the cross-bar, were standing out against a background of darkness.

(ii) Again, is it rash to trace a parallelism between the paintings on each side? There is an obvious connexion between a 1, β 1, and γ 1; and we might well call this series 'Herclean.' In the same way the three central or 'Hellenic' panels are connected, while the three last panels have a sufficient tie in their symbolism, standing respectively for Greece, Elis, and the Mythical world.

(iii) Another consideration is of some importance. A pair of figures only in the space below the cross-bar really leave too much unoccupied space, and Greek art of this period shows a decorum exact as distinct as it is scientific.

(iv) Finally, if we re-adopt the old arrangement, we get, in addition to the considerations already noted, a sort of gradation: the figures nearest the rigid perpendiculars of the legs are upright or in gentle motion, with the action more free in the centre; a remote though just parallel is supplied by the pediments of the Parthenon.

Whatever weight these arguments may have, they are not sufficient to outweigh Pausanias' statement, τελευταία δὲ ἐν τῇ γραφῇ, κ.τ.λ., if the ordinary interpretation of τελευταία be retained. In criticism of Professor Gardner's theory, it is at least curious that Pausanias should single out the last metope to call the 'last painting in the series'. Was not the lower panel equally important? Is it not better to take τελευταία in the sense of 'last scenes' or 'lastly'? In the latter case, but putting a comma after αὐτοῦ, we get perfectly good sense, and τελευταία will then cover the two final subjects. The loose use of 'lastly' might well be paralleled from any piece of modern description.

Such then is the evidence for a return to the old theory as to the paintings of Panaeus.

In conclusion, I should like to express my warmest thanks to Professor Percy Gardner for much kind criticism and encouragement, to Mr. G. F. Hill for several valuable suggestions and corrections, and also to the authorities of the Coin Department of the British Museum for furnishing me with casts of the relevant coins.

H. G. EVELYN-WHITE.

* Since writing the above, I notice that Mr. Frazer, in his translation of the passage (Paus. v. 11. 6), adopts this rendering.
THE SAMIANS AT ZANCLE-MESSANA.

[PLATE XXVI.]

In this article it is proposed to examine the available numismatic evidence relating to the settlement of Samians at Zancle, and the change of the name of the city to Messana, and to suggest possible lines along which a reconstruction of the events might proceed.

It will be well first to review such literary evidence as we possess. The earliest such evidence is found in Herodotus. He gives at length the story of the Samian settlement. After the battle of Lade, which ruined the cause of the revolted Ionians, the Samian oligarchs (οἱ τῆς ἐξουσίας) decided to abandon their city and sail away to found a colony elsewhere, rather than stay and endure the oppression of Aeaces, their old tyrant, restored under Persian influence (ἐν ἀποκεκλημένοις μηδὲ μένοντας Μῆδοις τε καὶ Αἰγαῖοι οὐλεύειν). Now the men of Zancle in Sicily had sent a general invitation to the Ionians to come to the West and settle at the Fair Shore (Καλὴ Ἀκτή), a Sicel possession on the north coast of Sicily. The Samians accordingly decided to accept the invitation. The other Ionians preferred home and slavery to freedom in a far country, and stayed in their cities. Only the survivors of Miletus joined in the migration. The emigrants sailed for the West and landed at Locri Epizephyrii. Here they received a message from Anaxilas, despot of Rhegium. This ruler was an enemy of Scythes, king of Zancle, and he saw an opportunity of stealing a march upon him. The Samians were to be his instruments. He urged them to think no more of the Fair Shore (Καλὴ Ἀκτή εἰσὶ χαῖρειν), but to appropriate a fine city already built, fortified, and stored. Zancle was undefended; Scythes and his army were fighting the Sicels. All that the Samians had to do was to step in and help themselves. The exiles seem not to have hesitated. They crossed immediately to Zancle, and king Scythes returned to find himself shut out from his own city. He appealed to his 'ally' Hippocrates, despot of Gela. Hippocrates, however, had his own view of the situation. Scythes had failed in his trust and lost the city (ἀποβαλόντα τῆν πόλιν), and he must pay the

---

1 Hdt. vi. 23 et sqg.
2 Anaxilas is τῆς συναπτεῖς; Scythes is βασιλεὺς; Hippocrates again in the sequel is called τῆς τὴν οὕτως. Elsewhere in the story Scythes is called μακεδόνας, but never τῆς τὴν οὕτως. Freytag (Sicily, vol. ii. appendix i.) is inclined to regard the difference of terminology as a reflection of a real difference of constitutional status. Meurs (note ad loc.), however, regards the variation as due merely to the nature of the sources. I incline to the latter view, for reasons which will appear in the sequel.
penalty. He was imprisoned at Inyx. Hippocrates then proceeded to make a bargain with the Samian invaders. They were to keep one half of the property within the city, handing over the other half, together with all outside the walls, to Hippocrates. The Zanclean army outside the walls was thrown into chains, and the leaders (τοὺς κρυφαίους αὐτῶν) delivered up to the Samians for execution. But the Samian oligarchs had mercy on their fellow-oligarchs of Zancle, and spared their lives.

Here we have a circumstantial narrative which has been generally accepted as historical at least in the main. A reference in a later book has caused some trouble. In giving an account of the rise of Gelon, Herodotus refers to a πολιορκία of Zancle by Hippocrates, in the course of which the Zancleans were reduced to servitude (δουλοσύνη). This has been regarded by some as a loose reference to the events described above. But surely, however wide a meaning is given to the word πολιορκία, there was no πολιορκία in this case. We do not even hear of any fighting at all between Hippocrates and the Zancleans. The Zancleans were indeed reduced to slavery, but the impression conveyed by Herodotus' language in this passage can hardly be reconciled with the apparent state of affairs on the occasion under consideration. But it is noteworthy that the attitude of Hippocrates to Zancle in the story of the Samian conquest is distinctly that of an overlord to his vassal. Scythes has lost a city in which Hippocrates has an interest, and is punished for it. Now this relation would certainly be expressed by Herodotus, from the Zanclean point of view, as δουλοσύνη. It is far more probable therefore that the πολιορκία of Zancle and its reduction to δουλοσύνη took place some years before the Samian occupation. If this be so, it is strongly in favour of the view that Scythes was really a τύραννος of Zancle set up by a despotic overlord, rather than a genuine constitutional βασιλεύς. It is probable therefore that this passage (vii. 154) must not be quoted in connexion with the question under discussion.

As to the change of name, we have only one passing reference in Herodotus. This again occurs in the passage dealing with Gelon, a fact which would suggest that this and the last reference cited are due to the same source, and that a different source from the one followed in the passage from the sixth book, a fact which should make us cautious in attempting to combine the narratives. Herodotus has here occasion to speak of Cadmus, son of

---

8 I have assumed that these 'asyphaei' of Zancle are oligarchs and presumably enemies of the 'monarch.' If, however, Scythes was a constitutional king (Βασιλεύς), these men would presumably represent a true nobility after the old pattern. But, as we shall see, there is reason to suppose that Scythes was really a τύραννος. If this be so, it becomes an interesting question, who invited the Samians. Herodotus says it was the Δαυδάνες. So also does Aristotle (Pol. vi. 3, 1309a 35). Most modern historians assume it was their king. It is tempting to conjecture that there was some sort of scheming between oligarchs and oligarchs, which would put the action of the Samians in a more favourable light, from the point of view of Greek morality.

9 Hdt. vii. 154.

9 Cf. vi. 22 Μισδωρος καὶ Αἰδώλου δουλεύειν, where the situation is precisely the same as that here postulated at Zancle—a city governed by a 'tyrant' acting as the vassal of a foreign despot.

6 Hdt. vii. 163-164.
Scythes of Cos. This man laid down the tyranny at Cos, and migrated to Sicily. Here, however, the text is doubtful. Stein, with the MSS. of the first class, reads—οικετο ἐκ Σκεκήν, ἐνθα παρὰ Σαμῖν ἐσχε τε καὶ κατολεκτε πόλιν Ζάγκλην τῷ ἐς Μεσσήνην μεταβαλόσαν τὸ ὀνόμα. With this reading Herodotus has commonly been supposed to imply that Cadmus arrived in Sicily after the Samian occupation of Zancle, and succeeded to the government of the town, whether by an act of "commendation" on the part of its Samian lords, or by conquest as the agent of Anaxilas. Freeman, however, adopts the reading of MSS. of the second class, μετὰ Σαμῖν, and makes Cadmus the leader of the Samian immigrants. A further difficulty arises about the tense of μεταβαλόσαν. Does it imply that the town had already changed its name before the arrival of Cadmus, or that the change of name synchronized with his accession to power? Obviously, the passage lends itself to almost endless schemes of reconstruction. The whole problem of Cadmus and of his relations with Scythes and with the Samians is discussed in an exhaustive series of notes on the passage by the most recent editor of Herodotus, Dr. Macan, who has kindly permitted me to read the sheets of his forthcoming edition of the last triad of the Histories. He marks the text as suspicious, but inclines to the reading μετὰ Σαμῖν, pointing out at the same time that παρὰ Σαμῖν does not necessarily imply an interval between the Samian conquest and the accession of Cadmus: the Samians capture the town and then by a vote confer the sovereignty on Cadmus. His own reconstruction of the Herodotean evidence identifies Scythes of Zancle with Scythes of Cos, the father of Cadmus, and makes the seizure of the town by the Samian exiles under the leadership of Cadmus a preconcerted affair. As to the meaning of μεταβαλόσαν, he rejects the pluperfect sense given to it by Stein, inclining towards the view that the aorist marks synchronism, although admitting that it is somewhat vague. That such a synchronism is as a matter of fact necessary, if Dr. Macan's interpretation of Herodotus' language on the connexion between Cadmus and the Samians is correct, I hope to show in considering the numismatic evidence; but the actual text does not, I think, commit Herodotus to any definite temporal indication. The expression τῷ = Μεσσήνην μεταβαλόσαν τὸ ὀνόμα seems to me to be quite vague. All that it tells us is that Cadmus received the city whose old name was Zancle, but which in Herodotus' time was called Messene. The aorist is, in fact, one of "timelessness" and not of "synchronism." Thus the only reference in Herodotus to the change of name is a quite indefinite one, although, we may assume that he did not think of it as having occurred before the Samian
settlement, from the fact that he uses the name Zancle throughout the narrative in chapters 22–24 of Book VI.

So far, then, as the narrative of Herodotus goes, we should not have suspected any connexion at all between the Samian settlement and the change of name, if we had had nothing outside of Herodotus to suggest such a connexion.

We turn next to Thucydides. He has a very brief passage in the Sicilian Αρχιαυγία dealing with Zancle. Here if anywhere we may hope to obtain from him some fresh light on the problem. After giving an account of the foundation of Zancle by Cuman and Chalcis, he proceeds to record the occupation of the city by 'Samians and other Ionians, who, flying from the Medes, landed in Sicily. These Samians, he further tells us, were shortly afterwards expelled by Anaxilas’ of Rhegium, who settled in the city a “mixed multitude” (εὐμέρειαν ἄνθρωπος), and re-named it Messene after his own original country. It is evident that this account, whether intentionally or not, supplements the Herodotean narrative; and as a matter of fact the traditional account of the events in question has been formed by a union of the statements of the two historians.

The date of the occurrence is to be fixed approximately by the reference to Anaxilas in both historians, and by the reference, explicit in Herodotus and implicit in Thucydides, to the Battle of Lade. The latter is dated beyond reasonable doubt in 494 B.C. The limits of the reign of Anaxilas are fixed by a passage in Diodorus at 494–476 B.C. Hence the Samian settlement is commonly placed shortly after 494, and the expulsion of the Samians at some later date before the death of Anaxilas in 476.

A further complication is introduced both in the narrative itself, and more particularly in the chronology, by a passage in Pausanias. At the close of his narrative of the Second Messenian War, which he dates to 608–7 B.C., he proceeds to record the adventures of the Messenian fugitives who escaped to Cyllene. The narrative is given in great detail. According to Pausanias various proposals were mooted among the Messenians. Some were for settling at Zacynthus, others for sailing away to Sardinia. At this juncture of affairs we are introduced to Anaxilas, tyrant of Rhegium. He was, we are told, the fourth in descent from Alecidamidas, who had fled to Rhegium after the end

10 Thuc. vi. 4 §§ 5, 6. This passage, so far as it concerns the present problem, is as follows:—'Στέρεες ἐν αὐτοῖς τὸ εἰς (call the original Chalcidian and Cananian colonies) ἐν Σαύλιοι καὶ ἐλλας Ἡσαύνιοι ἐκκόστωσαν, καὶ Πόντος φέροντος προεισόμεθα Σικέλιον, τότε ἐν Σαύλιοι Αραξίλασ ΢ικέλον τὸν τινί ἐντετελεῖσθαι ἀρχαιόντως καὶ τὸν τόλμα αὐτὸν ἑμιστατόν πολύτροτον ἑλεατέως. Μενετέρως ἐκ τῆς ἐκράτει τοῦ ἀρχαῖον παραδοθὸν ἀνενεργηθήσατο.

11 Diod. xi. 48: 'Εν δὲ εὐχοται Θασσαλιοί Θυακώνα, διαφνόντας μὲν χάρι χεῖρι προς τᾶς ἐκδοχευόμενοι καὶ τοὺς ἦχοι κτείνας τῶν Σανδίκης Μικρακίας, ἐν Ράχνη καὶ ἐνάκοος δυταῖς Καλόνων.
of the First Messenian War,\textsuperscript{14} and he now invited his distressed fellow-countrymen of the Second War to sail to Sicily, and aid him in reducing Zancle, which should be theirs if they agreed. The proposal was accepted. The Zancleans were defeated by land and sea and fled to sanctuary. Anaxilas advised the Messenians to put them to death, but the leaders of the immigrants refused. They came to terms with the defeated Zancleans, with whom they afterwards lived side by side in the old city with a new name—the name of the Messenian conquerors.\textsuperscript{15} All this happened, we are told, in 644–3 B.C.,\textsuperscript{16} and a memorial of the Messenian occupation still remained in the time of Pausanias—the temple of Herculæus Manticus without the wall.

All this is extraordinary stuff. Anaxilas, whose date is well known, is moved up nearly 200 years before his time, and made fourth in descent from the leader of the original Messenian element at Rhegium. Freeman has analysed the story in an appendix to the second volume of his History of Sicily.\textsuperscript{17} His conclusions, briefly, are that the details of the story are due to a confusion of passages from Herodotus,\textsuperscript{18} including the story of the Samian settlement cited above, and that the account of the Messenian settlement is derived from the poet Rhiannon, who used very freely his historical data. At the same time he is of the opinion that there is ‘something in it.’ It is remarkable that Strabo brings Messenians into connexion with Zancle in two places. In speaking of the foundation of Rhegium,\textsuperscript{19} he quotes Antiochus of Syracuse to the effect that the Zancleans induced the Chalcidians to settle at Rhegium, and goes on to state (whether on the same authority or not is not clear) that among the original settlers of Rhegium were Messenians who had been exiled in a party-struggle before the First Messenian War. The story is given at length and in detail, and in confirmation Strabo states that the rulers (tyrants) of the Rhegines were of Messenian stock μέχρι Ἀραξίλα. In another place\textsuperscript{20} he describes Messana as a colony of the Messenians of the

\textsuperscript{14} Paus. l.c. § 6 Ἐν τούτῳ δὲ Ἀραξίλαος ἐγοροθάνει μὲ Ῥηγέαν, τέρτοις δὲ ἀπόγονοι δὲ Ἀλκαδημίδος ἐπεράξανες δὲ Ἀλκαδημίδος ἐν Μεσσείας ἐν Ῥήγαις μετὰ τοῦ ἀριστερῶς τῆς Ἀγαθῶνι τῆς Ἰλίστης τῆς Ἰλίστης.

\textsuperscript{15} Paus. i.c. § 10 Υπέρ θέσεων καὶ Μέσσανοι τριστήλος Ἀραξίλαος μὲ σάρι, ὡς προηγούμενοι διήγησαν περιέρροις ἄλοχοι, ὡς οὖν μίστιοι ἐξ ἀρχαιοτέρων ἔλεγον ἄλλον εἰς τῶν Μεσσανῶν αὐτοὺς ἄνθρωπος ἔσχεν καὶ διήγησαν θέσεις ἄλοχον καὶ νεκροῖς ἀτέλεις ἐπεράξανες Ἀραξίλαος Ἀραξίλαος.

\textsuperscript{16} Paus. l.c. § 10 Τούτῳ δὲ ἐν τῇ Ἀραξίλαος ἐπεράξανες τῇ Ἰλίστῃ καὶ ἑλκίας, ὡς Ἰλίστῃ Ἰλίστῃ τῇ στήρει τῆς Ἰλίστῃς, Ἡρωδότου ἀρχαῖος ἄγαθος.

\textsuperscript{17} Freeman, Sicily, vol. ii. pp. 484–488.

\textsuperscript{18} Strabo viii. 17, 25 ὡς ὁ Ἀραξίλαος προσφέρει τοῖς Μεσσανοῖς καὶ ἀντικρύσσει καὶ τινὰς τινὰς ἅπας, ὡς ἐν τῇ Ἀραξίλαος καὶ τῷ Μεσσανοῖς συνήθει τῶν ἐν Πελοποννησίῳ κατοικημένων ἕως τῶν ἐν Μεσσανοῖς οὖν καὶ ἑλκίας ἀλλοιωθείς ἔνας ἐν τῇ Ἰλίστῃς, καὶ τῷ τῷ παρεμελῆται ἀντικρύσσει... ὡς ὁ Ἀραξίλαος εἰς τὰς Ἰλίστης καὶ τὰς Ἑλληνικὰς κατοικίας... ὡς ὁ Ἀραξίλαος εἰς τὰς Ἐλληνικὰς κατοικίας καὶ τῷ τῷ παρεμελῆται ἀντικρύσσει... ὡς ὁ Ἀραξίλαος εἰς τὰς Ἐλληνικὰς κατοικίας καὶ τῷ τῷ παρεμελῆται ἀντικρύσσει... ὡς ὁ Ἀραξίλαος εἰς τὰς Ἐλληνικὰς κατοικίας καὶ τῷ τῷ παρεμελῆται ἀντικρύσσει...
Peloponnese, who changed the name from Zancle. Now these statements are vague and confused. The latter is vitiated by the addition that Zancle was a colony of Naxos, and it bears no date. The former is impossible if the traditional dates of the foundation of Zancle and the First Messenian War be retained, but Freeman has shown cause for thinking that Antiochus, who was probably the original authority for Sicilian chronology, put the Messenian War later than the traditional date, and that the story in Strabo may be accepted, if we put the end of the war for the beginning. It is probable that the accounts represented by the two passages in Strabo lie at the root of the narrative in Pausanias.

Pausanias, then, stripped of the impossible elements of his story, may be taken to contradict Thucydides so far as to attribute the change of name to immigrants from Messenia in the Peloponnese, instead of to Anaxilas; and in this he may be regarded as receiving confirmation from the briefer notice in the earlier writer Strabo. It is remarkable that he has nothing to say of the Samians; but the fact that he makes Crataemenes, who in Thucydides is one of the original *σκισταὶ* and a Chalcidian, a Samian, would seem to indicate a consciousness on the part of his authority that the possessors of Zancle at the time of the change of name were partly of Samian extraction.

So far, and no farther, we are able to gather information from our literary authorities with reference to the problem before us. Various attempts have been made to obtain from them a consistent account. Generally the tendency has been to reconcile Herodotus and Thucydides and throw over Pausanias (and Strabo) as hopeless. Freeman, however, has attempted to build upon the whole evidence, including Pausanias and Strabo. His theory is worked out in an appendix to his *History of Sicily*, on "Anaxilas and the naming of Messana." Briefly stated, the theory is as follows. The Herodean
narrative of the Samian settlement, confirmed by the brief notice in Thucydides, and by a passage in the Politics of Aristotle, is to be accepted, and dated as soon as possible after the battle of Lade (404 B.C.). The expulsion of the Samians and re-peopling of Messana by Anaxilas is probably to be accepted on the authority of Thucydides; but he is wrong in his account of the re-naming of the city. The real date of the latter is indicated by the change from Ζάγαλη to Μεσσηνή in Diodorus, which takes place between the narratives of events in 476 and those in 461 (if Diodorus has his dates correct: at any rate they are approximately right). In this latter year Diodorus records a re-peopling of Messana with mercenaries, etc., from various places all over Sicily, and it is probable that they were joined by a body of Messenians from the Third Messenian War, who changed the name of the city. Thucydides has confused this settlement of a "mixed multitude" with that carried out by Anaxilas some twenty years previously.

This may be taken to represent the best that can be done by a criticism of the literary evidence; but it entirely ignores a considerable body of numismatic evidence which has recently been made accessible by the thorough study of coins from the Sicilian hoards. Freeman in his appendix merely copies the notice of coins of Messana from the Dictionary of Geography without any apparent consciousness of their importance. As early as 1870 Professor Percy Gardner had pointed out the discrepancy between the view of these events gathered from an exclusive study of the literary sources, and that which was suggested by an examination of the coinage. He followed up this brief notice in passing with a slightly longer account in an article on "Samos and Samian Coins," published in the Numismatic Chronicle for 1882. Starting from some hints thrown out by Professor Gardner, I propose to examine the numismatic evidence in some detail, and to attempt a reconstruction of some sort which shall aim at a reconciliation of the numismatic and literary evidence.

It will facilitate matters to give at once a list of representative coins which will be the subject of consideration. We have a good series of coins of Zancle-Messana, and a less satisfactory series of those of Rhegium. There are also some uninscribed coins which must be noticed. The coins

---

20 Hist. vii. 22-24. 21 Thuc. vi. 4 §§ 5-6. 22 Pol. vi. 3, 1309v. 33 Zágαλης ή Μέσσηνης εἰς Μεσσηναν εὖρεται σιδερέας νήσους. 34 See Diodorus xi. 45 and 79 (I take the references from Freeman in.). 35 Diod. xi. 76: οἱ Τάλαντα σφάδων ἢπειρα, κοινὸς ἰερὸς παράδοται καί τοῖς Λέμυσις τοῖς ἰσότοις διὰ τὴν διαμηνυμένην ἀλληλίαν τὰς τάξεις Τέμπαν, εὐσημεροῦς ἀνασκοίτησι σὲ τὴν Μεσσηνίαν [sc. κενσὴν]. 36 Freeman, Sicily, vol. ii. pp. 488-494. 37 Smith, Dict. of Greek Grp, s. v. 'Messana.' 38 It must be confused that this story (with the 'harmony' of Hist. and Thuc. which at that date held the field) excites some serious doubt. It does not seem to account at all for the appearances of Samian types at Rhegium; the Samians were never masters there. Nor does it satisfactorily account for the types at Messana. For the name Messana was not given to the city until, as we are told, the Samians were dismissed, whereas the inscription on the pieces of Samian type is MESSENION. 39 See op. cit. pp. 228-230. 40 It must now be added that there is a brief discussion of the question in Mr. G. F. Hill's new book "Historical Greek Coins," pp. 29-35.
here given are all published in M. Ernest Babelon's Description Historique des Monnaies Grecques et Romaines. I have also referred to materials to Dr. B. V. Head's Historia Numorum and Mr. G. F. Hill's Coins of Sicily, as well as to the articles of Professor Percy Gardner already cited, to articles in the third, fourth, and fifth volumes of the Zeitschrift für Numismatik, and to Dr. A. J. Evans' Contributions to Sicilian Numismatics in the Numismatic Chronicle for 1896.

A. Coins of Rhegium.


2. **Obv.** Lion's head facing. **Rev. ΝΟΜΙΣΜΑ**: calf's head l. **R** drachm 88 grs. (Aeginetan wt.) **Pl. XXVI. 1.**

3. **Obv.** Lion's head facing. **Rev. ΝΟΜΙΣΜΑ**: calf's head l. **R** tetradrachm 272 grs. (Attic weight.) **Pl. XXVI. 2.**

4. **Obv.** Mule car (ἀρέστης) driven r. by bearded charioteer. **Rev. ΝΟΜΙΣΜΑ**: hare running r. **R** tetradrachm 272 grs. (Attic weight.) **Pl. XXVI. 3.**

4a. The same, but inscription l. r. —PECINON;
(Many coins of various denominations are found with these types.)

5. **Obv.** Hare running. **Rev.** PEC in circle of dots. **R** obol. (Attic weight.) **Pl. XXVI. 4.**

6. **Obv.** Lion's head facing. **Rev.** PECINOS: male figure, seated, naked to waist, leaning on staff (?deity or Demon); beneath, hound, or other symbol: the whole in laurel wreath. **R** tetradrachm (also drachm). (Attic weight.) **Pl. XXVI. 5.**

B. Coins of Zancle-Messana.

1. **Obv. ΔΑΝΧ**: Dolphin l. in sickle (δῆτριον, ζηγχλων). **Rev.** Dolphin in sickle incuse. **R** drachm 90 grs. (Aeginetan weight.) **Pl. XXVI. 6.**

---

37 Num. Chron. 1890, pp. 101 sqq.
38 Babelon, op. cit., nos. 2187-2199; Head, op. cit., pp. 91-94.
39 Babelon, op. cit. Pl. LXXI. 8. The weights of the coins are given approximately, and on an average, except in cases where a coin stands alone and demands more exact treatment.
40 Examples of this coin are also found with the addition on the obverse of a Nike above, crowning the mule: cf. the corresponding coins of Messana (B. 4, 5).
42 This coin is fully discussed in Num. Chron. 74.
2. Obv. ΔΑΝΚΥΕ: Dolphin L in sickle.  
Rev. Scallop-shell in incuse pattern.  
R drachm 90 grs.  
(Aeginetan wt.) Pl. XXVI. 7.

2a. Similar to preceding.

3. Obv. Lion's head facing.  
Rev. ΜΕΣΣΕΝΙΟΝ: calf's head L.  
R tetradrachm 270 grs.  
(Attic weight.) Pl. XXVI. 8.

4. Obv. 'Αριάδνη driven r. by bearded charioteer; in exergue, laurel leaf.  
Rev. ΜΕΣΣΕΝΙΟΝ: hare running r., usually bucranium or other symbol in field.  
R tetradrachm 270 grs.  
(Attic weight.) Pl. XXVI. 9.

5. Obv. 'Αριάδνη etc., as above.  
Rev. ΜΕΣΣΑΝΙΟΝ: hare and symbol as above.  
R drachm 67 grs.  
(Attic weight.) Pl. XXVI. 10.

6. Obv. Naked deity (?Poseidon or Zeus) advancing r. with l. arm extended, and r. arm raised and grasping trident (?fulmen); across shoulders, εχθρίμος; in front, lofty altar with palm leaf decoration; border of dots.  
Rev. ΔΑΝΚΥΑΙΟΝ: dolphin L; beneath, scallop shell.  
R tetradrachm 263.5 grs.  
(Attic weight.) Pl. XXVI. 11.

Rev. ΝΑΙ in border of dots.  
R litra 12 grains.

C. Uninscribed Coins.

1. Obv. Round shield, on which lion's scalp facing.  
Rev. Πρως την ομοιομορία: in circular depression with ring of dots; above ship to L., A.  
R tetradrachm 267 grs.  
(Attic weight.)

---

\textsuperscript{a} Babelon, op. cit. No. 3226.  
\textsuperscript{b} These coins seem to have been regarded indifferently as Aeginetan tridrachms; there are obols of about 14 grains with the same types. (See Num. Chron. Lc.)  
\textsuperscript{c} Examples of this coin also occur with the addition on the obverse of a Νίκη crowning the archer; cf. the corresponding coins of Rhagium (A. 4.). I am indebted to Mr. G. F. Hill, of the British Museum, for calling my attention to a remarkable coin recently sold in the Struzy Sale at Rome (see Auction Catalogue No. 1237).

Note: The coin in question is a small Attic ιερό (wt. 1-46 grammes), of gold, bearing the same types (without the Νίκη on the obverse) and the same inscription as No. 4. The occurrence of a gold coin in the West at this period is startling, although paralleled by the early gold issue of Syracuse in Campania. The coin appears to have been regarded as genuine, and fetched a sensational price at the sale.

\textsuperscript{d} This coin is fully discussed in Num. Chron. Lc.

\textsuperscript{e} Babelon, Nos. 3191, 3192; Head, p. 134.
2. The same without Α on reverse. 
*AR* tetradrachm 267 grs.

Pl. XXVI. 12.

To these must be added a coin of Crotouian type which will come up for consideration:

_D. Obv. QPC Tripod and stork._

_Rev. DA_ Same type: in field, incuse altar: border of dots.

*AR* didrachm 119.7 grs.

Pl. XXVI. 13.

We are now in a position to consider these coins with a view to assigning to them their places in the history of the towns with which they are connected. The first coins of Zancle and of Rhegium alike are clearly those bearing a type on one side, and the same type incuse on the other (A. 1, B. 1). They are struck on the Aegeanetic system, which was never very extensively used in the West, and early died out there, but in style and fabric they are closely similar to the very peculiar coins of the Achaean colonies in Magna Graecia. These latter were certainly struck before 510 B.C., when Sybaris fell. Hence it is not unreasonable to suppose that these earliest issues of Zancle and Rhegium were struck about that date. This is the date arrived at by Professor Gardner in his _Sicilian Studies_. These incuse coins are very rare, for both cities. Zancle appears to have early dropped this quasi-Italian coinage, substituting the types of dolphin and scallop-shell represented by B. 2. The general style of this latter coin recalls the Syracuse coins attributed to the end of the sixth century, and having on the reverse a head in the midst of an incuse pattern. It would not perhaps be unreasonable to suppose that coins of this type were struck about 500 B.C. in imitation of the general style which had previously been in use at Syracuse. With Rhegium the case is different. The incuse coins of this city are even rarer than those of Zancle, and further, we have no other examples until we come to the entirely different types represented by A. 2. The evidence for the early coinage of Rhegium is in fact very fragmentary and unsatisfactory. We have at present no means of knowing what kind of coins the Rhegines struck between the old incuse pieces after the Achaean model and the lion-and-calf issues, which are clearly later, and certainly well within the fifth century. These coins, with the closely similar types at Zancle, are those which cause the trouble. These therefore we will pass by for the present, and go on to the next types which can be identified with reasonable certainty.

Both at Rhegium and at Zancle we find a series of coins coming in distinguished by the types of the _διατέχνη_ and _χάρα_ (A. 4, 4a, 5; B. 4, 5). Now

Gardner, _Sicilia_ and _Sicilian Coins_, Plate I. Nov. 27, 18. The _lion's head_ (not head) is quite unmistakable. Friedrich in _Zeitschrift für Numismatik_ (p. 17) quotes from the Wiccah Catalogue another specimen bearing B. on the reverse.  

*See Hill, _Coins of Sicily_, p. 71; British Museum Catalogue, Italy, No. 47.*

*Num. Chron. 1896, p. 7. Evans in _Num. Chron._ 1896 loc. also dates them to the latter half of the sixth century B.C.*
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we have the authority of Aristotle for attributing these types especially to Anaxilas, "tyrant" of Rhegium, who is known to have won the mule-car race at Olympia about 480 B.C., and is said to have introduced the hare into Sicily. We need have no hesitation therefore in putting down these coins as those of Anaxilas, and dating them between about 480 and 476 B.C.

We have now a roughly fixed terminus post quem and terminus ante quem for the coins with the heads of the lion and the calf (A. 2, 3; B. 3). They are to be placed somewhere between 500 and 480 B.C. Now the types of these coins must at once strongly recall the well-known coins of Samos. They are not indeed Samian types, for Samos has a lion's scalp and a bull's head, while the types we are here dealing with are a lion's head facing and a calf's head. These differences are quite clearly seen on an examination of the coins. Still the lion's head does actually occur on some early coins attributed with probability to Samos, and at any rate the types are close enough to justify the prevalent attribution of these coins to the Samian immigrants mentioned by Herodotus and Thucydides.

But here we encounter difficulties. In the literary sources we found nothing that would lead us to expect Samian influence at Rhegium. Yet the Samian types appear in identical form at both cities. Not only so: the earliest coins of this type at Rhegium would seem to be earlier than those at Messene. There is a Rhegine coin of Samian type (A. 2) belonging to the period previous to the change from Aeginetic to Attic weight. There is no analogous coin at Zancle. The first appearance of the Attic standard here apparently coincides with the introduction of Samian types. This creates at least a presumption in favour of an earlier date for the Samio-Rhegine coin than for the Samio-Messenian, for it would require a clumsy hypothesis to account for the facts on the contrary supposition. But our literary

---

\[\text{\textsuperscript{31}}\] Julius Pollux v. 15 (quoted by Freeman, Sicily, vol. ii. p. 488) Ἀναξίλαος δ' Ῥήγηνος, ἀρχηγός, τε φιλός Ἀριστοτέλεως, τῆς Ἀκολύβαη τῶν ἁγίων θεῶν, ἃς ἐκ ηγεμόνες δε λατρεύει, ἱππόπτερον τε καὶ ὀλυμπιακόν ἄγιον παραχώρησεν ἀκάμεροι τάλαρες. Ἡνέζ (Hist. Num., p. 93) criticizes the bare legend, and shows reason for supposing that it is due to a misconception: Anaxilas introduced 'hares' into Sicily in the same sense that Athens exported 'owls' and Syracuse used Corinthian 'colts.' None the more on that account is the tradition attributing them to Anaxilas to be neglected: if we accept Head's version of the story the direct connexion between Anaxilas and the coin is made clearer. What seems clear is that the hare appears on the coins as a symbol of the god Pan, who on a later Messenian coin appears carrying the animal. Babebon notes that Pan was especially connected with the mountaneous district of the Peloponnesus, whereas, according to the uniform tradition, the ancestors of Anaxilas.

\[\text{\textsuperscript{32}}\] See Gardner, Samos and Samian Coins, Plate 1, Nos. 2 and 3.

\[\text{\textsuperscript{33}}\] The case i even stronger if the coin given above as B. 3 is really Attic. For in that case we have the Attic standard already in force at Zancle before the arrival of the Samians. But this coin is a very puzzling one, Babebon calls it down as a Euboeic drachma, but it is about 14 grains short of the proper Attic-Euboeic weight, and yet from the plate does not look much worn. In any case one could hardly base an argument on a solitary coin in the fairly numerous series of Zancle-Messenian for this period. There is yet another difficult coin of the Zancleman series in the Ward Collection (see Greek Coins and their Parent Cities, by John Ward, with a catalogue of the author's collection by G. F. Hill, No. 222). This coin weighs 14 2/3 grains. It is very much worn, and might possibly be an Aeginetic drachma. If so, it is the only one known. But the shortage of weight (nearly
THE SAMIANS AT ZANCLE-MESSANA 67

authorities, so far from establishing Samian influence at Rhegium first, do not bring the immigrants to that city at all. The message of Anaxilas, according to Herodotus, reaches them at Locri, and they apparently sail direct for Zancle. Again, the first Samian coin on the Sicilian side of the Straits has the inscription ME" 

Therefore, from the re-naming of the town being immediately connected with the expulsion of the Samians, it would appear to coincide with their original settlement. Two attempts have been made to avoid this conclusion, and to discover a Zanclean coin struck during the Samian domination.

(i) Dr. Head\(^{20}\) seized on the Poseidon coin (B. 6) as fulfilling the required conditions. He points out that the style and fabric of the coin preclude an earlier date than 480 B.C., while the name Δῆμοςτέραευς indicates that the coin was struck before the change of name. Hence he puts it during the earlier part of the Samian domination. But it is hard to see what least indication there is of Samian influence on the coin. There was indeed a temple of Poseidon on the island of Samos, but the cult does not seem to have affected the coinage until quite late times.\(^{21}\) On the other hand, the reverse types are the familiar 'town-arms' of Zancle—the dolphin and scallop-shell,—while it is not surprising that a city on the Straits should honour Poseidon.\(^{22}\) It would be much more tempting to see in this coin a prolongation of the native coinage previous to the Samian conquest, and contemporary with the Samo-Rhegine coins of earlier type and Aeginic standard (A. 2). If this could be accepted, the Samian occupation would have to be brought considerably later than we should otherwise have suspected—in fact as late as possible before 480 B.C. (the approximate date of the Δῆμοςτέραευς- and bare types). We can, however, get rid of this troublesome coin very simply, if we accept Dr. Evans' theory worked out in his Contributions to Sicilian Numismatics.\(^ {23}\) He regards the style and fabric of the coin as indicating a date about half-way through the fifth century. The epigraphy indeed suggests an earlier date, but archaism is so common in coin inscriptions that this counts for little. Further, by a comparison of this coin with an approximately dated one of Caulonia, he is able to make it extremely probable that the Caulonian and Zanclean coins are contemporary, and that in consequence the Poseidon-coin of Zancle must be dated to about 440 B.C.—well out of our present period. He attributes the re-appearance of the old name to an unrecorded counter-revolution after the fall of the dynasty of Anaxilas. There would of course be nothing surprising in such an unrecorded counter-revolution, considering the highly charged condition of the political atmosphere in Sicily about this period, and the extremely fragmentary nature of our evidence for the history of the island in these centuries. Dr.

---

\(^{20}\) Dr. Head, Hist. Num., p. 123.

\(^{21}\) See Gardner, Samos and Samian Coins.

\(^{22}\) The figure is almost certainly Poseidon; if, however, it is Zeus, the argument is not affected, for that deity is, so far as our knowledge goes, an equal irrelevance on the coins of either city.

\(^{23}\) Num. Chron. 1896, pp. 190 sqq.
Evans quotes as another relic of this hypothetical counter-revolution the small coin given above as B. 6a, which is inscribed D\textsc{AN} and bears the dolphin, but does not easily fall into the old Zanclean series, while it offers parallels with Sicilian coins of the middle of the fifth century.\textsuperscript{38} Another possible item of confirmatory evidence is given by Mr. Hill, who regards Dr. Evans' theory as highly probable. He calls attention to the Crotomate\textsuperscript{37} coin (given as D. above), which bears the ordinary types of Croton, with the addition on the obverse of the inscription D\textsc{A}. According to analogy, this would indicate an alliance of Croton and Zancle (for D\textsc{A} can hardly stand for anything but D\textsc{ANKLAION}), and Mr. Hill may very likely be right in deducing that the revolutionary party who succeeded for a short time in restoring the supremacy of the old Zanclean element at Messana were in alliance with Croton, as the Messanians are known to have been allied with Locri—an alliance which is also commemorated by a coin bearing the names of both states.\textsuperscript{39}

(ii) The second attempt to save the credit of the literary authorities on this point rests upon the uninscribed coins of Attic weight and pure Samian types, given above as C. 1 and C. 2. Several of these coins were found in a hoard near Messina, and it is contended that they are Zanclean coins struck during the early part of the Samian domination.\textsuperscript{40} It may be observed that even if this were established it would not save the situation, for the literary authorities make the change of name a sequel of the \textit{termination} of Samian rule, while the coins at the very least show that the change took place during the Samian domination. But the argument resting upon these coins is singularly insecure. In no science is the argumentum \textit{ex silentio} less reliable than in archaeology, and at best the contention is based only on the \textit{absence} of a name which may have been either Zancle or Messana. But further, these coins do not belong to the same series as the known Samio-Messenian or Samio-Rhegian types. The fabric is not identical, and the obverse type is a lion's scalp (as on the coins of Samos), and not a lion's head (as on the Samian issues at Rhegium and Messene). It may be worth while to consider these coins in more detail. The hoard found near Messina consisted of several specimens of these uninscribed coins, many ordinary Samian types of Rhegium and Messene, some twenty archaic tetradrachms of Athens, and four coins of Acanthus in Macedonia. No place could be found for the uninscribed specimens in the series of coins of Samos, since they are of Attic weight, while Samos coined on the Phoenician standard, and there seemed some \textit{prima facie} evidence for attributing them to the Samian settlers at Rhegium or Zancle. The hoard was described by Dr. von Sallet in two articles in the \textit{Zeitschrift}

\textsuperscript{38} Numa. Chron. 1896, p. 111.
\textsuperscript{37} Cades of Sicily, p. 71; Evans, Numa. Chron. 1896, p. 106.
\textsuperscript{39} Is it possible that this temporary revival of the old name of Zancle misled Diodorus, or his authority, into placing the change of name at 481, and that the change be had in mind was in reality a restoration of the same Messana, and not its first application? (See Dion. x. 48 and 76.)
\textsuperscript{39} Head (p. 134) attributes the coins to the Sicilian city, but without committing himself on the question of their place in the Zancle-Messana series.
He discussed the attribution of these coins and came to the conclusion that they were struck in Samos for the use of the emigrants, who on their voyage called at Acanthus and Athens, and so arrived in Sicily well provided with coins of Attic standard. It was natural enough to suppose that the Samian refugees should have provided themselves with money struck with native types on the Attic standard, which in its various forms was almost ubiquitous in the West. No city-name could of course be inscribed, as the emigrants were ἀπὸ ἀνδρῶν. This theory has received pretty wide acceptance. A serious difficulty, however, is raised by the consideration of the style and fabric of the coins, which, although peculiar, approach more nearly to Western than to Eastern models. In particular the circular incuse is very rare in the East. In consequence it has been suggested that, although the coins cannot be attributed either to Zancle or to Rhegium, yet they may have been struck in the West for the emigrants, while they were still without a home. Here, however, another coin comes to our assistance. In connex- tion with his discussion of these coins, Dr. von Sallet published another coin in the Berlin collection, of somewhat similar fabric and closely similar style, the provenance of which was unknown. It bears on the obverse the lion's scalp, and on the reverse both the (Samian) bull's head and the prow of the 'samaia.' There is no inscription. The weight of this coin is 12-83 grammes, and it thus conforms to the Phoenician standard in use at Samos. Now in the British Museum there is an example closely similar, bearing in addition the legend ΞΑ on the reverse, above the ship. These two coins are published by M. Babelon, who discusses them and arrives at the only possible conclusion, that they are Samian coins struck at Samos. These coins serve to some extent to bridge the gap between the regular Samian issues and these unclaimed coins from the Messina find, and at least to diminish the difficulty raised by the question of the fabric. But there is another coin which has a more decisive bearing upon the problem. The Berlin Münzkabinett has come into possession of another example of the issue of uninscribed coins hitherto known only from the Messina find. This coin, which is as yet unpublished, has on the obverse the lion's scalp on a shield, and on the reverse the prow of the samaia, exactly as on the specimens already known. Unfortunately it is damaged so as to make it uncertain whether or not any letter was present on the reverse, but most likely there was none. The coin weighs 17-21 grammes, and is of the Attic standard. Now

---

91 This is the view of Babelon: he prints the coins among those of Rhegium, and holds that they were coined in the West for the Samian colonists immediately after their disembarkation.
92 Zeit. für Num. v. p. 105; the primary object of this second article was to reply to Friedländer, who in an article in vol. iv. (pp. 17 sq.) had maintained a later date for the coins. Friedländer's view has not, I think, been revived.
93 R.M.C. Jonas, Samos, ii. 26 (pt. 1994; grs. 1).
94 Trith. Description Historique, vol. 1, Nos. 483, 484.
95 He suggests, however, that these coins were struck in Samos for the use of the emigrants of 484 B.C.—a theory which has singularly little in its favour: see op cit, vol. i. pp. 293-294.
this coin was found in Egypt, along with a considerable number of coins from the Aegean area, including several Athenian coins, and some from Torone, Mende, and Acanthus. This example makes it very difficult to maintain the theory that the coins in question belong either to Zancle or to Rhegium, or that they were struck in the West at all, for coins of the Western Hellenes in Egypt practically non-existent. It may in fact now be regarded as almost certain that this issue belongs to the East, and if to the East, then naturally to Samos itself. The most reasonable explanation of the occurrence of such coins at Messina would seem to be von Sallet’s theory, that the coinage of Attic weight and Samian types without inscription was struck in Samos for the use of the emigrants, and carried over by them to their new home in the West. But farther, some pieces must somehow have passed into circulation at Samos before their departure, or, we may suspect, at Athens, where their weight would find them ready acceptance. Von. Sallet may therefore very likely be correct in supposing, as is indeed probable in the nature of things, that the voyagers touched at Piraeus on their way out. It is, however, hardly necessary to take them out of their course to call at Acanthus, as von Sallet did, for the occurrence of coins of the Macedonian and Thracian coast-district along with those of Athens in the Egyptian, as well as in the Messinian, find, would suggest that these coins found currency in the East wherever the Attic standard was in force.

This concludes our examination of the coins. It would appear that there is a direct conflict between the literary and the numismatic evidence. The evidence of the coins shows clearly Samian influence, predominant at Rhegium, and probably there earlier than at Zancle, while the literary authorities do not so much as bring the Samians to Rhegium at all. And in the second place the appearance of the name Messene absolutely coincides, so far as our evidence goes, with the introduction of Samian types at the Sicilian city; whereas the literary authorities make the renaming an immediate sequel of the expulsion of the Samians. It seems necessary therefore to form some hypothesis which will bring the Samians first to Rhegium, and place them there in a position to influence the coinage, and which will also provide some explanation of the coincidence of the change of name with the Samian settlement at Zancle.

In the first place let us consider the position of Anaxilas in 494 B.C., when the Samians set sail for the West. It becomes important in this connexion to determine his relation to the former régime at Rhegium. We may start with Strabo’s statement, already quoted, that the γρηγορεύς of Rhegium were of Messenian stock πέχρις Ἀναξιλά. There are here two problems: (i) who were the γρηγορεύς of Rhegium, and (ii) does πέχρις Ἀναξιλά

---

46 I have to thank Professor Dressel, Director of the Königliches Münzkabinett at Berlin, for kindly showing me this coin, together with the other examples from the Egyptian find now in the Berlin Collection.

47 Freeman has collected some evidence in connexion with the question in the Appendix on 'Anaxilas and the naming of Messene' (Nordiska vol. x. pp. 499–501), from which several references are here borrowed, but he draws no conclusion.

48 Strabo vi. 6, p. 267 (quoted on p. 8)).
mean that Anaxilas was the last of the ἤγερμοι, or that he was the originator of a new order, a usurper who abolished the power of the ἤγερμοι. These two problems hang together. The word ἤγερμοι is a peculiar one. It may of course be quite general in signification and mean merely ‘magistrates’ or ‘generals.’ On the other hand, the use of the term seems as if it might imply something more definite. It suggests the powers of a dynasty. Now if we have a line of Messenian dynasts at Rhegium, and then a Messenian ruler named Anaxilas, it looks as if Anaxilas must be one of the line of rulers and not the destroyer of an older régime. This view would appear to derive some support from the statement of Pausanias, that Anaxilas was fourth in descent from Alcmanidas. But Pausanias is hopelessly confused about Anaxilas, and not much weight can be given to his statements. Moreover, Anaxilas is regularly called a τύραννος, by Herodotus, by Thucydides, by Pausanias, by Strabo himself, and in general by almost everyone who mentions him. The only exception apparently is a scholion on Findar which styles him ὁ τῶν Ὑπατίων βασιλεύς. This is hardly sufficient to set against all the evidence for calling him a tyrant. But if he was the legitimate successor of a line of rulers of his own race and family, it is difficult to see how he could be styled τύραννος, unless indeed he did as Theidon is sometimes said to have done at Argos, and extended a power which he held as a constitutional ruler to unconstitutional lengths. But the Theidon story is very doubtful, and one can hardly rely upon it as a parallel. Further, we have the express statement of Aristotle that Anaxilas was an actual tyrant who overthrew an oligarchy. But what sort of oligarchy was it? Freeman quotes from Herodotus a statement to the effect that Rhegium was governed previously to Anaxilas’
tyranny by a senate of 1000 chosen out of the wealthiest. This would be a genuine 'oligarchy.' On the other hand Strabo's statement seems to imply rather an aristocracy of race. This might of course be styled an oligarchy in a loose way of speaking. If Strabo is to be accepted, we should conceive of Anaxilas as a member of the ruling clan who seized for himself the whole of the power which had previously been divided among a whole group of families, or perhaps as a second Cyropselus. Possibly there was an interval between the Messenian aristocracy and Anaxilas' tyranny, filled in by an oligarchy of wealth. In any case we must certainly conclude that Anaxilas overthrew the existing constitution, of whatever sort it was, and set up personal rule. This is confirmed by a statement of Dionysius of Halicarnassus cited by Freeman to the effect that Anaxilas seized the Acropolis of Rhegium—the usual step towards the establishment of a tyrany.

Now this being so, Anaxilas must be conceived as being at the beginning of his reign in conflict with a class whom he had deposed from power—probably a group of Messenian families, from whom Anaxilas was himself sprung. Accordingly, when the Samians came to the West, seeking for a home, Anaxilas was casting about him for any means of establishing his power. What more likely than that he should invite the Samian adventurers into his city as a support to his 'tyranny'? Surely it is more probable that at this date Anaxilas should be seeking to establish his power at home than that he should be already casting his eyes across the Straits. We may therefore conjecture, not perhaps too rashly, that the message which reached the Samian emigrants at Locri Epirothynnii was an invitation, not to Zancle, but to Rhegium, and that it was accepted promptly. The Rhegines now fall under the sway of a sort of coalition—Anaxilas reigning as 'tyrant' under Samian protection. The establishment of this new régime is signified by a change of coinage. The old civic mint is superseded by a new issue belonging to the ruler (a frequent step in the rise of 'tyrannies'), in which the old 'bull' types yield to new types modelled on the native coinage of the invaders. Zancle meanwhile remains under the rule of Scythes (as a semi-independent vassal of Hippocrates), and continues to issue native coinage.

Dr. Evans has made it probable from a comparison of the coins of different cities contained in a hoard discovered near Messina, that the hoard was buried at the time of the Samian conquest of Zancle. Among these coins

---

77. Herodotus ap. Freeman, Sicily, vol. ii. p. 409. Πραγματικὰ ἡ καταργηθή τοῦ ἀποκατασκευά-


79. The date which is ascertained for the beginning of Anaxilas' reign from Diodorus (loc. p. 59) is 494 B.C. But we have no means of knowing whether this was the date at which he first rose against the 'oligarchy,' or that at which his power was established. At any rate he does not seem to have struck any coin before the Samians came, and if so, was hardly by then secure in power for any length of time. But, as we have already seen, the early numismatic evidence for Rhegium is too fragmentary to allow any weight to the argumentum a silicibus.

are some dolphin-and-scallop-shell types of Zancle (B. 2) absolutely fresh from the mint. We may therefore fairly assume that the native coinage of Zancle continued without a break to the very eve of the Samian occupation. Anaxilas' power now steadily grew. We read of wars which he waged against the Etruscans, and no doubt there were other undertakings which increased the prestige of the monarch of Rhegium. It may have been about 488 that he felt strong enough to reach over the Straits to Sicily. At the same time it is probable that the 'tyrant' was restive under the restraints which would doubtless be imposed upon him by the formidable power of his Samian supporters. Accordingly he seized the opportunity when Scythes, the agent of his rival Hippocrates, was absent, to gratify at once his ambition and his desire to get rid of the Samians. He probably represented to them the advantages of having a city of their own, and pointed out the town on the Sicilian side of the Straits as a suitable field for their enterprise. The result was a combined expedition of Anaxilas and the Samians ending in the occupation of Zancle, as recorded by Herodotus. Hence the Samian coinage at the Sicilian city (B. 3).

But it still remains to account for the name MESSENIOn on coins of the Samian occupation. The account of Thucydides derives the name from the Messenian fatherland of Anaxilas. There is indeed a unanimous agreement among the authorities as to the Messenian extraction of the despot of Rhegium, but for all that, Thucydides' motivation, which even to Freeman sounded suspicious, becomes almost incredible when faced by the fact that the Samians were quite evidently dominant at Messene when the name was first used. We must therefore attempt to find some other ground for the change of name. Our theory here of necessity becomes in the highest degree constructive, for there seems to be something like a dead disagreement between our different sources of evidence. Pausanias, as we have seen, directly attributes the change to Messenian exiles after the Second Messenian War, and Strabo also traces it to Messenians from the Peloponnese, but without any definite chronological indications. It seems difficult to ignore these statements absolutely, and yet, as we have seen, Freeman's theory, however ingenious and plausible, if we look at the literary evidence only, completely breaks down when faced with the unansismatic data. Now I suggest as a

---

9 Strabo, p. 225 Ἐκ τῆς Ἡράκλειας, ἡ Μεσσηνή, ὡς ἡ Ἱπποκρατεία, ἔρχεται ἐπὶ τῶν ἱπποκρατικῶν τοὺς Λακεδαιμόνιους, καὶ τοῖς Ἐχθροῖς, δι' ἁπάντων ἐκ τῶν Ἱπποκρατικῶν τοὺς Ἐχθροῖς. Τοῖς Ἐχθροῖς τοῖς Φερμαντὶς, ἐκ τῆς Μεσσηνίας τῶν Ἰπποκρατικῶν τοὺς Ἐχθροῖς.

10 The adoption of the Attic standard for the Rhegian coinage, which brought Rhegium into line with the great trading cities of the West, may fairly be taken as a sign of the opening up of new commercial relations. This commercial development would most probably lie in the hands of the Samian settlers. They were Samiones of την Σάμιαν, that is, on doubt, the heads of the great mercantile houses in their native city. Now Samia belonged to the great commercial league which also included Chalcis and Phocaea (Hitt. v. 90, s. 163, epl. with τιν. 126, etc.). Hence the invaders would already have commercial connections in the West. Probably therefore we are to suppose that their settlement in Rhegium led to an expansion of Rhegian trade, the profits of which would mainly go to the immigrants, with the result that they acquired considerable prestige in their adopted city. Or their subsequent settlement at Zancle the Attic standard was probably introduced simultaneously with the Samian types (but see note 51a).
tentative explanation that Pausanias' exiles of the second war may have gone like Strabo's exiles of the first. (In the passage cited and in part quoted on p. 60 [8]) to Rhegion, and not to Zancle. Very possibly indeed these two sets of exiles are the same, duplicated through a chronological misconception. At Rhegion they would strengthen the governing group of Messenian families overthrown by Anaxilas. Even after the 'tyranny' was established these out-of-work aristocrats would be a thorn in the side of the ruler, and we may suspect that the Samian oligarchs who had come to help the 'tyrant' were not without sympathy for the Messenian nobles of Rhegion. What then more likely, than that the whole pack of dangerous nobles should be sent off to seize and hold an outpost, where they would be out of the despot's way, and yet would stand decidedly for Rhegion as against the Sicilian powers? The Messenian element in the colony, especially as it would have the peculiar prestige arising from its connexion with the monarch, would be considerable enough to give its name to the city; and no doubt Anaxilas himself was the sponsor. On the other hand the Samian coinage prevalent at Rhegion naturally formed the model for the reformed coinage of the new state.

It can hardly have been before 480 B.C. that Anaxilas found himself strong enough to assert his direct sovereignty at Messene. The Anaxillean types at Rhegion—at any rate those with a retrograde inscription (A. 4)—are probably earlier than the similar types at Zancle, but there is no evidence for this beyond general likelihood. At Messene it would seem that the arrangement did not work satisfactorily for Anaxilas; and he determined to establish thoroughly his rule over the new colony. Whether he actually expelled the Samians, or only completely broke their power, 44 is doubtful, but at any rate there was no more trace of Samian predominance. Anaxilas seems indeed from this time to have settled at Messene himself, leaving his son Leophas (or Cleophas) to govern Rhegion. In a scholion on Pindar 45 he is mentioned as 'tyrant of Messene and Rhegion' (not 'Rhegion and Messene') at the time of his war with Locri, and another scholiast states quite clearly that Anaxilas himself reigned at Messene and his son at Rhegion. 46

Finally we may observe, though it does not bear directly upon the
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44 Strabo, p. 237.
48 The retention of the Ionic form MESSENIAN with Anaxilas' types would perhaps tend somewhat in favour of the view that there was still a strong Ionic element in the population, whether Samians or survivors of the original Chalcidian colonists, unless indeed it is due to mere conservatism.
45 Schol. on Pind. Pyth. iii. 34 (quoted by Freeman [i.e. 'The Athenian of the courts of Kleophas' or 'Lycophron'] 43-44, or [on the other hand] 45-60 in Messian'] 46-51 in Pegas'] 47-50 in Ithracei. We have here in fact a curious parallel to the scheme of Periander recorded in Hdt. iii. 56, by which Periander was himself to reign in Corinth while his son Lycophron held the sovereignty in the mother-city Corinth, the original seat of the dynasty.)
problem, proposed, that when the tyranny was overthrown at Rhegium in 461 the people reverted not to the old bull-coingage, but to the Samian lion-head, with a figure on the reverse probably representing the Demos (A. 6). By this time the earlier role of the Samians as supporters of the 'tyranny' of Anaxilas had been forgotten, and they were remembered only as the tyrant's enemies whose coin-types had been displaced by the symbols of his power. Messene retained the Anaxilian coinage, and there is here no abrupt change of type (if we except the assumed temporary revival represented by the coins numbered B. 6, B. 6a, and D.) right down to the overthrow of the city about 396 B.C. One notable, though slight, change is the introduction of the Doric form MESSANION (B. 5), which, as the old form of Sigma is still used, probably came in not long after the time of Anaxilas. It must mean a growing preponderance of the Dorian element. It was in the Doric form Μέσσανα that the name passed into Latin, although in the end the forms Μεσσηνία, Μεσσηνία, prevailed, and gave rise to the modern name Messina.

The above is an attempt to indicate a possible line along which a reconciliation of the sources might be effected. In the interests of definiteness the theory has doubtless been stated with a dogmatism that is hardly justified. The available evidence is indeed a precarious foundation on which to build. But I have tried to bring out a few facts which I think are necessary deductions from that evidence, such as it is; and facts which seem to me in part to be in conflict with statements repeated by historians on the authority of a supposed deduction from the literary sources, and in addition I have attempted to show that it might not be impossible to account for these facts with some degree of consistency. It will be well to recapitulate these points:

(i) There is a Rhegian coinage modelled on Samian types, contemporary with native types at Zancle, probably to be dated to the beginning of the reign of Anaxilas, say 494-488 B.C. Hence we must assume a period during which Anaxilas ruled at Rhegium under Samian protection, while Zancle was still in the 'sphere of influence' of Hippocrates.

(ii) There is no ground whatever in the numismatic evidence for assuming a period of Samian occupation at Zancle previous to the change of name, and Samian types certainly do not cease when the name Messene appears. Hence the Samian occupation, which is to be put later than the traditional date, must have been combined in some way with Messenian influence—whether due to a large Messenian element in the party which seized Zancle, or merely to Anaxilas' personal prestige—sufficient to change the name of Zancle to Messene; and the idea, derived from literary sources, that the re-naming followed the expulsion of the Samians must be abandoned.

(iii) At some date between the change of name and the death of Anaxilas, the authority of the tyrant was thoroughly established at both cities. The Samian coinage disappeared at Messene for ever, and at Rhegium only to be resumed on the establishment of the democracy about 461 B.C.
(iv) The settlement of Messene by Anaxilas was permanent. The old name was never revived, unless for a very brief period about the middle of the fifth century, represented by only three extant coins. The Anaxilas types persevere in the coinage with various developments, but without any violent change down to the end of the individual existence of Messana about 396 B.C.

C. H. DODD.
THE POPULATION AND POLICY OF SPARTA IN THE FIFTH CENTURY.

It is, perhaps, somewhat venturesome to attempt to say anything upon a subject which demands full treatment from anyone who would write a History of Greece, and which has, therefore, been discussed at considerable length by many great historians. Still the research of the last twenty years has led to such material modifications of the views which formerly prevailed as to the exact significance of various important factors in the history of the Greek race, that the learned world has become emancipated from the tyranny of stereotyped tradition, and has ceased to regard deviation from the accustomed views as necessarily fanciful and untrue.

The present writer is therefore encouraged to state his conclusions, strange and novel as they may appear at first reading, by the assured feeling that they will be addressed to many who will not reject them out of hand by reason of a certain strangeness and novelty, but will form a judgment as to their truth or otherwise on an examination of the premises and of the validity of the logical arguments drawn therefrom.

There are certain chapters in Greek history, which, in the form in which they are commonly presented to the student, convey an impression of irrationality—of a story taken from the history of a world in which the ordinary laws of cause and effect do not hold good. No one of these chapters leaves the student with a more unsatisfactory feeling that he has not arrived at the truth than that which relates to the position and policy of Sparta with reference to external politics.

Lacedaemon was an enigma to its contemporaries. To that fact may be attributed the difficulty which has always existed with regard to its true presentment, and the very varied judgments which have been formed and expressed as to the motives and morale of its policy and actions.

Sparta's conduct on various occasions has been subjected to the severest criticism not merely in modern but in ancient times; yet a consideration of the whole long story of this unique state is apt to leave behind it the feeling that its critics have judged it too severely, and have above all blamed it for not doing that which was not in its power to do. There is such an extraordinary consistency in that "unambitious," "vacillating," "dilatory" policy, which even her friends and admirers condemned in the fifth century before Christ, and less passionate critics have condemned in the nineteenth century
after Christ, that a thoughtful student of history may well feel some doubt as to whether that policy was dictated by an innate, unintelligent, selfish conservatism, or was due to motives of such a compelling character as rigidly to condition the relations of Sparta with the outside world.

The statistics with regard to the population of Ancient Greece, which have been collected in Dr. Julius Beloch's work on the population of the Ancient World, have a significance which has been recognised but not always fully appreciated in relation to the history of some of the Greek States. But Dr. Beloch has not said the last word on the subject. He has failed to estimate the importance of the evidence which Greece at the present day affords. He tends also to discredit certain statements of numbers, from which larger estimates of the population of Greece in ancient times might be deduced than would be the case were the calculations founded on certain other existent data. The reasons which he gives for the rejection of this evidence are by no means conclusive, and betray at times a failure to appreciate certain factors in that Greek military history from which these data are largely drawn.

The cultivated, and, indeed, cultivable area in Greece at the present day is undoubtedly smaller than it was in the flourishing days of the fifth century. Pausanias notices the ruin of the hillside cultivation, of which the traces are still apparent in many parts of Greece; and in a climate such as that of the Eastern Mediterranean this form of cultivation, if once allowed to go to ruin, is almost beyond the possibility of reconstitution, owing to the soil being washed down into the valleys by the heavy rains of the Autumn and Spring. There is perhaps no country in the civilised world which has had a more distressful economic history during the last two thousand years.

Devastation and misgovernment have alike played havoc with the productiveness of a land whose cultivable area was, under the most favourable circumstances, but a little more than one-fifth of its whole extent. From returns published by the Greek Government in 1893 it appears that the total area in Greece which is capable of yielding food products other than cattle amounts to only twenty-two per cent of the whole area of the country; and of this a very large proportion is in the one district of Thessaly. Moreover, the area actually cultivated in that year amounted to only fifteen per cent of the surface of Greece. It is also stated—and this is a significant statement for our present purpose—that, were that seven per cent of area, which is the difference between those two amounts, under cultivation at the present day, the necessity for the import of foreign grain would cease, and this in spite of the fact that large areas of land in the Peloponnesse which are capable of yielding food products are sacrificed to the growth of the currant crop. But it is further reckoned that were the 72,000 acres of cornland which at present lie fallow in Thessaly brought under cultivation, the deficit of home food products would be supplied; and this acreage is but a fraction of the seven per cent to which reference has been made. It would therefore appear that at the present day, in spite of the cultivable area being in all probability appreciably smaller than it was in the fifth century before Christ, it would, if
brought under cultivation be enough and even more than enough to meet the needs of the present population in respect to food supply.

When we turn to the evidence of the circumstances as they existed in the fifth century we find a state of things which contrasts strongly in certain important respects with that existent at the present day. The population of the country at that time was larger, probably far larger, than the country could support. All the states from Boeotia southwards seem to have been more or less dependent on foreign corn. This dependence was of old standing. It had existed in Boeotia, and, if in Boeotia, almost certainly in the less fertile districts of Greece, so early as the days of Hesiod. Aegina and Peloponnesian were importing corn from the Pontus early in the fifth century. Later in the same century Peloponnesian was importing corn from Sicily. The evidence with regard to the import of corn into Attica is so well known that it need not be produced in detail for the purposes of this paper. One passage is, however, worthy of special consideration, because it shows the magnitude of the deficiency in the case of this particular state. In the middle of the fourth century Attica was importing 400,000 medimnoi of corn annually from the Pontus alone, and 800,000 annually from all parts. The passage from which these figures are derived seems to assume that this corn was intended for consumption within Attica itself, and not for re-export. If so, taking 7 medimnoi (and this is a liberal computation) as the annual consumption per head, it points to the fact that 114,000 of the population of Attica in the middle of the fourth century were dependent for food on imported corn, and this at a time when the population had very considerably decreased from what it had been at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War. Taking these broad facts drawn from ancient and modern evidence into consideration, it seems impossible to accept Dr. Julius Beloch's low estimate of the population of Greece in the fifth century. The contrast of circumstances between the fifth century and the present day is twofold. The cultivable and cultivated area was greater in that century than it is now; yet this larger area failed to meet the needs of the then population, whereas at the present day, were the cultivable area all utilised, modern Greece could supply the wants of its present inhabitants. Only one conclusion can be drawn from this, namely that the population of Greece in the fifth century was certainly larger, and probably considerably larger than at the present day.

The total population of Greece as given in the census list of 1896 is 2,433,800. Dr. Beloch arrives at the population of Ancient Greece by adding together the numbers which he attributes to the individual states.

He thus estimates a total of 1,579,000, or, including slaves, 2,228,000. To discuss the various items in his calculations would involve the writing of a small volume. He shows a marked tendency towards the belittlement of the ancient data, and suspects exaggeration, where no exaggeration can be
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1 Hesiod. Works and Days, ii. 42 and 236.
2 Thuc. iii. 83.
3 Herod. viii. 147.
4 Dem. Rahul Arreboz, 31, 32.
proved. The result is that he arrives at a sum total which, judged by the substantial evidence which the country at present affords, must err considerably on the side of under-statement. Anything approaching certainty upon this question is impossible, but the general, and indeed the particular evidence on the question, if treated without prejudice, point to an aggregate population in the fifth century at least 33 per cent. larger than the numbers at which Dr. Beloch arrives.

The ancient evidence with regard to the population of Laconia and Messenia varies greatly according as to whether the inquiries be dealing with the Spartiate, the Perioeci, or the Helot element.

For the purpose of this paper the important point to determine is the ratio which existed between the numbers of those three sections of the inhabitants of the Lacedaemonian state. There can be no question that the two first elements were small in comparison with the third, and it is further possible to arrive at some conclusion as to the maximum numbers which can be attributed to them. Whether these maxima are accurate or not is another question. Still it is possible to attain certainty on the point which is all important for the present consideration, namely that these numbers did not exceed certain limits which may be deduced from the ancient evidence. On the question of the numbers of the Helot population the ancient evidence affords but little help. The data are almost exclusively military; and only at Plataea in 479 did Sparta put a large body of Helots in the field. The unusual numbers on that occasion were probably due to two causes. The Greeks knew that they were about to meet a foe which was peculiarly strong in respect to light-armed troops. Furthermore, the occasion was so critical that Sparta, like the other states of Greece, thought it necessary to make the utmost effort; and, taking the field with her full Spartiate force, did not dare to leave the ungarrisoned capital at the mercy of the Helots.

From the numbers given by Herodotus, namely 5,000 Spartiates, 5,000 Perioeci, and 35,000 Helots, a ratio of 1:1:7 might be deduced between the elements of the population.

Dr. Beloch places no reliance on the numbers stated by Herodotus to have been present at Plataea; but a comparison between them and the data relating to an earlier and a later period tends to confirm the Herodotean estimate in nearly every respect. It is only in relation to some of the smaller contingents present at the battle that possible exaggeration may be suspected. This 5,000 is the largest number which we find attributed to a purely Spartiate force by Greek historians. But the occasion was unique and the effort was unique. It is almost certain that the full Spartiate force never passed beyond the frontier of Laconia during the fifth century save on this occasion. It was necessary to leave a garrison in Sparta when the army marched out. At Mantinea in 418 the numbers are either 3,552 or 3,584 according to the method of calculation employed, and this in face of serious danger. Moreover, the numbers contain Σχίρτα, Βροισία, and Νεωδαμόνι. At Corinth in 394 Sparta puts 8,000 hoplites into the field;
but we know that the Morae at this time were 600 strong, so that the Spartan contingent of six Morae would amount to 3,600 men, the remainder being made up of a Mora of 600 Στρατηγοί, and 1,800 Ναυαρχοί.

There can be little question that 5,000 represents the maximum of the Spartan force. It may be a slight overstatement of numbers; it is certainly not an understatement, and that is the important point in reference to the argument of this paper. By the middle of the fourth century there had been a considerable decrease in the numbers of the Spartiates. Assuming this 5,000 to represent the able-bodied male population between 20 and 30 years of age, it would, on a calculation based on age statistics of modern Greece, amount to 40 per cent. of the whole male population. This would imply 12,500 male Spartiates, or a total population of 25,000, as much as the number of males and females is about the same in Greek lands. For the Perioecic population no satisfactory statistics exist. The 5,000 at Plataea might suggest something like an equality with the Spartan population; but it is unlikely that Sparta armed the whole of the able-bodied of this section of the population as a hoplite force.

For the Helots the 35,000 of Herodotus is the only evidence in ancient history. But here again it is improbable that anything like the whole able-bodied Helot population was called out even on this occasion. It is, in fact, to the modern census tables that we must turn in order to arrive at some estimate of the ratio between the free and the non-free population of Lacedaemon.

The modern population of the regions included within its old boundaries is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Messenia</td>
<td>184,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laconia</td>
<td>198,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>10,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cythera</td>
<td>12,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>254,810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It has already been shown that any assumption that these numbers were larger than the numbers of those inhabiting this region in antiquity would be against the evidence which is available. It is on the contrary probable that Laconia and Messenia in the fifth century contained not less than those 400,000 souls. If so, the proportion of free to non-free population was 1:15. It certainly was not much smaller than this.

It is on this fact that the argument of this paper is based. Greek historians, though, of course, aware that the Spartiates were largely
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6 Xen. Hell. iv. 2. 19.
7 Cf. Xen. Hell. iii. 3. (5 and 6) where the Spartiates not belonging to the Σωματεία are reckoned as 4,500, while the Σωματεία are said to consist only of the King, Ephors, Senators, and about 40 others.
8 Cfr. E. 9, 1:3 reckons the warriors of the Helots to be 25 per cent. of the whole population. Dionysius Ik. 25 multiplies the census by four to find the total. Were we to accept these ratios, the Spartan population would work out at a maximum of 20,000. But for the purposes of this paper we will assume the larger number, 22,000.
9 Dr. Beloch, relying chiefly on data from the fourth and later centuries, computes their number at 15,000 males, which would imply a population of 30,000 Perioeci.
outnumbered by the Perioikid and Helot populations, have not until the last few years had at their disposal the means whereby they may realise the extraordinarily large ratio which the non-free bore to the free population of the country. Furthermore, the economic conditions of life in Greece have not been realised by writers, very few indeed of whom have had anything resembling an intimate acquaintance with the country.

I venture to say that this new evidence, when duly weighed and evaluated, does not merely present the Spartan state in a new light, but gives the clue to that strange and apparently tortuous policy which puzzled the contemporary world, and of which later writers, aided by the survey of the facts of centuries, have never been able to give a satisfactory explanation.

Nature had rigidly conditioned the part which Sparta should play in the life of its time. The external Greek world, seeing Sparta in possession of the most effective military force of which it had any experience in the fifth century, expected it to play a different and much larger part. The Spartiate, living face to face with danger so great that it would have been dangerous to confess its magnitude to the outside world, had not in the fifth century any illusions as to the nature of the policy which he must pursue. The policy of the state had, for him, limitations which the Greeks of the other states could not understand, because they could not realise the compelling nature of the motives which lay behind them. Sparta could not wholly conceal the truth, but she dare not let it all be known; hence of the most important element in the Spartan system Thucydides, a diligent enquirer, has to admit διὰ τῆς πολεμικῆς το ξαφνιξθέντο. Alike by geographical situation and by her internal institutions she was cut off from the outside world. She was situated at the extremity of a peninsula. Her sea communications were rendered difficult to the navigators of those days by the capes which projected far on either side of her harbours. Her land communications were scarcely less difficult. A rugged region separated her from the interior of the peninsula; and further north another rugged region lay across the path to the Isthmus. Moreover, all the roads thither save one, and that a circuitous route, were barred by Argos, her rival and enemy in Peloponnesse. Nature had designed her to lead a life of retirement in the valley of the Eurotas, a pleasant but secluded spot. Owing to her geographical circumstances alone, it would not have been easy for her to play the imperial part in the Greece of the fifth century.

But the Spartiate of the fifth century was heir to institutions which set even stricter limits on his activities. How those institutions had originated neither he nor those who wrote his history seem to have had any clear idea; but the fact remained that he had to face the problem of governing and exploiting in servitude a population many times larger than his own. It was a fierce, not a docile race which he sought to keep in subjection. He ruled by fear, but himself reaped the crop which he sowed. The situation could only be met, as it had been met, by the formation of a military community. His life had to be sacrificed in order that it might be preserved. He was
ever on the strain, holding, as it were, a wolf by the throat; and he knew it, and knew it better than that outside world, which had only half-grasped the reality of the situation. Compromise was impossible. The system was of long standing, and it had begotten a mutual bitterness which would have rendered any alleviation of the system dangerous to those who controlled its working. When we consider the proportion and the relations existing between the rulers and their serf subjects, when we realize that the former must have been outnumbered by at least ten to one, it becomes a matter of surprise, not that Sparta did so little in Panhellenic politics, but that she did so much. Every other page of Greek history testifies to her own fear of her own situation; and the evidence from the statistics of population testifies to the reality of the grounds wherein the fear was based. Aristotle, who spoke from the experience of several centuries of recorded history, says: 'For the Perseus in Thessaly made frequent attacks on the Thessalians, as did the Helots upon the Lacedaemonians; indeed, they may be described as perpetually lying in wait to take advantage of their masters’ misfortunes.' The awful tale which Thucydides tells of the treatment of the two thousand Helots shortly after the affair of Pylos exemplifies the extremity of the fear with which the ruling race regarded them. But it is unnecessary to quote numerous examples of what is a commonplace in Greek history. What neither the Greek nor the modern world realized, and that which Sparta wished to prevent her contemporaries from realizing to the full, was the extent of the danger which ever menaced the ruling minority in the state. The Spartan accepted a life of hardship, because he was face to face with a situation whose sternness he could not mistake. His ideas were ultimately limited by the confines of his own territory, because he had therein enough to occupy his mind. He was called narrow-minded and unambitious; but men who have to guard against destruction every day of their lives have no time for day-dreams or large ambitions. Sparta produced in the fifth century but few exceptions to her norm; and men like Pausanias and Lyssandros were the products of periods of panhellenic excitement, men who were carried away by the greatness of the positions in which the action of interests far larger than those of the self-centred Spartan state had placed them. But Sparta, with eyes intent on dangers near at hand, refused during the fifth century to be dazzled by distant splendours. It can hardly be doubted that she was wiser than her more ambitious sons. She treated their ambitions as crimes against the state.

The essential thesis of this paper is that Spartan policy is ultimately conditioned either directly or indirectly by her home circumstances. These
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9 The dilemma is stated—perhaps understated—in Aristotle, Pol. II, ix, p. 45, line 7, ed. Bekker; What is the right way of dealing with them? If they are left without restraint, they grow insolent and claim equality with their masters; while, if they are harshly treated they are in a state of conspiracy and bitter ill-will.

10 Aristotle, Pol. II, ix. (Ward's translation.)

11 Thuc. iv. 40.
dominated her policy and dominated it absolutely, even if not always directly. That policy may be represented diagrammatically by three concentric circles: the innermost, her home policy; the intermediate one, her Peloponnesian policy; the outermost one, her policy outside Peloponnesia. The Peloponnesian policy is conditioned by her home circumstances; and the same is ultimately the case with her extra-Peloponnesian policy; but here the influence is indirect, because, until the rise of the Theban power in the fourth century, the world outside Peloponnesia could only affect Sparta through Peloponnesia itself.

Of the Peloponnesian policy of Sparta it is not necessary to speak at any length. It was absolutely determined by the Helot question at home. Her neighbours, especially the Arcadian cities, had to be kept under sufficient control to prevent their tampering with that serf-population. Hence Arcadia was kept divided. Its two greatest cities, Tegea and Mantinea, were played off against one another, and any attempt at combination or even [omicron]s [omicron]s within the region was treated as a [omicron]s [omicron]s. Yet even here the limitations of the power of Sparta are shown. She might have conquered Arcadia at any time in the fifth century. In one sense this could hardly have failed to save her much trouble and anxiety. But she had not any surplus Spartiate population to expend on imperialist policy.

Elis was in some respects a more, in some respects a less difficult, problem. Its population was a rule, contented and unambitious. Its land was more fertile than that of most of the Greek states, and it was cut off from the rest of Peloponnesia by rugged mountainous regions, and from the rest of the world by a coast-line which afforded but little shelter to navigators. Still it was within easy reach of Messenia, and so Sparta kept a watchful eye upon it. She brought it within the League, and sternly repressed its perversity ambition to combine with Argos. Probably the Eleian agriculturist resented the necessity of furnishing contingents to the Peloponnesian League army during the seasons of corn and vine harvest.

The possession of Lepraon too, was a persistent cause of quarrel between the two states. Sparta's action in this matter seems to have been dictated by a consideration of her all-important interests in Arcadia.

Achaea was a negligible quantity, and was treated as such. It was cut off from the rest of the Peloponnesia by the great barrier of Erymanthus, and for this reason, and in consequence of its general weakness, could not in any way endanger the internal affairs of Laconia.

The states of the Argolid presented a special problem, or series of problems. Sparta's policy in relation to Argos illustrates too in a special way the necessary limitations of her general policy. Argos was hardly less dangerous than Arcadia, and more powerful than any single Arcadian city. She was anxious to win back that hegemony in Peloponnesia which Sparta had usurped from motives of self-preservation. She had a large population for a Greek state, Her citizens outnumbered the Spartiates. She was inclined to tamper with the Arcadian cities, and, furthermore possessd in the Thyrreatic plain a region which was in contact with the Helot district of eastern Laconia. So Sparta
took the plain from her, and ultimately settled the exiled Argiveans there. Three times in the course of the century, at Sepeia, Dipae, and Mantinea, she taught Argos lessons on the danger of interfering with Sparta's interests in Peloponnese; and moreover, as a set policy, she played off Epidaurus and Troezen against her. On the three occasions above mentioned she had Argos in the hollow of her hand. But she neither wiped her out of existence, nor even garrisoned the Larissa. Yet it was manifestly to her interest to hold this important strategic point. Of the five routes to the Isthmus, four, those via Caryste and the springs of Lerna, by Hydrae, the Prinias, and the Climax routes were all commanded by Argos. The circuitous route by the Arcadian Osmeneus was the only one which Argos did not command.

Sparta demonstrated that she could crush Argos if she so willed. It has been suggested that she refrained from so doing out of deference to Hellenic sentiment, which would have been shocked by the destruction of a Greek state. There were probably more practical reasons for her forbearance. The destruction of Argos' independence would have brought upon Sparta more difficulties than advantages. She was the kite which frightened the other cities of the Akte to take refuge under the wing of Sparta. But far more important than this was the influence which she exerted upon Corinthian policy. Since at least the time of Pheidon, Argos had had close connexion with Aegina, that trade rival which until the time of the sudden growth of Athenian power Corinth most hated and feared. Hence the trading town of the Isthmus regarded Argos with fear and hostility, and sought in alliance with Sparta protection against the possible combination of the two states against her. The first twenty years of the fifth century changed the circumstances without relieving the situation, as far as Corinth was concerned. For the rivalry of Aegina was substituted the far more formidable rivalry of Athens; and Athens, too, soon showed a disposition to make use of Argos. Little use she got of her. She tried to employ her as a cat's paw to get certain Peloponnesian chestnuts out of the fire. The cat's paw got badly burnt, but the chestnuts remained in the fire; and on one occasion, in 418, Athens burnt her own fingers. The connexion with Argos was one of the capital blunders of Athenian policy in the fifth century. Argos reaped advantages and disadvantages from it: Athens disadvantages alone. The reputed shrew wit of Sparta had probably arrived at a more correct estimate of Argos than had the imaginative cleverness of Athens. Of course the situation was one which contained elements calculated to cause Sparta anxiety, especially in times of political stress; but it entailed one advantage, in that it made Argos more formidable to Corinth than she would otherwise have been after the fall of Aegina; and, for the rest, the alliance was not of such a character as would preclude Sparta from forcing Argos to accept a position of neutrality or treaty conditions. But above all it kept Corinth more or less in order; and, of all the members of the Peloponnesian team, Corinth had the hardest mouth. It was a narrow, well-defined road along which Sparta sought to drive the team, and Corinth at times sought to drag her yokemates along other paths. Moreover at times she succeeded in so doing; and it is mainly these
divergences from the set policy of Sparta which tend to give it an appearance of width such as Sparta neither did nor could wish that it should possess. So much for the present with regard to the relation of the two states. They are of far more importance in connexion with the extra-Peloponnesian than with the Peloponnesian policy of Sparta.

Sicyon's connexion with the Spartan league was probably more due to the fact that it exploited and controlled the internal trade of the Peloponnes, than to anything else. Doubtless Sparta would have exercised coercion, had not interest been sufficient as a factor with a state so situated with reference to the allies of Sparta. The case of Megara, though intimately bound up with Peloponnesian policy, is, like that of Corinth, more really concerned with the relations of Sparta to the world outside Peloponnes.

The extra-Peloponnesian policy is that element in the matter under consideration which presents the greatest difficulties to the student of Greek history. It seems at times as if Sparta gave way, even in the fifth century, to attacks of imperialism. Even so, the attacks are brief, and the political actions of Sparta which may be attributed to them neither form a continuous chain of policy, nor even are pursued in themselves for any length of time. She stretches out her arm at times, but only to withdraw it both rapidly and soon. Sparta had no human capital to expend on such enterprises: what she had was fully employed at home and in the neighbourhood of home. As far as the government and the people are concerned, the imperial tinge of these acts is a false colouring. The action of Sparta outside Peloponnes was taken absolutely in reference to her position in Peloponnes, and was conditioned by it; and that again was equally absolutely conditioned by the situation at home. Spartiates of large ambition did now and then mistake or wilfully ignore the true situation, and tried to use the resources of the state for larger, and for the most part, for selfish ends; but their fellow countrymen had no mind to sacrifice their lives at home for the advancement of other people's ambition abroad. Their conservatism was the Conservatism of self-preservation.

But Corinth was the extra-Peloponnesian of Spartan foreign politics. It is very difficult to gauge exactly the grounds of the influence which this state exercised in the Spartan league. Intensely commercial, she afforded a strange contrast to her uncommercial leader. There can have been little community of sentiment between the two. A certain community of interests supplied its place. In so far as the interests were common, they were political. Yet political interests were subordinated in the case of Corinth to trade interests. As a great commercial state her interests were as world-wide as those of Sparta were narrow.

Though a complete understanding of the relations between Corinth and Sparta may be unattainable on the existing evidence, yet there are certain factors recognisable which must have played an important part in determining them. Corinth was the only state of the League which was potentially powerful on the sea. She was probably more wealthy than any other of the states, though there is no evidence to show in what way this affected the
situation. But above all she commanded the Isthmus, the highway to the states of the north,—a highway along which Sparta must have free passage unless she was prepared to allow her interests in Peloponnesse to be endangered from the north; for just as it was necessary that sufficient control should be exercised in Peloponnesse to prevent interference in Spartan territory, so also it was necessary, though in a fainter and more distant sense, that control should be exercised in Northern Greece sufficient to prevent interference with Peloponnesian interests. Sparta would have limited her interests to Laconia and Messenia, had she dared to do so, or, at the Isthmus, had that been a practical possibility. But the chains of the stern necessity laid upon her linked her with regions in which her direct interest was hardly perceptible. Her position with respect to her own dominions and her own ambitions is clearly analogous to that of Rome in the third and second centuries before Christ. Rome's personal ambition was limited by the shores of Italy. It did not even pass the Sicilian strait. Italy was her Laconia and Messenia, and the subject Italians were her Periokki and Helots. But she soon found herself under the necessity of controlling these lands from which her position in Italy could be threatened; and even then she could not stay her hand ere she had brought into subjection an outer circle of territories from which the regions surrounding Italy might be endangered. Still Rome could afford to incur responsibilities which she disliked, whereas Sparta could not.

Sparta would have left the states of Northern Greece to go to Elysium or Tartarus their own way, if only they had been in the impossibility of interfering in Peloponnesse. But that was not so; and hence the right of way across the Isthmus was all important to her as a land power; and the good will of Corinth had to be maintained by concessions which involved departures from that rigidly limited policy in which alone Sparta had a personal interest. How embarrassing for Sparta was the position which Corinth could, if she would, create, was shown in the wars of the early part of the fourth century.

The position of the Megarid astride the Isthmus rendered it necessary for Sparta to exercise a control over that state also. It is evident that she regarded its occupation by Athens in the middle years of the fifth century with the utmost disquietude. That extraordinary expedition which ended at the battle of Tanagra, had doubtless more than one motive; but it is probable that one object at which it aimed was to force Athens by direct or indirect means to relax her grasp of the northern part of the Isthmus.

It may be well to say a few words with regard to the general policy of Sparta in Northern Greece, before proceeding to deal in detail with the various occasions on which Sparta displayed activity outside Peloponnesse. The Tanagra expedition aimed, among other things, at the establishment in Boeotia of a power which might threaten and consequently restrict the dangerous activities of Athens. Throughout the rest of the century, save for a brief period succeeding the peace of Niæas, this is the policy pursued in
and towards Bocotia. With the Bocotians themselves the fear of Attic aggression was sufficient to make them wish to maintain relations with Sparta, until the time came in the fourth century when Athens ceased to be the formidable state which she had been. Then Sparta found she had fostered the growth of a power which she could not control.

But, in the fifth century, at any rate, and especially in the earlier half of it, the influence of Delphi was the factor in North Greek politics which Sparta especially desired to have on her side. Fortunately for her, Delphi was just as much interested in Sparta's support, owing to the claims which the Phocians set up to the control of that influential sanctuary. Delphi's influence, if exerted against Sparta, might have been very dangerous to her both inside and outside Peloponnesse.

The relations with Thessaly, though the two states rarely came into contact, are not unimportant. Sparta evidently feared that she might as ally of Athens be troublesome in matters in which Sparta was interested. On the whole the fear proved groundless. The Thessalian feudal lords had to deal with a problem of a similar nature, though not in so marked a form as that which presented itself in Lacoia.

But the thesis of this essay cannot be fully maintained by generalisation in Greek political history, and it is necessary to turn to the detailed records of the foreign policy of Sparta during the latter part of the sixth and the whole of the fifth century, in order to show the influence of her home problem on her actions abroad.

About the middle of the sixth century, probably in the years between 550 and 546, Croesus, so Herodotus tells us, formed an alliance with Sparta. He had discovered, we are told, upon enquiry, that Sparta and Athens were the most powerful of the Greek states. The acceptance of this alliance by Sparta is spoken of in some Greek histories as a first plunge of Sparta into Asiatic politics. The question may, however, be raised whether the action of Sparta on this occasion is to be regarded as implying any intention at all to incur responsibilities in Asia. Croesus had, doubtless, a special reason for seeking the alliance. What Sparta's reasons for accepting it were, we do not know. Croesus was threatened by danger from Persia. Whether Sparta knew this when she joined hands with Croesus is another question. It is probable that to her the alliance had no definite intent; for it was probably made before the danger from Persia had taken a definite form. But it is somewhat presumptuous to suppose that the Spartan government intended to embroil itself in Asiatic matters. When the critical moment came, Sparta showed neither preparedness nor even readiness to undertake her part of the obligation. There is a tale of a bowl having been sent to Croesus which never reached him. There is no mention whatever of any expedition having been prepared. Why then was the alliance ever made? To the Greeks of that day the Lydian power appeared great and, perhaps, threatening. It had subdued the Greeks of Asia and was winning influence in Greek Europe.

12 Hist. i. 56. 13 Hist. i. 70, 71.
The friendship of a power which might some day be expected to make itself felt on the near side of the Aegean might be valuable to a state which was forced to exercise a wide control in that part of the world. Sparta demonstrated again and again in the next century and a half that she had no intention whatever of undertaking responsibilities in Asia. Her indifference to the fate of the Asiatic Greeks appears heartless. She refused to send them assistance against Cyrus, confining herself to expostulations which that monarch treated with contempt. In 499-8 she refused to send aid to Ionian rebels. In 479, after Mycale, she would not undertake any responsibilities on their behalf if they remained on the Asiatic coast. She appears as fighting for their freedom in the last years of the Peloponnesian War. But her object is the ruin of Athens, to be attained by bringing about the revolt of the allies of the Asiatic coast. Those allies welcomed her as a liberator, but they were soon disillusioned in a two-fold sense. Lysander had no intention of playing the disinterested part of a pan-hellenic patriot on a limited income. He dreamed of a Spartan empire, with the founder of it, himself, the arbiter of the Hellenic world. With that end he planted harvests and boards of control in the revolted towns, a régime which soon dispelled all dreams of liberty. But the situation was intensely complicated: Sparta’s position on the Asiatic coast had been attained by financial aid from Persia. The fleet and the manning of the fleet had been dependent on the sums which Persia had advanced. The ships had to be paid for, and Sparta lacked, as we have seen, the human capital. Moreover, that capital had been terribly depleted by the long years of war. Persia could not be expected to supply funds for the prosecution of a policy directly hostile to her interests. The former allies of Athens must pay for their ‘liberty.’ They would have to pay tribute to their new master. Up to the time of the fall of Athens all went well with Lysander’s designs. But there was at Sparta a party, led by King Pausanias, which clung to the old policy and distrusted the new. For the time it prevailed. But Lysander had involved Sparta in ways from which there was no complete turning. The State had incurred obligations from which it could not recede. The Lysanderian system had created for it among the cities of the Aegean potential enemies which would fly at its throat if it relaxed its grasp of them. Moreover, many of its influential citizens, adherents of Lysander, had tasted the sweets of despotic power abroad, and were by no means minded to return to the obscurity of life under the stern levelling system at home. Amidst the intense excitement of the last years of the death struggle with Athens, Sparta had incurred obligations, some of which she could not perform, some of which she had to try to carry through whether she would or not; and furthermore it had come about that with respect to the latter the will of the state was divided. With the fourth century dawned an era which for Greece itself was in some respects better, in many worse, than the preceding age; but which for Sparta was wholly worse. The new designs depleted a population which had never been more than enough to maintain the less ambitious policy of the fifth century.
But of the new policy and its results it will be necessary to speak at the conclusion of this paper. The tale of the last years of the fifth and the opening years of the fourth century shows that Sparta had no interests on the Asiatic coasts save such as the last years of the fifth century had created for her. But those new interests were fatal to her. She might and did sacrifice the continental cities of Persia, because she had not the means, despite Agesilaus, of maintaining their independence, and because, under Persian control, they could not endanger her interests on the European side. But she had attained to a new position from which in certain respects she could not recede without danger to herself, and thereby she was ultimately ruined. It was part of the tragedy of her national life that she was forced in the fourth century to depart from that necessarily restricted policy which she had pursued in the fifth, and to which we must now return.

In speaking of Spartan policy on the Asiatic coast of the Aegean, no reference has been made to the expedition against Polycrates of Samos. The omission has been deliberate. The policy which lay behind the incident is of a piece with other examples in the sixth and fifth centuries, but has little connexion with Sparta's general attitude towards Asiatic affairs and Asiatic Greeks. The tale, as told by Herodotus,\(^4\) fails to carry conviction with it. The special motive for the expedition attributed to the Lacedaemonians is absurdly insufficient to account for their action. The substantial element in their story is the part played by Corinth. Behind the whole affair there obviously lies some trade dispute, which would seem to have arisen out of relations between Samos and Corinth's colony and enemy Corecyra. In such a trade dispute Sparta cannot conceivably have had any direct interest; and her action in the matter must have been determined by the necessity of maintaining good relations with Corinth; in fact, this is the first recorded of the various instances in which that important Peloponnesian state was able to divert Sparta from her customary and narrow path of policy. It was necessary for Sparta's safety that she should lead in Peloponnesus; but leadership entailed the incurring of responsibilities on behalf of those she led, above all on behalf of that Peloponnesian power whose position was so embarrassingly strong.

\(^4\) Her. III. 44.

Even amidst the obscurity which hangs over the history of Greece in the sixth century, it is possible perhaps to discern the main thread running through the apparently tangled skein of the relations between Sparta and Athens in the last twenty years of it. Athens under the Peisistratids, in consequence mainly of the economic reforms of Solon, had become a considerable factor in Hellenic politics. This alone would have attracted Sparta's attention to her, inasmuch as a disturbance of the political equilibrium in Middle or Northern Greece would ultimately mean the possibility of difficulty in the Peloponnese. Though Sparta's relation with the Peisistratids were friendly, the establishment of relations between them and Argos would be peculiarly calculated to arouse Spartan apprehension. Thus two policies were adopted, both aiming at the curtailment of the growing great-
POLICY OF SPARTA IN THE FIFTH CENTURY

The first was simple enough; namely, the elevation of the power of Boeotia to an equality and rivalry with that of Athens. Plataea's appeal for protection is referred to Athens; in order that that state may become embroiled with Boeotia. In the last decade of the century Boeotia is encouraged to join in an attack on Athens. The policy failed for the time being, but it bore fruit in the next century.

The second policy must have been, in a sense, alternative to the first. It consisted in an attempt to establish an aristocracy in Athens, which both by sentiment and by its numerical weakness would tend to be dependent on Sparta.

It is of course, the case that we only know a certain amount of the truth with regard to the expulsion of the Peisistratids and the events which followed thereon in the course of the succeeding years. No doubt Delphi played a part in the matter; but no doubt also the increase in Athenian power and the relations with Argos rendered Sparta anxious for a change of régime in Attica, especially as that change might be anticipated to result in the restoration of the aristocracy of a previous period. Sparta miscalculated the power of democracy in the rising state. She tried to rectify her mistake by expeditions to support Isagoras; and, when these failed, by a continuance of that alliance with the aristocratic party which is so marked at the time of Marathon. That alliance becomes a traditional policy in the fifth century. It comes to the surface at the time of Tamagia, and later in the century at the time of the Revolution of the Four Hundred and during the tyranny of the Thirty. But its tangible results were little or nothing. Had it borne substantial fruit, there might have been no Peloponnesian War.

The influence of Corinth is shown, too, in these last twenty years of the sixth century. She brings about a temporary reconciliation between Athens and Thebes, with reference to the troubles respecting the acceptance by Athens of the responsibility for the protection of Plataea. By passive resistance she wrecks Cleomenes' expedition to Attica. She protests successfully against the proposed restoration of Hippias. And Sparta, the great, the powerful Sparta, has to bow to her influence, and dare not punish her. Corinth was playing her own game, as she always did, knowing well that she was an absolutely necessary factor in Spartan policy. And what was the game? Probably she wanted Athens to be free to develop her rivalry with Aegina, and to crush that trade rival of them both. It was a mistake; but it was, at the time, a genuine policy all the same.

The war of 480-479, while it lasted, set up an abnormal state of things, under which the normal policies of the Greek states had to be laid aside. Sparta was, like the other patriotic states, fighting for her very existence. Doubtless her home circumstances tended to influence her plans; but the strategic questions as to the defence of Thermopylae, the defence of the Isthmus, and fighting at Salamis and Plataea, were debated on considerations which have nothing to do with 'Sparta's position at home or in the Peloponnese. A recent writer has tried to show that Argos' doubtful

---

10 Mr. J. A. W. Murray in the J.R.S., 1902.
attitude hampered Spartan strategy, and accounted for the meagre
ness of the force sent to Thermopylae, and the dilatoriness in the dis-
patch of troops to Plataea. The argument ceases to be convincing when
we consider that the available fighting force of Argos had been wiped
out by Cleomenes less than half a generation before, and that the mere
size of the Peloponnesian hoplite army which appeared at Plataea
would have sufficed to keep Argos in check. If the Peloponnesians could put
some 25,000 hoplites into line there, are we to suppose that they could not
spare more than 3,000 for the defence of Thermopylae? Was the remainder
required to watch a state which could never have more than 6,000 men into
the field, and cannot, on any reasonable calculation, have been in a position
at the moment to raise a force of more than half the number? No doubt
Sparta had to watch the Helots in 480, and to take them with her in 479,
but the two facts have little traceable effect on the Greek plan of campaign.

The war of 480 and its preliminaries brought about a great change in
the policies of the Greek States. The increase in the Athenian fleet had dis-
illuminated Corinth. For the rest of the century, even including the actual period
of the Persian War, she is conscious of the dangerous character of Athenian
rivalry. Except, perhaps, during the decade from 446 to 438 she is intensely
hostile to Athens, and consequently far more dependent on Sparta. Thus
far Sparta gained. But Athens issued from that national war with a strength
and prestige which excited apprehension in Sparta. The balance of power
for which Sparta had worked, and for which she continued to work, was upset.
Henceforth she was profoundly distrustful of Athens, but also profoundly
distrustful of herself. The situation is a curious and incomprehensible one
as it appears in the pages of extant history. Some important factor is lacking
from the historical record. Sparta lives for the greater part of the rest of
the century in a dilemma of apprehension, fearing alike the position of Athens
and the dangers which must be incurred in breaking it down. Wherein lay
the danger? If that can be discovered, it will doubtless prove to be the
missing factor in the situation. Sparta believed that the power of Athens
could be broken, unless Thucydides gives a very misleading picture of the
views entertained there in the period immediately preceding the Pele-
ponnesian War. She thought that the devastation of Attica must force Athens
either to fight or submit, and she had no doubt of her capacity to beat
Athens on land. Yet her participation in the war between 460 and 450
was singularly half-hearted, and Thucydides makes it quite clear that she
would have ignored the causes of the dispute of the period preceding the
Peloponnesian War, had Corinth allowed her to do so. In the years succeed-
ing the Peace of Nicias her reluctance is still more marked. In the case of
the first of these three periods the abstention may be accounted for by the
earthquake and the Helot revolt, if, as implied in the received text of
Thucydides, the latter took ten years to suppress. Moreover, Sparta had

19 The reference is, of course, to the well-
known crux in the text of Thuc. I. 193. In
Hede, Bekker and Stuart-Jones (Oxford edition)
the sentence is maintained. Shep has restored it.
failed in the campaign of Tanagra to break the grip of Athens on the Megarid; and when, after Oenophyta, Bocotia passed into the possession of Athens, the invasion of Attica became a matter of extreme difficulty and danger.

In the third case the reluctance might be due to the disappointing results of the Ten Years’ war, and to the fact that she could no longer rely on the support of her disillusioned allies, Corinth and Thebes. Still her forbearance in taking offence, except when imminent danger in Peloponnesus threatened her in 418, is unnatural, and cannot be satisfactorily accounted for except on the assumption that she feared her position at home; an assumption supported by the extraordinary alarm which the capture of Pylos, and, later, the capture of the Spartiates at Sphaeria excited in Sparta. One cause of fear was, of course, possible revolt among the Hебot; another was the loss of her citizens. But the Spartiates captured or killed at Sphaeria cannot have amounted to more than 175 men, the rest of the force being formed of Pergioki. Loss of prestige may account for the feeling at first excited by this disaster, but the ardent desire to get back the prisoners can only be attributed to the fact that the loss was severe relative to the Spartiate population. How far that had decreased since Plataea, it is impossible to say; but that there had been a decrease, and probably a considerable decrease, is practically certain.

The whole attitude of Sparta to imperial Athens up to the time of the disaster in Sicily is best explained by a sense that a direct attack on her was one which, even if successful, would imperil the position at home; by reason of the losses which would be involved in the defeat of a state so powerful. And so she sought to shun a war in which even victory might be too dearly purchased. Moreover, after 447 Athens was not too formidable on land, and it was only by land that Sparta’s position might be imperilled. Athens as a moderately powerful land power was not without her uses in Spartan policy. She was a factor in maintaining the balance which was Sparta’s political ideal in North Greece. Bocotia she had sought to play off against Attica in 500 and at the time of Tanagra. In both cases the policy had for the moment been a failure. But from 447 until 421 Bocotia played the part which Sparta designed for her. But if Bocotia was useful as a check on Athens, the existence of Athens secured the fidelity of Bocotia and Corinth to Spartan interests. Thus, as far as Sparta herself was concerned, the position of affairs north of the Isthmus in the years succeeding the Thirty Years’ Peace was at least fairly satisfactory.

in Closson’s text, though Closson preferred veras. Benoit and Holm prefer this latter reading. I must confess that the language of Ch. 165 seems to me to imply that the settlement of the Messenians in Naupaktos took place before Megara rallied in the aid of Athens against Corinth. It is mentioned before this latter event, and Thucydides, careful in chronological detail, gives no hint that he is departing from the chronological order of events. Were the matter of first-rate importance in relation to my present subject the question would demand further discussion. Under the circumstances I must only add that I believe veras to be the original reading.

17 Cf. note, p. 81.
years of the previous war, showed a disposition to be content with what she had got; and Sparta had little real interest in the fortunes of the states of the Athenian Empire—states which could not affect the interests of the Greeks on the mainland, and which were therefore a negligible quantity to her. There were hot heads among her allies who wished to intervene on behalf of the revolted Samians in 440–439, but the plan was suppressed—by Corinth, so Corinth said—though there is no reason to suppose that Sparta showed any enthusiasm for it.

The reluctance of Sparta to enter upon the Peloponnesian War is, at first, most marked. Even Thucydides does not conceal the fact, though he is intensely interested in proving his own original theory with regard to the causes of the war. It is clear that Sparta saw that the possession or control of Corcyra by either Corinth or Athens must inevitably lead to war between those powers. She took a bold step on the path of conciliation when she sent ambassadors of her own to accompany the Coreyanan embassy to Corinth. Nor does Thucydides conceal the difficulty which, even after the failure of that embassy, Corinth experienced in getting Sparta to take action. That is brought out in the Corinthian speech at the first congress at Sparta. Even after that, Sparta professed to be prepared to make peace, if only the Megarian decree were revoked. The language of Thucydides implies that the questions of Potidaea and Aegina were regarded as capable of settlement, perhaps of compromise, if only the decree were wiped out. Pericles, so Thucydides says, had no belief that such would be the case. Still Pericles may have mistaken the true inclination of Sparta, or have regarded the dispute with Corinth as only soluble by war. It seems, even from the evidence of Thucydides, that the Megarian decree forced Sparta to take a course which she had been peculiarly reluctant to take. The reason may possibly be conjectured. She had among her allies various states which were dependent upon foreign corn. Megara was peculiarly dependent on this source of supply, because she was a manufacturing state with a population far larger than the unfruitful Megarid could support. Athens controlled one at least of the main sources of supply, the Pontus trade. If Athens were allowed to mete out such measure to one of the states of the Peloponnesian League, she might adopt the same policy to others. On this point, therefore, there could be no compromise; and Sparta's hand was necessarily forced, as, no doubt, Pericles had intended that it should be. To Athens with her discontented allies a state of war was far safer than a condition of uncertain peace.

The Peloponnesian War changed the face of Greek politics. Something has already been said about the position after the Peace of Nicias. Sparta had discovered to her dismay that Athens could not be reduced by land warfare only, whereas Athens had threatened Sparta's position at home by the occupation of Cythera and Pylos. The enormous effect which the seizure
of these small fractions of Lacedaemonian territory had on Lacedaemonian politics itself goes far to prove that the Spartiate position at home was far more critical than either Sparta admitted, or Greece knew it to be. The neglect which Sparta showed of the interests of her allies when she consented to the terms of the Peace of Nicias has been ascribed to mere selfishness of disposition. It would have been a strangely perverse selfishness to sacrifice the support of Corinth and Boeotia for any sake a compelling motive. And the motive is there, in the pages of Thucydides—the extreme fear excited by the position at home. That position had first of all to be put to rights; the situation in Northern Greece could be dealt with afterwards. And so Sparta spent the next few years feeling about in a blind sort of way for alliances which might restore the situation north of the Isthmus, a prey meanwhile to the irritating pin-pricks of Athenian policy. Once only, when the danger came terribly near to her, was she moved to action—at Mantinea in 418; but only to lapse once more into a state of lethargy from which even the Sicilian expedition could not arouse her. It is probable that she mistook its real intent, until Alcibiades opened her eyes on the matter. She probably regarded with satisfaction the diversion of Athenian energies to a distant field, and against states whose weal or woe could not affect the situation in Laconia. But when she discovered the true nature of the Athenian ambitions, and recognised that the disaster in Sicily afforded an opportunity for ridding Hellas for ever of the threatening power of Athens, she was forced to take action.

Of the Ionian War and its results we have already spoken. It involved Sparta in a situation which she was wholly un fitted to maintain. Yet she had to maintain it in part because she could not wholly renounce it without running the risk of self-destruction. Moreover, she could only maintain it by means which rapidly exhausted her limited resources, and brought upon her the condemnation alike of contemporaries and of after-time. She was forced into a policy which made fearful demands upon her already depleted population. It was no longer a policy of spheres of influence; it was a policy of direct control of lands outside her own by means of garrisons. She had indeed to modify her policy towards the Helots, because she had to employ them more largely in regular hoplite service; but the conspiracy of Cimadon shows that they were still a serious danger. It was probably the Spartiate’s greatest enemy, Epaminondas, who saved the Spartiate from destruction, by withdrawing Messenia from his control. But Leontis and Mantinea are the direct sequel of the Ionian War.

It is impossible in the limits of a short article to deal in full detail with such a large historical question as the policy of Sparta. All that has been attempted is to show by reference especially to the less obvious factors in the history of Lacedaemon in the fifth century that that policy was, from the very nature of the circumstances, singularly limited, and, in a sense, singularly consistent. The contemporary world tended to condemn it, because it could not understand what Sparta could not afford to confess, the perilous weakness
of the situation at home. Διὰ τῆς πολιτείας τὸ κρεπτὸν ἄργοιτο,—though Thucydides did not apply the words to a situation of which he accepted, probably, the account current in the Greek world generally. Hence far more was expected from Sparta than she could possibly perform; and a great deal of condemnation has been pronounced upon her for failing to do in the fifth century that which brought about her ruin in the fourth.

G. B. Grundy.
THE APHRODITO PAPYRI

In vol. iii. (1902) of the Annales du Service des Antiquités de l’Égypte Mr. J. E. Quibell gave an account of a large discovery of papyri at Kom Ishgan, a village situated 7 kil. to the S.W. of Tell el-Abyad in Upper Egypt. The discovery was made in 1901 by some of the villagers who were digging a well, and the papyri found were divided among the inhabitants. News of the discovery coming to the authorities, a police-guard was despatched, only to find that the papyri had disappeared; some seem to have been burnt, the rest were hidden for the time being and afterwards no doubt disposed of to various dealers, through whom, like the famous and much larger Fujum-fund, they became dispersed through Europe. Excavations subsequently made by Mr. Quibell yielded only some household utensils, small fragments of papyrus, and a number of ostraca, many of which bore the name Ἀφροδίτη.

The papyri thus discovered have since found their way into various museums. The first publication of any portion of the collection was the
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valuable Papyri Schott-Reischedt: i. edited by Dr. (now Prof.) C. H. Becker, The volume consists chiefly of Arabic letters from the Governor, Kurrah b. Sharik, to Basilius, sāhib of Aṣqūn (i.e. Kom Ishgian: in the Coptic papyri in the British Museum the name is Jkōw). Besides the Arabic letters, however, there are five bilingual (Arabic and Greek) letters addressed to various places (χωρία) in the district of the κωμή of Ἀφροδίτη, the latter being the Greek name of Jkōw; and in an appendix are published twelve similar documents preserved in the library at Strassburg.

Not long before the publication of Becker’s volume there had appeared in the Arabic Palaeography of Prof. B. Moritz facsimiles (without transcription) of three Arabic letters from Kurrah to Basilius, and a bilingual document which may perhaps also belong to the Aphrodite collection.8

Portions then of the Aphrodite collection are at Cairo, Heidelberg, and Strassburg, and others may have found their way to other libraries; but by far the largest portion, so far as known, was acquired in 1903 by the British Museum. In 1906 some more fragments were acquired, several of which were found to belong to documents of the 1903 collection. These B.M. papyri are chiefly in Greek and Coptic, but they include a few, very fragmentary, Arabic letters, which were published by Becker along with the three Arabic documents of Av. Pal. in vol. xx. of the Zeitschrift für Assyriologie. With these purely Arabic letters Becker republished the bilingual papyri PSR. vii., viii., and ix., of which the missing portions had been discovered in the British Museum collection. Before this there had appeared in New Pal. Soc. Pl. 76, a facsimile with transcript of one of the Greek letters in the Museum, and five additional facsimiles were included in the atlas to the Catalogue of Greek Papyri in the British Museum, vol. iii. A complete edition of the whole Aphrodite collection in the Museum, with the exception of the Arabic documents, is now being prepared; but owing to the very fragmentary state of many of the papyri the work of sorting and piecing them together has been a slow one, and it is not likely that the volume will appear till next year. It seems therefore advisable to give some account of the collection, so far at least as the Greek documents are concerned; of the Coptic I am not competent to speak.

The collection is of unusual interest and value; and not only for the historian, to whom it will furnish an abundance of new material for the organization and government of Egypt under the early Khalifate. Palaeographically it is of the first importance; for hitherto our knowledge of Greek writing on papyrus has stopped short (with a few insignificant exceptions) at

8 This bilingual document is a receipt from two officials (not one as Karasha, *Peninsula Oriental Journal* xx. 134, note; see Becker, *P.P.R.,* p. 191) of the farm at Babylon for a tax-pament of 617 kurush of wheat (ʿeṣṣēn, which at this period means wheat as opposed to barley, not grain generally). The Greek portion of the receipt is clear and straightforward except the last line of the main portion, which I read: τοῦ συγγ. ἀπαξ; (i.e. Sept.-Oct., A.D. 799), which is inconsistent with the Arabic dates as given by Karasha, 15th ka'dah A.H. 87 = 15 Nov.-11 Dec. A.D. 796. The Arabic and Greek dates of the bilingual papyri at this date are generally inconsistent (cf. Becker, *P.S.R.,* p. 23, though the explanation there suggested is untenable in view of the evidence of the B.M. papyri).
the date of the Arab conquest of Egypt. The various hands found in this large collection of documents carry on our evidence for nearly a century later, and serve to bridge over the gap between the cursive of papyrus and the minuscule of vellum MSS. The many new words which occur, the curious phrases used in the letters, the mistakes in spelling, and the grammatical peculiarities are all of value for the study of the Greek language in its later developments; and to the Arabic and the Coptic scholar also even the Greek documents furnish much new material.

The collection falls into two main divisions, letters and accounts. The letters, all of which are from the Governor, may again be divided into two classes, those addressed to the head of the district, and those (known as ἐπιγραμμα) addressed to the people of the single χωρια in the district, the former being much the more numerous.

Of the first class, the letters from the Governor to the local administrator, there are seventy-five separately numbered documents, besides some collections of small fragments, and the dates preserved range from 25 Dec. A.D. 708 to 1 June, A.D. 711. During the greater part of this time the Governor was Kurrah b. Sharik, and all the dated letters, with two exceptions, though in many cases the beginning is lost, may be assigned to him. The two referred to, dating from the Governorship of his predecessor Abdallah b. Abd-al-Malik, have unfortunately both lost the earlier part.

As regards the form of the letters, it is to be noticed that they are all in Greek only, whereas the similar letters published by Becker are in Arabic only. It seems probable therefore that in every case two copies of the letter were sent, one in Greek and one in Arabic; the letters being often too long for both copies to be conveniently given on the same roll; as was done with letters of the second class (ἐπιγραμμα). The letters are all in roll-form, written, as is usual with Byzantine documents, across the fibres, the lines being parallel to the width of the roll, and they have on the verso, when the beginning of the roll is preserved, the address and a minute by a clerk at Aphrodito noting the date of receipt, the name of the courier who brought them, and the subject to which they refer. Several have also at the top minutes in Greek and sometimes also in Arabic written by the clerk at headquarters; and at the foot of one or two is a short account relating to the taxes dealt with in the letter. The majority have been torn in two down the whole length of the roll, and arrived at the Museum in separate halves; but

---

4 On the officials (αἱ ἀραί); cf. Hohlwein, Missale Byz. 1905, pp. 191 ff.; 1906, pp. 40 ff.; but Becker, PSE. ii. 114, shows that the former interpretation is the more probable.
5 Kurrah entered Fusiat, the capital, on the 3rd or 13th of Rabi' II. a. H. 30 (= 20th or 30th Jan. of 709), Becker, PSE. ii. 17.
6 PSE. i. and R.M. Inv. No. 1346, though they are not duplicates in wording, are probably the corresponding Arabic and Greek versions of the same letter.

---

7 Similar minutes were written on the Arabic letters, to judge from PSE. ii. The space then left between the name of Kurrah and that of Basilius is regular in the Greek letters also.
8 The Greek minutes should probably read ἡμέρας ἀπὸ τοῦ χώριου, i.e. Χανικά τῆς Κάσπου ἡμέρας ἀπὸ τοῦ χώριου. The omission of the infinitive is not unusual, but is paralleled in the R.M. letters. A courier, ἄγγελος ἢ ἅγγελος occurs in Inv. No. 1266.
fortunately in many cases both halves were included in the collection, and have been pieced together subsequently; and it may be hoped that the missing portions of the remainder will come to light elsewhere.

The letters afford a good illustration of the extraordinary centralization of Arab government in Egypt and the immense activity of the Civil Service; for example, there are contained in this single collection no less than nine Greek letters written during the month of January, A.D. 710, to this one not very important place in Upper Egypt, three of them on the 30th, and each no doubt accompanied by its Arabic counterpart and, in most cases its éphèma. In no case is more than one subject treated in a single letter, and if, as on the 30th of January, communications are to be made on several subjects, a separate letter is devoted to each. The letters are probably all addressed to Basilins, who is described as dvomatĭ n (Δρ. σαρί) of the ko.private of Aphrodito, his district being known as a diowość. These are somewhat vague terms, and it is not altogether clear from them what position Basilins held. Becker, in P.P.F. p. 70, states, on my authority, that παγαρχία appear in B. M. Pap. 1341 as identified with χρυσία, and therefore as ‘Unterbezirke’ to Aphrodito; and he concludes that Basilins is ‘in Abraham, sondern der Cöf von der Pagarchen’; adding ‘dennacht ist wahrscheinlich, dass diowość für den in anderen Teilen Ägyptens nach durchsichtlichen Terminus vomm sitzt.’ I regret to have misled him as to the evidence of our papyri; but subsequent evidence, both in the Greek and in the Coptic papyri, shows conclusively that Basilins was a pagarch: nor is the evidence of Inv. No. 1341 necessarily to be interpreted as I at first took it. In the Greek documents the principal evidence is furnished by the following three passages:—Inv. No. 1353, παρασκαινίου παραφεβής [σεαυτόν περιστον έπίσκοπον τῆς παγαρχίας, (addressed to Basilins), Inv. No. 1357, which concerns τῆς τηλεγραφίας (εἰς τῆς [εἰς τής] διόν ζωμοῖς [καὶ τῶν ύποτευχών τῆς διωκήσεως σου] ὑποτευχών), and Inv. No. 1451 (d), a fragmentary protocol, has on the back the minute [καὶ τῷ Αρκροτῆς χάριν τῆς ἔνδικτον παγαρχίας καὶ τῷ υποτευχών, τῆς τή

1 See below, p. 117.

The passage in question is—τοίῳ στατὲ γεραίων ἀπομαζόμενον καὶ [παραγγελίαν] τοῦ στατὸν τραβάσαντον αὴρ μεν ἔλλα καὶ οἰς πας χαῖρε τῆς διακήθους προσφορὰ περιτόν τῶν καὶ τίνος λαβόντος θηρίου τῆς ἐποικίας (καὶ θρίσσον), ὑποτευχὸς εἰς τῆς (καὶ) παραφέβης τοῦ ὑποτευχών τῆς τή

4 See below, p. 117.

The passage in question is—τοίῳ στατὲ γεραίων ἀπομαζόμενον καὶ [παραγγελίαν] τοῦ στατὸν τραβάσαντον αὴρ μεν ἔλλα καὶ οἰς πας χαῖρε τῆς διακήθους προσφορὰ περιτόν τῶν καὶ τίνος λαβόντος θηρίου τῆς ἐποικίας (καὶ θρίσσον), ὑποτευχὸς εἰς τῆς (καὶ) παραφέβης τοῦ ὑποτευχών τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τῆς τή
κύριος. Basilius by God's will ἄλοιπονος and pagarch of Jkow and its ἅπασικα and περανθές. In the Coptic papryi Basilius is never called ἰδιωκτής.

Basilius then was undoubtedly a pagarch and Aphroditos a pagarchy; but is the second part of Becker's statement, that Aphroditos was a nome, therefore necessarily incorrect? In other words, is it perhaps possible that at this period παραρχία and νομος were the same? I believe this to have been the case; but the supposition is so completely opposed to the accepted theory that it requires a somewhat lengthy justification.

I will discuss first the evidence other than that of the Aphroditos Papryi. And to begin with, it must of course be admitted that at an earlier period a pagus was undoubtedly not the same as, but a subdivision of, the nome, probably in fact, as Wilcken suggests, a later form of the old παραρχία. Thus in BGU 21 (A.D. 340) a προαιρετις of the 14th pagus of the Hermopolite nome is mentioned; in Amh. Pap. 147 (4th or early 5th cent.) occurs an 11th pagus of the Hermopolite nome, and in the Florentine papyri elsewhere are many similar instances. There is, however, no a priori improbability of a further change in organization, and I believe the evidence favours the supposition that there was such a change.

In the first place, there is evidence in the Rainer Fährer which, in appearance, is conclusive. In PEPF 550 and 551 occurs a 'Pagarch Apa Kyros von Herrakoplos Magna'; in 553 and 554 the same person is described as 'Pagarch des nördlichern Theilbes des heracl. Nomos'; and in 556, 557, and 559 we hear of a pagarch of or of 'Pagarchen-Stellvertreter des herakl. Gastes'; the same persons occurring in 558 as 'Pagarchen-Stellvertreter von Herrakoplos Magna.' The evidence, however, though strong, is not so conclusive as it at first seems, since, as Dr. Wessely kindly informs me, the word νομος does not occur. The readings are:—559, ἐφ' ὅ/ του βορραιου σηκων Ἡρακλεους διὰ Λαττα Κυρός μεγαλοτροπ παγαρ/κ αυτοῦ; 556, τὸ παγαρ/κ τῆς Ἡρακλεους; 557, Χριστοφόρου καὶ Θεοδωρικοι παγαρ/κ Ἡρακλεους; 559, νομος Χριστοφόρου τοῦ Θεοδωρικοῦ παγαρ/κ Ηρακλεους; 550, 551, and 554 have no indication of the pagarchy. In 561 it is to be noticed that a διοικησις of Herrakoplos Magna occurs; probably this person was also pagarch, in which case the papyrus furnishes a parallel to the use of διοικησις in the Aphroditos Papryi.

As further evidence for the meaning of the word παραρχία I give a list of instances of its occurrence and of that of the word παραρχία:

3: M. Pap. 113 2 (C.), vol. i. p. 212 (A.D. 600), τῷ παραρχῶν παραρχων [οἱ ἵπποι τῶν Ἀρακτίων καὶ Θεοδωρικοί ἰπποί]; 113, 10. p. 222 (A.D. 639-640), τῇ μεγαλοπρεστετίπῃ

---

* Cf. Milne, Hist. of Egypt under Roman Rule, p. 13: "Among the subordinate officials the strategos almost (quite: cf. Wilcken, Historia, xxvii. p. 387 f.) disappears in the Byzantine period, and their place appears to have been taken by the Archaeological nomes by the pagarchas who were not, however, like them, appointed to the charge of a nome, but merely in that of a pagus or division of a nome."

---

10 For καὶ διαίρεται, see W.D. Aen. 718 below.
Kenyon read [can] στρατηγός after Wessely's readings in Prolegomena, etc., but, according to the view of Wilkeson, L., incorrectly. Since the catalogue was published another fragment (continues with the previous one) of this papyrus has been found. It reads:

πολτον Ανδριαν Ωσσεσσον φίλον
Τερέμε καὶ Αδαμαν ναος Πεννουκά
. . . . . . . . . . . . .
Τερέμε καὶ Αδαμαν ναος Πεννουκά

For Wessely see Wessely, Tορογραφία δειν Σαιδίας, p. 164, Greek and Hunt, Tod, Papyr. ii. pp. 419 ff.

11 The same must occur in Wilkeson, Τούλιαν τον αιτησην με. Πολλογραφία, σελ. 11, 1-9. The first letter there is certainly K rather than Κ, as in PERE, v. p. 61.

12 W.—i.e., but the genitive is regularly used with τετράγωνα in this sense.

13 These references to unpublished papyri I owe to Dr. Crum. Or. 5731 (19) and Berlin 10667 are not very clear; Dr. Kenyon suggests that the person referred to was pægarch of the whole district from Thoebis to Latopolis. Dr. Hunt would take παρτές εν τέλης παρακάθαρτος, 'one of the pægarchs,'
Among all these passages there is not a single one which militates strongly against the view that παγαρχία was equivalent to νομός, and there are several which give strong support to that view. The evidence of the papyri relating to the house of Flavius Apion, where villages are spoken of as παγαρχόημεναι by the landholder, is indeed peculiar, but on no theory would these passages be easy to explain if the verb παγαρχία were taken in its literal sense. It seems probable then that it implies merely the dependence of the village upon the house of Flavius Apion. 77

To turn now to the other evidence: it will be noticed that in most cases a pagarch is described as pagarch of a city; but in all cases these cities are capitals of nomes, and the pagarchs are in several cases seen in relations with inhabitants of villages within the nome; and this moreover in an official capacity. In two cases, however, W.D. p. 109 and UKF. 260 (probably also in PERP. 586) the word παγαρχία is followed by the phrase τοῦ 'Αραμποτοῦ (w. νομοῦ); and it seems very probable that in the other cases the city stands for the nome. In the Aphroditio Papyri κόμη Αφρωδίτεω certain includes much besides the village itself; the pagarchs, as pointed out, have to do with inhabitants of the nome, outside their cities; such a phrase as τοῦ βορωμοῦ στέφεων of a πόλις or πολιτεία would be difficult to explain if the words are to be taken literally; the use of νομός with πόλις in Coptic texts as 'in the nome of the πόλις Ερμοτ' points in the same direction; and finally in B.M. Pap. Inv. No. 1380 occur the words τοῦ 'Αραμποτοῦ καὶ Ἡρακλέου καὶ Ὀξυρύκχου, where, as the first name stands for a nome (w. νομοῦ), the two last should do so too. 80 Again it seems very improbable that at this period a Muslim, as in UKF. 260, should be the head of a mere pagus. It may be objected that the cases of a pagarch of half a πολιτεία, as of Hermopolis (PERP. 553, etc.) or Hermopolis (see below, p. 105) prove the pagarchy to have been smaller than a nome; but there is nothing improbable in the supposition that a nome might at times be divided.

But further, the common identification of παγαρχία = πύγεος, and παγαρχίας = προποσίτως μοι 10 may well be doubted. The word πύγεος does not seem to occur in late Byzantine times, and the question may be raised whether the term παγαρχία ever did mean the head of a πύγεος; for certainly in the earlier period, when the word πύγεος was used, its official is always in papyri called προποσίτωτος. 29

---

78 Cf. too Wilcken in Becker, PSE. p. 22.
79 Wilcken, Hermes xxix. p. 220.
80 In Skuders Palaeocra. Lib. ii. ep. 8) (Migne, Patr. Gr. 78, col. 350) occur, however, the words πάγαρχῃ καλοῦντες πάντα ποιεῖν, al λήγοντα καὶ τοὺς καὶ τὰς ἀρχαῖς, where the pagarch seems a small local official. In Justinian's Edict xiii. De Discur. Ag. (ed. Zacharias von Lingenthal, p. 11) οἱ παγαρχίαι καὶ οἱ ἀρχαὶ εἰσόμεναι are mentioned, and the editor explains the latter word as γεγονός εἰς οἱ ἀρχαὶ Αἰγυπτίων, quibus δοῦλος εἰς curatoribus concussus est'; cf. too Pap. Lips. 34. 1. 11, οἱ παγαρχίαι τῆς Βασίλειας. This might, possibly, though not necessarily, make it appear that the pagarch had no jurisdiction over towns which had a δοῦλος;
Even on the pre-existing evidence then the reigning theory as to the word παγαρχία seems to me to rest upon very uncertain foundations. The evidence against it is strongly reinforced by that to be found in the Aphroditus Papyri, which I will now proceed to summarize.

First of all, one piece of seeming evidence must be set aside. As we have seen, Basiliki, who was a paikarch, is called διοικητής and his district a διοικησία. Now in Inv. No. 1341 mention is made of ψυγάδεα τῆς ἀνώτέρως λεχθείσης διοικησίας τοῦ Ἀρσενίου. If διοικητής were a definite term this passage would tend to prove the contention that παγαρχία = νομός; but unfortunately it, or at least διοικητής, seems to have been used loosely. Thus in Inv. No. 1431 occurs the words τῶν τε μείζων καὶ διοικητῶν καὶ δύνακας αὐτῶν (κ. τ. τοῦ χωρίου), where διοικητής seems to be a local official, and in Inv. No. 1440 payments to the treasury are recorded as made in one year by Dioscorus, διοικητῆς (ἐγ.) and Ionannes, παγαρχία (ὁ), where the two terms should be distinct. Again in B.M. Or. 5885 a certain Chael son of Psimo is named as διοικητής of Jēnas, and in B.M. Or. 4878 the same person recurs as λαμπροσκυνῆτη; but λαμπροσκυνῆτη is equivalent to πρωτοσκυνῆτη. In the Jēnas documents indeed the διοικητής regularly appears as an official distinct from (and apparently inferior to) the αἰστήρ. It seems likely then that διοικητής and διοικησία in these letters are used in a general sense, as respectively "administror" and "administrative district," and no argument can be founded upon them.

There is, however, other and stronger evidence in the Aphroditus Papyri. In the first place it is, as remarked by Becker (PSR, p. 36), in the highest degree unlikely that the central government would maintain immediately so constant a correspondence with the mere head of a pagus. Again, there is not in all the Aphroditus Papyri a single instance of the occurrence of the word νομὸς, whereas, on the other hand, παγαρχία seems regularly used as the administrative unit, for example in the following passages:—Inv. No. 1332, ἐν τῶν νομῶν χωρίων ἐν τῷ πιὸ τῶν καὶ ἐν τῷ παγαρχίᾳ προσφέροντες; Inv. No. 1341, τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν τῷ προσφέροντος ὁμ. μὴ παρασκεύης (οὐ) ἐν Ἀλεύηθρῳ πλοῖο παγαρχίας καὶ μόνη σφι ἐκ τ. τ. λ.; Inv. No. 1344, χωρίου Μουσακῆς παγαρχίας Αὐτωνοκοῦ καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος; Inv. No. 1379, εἰ δὲ καὶ τε[ν] εὐράθυμον ἐν τῇ διοικησίας σου ἐπὶ ἑτέρων παγαρχίων; Inv. No. 1382, τινά τῆς διοικησίας σου εὐράθυμου νορίας] ἐν ἑτέροις παγαρχίας οὗτος ἐκ τ. τ. λ. γ. 2190.

...but the sound is not heard of in the later papyri, and it is certain from the evidence given above that the pagarchs had authority even towards like Arinna. Perhaps a change was made at about the time of Justinian's edict (A.D. 554) laid. Pct is too early to be any evidence for the late Byzantine period, but is very likely an instance of παγαρχία as = προσφέροντας παγαρχίας. Paris App. 164 (which and not to Rahn. 135 the reference should be) is in Rec. Pop. II. p. 323 specifies pagi in the Acremate name (Wessely, Topogr. des Jaffas, pp. 53, 81, etc.).
Moreover there are many names of pagarchies mentioned in these papyri, and in practically every case these are certainly the names of ancient nome-capitals. The following are those at present discovered: 28 Κέφων, νετινόν σκέλος (ἠμανυπόλεμος), Α' αἰταῖος καὶ Απολλονιος and 'Απολλονιος alone, Τυφίλης, Α' αἰτινόν, Πανος, Λύκαν, Θεοδόσιος, Κωντίνος, Νο (obscure), Θεοδόσιος, Αλεξάντρος and Σαί. One or two of these names call for some remark. No is obscure, and occurs in the badly written Pap. Inv. No. 1494. I suspect, in view of the many errors of that papyrus, that it stands for Πανος (=Πανος). Alexandria was of course never a nome-capital; but neither was it ever in a nome, and from a city, occupying so exceptional a position no arguments can be drawn. Moreover it is not unlikely that at some time after the revolt in A.D. 645 Alexandria may have been organized differently. 28 For the νετινόν σκέλος of Hermopolis we may compare the case of Horacleopolis mentioned above; 29 but it must be added that, though it occurs with a number of pagarchies (in Inv. No. 1568 στ) it (and it alone) is not preceded by the word παγαρχή; hence it may not have been a pagarchy at all. Α' αἰτινόν requires a word of explanation. The place meant is Apollinopolis Minor, the next city to the south of Hypsele. 30 Wilcken 31 has shown that this place was for a time the head of a separate nome. Afterwards it disappears as a nome-capital, and it has commonly been assumed (e.g. Pauly-Wissowa, etc.) to have been one of the places in the Hypseleite nome. In these papyri it sometimes occurs alone as a pagarchy, sometimes along with Antaeopolis, the capital of the next nome to that of Hypsele. Antaeopolis, however, never occurs alone, from which it appears that Α' αἰτινόν was merely a shorter form of 'Α' αἰταιος καὶ Απολλονιος, that in fact when Apollinopolis ceased to be a nome-capital it was annexed to the Antaeopolite nome and that the name was now denoted by a double name. This supposition is confirmed by the already quoted Inv. No. 1344, where a single χωρία is named as in the παγαρχή 'Α' αἰταιος καὶ Απολλονιος; for if two pagarchies united under one government were intended by the phrase, the χωρία would have been stated to be in one, not both, of them. That Απολλονιος is sometimes named alone is perhaps due to the fact that it had by now become the more important place. The last name which calls for remark is Θεοδωσιος. A Theodosiopolite

28 Most of these occur in Inv. No. 1494 (see below, pp. 108 f.). It is a document much damaged and written in an uneducated hand of Coptic type and in very corrupt Greek. If in several cases the names of pagarchies and χωρίας are mutilated or corrupt. If any of these obscure passages should hereafter yield a pagarchy-name which is clearly not a nome-name, the remarks in the text would require modification.


30 It may be noted also that the Arabic name, Akmumina, means the two 8num, as a dual form, cf. Becker, RE, p. 21.

31 Hesychius, Synced. 761, 3; Georgius Cypri. 767; Partly, Not Epigrammaton 1, 767; Ateus, I. 158, 1; in the last case Hypsele is not mentioned, and Antaeopolis minus. See e.g. Mr. C. C. Swain informs me that the wadi-ghum of the new Petrie Papyrus (Göreck and Heek, double, p. 20), shows the town to be the modern Kom Elbakh.
The conclusion is that the former Archeopolitae, now known as Akkon, was a distinct place. It is possible that the letters "A" and "Aka" were a corruption of "Kakos" and "Kakosia," respectively, with the original spelling remaining unknown. However, it is clear that the name change occurred due to the administrative changes in the region.

The second conclusion is that the term "Equitarches" is not used in the context of the present name. It appears to be an error in the text, as the term is not found in the relevant historical records. It is possible that the term was used in a different context or by a different authority, but the evidence provided in the text does not support this conclusion.

The third conclusion is that the term "Equiarches" is not used in the context of the present name. It appears to be an error in the text, as the term is not found in the relevant historical records. It is possible that the term was used in a different context or by a different authority, but the evidence provided in the text does not support this conclusion.
difficulty arises. Aphroditopolis is now universally identified with Itfu or Edfu, which is situated some twenty-three miles to the south of Kom Ishgan. If this identification is correct, we can only conclude that the headship of the nome had been transferred from Itfu to Jkow, and that with the transference the latter had received the Greek name formerly applied to Itfu; but it seems very much more probable that the accepted identification of Aphroditopolis with Itfu is wrong; the evidence of the Aphroditus Papyri seems strong enough to outweigh that on which the identification rests.

As regards the subjects of the letters, most of them, as is natural, deal with taxation in some form or other. One important section there is, however, which relates to certain fugitives; and though there is unfortunately no indication as to the cause of their flight, the letters are nevertheless of considerable interest. An important clue is furnished by a document at Cairo (Jr., Ptol. 105), of which a portion probably exists at Heidelberg (PSE, xii.). The portion of this letter relating to the fugitives is thus translated by Becker:

"Hišām b. 'Omar hat mir schriftlich mitgeteilt, dass sich Flüchtlinge seines Bezirkes auf dem Gebiet befinden, und ich hatte doch zuvor die Prätikten geschrieben, dass sie keinen Flüchtlinge bei sich aufnehmen sollten. Drum gib ihm, wenn dieser mein Brief zu dir kommt, seine Aufsicht auf seinem Gebiet zurück, und nicht will ich (wieder) hören, dass du seine Boten zurückschickest oder er schriftlich bei mir über dich Klage führt."

The fragment at Heidelberg has on the verso a minute: "[Über Hišāju', den Sohn eines Malters, betreffs seiner Flüchtlinge (Colomen)."

Becker explains the jāliya (fugitives) as 'die Colomen, die um die Bezahlung des Landes garantieren, an die Scholle gefesselt werden mussten', and he refers to such documents as PERF. 601, 602, 631, which show that an official pass was necessary for any peasant who desired to leave his district. These jāliya then were peasants who for some reason had fled from their kāira or nome and made their way to the Thebaid; and as good cultivators would of course be a valuable acquisition for any kāira, it is natural that the heads of the districts to which they fled should show some reluctance to give them up.

Now for the evidence of the R.M. papyri. The earliest dated letter (Inv.
Nos. 1332 and 1333, duplicates, except in one respect) relating to this subject was written on Choinach 29, 7th indiction = Dec. A.D. 708, and the latest on 7th indiction = 31st July A.D. 710. It appears from this that the fugitives left their homes in the governorship of Kurrah’s predecessor, ‘Abd-Allah, and probably all the undated letters relating to them are to be assigned to the earlier part of Kurrah’s term of office. They are regularly described as the ḵωρὸς τῶν ‘Αρατανησίων, but in Inv. No. 1330 two other names are named: τὰ ἔθνη τῶν φυγίων τῆς διοικήσεως σου [ἐπὶ τοῦ ‘Αρατίου] καὶ Ἡμικλίους καὶ Ὀξυφόνχου. In the earliest of the dated letters, Inv. No. 1332 and 1333, mention is made of six men who are apparently charged with the duty of searching for fugitives, and Basilius is ordered to send to them a clerk who is to accompany them to the commissioners for the fugitives (οἱ ἐπισκεύοντες τῶν φυγίων) and there draw up a list of the fugitives, specifying the name and patronymic of each, the place of his origin, and the τόπος and pagarchy to which he fled. This list is to include both those ordered to be sent home and those who are to be left ἐν οὗ ἑτοίμην ἐνὶ σεβαιᾳ; the last phrase meaning apparently that certain of them were to be allowed to remain in the pagarchies to which they had fled, bearing their-share of the public burdens. In a short memorandum at the foot of the letter is shown the destination of the six men mentioned above. Two are to be sent to Salamah b. Jukhāmīr in Arcadia, two to Zaurāh (i.e. MS. Zωρα) b. Al-Wasil in the Thebaid, two to ‘Abd-Allah b. Shumlī in the Ἡλισταρια. The sending of these men is apparently a public ὄντομαι or compulsory service, and the letter shows clearly that the fugitives were numerous and widely diffused. Apparently the three Arab officials just named were the commissioners referred to in the letter.

In Inv. No. 1338, a letter in which Basilius is instructed to come to headquarters, bringing his papers with him, he is ordered to include in these a κατάγγειλμα of the fugitives in each χωρίῳ of the διοικήσεως.

In Inv. No. 1341 orders are given to draw up a similar κατάγγειλμα, which, in addition to the information demanded in Inv. Nos. 1332–3, is to include the property of the fugitives and also the names, age, and property of all those in the pagarchy guilty of disobedience to the Governor’s instructions. The fugitives are to be sent back with their families (φαμελαὶ) and goods, and Kurrāh declares that he has ordered his messenger not to leave Ἀρποδιτός till all the fugitives are sent ‘from twenty years and upwards’ (ἀπὸ ἀκροβατών καὶ ἐκά), Threats of heavy punishment in case of

---

40 In 1832, also; in other respects the letters are duplicates.
41 Cf. Becker, PSE, p. 40: “Diese ἰστορία scheint sich aber doch nicht auffällig zu halten und muss dann an der Kumatioνique der neuen Gemeinde nach Kraften leiblichmen (🎬 gather on, p. 77, 12).”
42 In 1832, three in each case.
43 These names are interesting, as they show, contrary to what Becker says (PSE, p. 39) that the old εἰρήνεια still continued to exist, at least for some purposes. The names require a word of explanation. The first two are the old εἰρήνεια of Arcadia and the Thebaid, the latter either Ἑγγυα and Ἐκας, or Amis or the first alone. The Meroe is new. Possibly it represents the two Angypt of Justinian’s Edict xiii. In the Not. Dejord, xxviii., the authority of the ‘Comes Limitis Angypti’ extends apparently much farther.
disobedience are added, and Basilus is told to read the letter to the people of his διοικησις, to send copies of it to every χωρίον and to have it published in the churches. Finally a reward is offered to informers.

Inv. No. 1342 is concerned with a fine to be levied on the whole διοικησις; and though the fugitives are not mentioned, it is very likely that they may be the cause.

In Inv. No. 1379 occur the clauses τινις εἰς τὸν ταγέντων ἀποστραφήμαι ἀπτερήσεις (ἐκ τῆς διοικήσεως) εἰς ἑτέρας παγαρχίας and εἰ δὲ καὶ τίνες εὑρεθῶσιν εἰς τὴν διοικήσιν σου ἀπτερήμων παγαρχίας, again showing that a number of pagarchies were concerned.

Inv. No. 1380, a very incomplete letter, adds, as already stated, the Heraclopolite and Oxyrynchite pagarchies, and it contains also, in an obscure context, the name Al-Mughira b. Selim, who is described in the minute on the verse as governor of the Fayum (ἐπίσκεψιμος των Ἄρακος). Finally in Inv. Nos. 1381 + 1382, instructions are given as to the punishment to be dealt out to offenders. The fugitives themselves, those who have given them shelter, and the local officials are to be fined; rewards are to be offered to informers, and Basilus is to call together all the local officials, read the letter to them, and order them to send copies to their χωρία. These copies are to be published in the churches, and Basilus is to proclaim a period (the number of days is lost) within which all fugitives must be surrendered. On their surrender they are to be fined, scourged to the extent of forty lashes, and 'nailed' into ξυλομείγμα, by which apparently is meant some kind of apparatus for confining the arms and perhaps also the neck during the march. Then they are to be sent somewhere, apparently to Kurrah, in charge of an agent, who is to be commissioned to receive an ἀποικογραφία or receipt for them; similar receipts are to be given by Basilus to those who bring him fugitives of his own διοικησις; and Kurrah concludes by announcing that he is sending an agent to search for fugitives, who is to subject all persons concerned to similar penalties to those already mentioned in case any further fugitives are allowed to enter the διοικησις.

The other letters on this subject add nothing of importance; but among the accounts are two documents which may with great probability be referred to the fugitives. The first (Inv. No. 1494) is the account-book already mentioned in connexion with the question of the pagarchies. It has a protocol apparently dated in the governorship of 'Abd-allah, and consists of a list of names with patronymics, each followed by the word ἀπὸ and a place-name with the name of a pagarchy. Any general heading there may have been is lost, but there are several sub-headings, which furnish a clue to the character of the account. They consist of the name of some ἐπισκέψις of Aphroditos, followed by the words ἀπὸ Χρονισιαὶ (και) ἄνω; and this heading is succeeded lower down by a similar one, ἀπὸ Χρονισιας (και) κάτω. It will be remembered that Basilus was ordered to send a σατυρμαθαι of the fugitives.

40 Cf. Ρ.Τ. ii, where the meeting of inhabitants for the preparation of χαρακτηρια is also to be held in the church.
and that every fugitive ἀπὸ εἰκοσατέρων καὶ ὁδὲ was to be sent home. The similar heading in the present document, together with the fact that no amounts in money occur, as would be the case if the persons mentioned were tax-payers, suggests very strongly that the document is the κατάγραφον in question, or rather perhaps, as it is in so illiterate a hand, that it is the rough list on which the official report of Basilius was based. Probably the persons named were fugitives from other pagarchies discovered in Aphrodito; but it is curious that none of them are described as from Arsinoe.

The second document (Inv. No. 1503α) consists of the scanty remains of another book. No folio is complete, and there is no complete line, but by putting together recto and verso of each fragment we can form an idea of what the complete line must have been. The following specimen (fragm. 5) will show the character of the account:

**Recto.**

[ἐκ ἓν ἵνα] παγαρχὰς ἤτοι Τυφηλής.
ἐκ ἓν πολεμοῦ
— Ἰακάνων Ἑριτ[
Μάρκος Γεωργίου
Διονυσίν 
Ποταμείον

[ἐκ ἓν ἵνα] παγαρχὰς ἤτοι Αὐταῖον (καὶ) Ἀπόλλωνος[

**Verso.**

[Ἐκ] ὅτε ὁμαδ. Α.
Π[Ἰωσίᾳ (καὶ) Μυραῖν] Πασινοῦν, ὁματα ὁματα 
[ουθὶ]ς (καὶ) ὤστὶ ὤστὶς ὀψὶν, ὁματα ωματα 
(καὶ) ὁματα

This may very likely be a list of the fugitives, the numbers placed after the names apparently referring to each man’s family (φαυνία as in Inv. No. 1344).

All this evidence makes it probable that we have to do with no mere local movement, no mere migration of agriculturists from one district to another, but a general disturbance and unrest, originating in Middle Egypt.

---

46 Since this was written Mr. Crum has kindly sent me a translation of a Coptic letter in the Rylands collection (No. 277 in the forthcoming catalogue), which still further increases the probability that the document refers to the fugitives. The letter is in Coptic, but in its phraseology strongly resembles the Greek letters of the Aphrodito collection, and is probably, like them, from the Governor. It is addressed to a pagarch, probably of Anthémus, and many of the phrases are identical with Greek phrases used in the Aphrodito letters. It concerns certain ‘strangers’ whom the pagarch is ordered to ‘bring forth’ from his pagarchy; and mention is made, as in Inv. No. 1401, of ‘such of them as have fled away, from fifteen years and under.’ [Since this article was sent to press, Mr. Crum has discovered another fragment of this Coptic letter, from near the beginning: It reads ‘The men of Ἐριτ [i.e. Fayum] and those of... and those of Σιμών and those of Ἰκα...’ This makes it almost certain that the letter relates to the same fugitives as the Aphrodito letters; and it seems to make against the letter being from Asinu.]
communicating itself also to the Thebaid, and extending over some years. There does not, it is true, appear to be any record of an actual revolt of the Copts so early as this, and indeed Al-Makrizi expressly states that the first Coptic revolt took place in the year 107 (= A.D. 725–726); but there may have been minor disturbances which have not been recorded, and it is significant that ‘Abd-Allah, in whose governorship the disturbance began, is known as an oppressor of the Copts.

Before leaving this subject it may be well to refer to two other documents, not in the Aphroditos collection, which relate to fugitives. One is PERP. 562 (see above p. 102), in which the writer, apparently a high official, speaks of a former tour of inspection which he had made ‘wegen der Flüchtlinge.’ The letter is assigned by the editor to the period of the Arabic conquest, but as fugitives are seen to have been widely scattered over Upper and Middle Egypt in the early years of the eighth century, it is possible that it relates to the same period and occasion as the Aphroditos letters.

The second document referred to is B.M. Pap. 32, published first by Forshall (in Papyri in the B.M., xiv.) and afterwards by Wessely (WS, 1886, p. 212; and Kenyon (Catalogue, i. p. 230). The ‘analogy’ of the Aphroditos Papyri enable it to be read more completely than was done by the previous editors, and as it is in any case an interesting letter, I publish it now.

1 "[ά]πελάσαμεν ἐξῆλθε[ν] εἰς Ἄρατο[λήν..."
2 δέδωκες αὐτοῖς προθεσμία μηρο[ν]... ὑπὸ τῆς σήμερν[...]"
3 [θ]μ[ε]ρ[α]ς, ἔτη[ς] εἰς τοὺς μηρο[ν]... Π(α)υ(λ)[δ][θ]αι(κ)ιόνοι(ν) ι(ε)ρο[ν...]
5 Ἀρμ[α]λαμ[α]μένων τοῦ δικαίου e[ἰ(ς)] τοῦ Ἀρατόλην καὶ Ἀργυττῶν μετὰ τῆς ἑ[[δ]ωκέρεων..."
6 αὐτοίς παρ' ὧν προθεσμίαι τούτους κρατῆ[σ]α καὶ ἀποστρέψ[εί(ς)] τῶν ἑ[ῖν] ὑπάρχουν..."
8 [α]υτο[ν... διώκει, καὶ πρός τοῦ δήλου εἶναι τῷ πάντων συγγελλόν ἐρχόμεθα[...]"

* In the translation by E. Hourani, Ministère de la Matière Archéologique Française du Caire, 1895, p. 227.
* S. Lane-Poole, Egypt in the Middle Ages, p. 27.
* K. marks a blank before all the lines, but in ii. 4–5 the beginning is, I think, certainly preserved.
* See below, p. 115.
* The tops and bottoms of the letters in these two words are visible.
This letter evidently relates to certain fugitives, and if, like most of the papyri in the volume, it came from the Fayum, it may relate to the very fugitives mentioned in the Aphroditus Papyrus. The mention of 'Αρατολή, however, makes it appear more probable that the fugitives were sailors requisitioned for the καιρόν τ' 'Αρατολήν,25 who had fled to escape the service; cf. B.M. Inv. No. 1505, (ὑπὲρ προστίμου καυτίων μια φυρά(ντων) τών πάροχων) Τ."26

Another subject of frequent occurrence, both in the letters and in the accounts, is the naval organization of the early Khalifate, on which a good deal of light is thrown by these papyri. The maintenance of the fleet was charged upon the inhabitants in three ways: the payment of money, for specified purposes, the provision of articles of various kinds, and the supply of sailors. It appears that sailors were raised by government requisitions from all parts of Egypt, and not only from the coast-towns, as we might expect, and as assumed by v. Kremper.27 The service was evidently a compulsory one, but the sailors requisitioned received wages, and sometimes instead of the sailors themselves an απαγγείλασις or money-payment was accepted. In one letter (Inv. No. 1336) Kurrah writes to the effect that as Basilius had neglected to send the sailors asked for he has been compelled to hire them elsewhere, and he therefore orders Basilius to send the amount of their wages; and another interesting document, the Coptic papyrus Or. 6220 (1), concerns a refusal by the government to accept απαγγείλασις. It appears

25 The word is frequent in the Aph. Papyri, denoting an account. It used here, it will probably refer to a list of persons missing, placed at the foot of the document.
26 See below, p. 115.
27 The text of this letter, taken by Dreyer for a glosary of some foreign languages, but correctly explained by Wessely as an account and published by him, though in a rather unilluminating form, in "ZS. 1887, p. 245, receives, like the letter, some light from the Aphroditus Papyrus, Codex (Catalogue, p. 510, No. 695) has shown that it contains Coptic headings but the main portion of the text is Greek, though the place-names are of course Coptic. It appears to be a μεταφάγα of assignment of the tenant-houses among various estates. As a specimen I give lines 2 and 3, following the Coptic heading:

2 | "εν α(ιτε)ρα(κτι) ἐν γ' γεράλισ(ιν) παρετήρει νεκροτομηματα. γ' ὑποτενα δραματε- 

26. Under the indication numbers 1-3 are placed in the following lines the entries in brackets with an amount in solidi. Wessely has frequently read the στοιχεῖον, which at this period became a more common, like our invented comma, as a γεράλισ(ιν) stands, not, as explained by Wessely, for γεράλισ(ιν), but for γεράλισ(ιν), a word frequently used in the accounts of the Aphroditus collection, to mean, apparently, a smaller hand than the γεράλισ(ιν). The word at the beginning of 1, 2 may and in γεράλισ(ιν), but is hardly καρπαθια.

27 Ολοκληρωμα, des Orients unter den Khalifern, 1, p. 214.
that the ṭoshane of an ἐποκλέων under Aphroditio paid through the pagarch Basilius ἀναγραφομένου in lieu of workmen ordered for work at Babylon. The pagarch received the money and paid it to the tax-official at Hypsela. When Kurraḥ's messenger, ‘Garrab the Saracen,’ arrived, he declared that only the workmen themselves could be accepted; and we (it is the ṭoshane who is speaking) went and hired the aforesaid workmen. Basilius therefore, at the request of the ṭoshane, applied to the tax-official for the return of the money; and the document is a receipt for it from the ṭoshane.

As regards the method of choosing the sailors it is probable that this was the same as that for the raising of ordinary taxes. The number required was stated in the Governor's letter to the pagarch; the quota for each ἐποκλέως was specified in the ἄντιγνωσμα addressed to it; and the choice of men would be left to the local officials. There are indications that the choice was made on the basis of a register, in accordance with which certain persons were noted as liable to service.

The sailors having been chosen, the next step was to take security for their due fulfillment of the service. Among the accounts are lists of sailors and workmen requisitioned for various services; and in some of these the names are in each case followed by the name of the surety (ἀναγραφομένης). The agreements themselves were probably always in Coptic; the Coptic documents include several of this kind.36

In addition to the Egyptian sailors obtained by this kind of conscription, we meet two other classes of persons connected with the fleet, the μωσεῖπατος and the μαυλόι.37 The former word is the Ar. Μωσίπατος, which originally denoted the Arabs who had taken part in the Hegira, or flight from Mecca to Medina; but by this time it had come to be applied not only to them but to Arabs who left their homes subsequently; Hegira in fact now meant, not flight, but emigration.38 These emigrants were the Arabs who had settled in the military colonies established in various parts of the Khalifate, such as Kafranban in Africa and Fustat in Egypt. On the original Muslim theory the whole of a conquered country became the property of the conquering army, but this practice, impossible to carry through, was soon given up, and the Arab settlers, instead of this huge and unmanageable booty, received an allowance for their support.39 This was of two kinds, the ρουκέτες, explained by Becker as the Ar. ῥίζις, an allowance in corn from the semola, and the ρογά, a similar allowance in money from the

36 The protocol fragment in P. Zieg. xxi. is probably from such an agreement. The word 1, 2, should read ημερητής, both accusatives.
37 See n. 35.
38 The nominative never occurs.
39 In Inv. No. 1348 (New Jan. Soc. Pl. 70). 1, 8, and several other places occurs a mysterious word ἀσκες (gen. plur.); Professor Becker has suggested in a letter that ἀσκες should be read. The reading in all cases is certainly ἀσκός, and the fact that it occurs several times, sometimes as an abbreviation (α), shows that it cannot be a slip of the pen. ἀσκός would make very good sense.
40 Wellhausen, Ar. Reich, p. 26; Becker, P.A. p. 32.
41 Wellhausen, Ar. Reich, pp. 19 f., etc.
42 P.A. p. 32.
χρυσικὰ δήμια." Other supplies were however raised for the Muslins, for example clothing. It appears from these papyri that the *Mohnārūna* were largely employed in the fleet.

In *μαύλο* we have the Ar. *mawhili*, a word which denotes either freedmen or persons of non-Arab race who had embraced Islam. In these papyri it seems often to be used of the former, and we thus get phrases like Ἀβου Σαειδ *μαλ* Αλεφ *υι* Λαχαμ, where the second name is that of the person whose client or freedman the former was. The *mawhili* were of course employed in various capacities, and were affiliated to Arabic tribes; and it appears from the Aphrodito Papyri that some of them served in the fleet, the provision of their food and wages being charged upon the tax-payers.

Besides sailors, workmen, such as carpenters, unskilled labourers (ἐργάται), and sail makers (καλαφαταί), were requisitioned for naval purposes; and money and supplies in kind were regularly called for from Aphrodito. Among the latter are ropes, cables, wood for building, nails, bread, wine, δικά, *ἐλιβάρα* and butter. In one case nine measures of butter are ordered for a fleet apparently just setting out. They are to be sent to Alexandria and delivered to the Augustan.

Coming now to the disposition of the fleet itself, we find that it was regularly employed in making raids upon the coasts of the Byzantine Empire. These raids, known as *κούρσον*, from the Latin *curza*, were made yearly, the taxes for each *κούρσον* being raised in the previous indiction. This system of periodical raids was, according to Amari, commenced by Mūsā b. Nusair in A.D. 704, and it was certainly fully established during the governorship of *Abd-āl-lah* and Kurrah.

The word *κούρσον* seems to have been transferred from the raid itself to the fleet making the raid, and we thus find it used with certain place-names, showing that the Arabic navy was sub-divided into distinct fleets with their own organization, probably much like our Home Fleet, Channel Fleet, etc. The fleets which occur are the following:—*κούρσον Αλγύπτον, κούρσον Ἀφρικής, κούρσον Ανατολής, καὶ κούρσον θαλάσσης*. These names are interesting as they throw incidentally some light on the organization of the Khalifate. The first two are the provinces respectively of Africa and

---

64 In EUG. 394, l. 11 ἰέρνα (sic) is used of corn; but in the Aphrodito Papyri it always means the money-allowance, as opposed to the *ζυγεῖα*.
67 It is interesting to find this official so late. This is a later instance than Ammianus, *Pere* of *Iman*, Patriarcha d'Alexandria, p. 121; another instance is in Crum, *Catalog of Papyri*, 326, l. 5.
68 Hence our *νομισμα*. In Inv. No. 1888 the persons making a *κούρσον* are called *κούρσον κρατηται*.
69 In P.A.E., p. 90 Becker quotes me as stating that *κούρσον* is used also as a dating-system. This was a misapprehension on my part, due to such expressions as *κούρσον έν ενέκτοις* καί *κούρσον ἐν ένεκτοις*.
70 *Storia dei Mussulmani di Sicilia*, l. p. 124.
71 Mr. Crum points out that in no case is it necessary to assume this transference; but it would be very natural with such an expression as *κούρσον Αλγύπτον*. 
Egypt representing the Byzantine dioceses of the same names. The third again in all probability is the old ἀνατολικὴ διοίκησις, or Oriens, or so much of it as was under Arab rule. It appears from this, taken together with the fact that the eparchies still existed, that the Arabs had modelled their empire very closely on that of the Byzantine Emperors, even to the retention of such a name as Oriens, which, to them, was no longer appropriate. The κούρσον δαλάσσων is obscure.

The κούρσον of which we hear most is naturally that of Egypt. There were two great arsenals connected with this, that in 'the island of Babylon' under the control of 'Abd-al-Aţâ b. Abi Hakim, and that at Clythus on the Red Sea, under 'Abd-er-Kahmán b. Iyâs. As to the headquarters of the κούρσον of Africa we hear nothing in these papyri; those of the κούρσον ἀνατολικῆς were perhaps at Laodicea in Syria, as we hear in an account of ναυτών ὑπὸ (ομοίων) ἐπὶ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ κούρσος σταλέστων, εἰς τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἀνατολὴν ἀκαρνάνιον καὶ ὄροιν καὶ ἄλλα ἄγαμα, (καὶ) δρομοὶ (ουριον) κούρσον ἐπὶ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ μετα (τῆς) παραβάσεις ἐν (τῆς) ἑτέρα (τῆς) ἑτέρα (τῆς). It will be noticed that sailors were requisitioned not only for the κούρσον of Egypt but for others as well.

Besides the κούρσον fleets we hear also of a fleet called παραφύλακτος τῶν στρατιών, evidently a squadron occupied in guarding the mouths of the Nile; and it appears that παραβάλει were employed in this as well as in the κούρσα.

The letter relating to naval matters which is of most general interest is Inv. No. 1347, of which a facsimile was given in the third volume of the Catalogue of Greek Papyri, Plate 98. It is a request for information as to the ναυτῶν ὑπὸ τῇ διοίκησις συν ἐπὶ τῶν ἑξάρχων εἰς τὸ κούρσαν Ἀφρικῆς μετὰ Ἀτά νῦν(ο) Ραφε, ὅπερ ἀποστείλεις Μουσή νῦν Νοσσαίρ. The reference is to the expedition in A.D. 703-4 against Sicily or Sardinia by 'Atâ b. Râfî, whose fleet, on its return voyage, was wrecked off the African coast, the commander being drowned. According to the so-called Ibn Kutaibah, 'Atâ was despatched by 'Abd-al-'Azîz b. Marwân, the Governor of Egypt, against Sardinia, and having put in to an African port was forbidden by the Governor, 'Ummâ b. Nusair, to proceed, on the ground that the season was too late for safety; but he disobeyed the command, with disastrous results. The present letter seems to show that the despatch of the expedition was due to 'Ummâ himself; but it confirms the statement that at least part of 'Atâ's fleet came from Egypt.

---

16 Not. Dignit. i. 42-43, etc.
17 See above, p. 165.
18 This may be the headquarters of the κούρσον δαλάσσων, but it is difficult to see what a raiding fleet could do there. Under the Fatimid Khalifs the headquarters of the Red Sea fleet were at Abîlâb, further south (Win-

---

19 Well, Gesch. der Chalifen, i. p. 478; J. H. Jomæ, Ibn Abdel-Kelâma's Hist. of the Greek-ophians, pp. 28, 29; Amari, Biblithon Arab."
Workmen, money, and various articles are naturally raised for other purposes than the navy; and among others for the buildings erected so plentifully by the Khalif Al-Walid. One of these, frequently mentioned, is the ‘mosque of Jerusalem’ (μαινήδα Ιερουσαλήμ), evidently the great Aqṣā mosque, about the foundation of which the tradition is somewhat uncertain. The great majority of historians attribute it to the Khalif ‘Abd-al-Malik (A.D. 683-705), and the founder’s inscription in the building seems to bear this out;78 but Ibn Al-Athir, who wrote in the first half of the thirteenth century, states that ‘El-Walid ... built of mosques the mosque of Damascus, the mosque at El-Madina, supported on columns, and the Aqṣā mosque’.79 The testimony of the Aphrodito Papyri is not conclusive, but it seems clear that extensive building was going on during the reign of Al-Walid. Mujir-al-Din80 states that in this Khalif’s reign the east part of the mosque fell, and had therefore to be repaired; but we hear in Inv. No. 1515 of the νέω κτίσιοι τοῦ 'Αμιράλμουνος εἰς τῷ Φοσσάτῳ παρὰ ποταμὸν ὑπὸ Ιανείν οἰκίας (sec) Ἀνδαλά (Inv. No. 1374). As this Yahyā b. Ḥanḍala is known as the builder of the mosque at Fustat, which was re-built under Al-Walid,81 it seems likely that αἰγῶν is here used as mosque.

Another building of which we hear a good deal is the mosque of Damascus, which all historians attribute to Al-Walid; and a third is the αἰγῶν κτισκέρων τοῦ 'Αμιράλμουνος εἰς τῷ Φοσσάτῳ παρὰ ποταμὸν ὑπὸ Ιανείν οἰκίας (sec) Ἀνδαλά. As this Yahyā b. Ḥanḍala is known as the builder of the mosque at Fustat, which was re-built under Al-Walid,82 it seems likely that αἰγῶν is here used as mosque.

As with the fleet, so with these mosques, the contributions of Aphrodito were of three kinds—money, materials, and workmen. The materials consist of building materials, such as copper-plates (χαλκώματα κύπερα) and wood, and of provisions for the workmen. Workmen, it should be added, are requisitioned even for mosques outside of Egypt, such as Damascus and Jerusalem.83

78 See C. J. M. De Vogüé, Temple de Jérusalem, pp. 85, 86. The inscription at present bears the name of the ‘Abbadid Khalif Al-Ma’mun, but the date is given as a. H. 72, the inference being obvious that Al-Ma’mun substituted his own name for that of ‘Abd-al-Malik, but forgot to alter the date; and this conjecture is supported by the appearance of the inscription.
79 G. Le Strange, Palæstina under the Moslems, p. 357.
81 Or κτισκέρων; there is no sign of contraction after οικία.
82 It should however be added that there is some doubt as to whether this really refers to the mosque, as in one case the word αἰγῶν is used as the equivalent of the above expression. If αἰγῶν is not the same as μαινήδα (mosque, mosque) the remarks in the text should be modified; a discussion of the question must be reserved for the volume in which these texts are published.
84 Becker, INS, p. 19.
85 Cf. Loudoun’s, Life of St. John of Alexandria (ed. Gelernt), rh. xx. p. 37, where the patriarch sends for the rebuilding of the church of Jerusalem χειρὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου εὐγένειας. This was under the Empire.
In concluding this account of the letters it may be well to add that they go with the Arabic letters to indicate the character of Kurrah b. Sharik as Governor. Most of the earlier Arabic historians wrote under the 'Abbasid Khalifs, with the result that the tradition has been almost consistently hostile to the Omayyads and their subordinates. Kurrah has suffered with others from this tendency, and though he does not reach quite such a depth of infamy as the notorious Hajjaj, with whom tradition tends to associate him, he is nevertheless represented as oppressive and irreligious in the extreme. This literary tradition finds no support in the Aphroditto Papyri; on the contrary Kurrah appears in a distinctly favourable light. Many of the letters are indeed filled with threats of summary punishment against Basilius and the people of his dioikia in the event of disobedience to the Governor's orders; but this was probably the usual tone of the officials at headquarters to the local officials; and as Basilius continued month after month to retain his post, and the rebukes for neglect of duty had to be constantly renewed, Kurrah's threats can hardly be taken as pie de la lettre. Certainly Kurrah is careful to safeguard the interests of the tax-payer. Thus in Inv. No. 1353, in giving instructions for a mourosamos or assessment, he threatens Basilius and the assessors with punishment an autonov pantaan xarion bazein (sic) [para dunamei h kai elaphrosi par o h elakos ektaroj], and similar injunctions occur several times. In the letter just quoted he seems to be finding fault with Basilius for being too inaccessible to the complaints of the inhabitants, and he says — 'apodocholasos sevntov tois tis dioikis (sew) sou [eis to 'o] kousai ta par' auton lefomeva kai krapai ekastj [to elakoj].

Leaving now the letters to Basilius we need not devote much time to the ektasto. The word ektasos usually means ekeine, but in these papyri it is used of the official order for the raising of a tax. These ektasto were addressed by the Governor to the people of the village concerned and contained a specification of the amount of the tax; and they were enclosed with the letter to the pagarch. As already said, they were bilingual, the Arabic being written first, and afterwards the Greek. The Greek, though written at headquarters, like that of the letters, is in a different style of hand from them. The hand of the letters is a flowing, sloping cursive; that of the ektasto is a compact and regular minuscule, almost identical with the early minuscule hand of vellum MSS. and therefore of value for palaeographical purposes. The Museum collection includes only five
ἐὐτάγμα, all incomplete. Three of them supply the missing halves of
P.S.R. viii.-ix.

This article is already so long that little space remains to speak of
the accounts; and indeed the problems connected with them are so many
and at present so obscure that it would in any case be useless to deal with
them in detail here. They are, however, not less interesting in many
respects than the letters and perhaps even more valuable for the light they
throw on the details of administration. Their difficulty arises from various
causes: in part from the fragmentary state of many of them, in part from
the extent to which abbreviation is carried, and in part (and this is perhaps
the chief cause) to the novelty of their contents and the fact that accounts are
inexorably much more summary and disconnected in their phraseology than
letters. Fortunately the collection included several accounts practically com-
plete; and these have been of great assistance in sorting and piecing together
the innumerable fragments; for the papyri arrived at the Museum in terrible
disorder, hundreds of fragments, large and small, being jumbled together in
endless confusion. Naturally many fragments are too small to be of any
value, and others, containing nothing but lists of names, are scarcely worth
the trouble of piecing together; but the whole collection has been gone
through several times, the scattered fragments of the more complete
documents united to the main portions, and all fragments of any interest
sorted out and if possible pieced together. In some cases it has been possible
from these disjuncta membra to restore the greater part of the original MS.;
and even where the collected fragments of an account do not fit together, it
is in many cases worth while to publish them in full. So far as can be seen
at present, the volume will contain texts of forty-eight Greek accounts,
complete or fragmentary, varying in length from four or five to over fourteen
hundred lines; besides which somewhat full descriptions will be given of all
such fragments as, though not worth publishing in full, contain anything
which seems of value.

With very few exceptions the accounts are in book-form; and they are
written in various types of the minuscule hand seen in the ἐὐτάγμα. Some
are coarsely written, but as a rule the writing is neat and clear to read, and
sometimes is astonishingly regular and elegant. Only a few of the docu-
ments can be certainly dated, but it seems clear that they all fall within the
last few years of the seventh and the first twenty years of the eighth
century A.D. Their value is great in many directions. To the Coptic
scholar the many Coptic names both of persons and places will be of
great interest; the Arabic names which occur plentifully will furnish, in
their transliterations, material for estimating the pronunciation and vocaliza-
tion of Arabic; and a number of new Greek words or words used in new
senses will appeal to the lexicographer. The chief importance of the
collection is of course for the historian of Arabic Egypt, to whom it is likely
to yield a great amount of information as to the organization of Egypt
under the early Khalifate, and especially as to the kinds of taxes and the
method of their collection. It includes registers relating to the ἱππεῖα
THE APHRODITO PAPYRI

It will be seen that the interest and value of the Aphroditio Papyri are great; indeed there has probably never before been discovered so large a collection of papyri from any single place, all falling within so short a period. There are, as already stated, innumerable difficulties in the explanation of the documents, especially the accounts, but it may be hoped that the united labour of other scholars, both Arabic and Greek, will avail to clear up many points which in the forthcoming edition must be left doubtful.

In conclusion I must express my thanks to Mr. W. E. Crum for information as to the Coptic papyri and many hints on other points, to Dr. Kenyon for advice on various matters, to Mr. A. G. Ellis and Professor Becker for assistance in questions of Arabic history and nomenclature, and to Dr. Hunt, who has read through the proofs and made several suggestions.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE.

Since the article was in type a few modifications and corrections have been suggested, which, for convenience, are collected here—

P. 102, note 15.—Mr. Crum remarks that these Coptic Papyri are all of the second half of the eighth century. He suggests for ṣawq ‘ late pegarch.’

P. 105, note 26.—These Petrie Papyri are about contemporary with the Aphroditio Papyri, and in them the σαου of the σαους of Sbeht (Apollinopolis) is always named (Crum).

P. 106, li. 14, 15, and notes 30 and 31.—Mr. Crum shows that Krall’s identifications in the passage referred to are very precarious. The subject is a complicated one, but its decision is not of great importance, as it is clear from the Coptic and Arabic σαους that there was a Theodosiopolis—ΤΟΥΚΟ—Taht el Madinah, which was a nome-capital. There were probably two places called ΤΟΥΚΟ, Taht, Theodorin.

P. 107, note 36.—The whole series Taht—Dbôt—TRIO as applied to Ifu is very possibly a myth. These are the names of Edfu = Apollinopolis. Delete the sentence beginning ‘as in one.’ The phrase quoted proves nothing, as it probably means not ‘the Panopolite nome opposite’ but ‘the portion of the Panopolite nome on the opposite side to Panopolis.’ A number of papyri from this σαους ‘Aphrodita’ are at Florence; see Vitelli, Asamia, ii pp. 137 f. The evidence of the B.M. papyri and of these at Florence, according to information kindly supplied me by Prof. Vitelli, seems to indicate that the village was our Aphroditio.

I owe these identifications to the kindness of Professor Becker, to whom I sent a transcript of the fragments first discovered. The Kurish and Anšar were the two most distinguished of Arab tribes.
P. 108, note 42.—‘Abd-illāh b. Shuraiḥ appears in B.M. Or. 8218 in connexion with the name of Koitś (Crum); possibly, therefore, the Khāırā already was simply the border district between Arcadia and the Thebaid.

P. 109, note 43.—Mr. Crum informs me that the translation of R.K.T. iii., given by Krall is quite wrong; the letter merely asks for information as to palm-trees belonging to churches.

P. 116, note 82.—The Arabic minute of one of the letters, read since the article was in type, shows that ʿaššaḥ = palace, not mosque. Consequently the reference in Inv. No. 1374 is to a palace built at Fustāḥ for the Khalif, probably as an official residence for the Governor. Another ʿaššaḥ was built at Jerusalem.

II. I. Bell.
RELICS OF GRAECO-EGYPTIAN SCHOOLS.

In the winter of 1905-6 Mr. C. T. Currelly and I acquired a large number of ostraka from the dealers of Luxor and Karak, amongst which were several examples of school exercises. A few ostraka of this class, and tablets of a similar kind, have already been published; and, by comparison of these with our collection, it is possible to gather some facts in connexion with the methods of instruction pursued in the Greek schools of Egypt.

The ostraka purchased were said by the dealers to have come mainly from the neighbourhood of Karak, and to have been found at different times during the preceding five years. The majority of those here published—all those from our collection except numbers II, IV, VI, IX, X, XVI, and XVII—appear, however, to belong to one group: they are written on pottery which is discoloured in a rather unusual way, and are very distinct in this respect from any of the others bought with them; while from the general character of the writing the texts upon them may with reasonable probability be regarded as contemporary. It seems in accordance with the facts to suppose that the finder of these ostraka had chanced on a spot where a schoolmaster of Thebes had taught his classes in the open air near a rubbish heap, on which material for writing exercises might be obtained in plenty, to be thrown away again as soon as used; or possibly, if it is more in accordance with educational dignity to imagine the school as held among more savoury surroundings, we may have here the contents of the waste-ostrakon-basket which were deposited on the dust-tip after a day's work. The date of this group seems, judged by the writing and the character of the pottery, to be about the middle of the second century A.D., and so is approximately the same as that of the dated ostrakon published by Joungnet and Lefebvre to which reference is made below. The other ostraka here published are probably of slightly later date, except No. III, which is of the fourth/fifth century; No. X, of the third century; No. XVI, of the third/fourth century; and No. XVII, of Ptolemaic date, probably early first century B.C.

The most elementary in character of all is an alphabet.

I. (G. 5). 078 x 064.¹

A  Ω
B  Ψ
Γ  Υ
Δ  Δ
Ε  Ε
Σ  Σ
Η  Η
Ο  Κ
Π  Π
Κ  Κ
Λ  Λ
Ξ  Ξ
Μ  Μ
Ν  Ν

¹ The dimensions given are the external height and breadth, in millimetres. The numbers in brackets are those provisionally assigned to the ostraka as catalogued.
Academia are not uncommonly found in Greek lands, but the curious hexameter arrangement adopted in this instance is quite unusual. The nearest parallel seems to be in an alphabet found at Sparta cut on a small column of blue marble, in which the letters are arranged in six vertical rows of four. The principle may be that enunciated by Quintilian, who advised that pupils should be taught to recognize the forms of the letters apart from their position in a regular order. The hand in which the ostrakon is written is a clear and firm one, doubtless that of the teacher.

Another example is also to be connected with instruction in the alphabet.

II. (G. 20). 080 × 006. Lower right-hand corner broken away.

AXI... EYC
BIΩΝΓΑΙΟC
ΔΙΩΝΕΡΩΣΩΝΗΩΝ
ΗΡΩΝΘΕΩΝΙΩΝ
ΚΛΕΩΝΑΕΩΝΜΑΡΩΝ
ΞΕΡΖΗΚΟΡΦΥC'
ΡΟΥΦΟ]
ΦΙΑΩ]

'Αχι[λλ]ησ
Βιον Γαιος
Διον Ἐρως Ζήσων
Ηρων Θεωρ Ἰων
Κλεον Λεων Μαρων [N . . .
Ξερξης Ὀρφεώς [C . . .
Ρούφως Σ . . . Τ . . . Τ . . .
Φιαωρ Χ . . . Ψ . . . Ω . . .

Here the order of the letters is impressed on the mind of the pupil by a catalogue of familiar names. Two similar lists are contained in a papyrus from Thebanus published by Grenfell and Hunt: the first gives an alphabetical catalogue of trades—ἄρτοκαταστασις, θηφαίνα, γραφή, and so forth; the second is slightly more elaborate and furnishes a kind of nursery-story, beginning,

ἀπολλυται μοι [. . .
βιοις δ . . . πλ . . .]
γεναιος ἁ ἀρας

and continuing with short sentences through the alphabet. This ostrakon also appears to have been written by the teacher.

The next stage in the education of the child was the instruction in syllables, or word-building. A good example of this process in its most elementary form is given by an ostrakon from Oxyrhynchus found by Grenfell and Hunt in their excavations of the season 1905–6 and now in the

* H. J. W. Tillyard in Annual of British School at Athens, xii, p. 476.
2 B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, Tēbtana Papyri, ii, 278.
British Museum, which shows a scheme of the letters of the alphabet each in turn combined with the different vowels. A considerable part of the ostrakon is lost. I have to thank the Museum authorities for permission to publish this.

III.

\[\text{II} \]
\[\text{I} \]
\[\text{K} \]
\[\text{Λ} \]
\[\text{Μ} \]
\[\text{ΝΑΕΝ} \]
\[\text{ΞΑΞΕΞΗΞΙΞΟΞ} \]
\[\text{ΙΑΟΟΟΟΟΙΟΟ} \]
\[\text{ΙΑΝΕΝΗΠ} \]
\[\text{ΡΑΕΡΗΠΗ} \]
\[\text{ΣΑΣΕΣΗΣΙΣ} \]
\[\text{ΤΑΣΘΗΣΗΣ} \]
\[\text{ΥΣΥΓΗΣΗΣ} \]
\[\text{ΦΑΦΕΦΗ} \]
\[\text{ΧΑΧΕΧΧΗΧΙΧ} \]
\[\text{ΙΤΕΘΗ} \]

(In l. 11 ΡΗ is corrected from ΡΕ.)

This scheme might almost have served as a text for the performance described by Athenaeus, in which a chorus sang "βήτα όμη φάνα βά, βήτα ἔλ βά, βήτα ἡτα βά, βήτα ιότα βά, βήτα οὐ βά, βήτα ὑ βά, βήτα ὃ βά, and so on in antistrophes through the alphabet; but it is slightly fuller, as it contains combinations of two vowels as well as of a consonant and a vowel, the latter only of which would appear to have been included in the song.

A word-building exercise of a somewhat similar kind has been found at Athens. In this the scheme is

\[\text{αρ βαρ γαρ δαρ} \]
\[\text{ερ Βαρ γερ δαρ} \]

The following ostrakon may have been intended to serve for instruction in word-building, though the results can hardly be regarded as satisfactory.

---

* Athenaeus, 458a.
* Quoted by R. J. Freeman, Schools of Hellas, p. 131.
sentiments should be used for this purpose. Of the same nature is a verse on one of our ostraka.

VII. (G. 7). \ 066 x 098.

ομηθεν δικαίω
ουδένος δείται νο-

μον

Here the writer has made two corrections, the \textit{e} of \textit{ΜΗΘΕΝ} having been originally written as \textit{∆} and the \textit{Δ} of \textit{ΟΥΔΕΝΟΣ} as \textit{Θ}. These mistakes suggest that this is work of a scholar, either reproducing a copy set by his teacher or writing from dictation a piece of moral instruction. A similar moral purpose, in a more advanced stage of the course, is found on another ostrakon, which appears to give the end of an elementary composition on the advantages of virtue.

VIII. (G. 9). \ 108 x 106. Broken above.

\textit{ΔΩ}[

\textit{ΘΝΟΥΙΟΝΕΩ}[

\textit{ΚΑΛΗΝΤΕΚΑΙΠΟΝ}

\textit{ΛΡΑΙΑΙΚΠΕΕΧΚΕΙ}

\textit{ΜΑΖΕΤΑΙΑΙΑΠΑΝΤΑ}

\textit{ΔΙΑΤΕΛΟΥΣΤΕΤΟΝ}

\textit{ΒΙΟΝ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΙΟΣ}

\textit{ΚΩΝΕΑΝ}

\textit{ΙΟΜΕΝΟ'ΟΝΥΜΕΝΙ}

\textit{ΘΝΟΥΙΟΝΕΩ}

\textit{ΚΩΝΕΑΝ}

\textit{ΙΟΜΕΝΟ'ΟΝΥΜΕΝΙ}

The last two lines and a half are written in a smaller hand; the last is presumably the signature of the pupil. The purport of the exercise is paralleled in a papyrus published by Grenfell and Hunt,\(^\text{10}\) which contains a little story of a man who slew his father and fled into the desert, where he met his punishment from a lion and a serpent: it was, however, copied by a less advanced scholar than the above ostrakon.

There are several analogous examples on other ostraka and tablets, in form more nearly resembling the last but one of those here edited, inasmuch as the sentences are arranged in verse. Such are a group of waxed tablets now at Paris published by Weil\(^\text{11}\) and said to have come from Saqqara, on which are written, in a late third century, cursive with many errors, some

\(^{10}\) B. F. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, \textit{Greek Papyri}, Series II. 84.

distichs in iambic trimeters, wherein the teacher appears to have dictated moral sentiments placed in the mouths of mythical personages. One of these may be quoted as a specimen—

"Iκαρος ἔλεξεν καταπεσὼν ἀπ' αἰθέρος

ἵνηλα μή κομπαξε, μή τίσης μακρά.

Of later date—possibly sixth century—is a collection of hexameter apopthegms on a papyrus at Heidelberg,12 such as: an address from Phoenix to Achilles intended to stay the wrath of the latter, in six lines: the scholastic character of this document seems to be shown by the numerous mistakes and corrections. A more ambitious effort of a Theban student is preserved on one of Jouguet and Lefebvre's ostraka,13 which is fortunately dated by the writer in the fourth year of Antoninus Pius: this bears an unfinished account, in seven lines of iambic trimeters, of a father who brought his son, who refused to contribute to his support, before Anacharsis the Seythian for judgment: in this exercise there are only three errors of spelling.

An ostrakon, unfortunately very fragmentary, from our collection seems to show that the moral instruction was extended to include the duties of a citizen.

IX. (G. 10). 106 x 609. Broken on r. and below,

ΕΙΝΕΙΓΑΝΑ[TA

ΒΙΟΝΚΑΤΑΚΚΕΠ[θ

ΕΙΝ.... ΓΥΝΑΙ[θ

ΤΟΚΑΙΔΗΜΟΚΡ[θ

ΤΟ...ΟΥΚΟΙΟΙΚ[θ

ΘΕΣΤΟΙΚΟΙΟΝΟ[θ

ΩΔ...ΟΙΚΑΙΝ[θ

ΤΟΙΚΑΣΘΕΝΕ[θ

ΠΟΝΤΩΝΩΣ[θ

ΚΑΙΝΙΩΤΩΝ[θ

ΤΡΙΩΝΠ...ΟΙϹ

..ΑΙΤΙΑΝ...ΤΡ[θ

ΟΥΤΟΥϹΤ[θ

..ΙΝ[θ

12 Milaourou Nicola., p. 619. O. Crum and
13 R.C.H. 1904, p. 201. P. Jouguet and G.
G. A. Gerhard, Mythologische Hypogramme in.
Lefebvre. Deno ostraka de Thèbes,
13 Le Heidelberger Papyrus.
The first letter in each line is well written and regular; the following ones are clumsy and in most cases faint. The general appearance of the ostrakon suggests that the teacher wrote the initial letters in a column and directed his pupil to complete each line a word ending in -ouθ. He may have intended that the words should be simply monosyllabic compounds of -ouθ with the initial letter; and though the pupil was beaten by Ε, he got on all right with Ν, Ο, and Π. After that, however, he forsook the monosyllabic principle and completed words of two or three syllables.

A similar method seems to have been pursued in another case. Unfortunately the ostrakon is a mere fragment; but enough remains to show that the initial letter of each line is in a different hand from the later ones, and is by a more practised writer. These letters, however, are not in alphabetical order.

V. (G. 25). 118 x 173. Broken on all sides except left.
Passing on to instruction in writing, we do not find any clear instances of ostraka used for 'copy-book' purposes. The nature of the material would interfere with many copies being made on a single ostrakon: it is more likely that the teacher would write out his specimen on one piece of potsherd, and the pupil proceed to reproduce it on others. There is, however, one example which seems to have been utilised for practice in the formation of numerals.

VI. (G. 17). 096 x 070.

There is a good specimen of a writing exercise on papyrus in Hawara papyrus 34, which shows on the verso the remains of seven repetitions of the line

Non tibi Tyndaridis facies [Innusa Lacaeanae]

in a large sprawling uncial hand, and on the verso seven repetitions, apparently in the same hand, of

jut celoeins

followed by a number of flourishes.

Other instances of reproductions of a sentence, presumably set as a copy, on waxed tablets have been published by Frohner 7 and Goodspeed. 8 In the former case, on one tablet is written "Αμπελος ύδαρ πιόονα παρά τοῦ δειπνότου ἀκράτου αὐτῷ ἀποδίδεις τὴν χάριν δικαίων φιλότοιο: while three other tablets contain each three copies of this in smaller characters, with some errors and corrections, all three being signed above by M. Aurelius Theodorus, son of Anoubion. These can be dated by another tablet of the same collection to about 214 A.D. Goodspeed's tablets show epigrams similarly copied: in one instance

οὐ μὴ δέδωκεν ὃ τύχῃ κοιμώμενης

μάτιν ὁμοίωτα κἀπ' ὕπερ Λάδαν ὀράμη

in another

ὅταν ποιῶν πομηρά χρηστά τις λαλή
tων παράπτα πλησίον μὴ λατήνη
dιπλάσιον πάντω γίνεται ἡ πομηρία.

These examples of sentences set as 'copies' show that the teachers in choosing them followed the doctrine laid down by Quintilian 9 that moral

7 W. Frohner, Tablatus Graecicus du Musee de Marseille (Paris, 1867).
9 Inst. Or. i. 1. 38: "il quaeque usum, qui al initiative scribendi proponentur, non ostias nullam sententiam habeat, sed humatum aliquid momentis.
The recourse to mythological characters, especially Homeric heroes, which is found in some of the documents quoted above as examples of moral instruction, recurs in others which seem to be more of the nature of exercises in composition—at any rate their moral purpose is not evidenced by what remains of them. One of the largest fragments is the following.

X. (G. 4): 095 x 133. Broken diagonally across from left.

Μέτα τὴν Ἀχιλλέως τελευτῆς καὶ θανάτου τούτου τούτος Ἀχαίοις μετατευθυνόντας Φιλοκτηνή Ἐκ τῆς Δημοκρίτου ὧν εἶχεν τὰ πολλὰ ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἡρωκλεοῦς τοῦ κατάλειπεν γαρ ἀυτῶν ὑπὸ ὑδάτων πεπληγμένον καὶ σῶμα ἐφετεροφυθήν ὁ ὄντως ὑπὸ τοῦ καταγγέλας καὶ διορίσκειν ἀυτῶν καταγγέλλων καὶ διελεύσιν αὐτῶν Μαξαμίου Ἀσκληπιοῦ. θεσκηνίαν... ἢ τὰ κατερτεῖν... Φιλοκτηνής...
XI. (G. 1). 122 x 082. Complete at bottom only.

XII. (G. 8). 067 x 103. Broken above and on right.

XIII. (G. II). 091 x 062. Broken on all sides.

R.S.—VOL. XXVIII.
With these may be classed one of Fröhner's waxed tablets, which contains the remains of a story of Kaichus and Agamennon.

An example of a theme dealing with more recent events is given by an ostrakon on which has been written a letter apparently from Alexander to the Carthaginians—more probably a composition of the student than a copy from any historical document.

XIV. (G. 26.) 135 x 140. Complete at top only.

\[\text{Αλεξάνδρος Καρχηδόνος} \]
\[\text{ληστε και αὐτοὶ... Λ} \]
\[\text{μα φιλαστουτε ἐπειδὴ} \]
\[\text{των πεπομφασιν πρός} \]
\[\text{κομιαν δεξιασίν.} \]
\[\text{ν δεξιαμενος καὶ} \]
\[\text{κλήμαι αὐτῷ} \]
\[\text{κήπη δ' ἐν} \]

The last five ostraka may be classed together as bearing specimens of the exercises described by Quintilian as narrationes. He complained that the stage of training at which such exercises should be practised had been usurped by the grammatici, though it properly belonged to the rhetores; and, as our ostraka clearly come from schools taught by the former class, it would appear that the usurpation had been made in Egypt as well as in Rome. Some of the more ambitious quasi-historical narratives preserved on papyri may perhaps represent the compositions of more advanced students in the schools of rhetoric.

A somewhat different side of the instruction, developed from that previously mentioned, where the pupil transcribed apothegms or epigrams, appears to have consisted in giving selected passages to be written out with comments. The following is a good example: a line and a half of verse followed by some observations, which from their nature may perhaps be ascribed to the scholar rather than to the teacher, and then another sentence of poetry, apparently quite unconnected with the previous one, which was doubtless expounded in its turn.

XV. (G. 27.) 121 x 175. Broken at bottom.

\[\text{Πλατέαν ὁ Προμηθεὺς} \]
\[\text{τάλανθος γενοῦς ὄμοιον} \]
\[\text{γνωρίζεται ἐν τῷ Δια τοῦ} \]

---

14 W. Fröhner, loc.
15 Inst. Or. II. 1.
RELICS OF GRAECO-EGYPTIAN SCHOOLS

MEGICTONEGEYREPEIΔHEI
RHKENTHNGYNΔIKEIΔANΦ
ΦΥΚΗΠΑΝΤΩΝΜΕΤΗΡΙ
ΘΗΘΝ, ΕΑΝΝΝΕΔΑΡΕΠΙ
ΧΕ
ΤΥΧΗΜΕΤΕΥΤΗΝΒΙΜΟ
ΧΩΝ, [. . .], ΙΠΟΛΛΩΝΤΑΡ
[ ], ΝΑΕΙΣ

There are several corrections in this exercise: in l. 2 the Η of ΕΓΕΝΗ is altered from Π; in l. 4 the second Ε of ΕΥΡΕΠΙΔΗ has been struck out and rewritten above the line; the Φ at the end of l. 5 and the second ΘΗ at the beginning of l. 7 are partly erased; and in l. 8 ΧΕ in ΕΥΤΥΧΕΙΝ is inserted above the line.

Copies of passages of poetry without comment are found fairly frequently: some of the innumerable Homeric fragments on papyri may be schoolboy exercises, and the same origin may be more certainly ascribed to the wooden tablets with Homeric quotations. One ostrakon with a line from Homer upon it has been published, and two with passages from Euripides—respectively Hippolytus 616, 624 and Phaenissae 107, 118 and 128, 130.

It is noteworthy that the two latter are both of Ptolemaic date, and so much earlier than most ostraka of the scholastic class. Another Ptolemaic ostrakon of literary character, which may be a school exercise, has been edited by Reimach: it contains an erotic dialogue, couched in prose of poetical diction.

Mathematical ostraka are rare; but there are two in our collection which may be placed under this head. The first is an extremely ill-spelt list of ordinals from first to twelfth in a very irregular hand.

XVI. (G. 4). - 086 x 150. Chipped at bottom.

Η ΠΡΟΘΥΕΥΤΕΡΑ
ΤΡΙΤΗΔΙΑΡΟ
ΠΕΜΥΧΕΚΘΕΒΤΟ
ΜΗΚΤΟΨΕΝΝΑΘΗ
ΤΕΚΘΑΚΕΝ
ΔΟΘΑΚΘΗ
ΤΕΚΑΘ

18 C. Willebrord, Griechische Ostraka, 1146.
19 M. Pernö, p. 291. Th. Reimach,
20 M. 1147.
21 H. R. Hall, Cl. Rev. xxvii. 2.
The second ι in TETKATHC is partly erased.
The other is of much earlier date, and seems to be an exercise in weights and measures.

XVII. (G. 30). 083 x 072

\[ \pi N \phi e e \phi N e i c \]
\[ \pi I \theta A A P I A = \]

\[ v \]
\[ \Lambda B \]
\[ \Xi \Delta \]
\[ P K I H \]
\[ C N S \]
\[ F I B \]
\[ \Lambda K A \]
\[ B M I H \]
\[ I A S \]

The arrangement of the two top lines is not quite clear. It would seem that each figure is intended to be one-tenth of the one to the left of it, and those in the second line one-fifth of the ones above them; but in reducing from talents to drachmae there is a break, 5 talents being followed by 5000 drachmae, and 1 talent by 1000 drachmae; and the final signs do not fall in with the series, the last in the upper line being 4 chalki, which is not one-tenth of three obols, and the last in the lower 2 obols, which is neither one-tenth of one drachma nor one-fifth of 3 obols. The vertical line gives a regular series of fractions of the aurora, beginning with \( \frac{1}{9} \) and dividing by two in each line down to \( \frac{1}{9} \) th.

Finally it may be worth while to note a fragment of school material of a more finished nature than the ostraka. This is part of a well-made limestone tablet, 14 mm. in thickness, with a bevelled edge, both faces of which are ruled in squares; on one side these measure approximately 12 mm. each way, on the other, approximately 10 mm. There are traces of writing in Greek on both sides, unfortunately almost entirely effaced; but enough remains to show that the ruled lines were carefully followed. The only place where the writing is consecutively preserved seems to read as the end of a line—presumably of an iambic trimeter.

\[ \text{\textit{Iov o\beta o\betaes}} \]

J. GRAFTON MILNE.
WHERE DID APHRODITE FIND THE BODY OF ADONIS?

In ancient Cyprus no one could have hesitated to point out the spot in question. But in the present day we have nothing to guide us except a hint of the famous Καύη ἱστορία of Ptolemy Hephaestion, as recorded by Photius in chap. xix of the Μυριοβιβλος.

The mythographer deals in the seventh book with the Λευκάς πέτρα, which had the miraculous power of curing those who, when afflicted with love, dared to jump from it. It was this extreme remedy that Apollo counselled to Aphrodite, disconsolate at the death of Adonis: Μετὰ τοῦ Ἀδώνιδος φασὶ θάνατον περιεχομένη καὶ ζητούσα ἡ Ἀφροδίτη, εὑρεν αὐτὸν ἐν Ἀργοι πόλει τῆς Κύπρου ἐν τῷ τῶν ὑπότου Ἀπόλλωνος λεγό καὶ ἀνέθλην αὐτὸν.

Whereabouts in Cyprus was this πόλις Ἀργος? None of the ancient geographers tells us, and, so far as I know, no modern scholar has elucidated this point. All of them mention Ἀργος among the towns in Cyprus not yet identified.

A short while ago I expressed the opinion (in 'Λήθηνα' vol. xviii, p. 343) that this Ἀργος was Ἀργας, and I now explain the reasons which appear to me sufficient to justify my conjecture.

The reading Ἀρασὶς for Ἀργός is by no means a venturesome one. In whatever form of writing it was written, Ἀργός or Ἀρασὶς, Photius, or, what is more probable, his copyists could read the well known name of Ἀργας instead of Ἀρασὶς, which later became quite unknown in Christian times. But if the name of the town was really Ἀρασὶς, Ptolemy would hardly have added the word πόλις, since everybody knew of other towns named Ἀρασὶς, and he would only have said ἐν Ἀρασὶς τῆς Κύπρου. On the contrary, for the expression ἐν Ἀρασὶς πόλει there was a reason, which we shall see later on.

Now in Cyprus there are two villages called Ἀρασὶς, one in the district of Κιάδων and the other in the district of Μεσαρᾶ. But it is to be feared that many archaeologists will be disposed to repeat the contemptuous phrase, with which Richard Neubauer rejected the conjecture that Πασκας of to-day is the ancient Γολγοθα, 'bless well die dortige Gegend bei der heutigen Bevölkerung Jorgos heisst'18. But Neubauer, being compelled to offer some other etymology of the name, found

---

mit Recht in dem heutigen Namen von Altaphos Kukla oder Kukla den alten Namen Golgoi.

To this discovery of the German scholar we may put, in our turn, two notes of exclamation. In the Αγώνα of Athens (No. 176, and in Αθηναία, vol. xviii, p. 376) I gave the etymology of Κουκλία, which was Κουβρούκλια, and later on I shall attempt to explain how Γολγοθα became in the new Cypriot Γορκοθ, as it is not irrelevant to the question of Ἁρσος.

Now, what can Ἁρσος stand for? As a substantive it is not in use today, nor was it in mediaeval Greek. Then we must accept the fact that the name comes down from ancient times. Furthermore, all those who are familiar with modern Greek must have observed that before the consonants we pronounce ρ where the ancient Attics pronounced ι, for instance ἁμερός, ἀπρόσφος. Especially in Cyprus, before every consonant ι is pronounced as ρ, for instance ἀριβαντίτης, κεφαλαρίον (et cetera). Ἀρχαίας ἁμή, Ἀρχιακής, Μυτιληνής, Ἀρέαρος. Consequently it is quite easy to infer that Γορκοθ was Γολγοθα and that Ἁρσος was Ἀλσος. Dr. Max Ohnefäsch-Richter has really noticed that The ancient word Ἀλσος, holy grove, has survived in the name of the modern village.

But I am of opinion that like the Cypriots of to-day their ancestors also pronounced not Ἀλσος but Ἁρσος. Prof. Psichari in a special pamphlet gives numerous examples of this changing from modern, mediaeval, and also ancient Greek. But of this same word Ἁρσος we have evidence in the Lexicon of Hesychius, Ἁρσος: λειμόνες <τυ ἀλσος>.

Knowing, as we do, that the Alexandrine grammarian preserved to us several ancient Cypriot words, we must accept the conclusion that the Cypriot pronunciation was from the outset Ἁρσος, which agrees with the etymology from ἁρδος.

Such Ἀλσος, viz. ἀφερεσιά χορλα, afforested or not, were, of course, numerous in all Greece, and in some places the name is still living. In Κω there is a place Παναγία τ' Ἁρσον, and it was there that Rudolph Herzog excavated the Ἀρσάκειαν. What the meaning of το Ἁρσον (ὁ τοῦ Ἀλσος) was, has been explained in the periodical Πανδώρα (of Athens, vol. xvi, 1865, p. 128). But Mr. D. A. Mylonas complains in the Ξενοφάνες (of Athens, vol.
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iii. p. 372) that this perfectly just conjecture had not been taken into consideration by the archaeologists who excavated there.

In Cyprus we have the testimony of Strabo (xiv. 6. 3, pp. 681-685) that there was a Δίας: ἄλσος at Arsinoe and another at Idalion, and it would be unreasonable to deny that the other gods also must have had such spots sacred to their cult. We may consequently conclude that it was in the ἄλσος of 'Ερμίων Απόλλων that Adonis died.

With this conclusion the whole legend in question, so romantic in itself, agrees, and so also do the ancient poets. The poet of Βουκολιάων says (γ 35)

οὐ τὸν Ἀδωνί
ἐν ἐν δρυμοῖς φίλασε καὶ ἐν ἐν δρυμοῖς στῶ ποτὲ ἐκλαυσον;

(viz. ὁ Κύπριος). Also Bion (Ἀδωνίδος Ἐπιταφίος, v. 68)

μνηστ  ἐν ἐν δρυμοῖς ἐν τοι ἄλσος. Κύπριος.

It is obvious that here ἐν δρυμοῖς is equal to ἄλσος.

But it is equally evident that the testimony of Ptolemy, that Adonis died in a πόλει τῇ Κύπρῳ, appears to be against our suggestion.

Richard Neubauer, in order to show that Σολογοί had not been a πόλις, observes that Pausanias vii. 5, 2 states τέως ἐν ἔν θεός παρόν Κύπροις τιμᾶν εἰκόνα ἐν Γολγοθείς καλονύμιον γορίον; and he adds (p. 677) : ‘Aber auch nicht von einer Stadt Golgoi’ (speaks Pausanias). This argument seemed so strong that in the latest excellent Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Cyprus we read ‘Cesnola’s identification with Athienou is a guess, founded on the modern name of the locality Yorgos. Indeed, there is some doubt whether a separate city of Golgoi ever existed.’

Athanasius Sakellarus, the modest Greek scholar, who, guided by his linguistic feeling, had expressed many years before Cesnola and the ‘Franzos’ (viz. the Comte de Vogtié) the suggestion that ‘Σολογοί’ is Γολγοι (in the first edition of his Κύπριακα, Athene, 1855, vol. 1, p. 187), in the second edition (vol. i, p. 185) cited many passages in order to show that the word χωρίον had also the meaning of a πόλις and he added ἡ ἄνε τῇ Θρακικῇ χωρίᾳ.

It is easy to show that the word χωρίον was used with the meaning both of uninhabited places and of townships, and is still used as equivalent to κωμή, κω τε χωρία is now equivalent to πόλις. But it is much more useful to illustrate the evolution of such places, devoted to a deity, like Σολογοί and Ἀρσοῦ.

I agree that in this passage of Pausanias τέως ἐν ἔν θεός τιμᾶν εἰκόνα ἐν Γολγοθείς καλονύμιον γορίον the writer means an uninhabited place, but τέως uninhabited, viz. before the Palaeaphos temple was established. Of course, that is no proof that Golgoi remained always uninhabited, but rather the reverse, and on the contrary the words of Ptolemy, ἐν Ἀρσοῦ πώλει τῇ Κύπρῳ, are

no proof that Ἄρσος had always πόλις, but rather that in his time it was a town.

This can be proved from other place-names which, like Ἄρσος, were originally common substantives and then became in some places proper names. In Cyprus we have villages Βάσα, Δρόμος, Δρυκιά, Δέρμος, (Ἀγία) Νάπα, viz. Βάσα, Δρόμος, Δρυκία, Λεμιόν, Νάπτη. For every one of these names we have ancient testimonies from other Greek countries that they had become proper names before the Christian era.

Strabo ix. 4. 5 Βάσα: ὁτο γὰρ τοῦ δρυκιόνων ὀνομασται δρυκιόμως, ἀστερ καὶ Νάπτη ἐν τῷ Μηθύμνεις ποδίω. Well known is also Βάσα in Arcadia. Stephanus Byzantinus: Δρυκία πολις Φοκίδος το εθνικόν Δρυκιόν, Pausanias π. 35. 3 ὅραμα δε ἐστι τῆς χωρίου Λεμιον.

Now it is important to examine what was the cause of such afforested places becoming settlements. I think that it was a temple of a deity which had been built there in accordance with some ancient legend. Who was the deity of Δρόμος of Paphos has been shown by two Cypriot inscriptions excavated there, and dedicated τῷ θεῷ τῷ ἑλάτῃ (Deecke, Korp. Inschriften, Göttingen, 1883, p. 18, Nos. 26–29). In the θεόμος there was an altar of the god of Ἕλατ, as Hogarth explained the epithet (Dios. Cyprus 30), and θεόμος after having been inhabited became ὁ Δρόμος, and then ἡ Δρόμος, τῆς Δρύκιας. At Δρύκια or Δρυκία of Phocis was a temple of Δημητήρ. Pausanias v. 33. 11 says ἄγαλμα τοῦ θεοῦ Δρυκίας (or Δρυκιός), ἵππον ἐστις ἁργαὶον καὶ ἀγάλμα ὀρθόν λίθου κτεινᾶται. The expression is not precise. It is plain that this ἀγάλμα and ἁργαὶον ἵππον were there before the θεόμος became Δρυκία πόλις.

In exactly the same manner Ἄρσος had been ἄλσος dedicated to Ἐρίθης Ἀπόλλων, and later on with the help of the Adonis legend became a πόλις, as Ptolemy styles it.

Equally, Golgoi had been a χαρίσιον, dedicated to Aphrodite, perhaps on account of a ξύλον found among γολγοι το βελσολ (Ἀφροδίτι ἐν γολγοίς like Ἀφροδίτι ἐν κήποις), but afterwards, when the cult of Venus extended all over the island, the place became a πόλις, which was called Γόλγος or Γόρμα, and its citizens were known as Γολγοτα. Pliny enumerates it as last of the fifteen Cyprian oppida, existing in his epoch (Nat. Hist. v. 35).

The population of these ἵπποι χαρίσιων increased with the honour attributed to their deities, or, to speak more concretely, with the success of the πανθυρώπειν held there, which were religious as well as commercial. I mean that the formation of such settlements in ancient times is comparable to the formation in later times of the villages in the proximity of our monasteries or country chapels, dedicated to saints. I will give an example.

Παλαιωκώνισσα is the name of an ikon of the Theotokos, which, according to tradition, had been found among παλαιόρει, viz. παλιώρειον. In honour of this ikon a nursery had been built at the place and then a village was formed.10
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Hermeias Samomemos gives us a striking description of the last pagans, who ἄνεστο τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν Χριστιανῶν, ἱργαιοτήτως τε ἐπεμελοῦντο καὶ τῶν πατρίων θεῶν καὶ πατριγύρων. When Constantine the Great prohibited γράμματα βασιλικοὶ the continuation of these customs, γυμνοθέους τῆς τοῦ πλήθους ῥοπῆς οἱ νεκροὶ καὶ οἱ ἰερεῖς προῦσαν τὰ πόριαν τίμιατα καὶ τὰ διευπητή καλοῦμενα.

Thus some of these dedicated places were deserted, some were converted to Christianity, while the ancient πανγύρων continued with the ancient names of the places in honour of the new religion. Νάπα of Cyprus became a monastery of Παναγία.

But how large or how small were these settlements like Γέλγος, or Ἄρσες, or Δρίμος during their prosperous times, we cannot estimate from the mere use of the word χωρίον, or πόλις, or even from the silence of the ancient authors, who never visited them. We can only form some idea from the excavations and inscriptions. We know nothing from ancient authors with regard to a town in Cyprus called Παναίστρα, but we know of an estate called Άρσαίστρα, and an inscription, excavated near there, mentions the name Παλαιατρίτα (C.I.G., vol. ii, p. 441, No. 2627).

Now, which of the two existing settlements called Άρσες of Cyprus was the πόλις mentioned by Ptolemy Hephaestion?

The reply is easy. It was that of Mesarea, as is proved by the excavations made there.

Dr. Max Ohnesold-Richter (Kypros, Bible and Homer, p. 12) says: 'To the N.E. of the village are the remains of a temple of a god of a male divinity. I investigated the spot in 1888. A small bronze votive ox and a large bronze group of a man leading an ox to sacrifice (now in the Louvre) had been found here by the peasants. I discovered, among other things, fragments of figures representing Geryon, who often in Cyprus appears as a companion of Apollo.'

Unless my judgment is much at fault, this πόλις was that of Αἱρίθως Ἀττάλους, ή τὸ Άρσες πόλις τῆς Κύπρου, where Aphrodite found the body of Adonis.

Σήμερον Μενάρδεν.

---

12 In the village of Athimou (near) to Πάφος, two inscriptions were lately found, the one on the pedestal of a statue and the other on a column. These I intend to publish shortly.
A STATUE FROM AN ATTIC TOMB.

[PLATES XXVII.-XXIX.]

The reliefs upon the tombstones of the Attic cemetery of the Ceramicus have long been among the most familiar of the products of Greek art, and have enjoyed a popularity, even beyond their artistic merit, because of their direct appeal to a common basis of human sentiment—mentem mortalis tangunt. The sculptors who made these reliefs did not probably, for the most part, enjoy any very exalted position in their profession. The artistic quality of the work varies greatly; while some of it preserves the best traditions of the school that made the Parthenon frieze, some is comparatively commonplace and mechanical. There is little reason to suppose that any of the extant reliefs are from the hands of a distinguished sculptor. We know, however, that well known sculptors were sometimes employed on works to be set up over tombs. Pliny expressly says of Praxiteles 'opearat eum in Ceramicum', and Pausanias mentions a statue by Praxiteles of a soldier standing beside his horse, set up just outside the Dipylon Gate. There is therefore good reason for looking for statues of the highest artistic value among those set up as monuments over tombs. The reason why they have not hitherto attracted the same general interest as the reliefs that served the same purpose is partly their much more limited number, partly the difficulty of recognising them with certainty.

It has, of course, long been known to students that such tomb-statues were to be found in Greece. There is evidence that all the three most familiar types of early Greek sculpture, the nude male standing type (commonly called Apollo), the draped female standing type, and the seated type, were sometimes used as statues representing the deceased and set up above his tomb. The well known 'Apollo' of Teos is said to have served this purpose; and the feet of a statue of the same type as the draped female figures on the Athenian Acropolis were found attached to an inscribed basis which shows that the statue was set up as an image of the deceased upon the mound over a tomb at Bourbaki in Attica, and that it was the work of a sculptor named Phaedia.¹

The most satisfactory records of statues set up for a similar purpose in

¹ See J.H.S. xlii. p. 330; Αξωναί, Aug. 1880.
later times relate to a series of groups of two figures of a special character. In each of these a richly draped female figure is set up beside a nude male figure; but the male figure in each case seems to be identified as Hermes, while the female figure is in all probability a portrait—or rather a conventional representation of the deceased. If this identification be correct—and there is, perhaps, no sufficient reason to doubt it—the intention of the artist seems to be to represent Hermes Psychopompus as escorting the inmate of the tomb on her journey to the other world. The best known of these groups consists of the Hermes of Andros, a statue well known as a variation on the type of the Hermes of Praxiteles, and a woman whose drapery is a fine example of the study of surface and texture that is associated with Praxiteles. Her head, which was made in a separate piece, is lost; she is fully draped.

1 It has also been suggested that the Hermes typifies a dead man or woman as the female figure typifies a dead woman. See F. Gardner, Sculptured Tombs of Athens, p. 125. The discussion does not really concern me here, as the female statue certainly represents the deceased.

2 Athens, National Museum Cat. 218 and 219.
with her arms, all but the now lost right hand, enveloped in the folds of her cloak, which was of some light and diaphanous material. Her right arm was bent, so that her hand was in front of her breast, her left hung down by her side. It is especially attested in this case that the two statues had been set up on a common basis near a tomb. Another similar pair was found at Aegion. The Hermes is of a different type from the Hermes of Andros; the lady is fully draped, in a walking position with the left foot advanced, and with both her arms enveloped in her cloak.

Other instances of richly draped figures set up over the tombs of women are known. An interesting example, found at Rheina, is the unfinished figure representing the upper part of a lady with a veil over her head (Fig. 1); here again the arms are enveloped in the cloak, and the right hand holds part of the veil over the head; the expression of grief or melancholy is already clear, though the statue is only blocked out; there is little doubt that it was intended to be set up over a tomb. There is a curious similarity of type about all these statues, all the more conspicuous because of their variety of style. We also find the type repeated, with a certain amount of variation, in a series of statues which seem to have been meant more or less for portrait statues, but which are not known to have been set up over tombs, and in some cases were certainly set up elsewhere. The most familiar examples are the two statues from Herculaneum (one of which is shown in Fig. 2) now at Dresden, and a statue almost exactly similar which was found in a private house in Delos. It is commonly stated that statues of this kind represent some individual lady in the character of a Muse; and this view at first sight appears to receive confirmation from the figures of the Muses on the Mantinean relief, which are all variations on the type, while one of them resembles very closely one of the Herculaneum statues. It is, however, by no means easy to say, apart from attributes, whether such a female figure is intended to suggest a Muse or not. The differentiation of the Muses into a certain number of clearly defined and easily recognisable types is comparatively late; and the series of Muses which we see on the Mantinean relief is not to be distinguished from any group of female figures, such as the 'Mourners' on the Sidon sarcophagus, or any set of Tanagra statuettes.

If we are justified in assigning the design of the Mantinean reliefs to Praxiteles, we have a presumption that the origin of the type must be attributed to him also; but here we are on somewhat dangerous ground. It is true that the relief was on the basis of a group by Praxiteles, and therefore must probably be a work of his school, even if it be not designed by himself. But in one figure at least, that of Marsyas, the type is borrowed from Myron; and it may be suggested that the Muses also follow conventionally accepted types. Nor need we look far for the originals of

---

4 Athens, Not. Mus. Cat. 341 and 342; A.A. Mitt. 1878, Pls. 5 and 6.
5 Hermes Arch. 1890, ii. Pl. XX.
6 E.R.H. 1896, Pl. VII.
these types, when we remember that there were sets of the Muses on Mount Helicon made wholly or in part by Cephasodotus. There is, however, a
certain refinement and elegance in the treatment of drapery which seems to
distinguish these Mantinean Muses from the work of Cephisodotus, who
in his Eirene and Phitus seems to follow very closely the simple and
dignified Phidian tradition. Even if we grant, however, that the type of
figure exemplified by the Mantinean Muses is to be assigned in its origin
to Praxiteles, we have still to consider whether this type is exclusively
suitable for Muses. Its use in later times for more or less generalised portrait statues, whether set up on tombs or elsewhere, suggests some doubt on this point. But the evidence hitherto available has been somewhat unsatisfactory; and therefore a statue which is evidently of fourth century workmanship, and which gives us an example in the round earlier than has hitherto been known and near to the original of the type, even if it be not that original itself, is of the highest value to us. Such a statue we now fortunately possess in that recently acquired by the British Museum from the Duke of Sutherland's collection at Trentham (Plates XXVII.-XXIX.).

The Trentham statue represents a lady advancing slowly, her weight thrown on the right leg, and the left dragging behind it; the head is bent, as in an attitude of grief. The effect of the position is greatly enhanced by the drapery; her cloak is drawn across the front of her body, so as to envelop both arms, and hang down behind over the left shoulder; it is drawn into a kind of roll below the neck, and a portion of it is drawn over the head from behind so as to form a veil. Beneath the cloak the left arm is lowered, the wrist pressing a gathered knot of the drapery to the side; the right arm is bent at the elbow, so that the hand is in front of the breast. In most other statues in the same position, this hand grasps the edge of the cloak. Here, however, it is turned over, so that the drapery clings close to its back, and clearly outlines its form. There is a line round the lower edge of the cloak showing where a border of some sort was once added in colour. The state of preservation of the statue, and the evidence as to its history, call for some comment. The amount and character of the restoration it has undergone are best reserved until we have noticed the vicissitudes through which it has passed. When I first saw the statue at Trentham in 1906, it was placed in the conservatory; but I understood that it had been moved to that position at the suggestion of Mr. R. Bourne, who appreciated its artistic value. Previously it had been set up in the open on the terrace before the house, protected only by a small circular canopy supported on columns; and this exposure to the smoke and acrid air of the district of the potteries has been most disastrous. The discoloration has now, indeed, been removed by the Museum workmen; but the granulation of the marble stands out all over the surface of the statue, and nothing of the original finish can now be seen. There does not appear to be any exact record of the acquisition of the statue; but there seems to be little doubt that it was acquired in Italy by the second Duke of Sutherland between 1830 and 1845. Trentham Hall was being rebuilt between those dates, and the Duke was collecting works of art for the house and grounds during the building operations. We have no information as to where it was found; but the state of the basis supplies evidence that it had been used a second time in the Roman age. The

This statue has already been published by Mr. Cecil Smith in the Burlington Magazine for March, 1906. The photographs accompanying his article, here repeated, give two rather unsatisfactory aspects; but the other illustrations show the character of the work.

For this information I am indebted to Mr. Alexander Simpson, whom I wish also to thank for his help during my visit to Trentham to examine the sculptures.
portion of flat ground surrounding the feet and the bottom of the drapery, and made of the same block of marble with them, is cut in a roughly oval shape, approximately following the contour of the statue; this oval was probably originally sunk in a square plinth, according to a common practice in Greek work. It is now surrounded by a kind of marble 'collar' with a debased moulding on its outside, and cut away flat at the back. Round the edge of the top surface of the original basis is an inscription, cut in very shallow and narrow lines, and now partially defaced—

P. (Maxim)ina Senthii Clementis

It is impossible, in view of the style of the statue, to suppose that this inscription has anything to do with its first erection. It is evidently an example of the appropriation in Roman times of an earlier statue for a new purpose. This custom is familiar enough, especially in Cicero's stricture 'od falsus inscriptiones statuarum alienarum.' 10 Examples of it are already known from the Ceramicus at Athens, as well as in the fifth-century relief from Theopseis inscribed in Roman times with the inscription 'Apyaioi, xaipe.' 11 It seems probable, however, that Maximina, or her survivors, did not merely alter the inscription, but carried the statue away bodily and had it set up in Italy; or it may have been part of a consignment of statues carried off from Greece and sold for fresh use in Italian markets. In its new function it seems to have been set up against a wall, in such a position that it would only be seen from the front. It is possible that a certain amount of restoration may have taken place at the time of this second use. There is no evidence as to the place where the statue was originally set up; but style and subject alike suggest the Athenian Ceramicus.

It is now necessary to consider how far the statue as we now have it is identical with that originally set up in Greece; and circumstances make this investigation peculiarly difficult in the present instance. Recent weathering has made it impossible, from a mere examination of the surface, to distinguish modern restorations or insertions from ancient ones; and the double use of the statue in ancient times also offers alternative possibilities as to the date of different portions. In the first place, the head is not only made in a separate piece from the body, but is also in a different marble, of coarser grain; in all probability it is Parian, while the body is Pentelic. There are also a good many repairs in different parts of the body, especially in the front of the breast and in the folds of the drapery; some of them are in finer, some in coarser grained marble; the veil at the back of the neck is a modern restoration in plaster. The left hand is also a restoration, and a rather clumsy one; it is too large, and spoils the effect of the outline from several points of view. This hand is certainly not original, though it is difficult to say whether it belongs to the Roman or the modern restorer. As
to the patches on the body and drapery, it is more difficult to judge. Some of them, which are of the same marble as the body, may even have made some flaws in the marble in the original finishing. What interests us most, however, is clearly the head. From the style it is evident that the head is ancient, not a modern restoration; and its harmony in character with the body, as well as such details as the lines of the veil, shows that it cannot be an ancient head of independent origin. It might, indeed, be a part of another almost exactly similar statue in different material, fitted in either by the Roman or the modern restorer; another possibility that must be considered is that the original head may have been damaged, and have been replaced by a copy in Parian marble by the Roman restorer. The state of the surface makes it very difficult to judge whether this last is the true explanation; but there is certainly nothing now visible in the workmanship to compel us to accept it. There is nothing unusual in the head of an Attic statue being made of a different piece of marble from the body. It is not so common for the head to be of Parian while the body is Pentelic. But the superior quality of the Parian for rendering the texture of the flesh was recognised even by Attic artists—Praxiteles among them. And of the use of the superior material for the head alone a familiar example may be seen in the Demeter of Cnidus.

If then we find that the head and the body appear to combine in a harmonious effect, and that there are no technical reasons against their association as parts of the same original statue, we need not hesitate to consider them together. The head is covered at the back by the portion of the cloak drawn over to form a veil; the hair is also bound above the forehead by a broad fillet or a σφενδόμη, which spreads in the middle, and has the hair drawn over it in wavy curls at the sides. The nose and lips are inserted in what seems to be the same marble as the rest of the head; its texture is certainly similar; but they probably date from the Roman restoration, if not more modern. The weathering of the lips, since this restoration, has exaggerated the opening of the mouth, so as to give a somewhat vacant expression. The shape of the face, the simple and broad modelling, the treatment of the eyes, just sufficiently shadowed by the brow but not sunk deep below it to gain expression, the wavy hair, are all of them characteristic of Attic work of the age succeeding the sculptures of the Parthenon; they find their closest analogy in the heads on the best Attic tomb-stones, but are represented with more grace and delicacy of work, and with a more refined oval of the face than we usually find upon those monuments. The work is that prevalent in Athens before the influence of the great masters of the fourth century, Scopas and Praxiteles, was making itself felt. The expression of sorrowful contemplation is in a great degree due to the bent position of the head.

The treatment of figure and drapery is by no means inconsistent with that of the face. At first sight it may seem to show some later character-
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77 This was suggested to me in conversation by Mr. Cecil Smith; but he has not mentioned it in his article.
A STATUE FROM AN ATTIC TOMB

istics. Mr. Cecil Smith compares the drapery of the Antioch by Eutychides, and is therefore inclined to attribute the Trentham statue to the beginning of the third century. Like the Antioch, this figure certainly recalls the character and style of the Tanagra statuettes; but the resemblance may be otherwise explained. It is generally recognised that the Tanagra statuettes, with their graceful poses and subtle arrangements of drapery, are inspired by the art of Praxiteles, and that their prototypes may be seen in figures such as the Muses on the Mantinean basis. Now the Trentham statue has much in common with those Muses, and when we compare it with later variations on the same type, such as the Delian or the Herculanean ladies, its earlier and simpler character is at once obvious. Whether M. Salomon Reinach be right or not in associating this Herculanean type with Lysippus, it certainly represents a later elaboration, prevalent in the Hellenistic age, of a Praxitelean original. With all these indications to guide us, we may feel some confidence in attributing the Trentham statue to the earlier part of the fourth century rather than to its close, and the character of the head, as we have seen, clearly indicates the same date. The head is not Praxitelean, but pre-Praxitelean. Can we say the same of the drapery?

At the close of the fifth century we find two main tendencies in the Attic treatment of drapery. On the one hand there is the simple and severe style, based on the Phidian tradition, which is exemplified by the Eirene of Cephissodotus. The dress is treated in broad and simple folds, but the outline of one leg is usually seen through the drapery. On the other hand we have the delicate and somewhat affected style exemplified by the Aphrodite of Frejus (Venus Genetrix) and the Balustrade of the Victories, with its devices of drapery now clinging to the limbs as if damp, now sweeping away from them in tempestuous and often exaggerated folds. This last was frequently imitated in later times, notably in the neo-Attic reliefs, but we also see its influence in much work done by Attic artists or under Attic influence in the late fifth or early fourth centuries—for example, the sculptures by Timotheus at Epidaurus, or those of the Nereid monument in Lycia. When we turn from these two styles of drapery to that of the Trentham statue, we feel at once that we have before us a new and original treatment. The regular folds of the chiton,18 indeed, which show just above the feet, are not unlike those of the Phidian tradition, and the moulding of the left leg through the drapery also suggests a similar comparison, though the cloak obscures it. But the treatment of the cloak itself is characteristic. The roll into which the material is gathered round the shoulders and below the neck is not easy to parallel in earlier work; the upper edge of a cloak is more often turned over in a flat fold. A fairly near analogy may be seen in the way the upper edge of the drapery is made into a roll round the waist of the Aphrodite of Aries, and this certainly represents a Praxitelean type, even if we do

18 They are more regular than they appear in the photograph, many apparent breaks in the lines being due to damage of the surface.
not accept Furtwangler's identification of this figure as the portrait of Phryne. In the general scheme of the drapery we have nothing of the cross strain in two different directions, and the somewhat restless effect that marks the Lysippian or Hellenistic variations. In this respect, as in many others, it is nearer to the Mantinean Muses and to the Mourning Women of the sarcophagus from Sidon. But in the clear indication of the form of the right arm through the thin drapery we have a characteristic that we do not find in any of these figures. On the other hand, the way in which this effect is attained is totally different from what we see in the Baulustrade of the Victorines and in the other works that show the same influence. It does not cling, as if wet, all round the limb, and then float away from it in sweeping folds; but there is here the strictest moderation and harmony, above all the most exact observation of the nature of the stuff; there is nothing of the seeking after effect at the expense of truth. But while the drapery is in the best sense realistic and not conventional, it also avoids the accidental, and every detail is in harmony with the general scheme of the arrangement. Such a treatment at such a time, when other tendencies were paramount, seems to imply a high degree of originality, and may even incline us to attribute the statue to the hand of a master.

The question whether we can go further than this is a difficult one. If we turn to the literary evidence, suggestive comparisons occur readily enough. We have already noticed that Praxiteles is said to have made statues set up over tombs in the Attic Ceramicus; his Mourning Lady (flens matrona) must have been similar in subject and treatment to the Treanham statue, and we have already been led by a technical similarity to quote in comparison the statue identified by Furtwangler as the Phryne of Praxiteles—the triumphant courtesan (meretricia gaudens) which is quoted by Pliny as a counterpart to the 'Mourning Lady.' We must, however, remember that it is probable that other sculptors besides Praxiteles made such tomb-portraits: the fact is recorded of Sthennis, a contemporary of Lysippus. On the other hand, we do not know of any other Attic artist of the required date and tendencies to whom the Treanham statue may be assigned. In view of the fact that the face does not show any distinctively Praxitelean characteristics, it seems safer to assign the statue to some unknown master inheriting many of the same tendencies from which Praxiteles started, and a contemporary of that master during the earlier part of his career. If so, we must also admit some influence of this unknown sculptor on Praxiteles himself, as well as on the numerous statues and statuettes that are generally regarded as Praxitelean in type. It is hard to believe he was influenced by Praxiteles, since the head of his statue—assuming it to belong—is pre-Praxitelean in character.

If, then, our estimate of the position of the Treanham statue in the history of art be correct, it supplies us with valuable information as to the origin of a type that has been very popular in all later art, and that
has had a wide influence not only in Greece and Rome, but also in mediaeval sculpture.

It is needless to enumerate later variations upon the type. Several have already been mentioned; and the list, to be complete, would have to be a very long one, for the type became a favourite one in Hellenistic and Roman times for more or less idealised portraits. Examples from later art are quoted by Prof. Strzygowski in his article on the Cook Sarcophagus published in the last volume of this *Journal*, notably in connexion with the figure reproduced in Plate X., which he assigns to a Praxitelean origin. One example of the persistence of the type in mediaeval art must suffice, the two figures in the beautiful group of the Visitation of St. Elizabeth on the Cathedral at Rheims, a work of thirteenth-century sculpture. The figure of the Virgin in this group is a good example of the type which the Trentham statue shows us in its earliest form. It may not be easy to trace all the channels through which the influence has passed; but it would not be easy to find a clearer instance of that continuity of artistic development which may be traced through the finest sculpture of all ages.

E. A. GARDNER.
GRATEFUL as we must all be to Mr. Compton and Mr. Awdry for their
adventurous climb, which to my mind has finally settled the path that the
Messenians took to reach the foot of the gorge or gully, we have probably
been puzzled by some of their incidental remarks. I feel the less reluctance
in commenting on them that most of my criticisms would, by their kindness,
have been embodied in the article itself, had I not been absent in Greece at
the time it was being written.

In the first place what they call the 'notch' is what Dr. Grundy and I
both call the 'hollow.' The word hollow was kept by Messrs. Lindsay,
Boisquet, and Crowfoot, and there is no reason, I understand, for the
change except inadvertence. It is more serious, however, that the part
played by this hollow in the last struggle of the Spartans is misconceived.
On p. 277 of the article we read, 'the summit was gained behind the backs
of the Spartans; the Messenians when they appeared were above them.'
It was in the notch that the Messenians gathered their forces before they
ascended to the summit; and on p. 281, 'from the notch to the summit, as
has been shown, the final scramble of the Messenians would be accomplished
in a very few minutes; so that we may conclude that they were sighted on
the summit within one-and-a-half hour of the time when they offered to the
Athenian general the prospect of seeing the Spartans outflanked.' All this
assumes that to command the Spartan position it was necessary to get to the
summit, and that this summit could only be reached by such a climb as the
Messenians made along the cliff and up the gully. The Spartans are
imagined as facing west, and lining the walls of the παλαιος οχυρος numbered
AA, BB, in my original plan, while the Athenian forces face east. The
summit on such an hypothesis must have been some little distance from the
walls, as the narrative makes it clear that when they had reached it the
Messenians did not ποιο τάξοι come to close quarters with the Spartans.
Mr. Compton and Mr. Awdry have unfortunately not noticed my discussion
of the problem of the relation of the hollow to the summit, the discovery of
wall CC, and the photographs and plan of the fort with which Mr.

* J.H.S. xvi. pp. 274-78.
* E.g. 36. xvi. pp. 49, 60.
* J.H.S. xvi. p. 57.
* Thuc. iv. 36. 2.
Lindsay and Mr. Crowfoot supported my views. If the Spartans had only faced west and defended nothing but walls AA, BB, the Athenians would without a doubt have passed round north-east to the north end of the hollow, and scrambled up the summit, without waiting for the elaborate stratagem of the Messenian climb. There would have been nothing to prevent them. Once on the summit, too, there would have been no chance for delay or parley. They would have been right on the top of the Spartans, and must either have fought or retired. In point of fact the Spartans were defending wall CC, which run along the north of the hollow, as well as walls AA, BB; they faced north as well as west. The Athenians, as Thucydides says, could not surround them except by the plan the Messenians carried through. What, then, was the position that the Messenians won? It was not the summit at all. They never got to that. The position they won was the top of the gully itself. The part of the Spartan force that they primarily threatened was that defending wall CC, and the Athenians by whom they were sighted were those attacking that wall. They were still some way off, so that parley was possible. But they had complete control of the situation. One body of the Spartans was already surrounded from a point of vantage. If the attack were pressed home and this body were defeated, the Athenians would swarm up the hollow, mount the summit, and take in the rear the defenders of the western wall.

There is a further point in regard to the plan that Messrs. Compton and Awdry print on p. 276. While adopting my position as to the slope at the south-east corner of Pylos, where the Spartans intended to land and attack with engines, they have followed Dr. Grundy as to the main line of Demosthenes’ defence on the south side. Their hypothetical wall runs, as his did, from south-east to north-west, and leaves a considerable gap between it and the Sikia channel. As I have pointed out, this is against all the probabilities of the case. All along the shore of the Sikia channel Demosthenes must have built close to the water’s edge, where foundations of later walls still run to-day. He carried it inland only at the south-west corner, where it was impossible to build across the jagged rocks. This corner was where Brasidas tried to force a landing and Demosthenes led his men outside the wall. A glance at Mr. Lindsay’s photographs will drive my point home.

While on the subject of Dr. Grundy’s views, I should like to break a lance for him. In an incidental note to his Thucydides Mythistoricus, Mr. Cornford has inadvertently put forward as new the view that the two entrances to the harbour referred to by Thucydides are, first the Sikia
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Footnotes:
1 J.H.S. xvi. p. 61, and Plan p. 67; xvi. pp. 44-8, 330, and Plate VII. Fig. I. VIII. Fig. 4. C. Rev. xi. pp. 2-4.
2 Though the point does not come under discussion in the text of their Article.
3 J.H.S. xvi. p. 61.
5 C. Rev. xi. p. 3; J.H.S. xviii. p. 149.
6 J.H.S. xviii. Plate VIII. Figs. 1 and 5.
7 P. 28, n. 2.
PYLOS AND SPHACTERIA.

channel, and secondly the gap between the west end of the southern sandbar and the north-east corner of Sphacteria. This view, which makes the two channels really two ways of approach to an inner harbour, covering the area of the present lagoon, is not new at all. It is not unlike one that I discussed but rejected in my first article, and exactly the same as that which Dr. Grundy brought forward soon after the appearance of his first article. Further, in answer to my criticisms, Dr. Grundy used identically the same arguments in defence of it that Mr. Cornford does.

In conclusion, I should like to emphasize the fact that Mr. Compton and Mr. Awdry have made a real discovery. I have for a long time looked on any hypothesis that involved re-embarkation as a pis aller, and, when I was last at Pylos in 1905, tried myself to find a land route. None that I could see was more than barely possible, while that described by Mr. Compton and Mr. Awdry is convincing.

RONALD M. BURROWS.

---

12 First as an addendum to the special copies of his J.H.S. xvi. article, then in Ch. Rec. xi. pp. 188-9. For the sum of it, see his plan, J.H.S. xvi. Plate II, and p. 22.
18 Ch. Rec. xi. pp. 8, 9.
18 Ch. Rec. xi. p. 158. For my further answer see J.H.S. xviii. pp. 150-1.
19 Ch. Rec. xi. p. 2; J.H.S. xviii. p. 155.
LOST FRAGMENTS OF THE IPHIGENEIA GROUP AT COPENHAGEN.

In the Anteiger of the Arch. Jahrbuch, 1904, pp. 224 ff., the discovery and reconstruction of a life-size marble group, now in the Ny-Carlsberg Museum, is briefly reported: it is described as an original marble work, approximately contemporary with the Niobids, and representing Artemis substituting the hind for Iphigeneia.

The complete investigation and publication of this fine work have been up till now retarded by the disappearance of two important fragments, originally found with the rest at Rome in 1886, in the Gardens of Sallust, on the Spithoeve Estate. Towards the end of the last century these fell into the hands of Roman dealers, and in spite of much searching have not so far been rediscovered. They were, however, known from brief written memoranda (supplemented by oral statements), and in particular from a photograph taken by Herr Joseph Haas at the time of their discovery. This photograph is here reproduced. The circular altar with the figures of seasons which is so conspicuous thereon does not belong to the group, but was at one time in the hands of a dealer at Florence. On this altar may be seen, besides other fragments of the group, found therewith or rescued from dealers' hands, the right foot of the Artemis, in high hunting-boot with crossed straps; below the thick sole are remains of the plinth. The heel is evidently raised, and the motive of the foot is therefore similar to that of the Diana of Versailles, a figure of the same proportions.

Even more important for the reconstruction is the large fragment in the lower left-hand corner, of which only half is visible in the photograph. It represents the back part of the hind, slightly under life-size. The letter α marks the broad flap-like tail (compare the animal in the Versailles group); δ, the broken right hind thigh. The rest of the hind-legs, one fore-leg, as well as the neck, head, and rump, are mostly preserved, the hide being admirably reproduced by means of fine chiselling.

The heads of Artemis and Iphigeneia do not appear ever to have come to light; nevertheless they may have been concealed by the workmen at the time of the original excavation. Of the former, the knot of hair, resembling that of the Versailles statues, and the ends of the fringed diadem have been preserved; of the Iphigeneia, the lower lip of the half-opened mouth.

The object of this preliminary publication is to draw the attention of archaeologists to the missing fragments, with a view to a complete restoration.
If anyone should meet with the least trace of these fragments, he is earnestly requested to communicate at once with the undersigned, who is undertaking the reconstruction and publication of this masterpiece, in conjunction with the founder and head of the Ny-Carlsberg Museum, Dr. Karl Jacobsen.

F. STUDNIEZKA.

[The above is a free translation of a note by Prof. Studnieszka in the Archäologischer Anzeiger for 1907, which we insert at his request, together with a reproduction of the photograph for which he has kindly supplied the cliché.—Ed.]
ARCHAEOLOGY IN GREECE—A CORRECTION

In my article on Archaeology in Greece (1906–1907), published in vol. xxvii. of this Journal, I inadvertently misrepresented Dr. Doerpfeld’s views on the relation of Geometric to Mycenaean objects in Greece, and as he has pointed this out to me, I am anxious to rectify the error as soon as possible. At the bottom of p. 295 I wrote that “few will follow him [Dr. Doerpfeld] in his revolutionary view that the “Geometric” finds at Olympia are pre- and not post-mycenaean.” This is not Dr. Doerpfeld’s view. He has kindly told me that he holds that the “Geometric” objects belong to a different sphere from the Mycenaean, and thus may be some older than, some contemporary with, and some later than, the Mycenaean period. If I had written that his view is that some of the “Geometric” finds at Olympia go back into the Mycenaean and even into the pre-mycenaean period, or had even written ‘some of the “Geometric” finds’ instead of ‘the “Geometric” finds’ in the sentence in question, I should have presented his theory correctly. I have to thank Dr. Doerpfeld for the kind way in which he privately pointed out this mistake, and am glad to have this opportunity to put the matter right.

I should also add that Zacharo, the site identified (p. 296) with the Homeric Pylos, is south and not north of Samikon.

R. M. Dawkins.
NOTICES OF BOOKS.


The interest and enthusiasm which these brilliant lectures aroused when delivered at Harvard and Columbia Universities will assuredly be felt by all who read them in book form. Mr. Murray, setting out from the axiom that the poetry of the nations represents gradually progressive ideas in social ethics, essays to show that, in this respect, the Homeric Epics contain ideas not only inconsistent with each other, but to some extent also inconsistent with the times to which they refer, and in which they must, in part at any rate, have come into being. From these considerations he deduces that many strata have been superimposed one on another in the text as we have it, the Iliad, in particular, having been a traditional book in the private possession of a certain school of bards, and having been altered and added to from time to time, as we know have been the case with similar heroic chronicles in many other literatures. The whole, he seems reason to think, was revised comparatively late, and greatly expurgated, but by no means perfectly welded or rendered flawless from a literary point of view. He shows successfully that many similes, for example, are not appropriate, as they stand, and many incidents are historically inconsistent. These represent different passages in the old traditional songs, too popular or too fine to be discarded by the later editor, and left standing for the edification of a generation which did not read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest, but got its Homer rapidly by oral recitation. The original large period which he thinks the lays, as first composed, reflected was the epoch of disintegration, subsequent to the collapse of Aegean civilisation. In this fell the disturbance of the Greek sea by a Semitic expansion, and the great Early Migrations of the Hellenes, during which old local associations went into the melting-pot with much traditional religion and morality.

The idea is, of course, not new, but Mr. Murray's method is largely so. He goes very far to convince his hearers that the Iliad is a 'traditional book,' and his final lecture on that subject is a most fascinating piece of reading. We may not always go all lengths with him; we may feel that the argument is often dangerously circular, especially where original characteristics of the poem are inferred from their absence in our present text; we may become uneasy conscious, as we proceed, that Mr. Murray's criterion of early, late, and revised passage is no more scientific than anyone else's; but, if anything, more subjective than ever: we may suspect a 'metrical' tendency in the author's mind, which leads him to favour the theory on which the ink has had least time to dry; but not only do we succumb to the spell of brilliant suggestion and brilliant style, but we feel for the first time that the Epics are being treated by a great scholar who is at the same time himself a poet, and we are only too ready to sit at his feet and learn all we may.


All scholars know what to expect in a new book of Dr. Verrall's upon Aeschylus. This edition of the Eumenides is quite up to the high standard of its predecessors, and shows
very much the same qualities, both for good and for evil. It is the work of a fine scholar, with an intimate and profound understanding of Greek tragedy. Every line of it is alive; no difficulty has been shirked either through mere deference to authority or through slackness of imagination. These qualities give it at once a high place, in many ways a unique place, among modern commentaries on the Greek classics. On the other hand, the reader will, unless he is in some special sense a disciple, find abundant points to disagree with in the book. On almost every page Dr. Verrall says things which the average scholar will think wrong; but his wrongness often teaches one more than the rightness of others.

He starts with an analysis of the story as it was before Aeschylus, and as Aeschylus transformed it in order to reach a satisfactory solution to the moral dilemma of the Choephoroi. The Delphi of Aeschylus is totally different from the real Delphi; the treatment of the Senenai or the Eumenides is obscure, but certainly in some way special; the moral problem receives a solution which must be the original work of Aeschylus, if only for its "profound unlikeeness" and immense superiority to the common religious products of the Greek mind. It is, according to Dr. Verrall, the mystic identity of Vengeance and Grace. It does not depend on the chance vote of the Areopagite jury; no vote of a jury can alter eternal laws. Still less is it dependent on Apollo's famous physiological argument in defence of Orestes, that the child receives life only from the father, or with Athena's pronouncement that she is "thoroughly on the father's side," or with the various considerations of expediency that are allowed to affect the court. In fact, it is not really the verdict that matters, but what matters is the conciliation of the powers of Vengeance, and their transformation into powers of Grace. How this is effected must be in the nature of the case a mystery; nothing in the words of the play seems to Dr. Verrall to explain it. He believes that at a certain point, just after v. 887, Athena's voice seems to be heard. She is communing with the Furies in silence. During this silence they become calm and show a great awe of her. The mysterious word has been spoken! This explanation is very interesting and deserves consideration; but the present writer must confess that to him it is incredible. He thinks not only that the stage-craft implied is of an unexampled sort, but also that Dr. Verrall err by raising metaphysical subtleties which were not present in the mind of the poet; and that altogether there is more of primitive pre-Hellenic tradition in the Eumenides than the editor quite likes to admit.

The treatment of the text also is in detail unconvincing, but again very instructive. As usual, Dr. Verrall rejects wholesale the critical work of the many generations of scholars who have studied Aeschylus, the "universally accepted conjectures," the vulgar text which imposes upon us as if it possessed authority. This is a useful process. Then, when he has got rid of all the superstructure of modern emendation, he proceeds to use his manuscript—practically he considers only the Medicean—in his own way. He employs all his immense ingenuity to extract sense out of passages that seem corrupt; he sometimes takes refuge in what seems to us the fallacious argument, that a given form "cannot be demonstrated to be impossible." Scarcely any conceivable form ever could. The editor's task is to choose what is most probable among many uncertainties. Again, we cannot help thinking that in handling his MS. he ought to allow more for errors of mere chance. It is not in the least true that all errors in MSS.—or in anything else—can be deduced from specific processes of misunderstanding. Dr. Verrall concisely of the scribes as persons who never modeled, however much they might misinterpret through conclusions stupidly. This is the impression left on one from reading articles on textual criticism, where the most interesting emendations are collected; but it is not the impression left by MSS. themselves. The result in the present case is a text which perhaps does more to advance our knowledge and to make us think than any text since Kirchhoff's, but which in itself probably contains more wrong readings than the average.

It is interesting to compare this edition with that of the same play by Blans, published after that great scholar's death in 1907. It contains text, complete scholia, critical notes, and a full and detailed commentary at the end of the book. Blans, though on
the whole conservative in his treatment of the text, probably accepts fully five conjectures where Dr. Verrall accepts one. His immense learning, aided by his general common-sense, makes the notes exceedingly valuable, and we think that in many cases Bliss successfully explains a received view which Dr. Verrall treats as impossible. But it is striking to notice, not how much the two editors differ in their explanations, but what different problems they select to explain. Most of the large questions treated by Verrall are hardly noticed by Bliss, whereas there is in Bliss a constant stream of close linguistic comment and of critical illustration which finds no place in Verrall. It is seldom indeed in the history of scholarship that two editions of a classical text so different and both so brilliant can have appeared at the same time.

The Riddle of the Bacchae, the last stage of Euripides' Religious Views.

This clever but, in our judgement, wrongheaded book applies to the Bacchae the methods and theories of Dr. Verrall. Euripides is a sceptic forced by the conditions of his art to perform at a sacred festival; that is, as it were, in Church. (A good instance, this, of confusion between ancient and extremely modern conceptions of Religion.) He conceals his scepticism from the public, but to the elect his plays are meant to be not so much plays as philosophic dissertations, in the spirit of Eleusinerae, on the origin of religious belief. In the Bacchae his point is to show how the belief in Dionysus as a god may have arisen, without of course admitting my miraculous element. Dionysus in the Bacchae is so revolting a character that he cannot be divine; he must be human. (Other students of ancient religion would perhaps make the 'must' and the 'cannot' change places.) His divine power purported to be shown by the earthquake which wrecked the palace; but since no one but Dionysus himself and his worshippers, all of them interested parties, say that the palace is wrecked, and the Second Messenger for instance makes no remark upon it, it must be assumed that the Palace was not wrecked at all. It was a delusion: a delusion into which Dionysus hypnotized the hysterical Asiatic women. Dionysus, when analysed, proves to be no god, but a professional 'medium' from Asia Minor, morbidly ambitious, daring, and cowardly. Pentheus is a just and patriotic prince, and—most readers will be surprised to hear—has much the best of it in his discussions with the medium. Tiresias is a mischievous old medicine-man who has been bribed by the medium. Every miraculous element in the play is then taken separately and explained away; some are not miraculous at all, some are only reported by insane or credulous people.

The main theory seems to us not merely wrong, but utterly disastrous to any adequate appreciation of the wonderful beauty of this play. Sympathetic imagination, not the science of a cross-examiner, is the quality which Euripides chiefly needs in his readers; happily he now often receives it. But as an application of the Verrallian method to a new object the book is of value. It is well and vigorously written; it makes an attempt, not in our judgement a successful one, but still an attempt, to find a parallel to Euripides' supposed method of work in Marlowe's Jew of Malta; and much of the detail shows close observation and good scholarship.


Prof. Hauvette prints no text of Callimaque; his work is therefore to be regarded as a companion to, and commentary on, the recent edition by Wilamowitz, to which frequent reference is made. He defends the authenticity of the epigrams, classifies them by subjects,
translates, and explains them. Some of the explanations will appear to many readers as forced and improbable, but in general this pamphlet will be found a useful aid to the comprehension of poems which stand in considerable need of commentary.


Mr. Headlam’s volume may be cordially recommended to all scholars. It contains a preface on the art of translation, translations to and from Greek verse, and a few notes. The versions in both kinds are often quite admirable, and give Mr. Headlam a place in the same class as Sir R. Jebb and Mr. Gilbert Murray. The translations from Sappho are not, indeed, wholly satisfactory, but the Dausé-fragment of Simondes is perfect, and so are several of the smaller pieces; and the longer passages (the choruses from the Suppliants and Eschylus, the Aigis of Sophocles, and the Phaiakaira and edicula of Theocritus) are excellent. The translations into Greek also rank with the best of their kind; notably the version of Hugo’s Georgica in Theocritus verse. It is a book written by a scholar for scholars, with that taste for great literature which is the fine flower of scholarship.


The recovery of some 1300 lines of Menander must rank as unquestionably the most important event in the history of Greek literature since the reappearance of Bacchylides. If a complete play had been found, it might easily have taken the first place among all the discoveries of the present generation. Unfortunately the leaves of the papyrus codex obtained by M. Lefebvre at Kôm Iškân, in Upper Egypt, are divided between four plays. The play best represented is the Eretéρeωs, of which about half (530 lines) is preserved; in addition there are the prologue and 50 lines of the Ἕρα, about 320 lines of the Ἐρατηρεως, and about 340 of the Σιβυ, besides a few detached fragments. The identification of the first and last of these three is not certain, but appears highly probable. Much of the Ἐρατηρεως is seriously and often hopelessly mutilated; but where the papyrus (the age of which remains uncertain until a facsimile is published) is intact, it appears to be easily legible. M. Lefebvre’s edition (in which he has had considerable assistance from M. Maurice Croiset) appeared within two and a half years of the date of his original discovery, and for this promptitude (in the circumstances of the case) scholars are greatly indebted to him. It contains a transcript, restored text, translation, and brief introductions and notes. The difficulty of preparing it in Egypt, at a distance from libraries, and in the midst of official work, must have been great; and in consequence many defects are left which a more careful revision would have removed. Several obvious emendations or supplements are overlooked; and not a few lines have been left with defective metra. A second edition is promised, with a facsimile of the papyrus; and materials for the revision of the text have meanwhile been contributed by many scholars. The most noteworthy of these contributions are two articles by Wilamowitz in the Römische Berichte of the Berlin Academy and in the Neue Jahrb. für Alt., Bd. xxii, and a pamphlet by Mr. Walter Headlam (Restorations of Menander, Cambridge, 1908). In particular, it has been shown by Wilamowitz and Legrand that the leaves containing II. 342–486 of the Σιβυ as published in the edite princeps really belong to the Ἐρατηρεως. It may be added that the more complete portions of the Eretéρeωs and the Σιβυ (about 550 lines in all) have already been reprinted in a very neat little edition by MM. Bodin and Maze (Paris: Hachette, 1908), with brief notes.
More important, however, than the details of textual criticism is the question as to the general literary quality of the recovered comedies. They suffer, no doubt, from their mutilation, but wherever a complete scene is preserved (and notably in the *Eumenes*) it is bright, lively, and natural. The action moves briskly, and the characters are alive. The plots are unpleasing and show little variation in theme, and the verbal wit is not especially striking; but it is easy to imagine that the plays would be amusing and effective on the stage. They have a life and spirit which their Roman imitators too often fail to reproduce; and they are not so sentimentally as the extant quotations might lead one to expect. In short, though we are still without sufficient materials for a full and fair estimate of Menander, the recovered fragments are not unworthy of his reputation.


The fifth volume of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* puts all its predecessors into the shade. It contains only five texts, but of these, two are new classical works of considerable size and interest, two are unusually long MSS. of known works, and one is theological. The last, a single vellum leaf (fourth or fifth century) from an apocryphal Gospel, may be left to theologians. The two known classical works are the *Symposium* of Plato and the *Panegyricus of Isocrates*, of each of which approximately half is preserved in papyrus rolls of about the second century. The text in both cases is eclectic, as usual in papyri. The Plato MS. rarely supports the inferior MSS. or modern conjectures, but it oscillates between the better MSS. and has a few good readings peculiar to itself. The Isocrates MS., like the British Museum and Marseilles papyrus of the same author, agrees with the Urbinas often more than with the vulgate, but not by any means invariably, and its peculiar readings do not command respect.

Of the new texts, the first consists of portions of nine Panes of Pindar, written in two hands on the nerve of a roll which is assigned to about the end of the first century. None is perfect; but about 60 lines of the second paeon, 33 of the fourth, 13 of the fifth, 30 of the sixth, 13 of the eighth, and 30 of the ninth, are either complete or can be approximately restored. In general character they resemble the epinician odes, and contain some striking passages; but no doubt their mutilation detracts from their effect. Prof. Bliss and Prof. Furtwängler have made contributions towards the restoration of the text. The second discovery is a historical work, comprising 21 broad columns (some imperfect) written on a nerve of a land-register of the second century. The editors have succeeded in combining the remains into four groups, the relative order of which is somewhat imperfect. If the order finally adopted by them is correct, the events recorded belong to the years 306-5 B.C.; if the alternative (for which there are considerable external grounds) is correct, the whole falls into the year 396. The principal contents are an account of the anti-Spartan feeling in various states of Greece, the naval campaigns of Conon, the operations of Aegaeus, and the Boeotio-Phocian war (including a valuable description of the Boeotian federal council). There are marked divergences from Xenophon. The style is very plain and undistinguished, and the tone impartial. Internal evidence shows that it was written between 387 and 346, and perhaps as a continuation of Thucydides; but the identity of the author is very uncertain. Three claimants are considered by the editors—Ephorus, Theopompus, and Cratippus. Bliss was in favour of the last; and Furtwängler is disposed to agree with him; but so little is known of Cratippus that scarcely any positive argument in his favour is possible. Meyer and Wilamowitz argue for Theopompus, and the editors, after a very clear and impartial statement of the arguments on either side, cast their vote with them. The main difficulty in this identification is the style of the new writer, which is totally unlike all that we know of Theopompus. Since the publication of the volume, Prof. De Sanctis of Turin, after adding several strong arguments against Theopompus, has proposed to identify the work with the *Arca* of Androtion; but here again
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Positive grounds of identification are scanty. Probably the question will have to stand over until further discoveries have been made. Meanwhile the whole volume is admirably edited, as usual, and specimen facsimiles are given of each MS.


This small but handsomely printed fasciculus is the first-fruit of the Institut Papyrologique de l'Université de Lille, founded and directed by M. Jouguet. It contains seven non-literary documents, with introductions and commentary; after the manner now usual except at Berlin. Their interest is mainly for specialists, but for them the first text in particular is of some importance. It is a description (with plan) of a plot of ground with its irrigation canals, and incidentally it solves a problem in metrology which has been a puzzle since the first publication of the Petrie Papyri, namely the dimensions of the sekos, a measure of capacity used especially for measuring excavations of soil. It is now shown to be the cube of two royal cubits. The other texts (all of which belong to the third century B.C.) include a fragment of a land-survey, some letters of a man named绑约�, correspondence relating to escape, or military settlers (giving useful evidence as to the conditions under which the allotment might pass from father to son), orders for advances of seed-corn, and petitions of various kinds. It is to be hoped that the Lille Institut will shortly be able to complete the volume of which this is the first part, and supply it with facsimiles and indices.


We notice these as the first two parts of what it is hoped will be a complete translation of the extant works of Aristotle. The undertaking is the outcome of the desire of the late Dr. Jouguet, that the proceeds from the sale of his works should be used to promote the study of Greek Literature, especially by the publication of new translations and editions of Greek authors, and that the translation of Aristotle should be proceeded with as speedily as possible. The editors would be glad to hear of scholars who are willing to cooperate. The Organon, Physics, De Caelo, De Anima, Historia Animalium, De Anima Animae Generationes, Metaphysics, Ethica Nicomachea, Rhetoric, and Poetics have already been arranged for.


Dr. Mosso's book is a translation of a description of the Cretan discoveries which is 'charity' enough, and occasionally slightly amusing, but is not a contribution to scientific literature. Although from his own account Dr. Mosso would appear to have taken a considerable part in Dr. Pernier's excavations of 1906, he makes no claim to be a Fachmann. Only in the last chapter does he definitely speak of the conclusions to which I have come on the subject of the racial affinities of the Mycenaeans, and evidently regards these conclusions as original. As a matter of fact, however, these opinions, whether they are right or
wrong have always been in the air, and were first put forward in a systematic theory by another writer some seven years ago. Since then all archaeologists have been thoroughly familiar with the ideas which Dr. Meso apparently considers to be novel.

Dr. Meso is apt to let his pen run away with him, especially when he is discussing the appearance and costume of the Minoan ladies, to whom he constantly returns with gallant but wearisome iteration. Speculations as to Minoan cookery also interest him mightily.

The best thing about the book is the illustrations, which are chiefly good and include numerous photographs, some of which have not yet been published in England, notably the Agla Triads vase shewing a king receiving a warrior, or sending him forth to war. The worst thing about the book is its price. A guinea, even for these good photographs, is a heavy price to pay.

Prof. Burrow's book has been reprinted, with additions. It is evident that its low price has in great measure atoned for the lack of sufficient illustrations. We are glad that it has been so successful, as there is no doubt that it has supplied the want, much felt among university men, schoolmasters, and the large body of those who are interested in Greek antiquity, of a succinct and critical description of the results of the archaeological work in Crete, which should not be written by one of the actual discoverers, nor by a mere summarizer of their views, like Père Lagrange. Others have thought of supplying this want, but had preferred to wait till yet more was known and Mr. Evans had published his results in prose, but Prof. Burrow has thought it best to step in and publish his book now, with results that are encouraging to those who believe in the paramount importance of the work of investigating the older culture of Greece. After all, there is something live and young about 'Minoan' study, which, properly advertised, would interest far wider circles than do the discussions of later Greek sculpture and vase-painting, of which 'classical' archaeology seems chiefly to consist. This advertisement has been given by Prof. Burrow; his book is a cheap poster which has attracted attention, and has probably determined the course of a certain number of guineas into the unhappy noses too well filled offertory-bag of the Cretan Exploration Fund.

Of the general trend of Prof. Burrow's criticism we have not space to say more than that it is eminently sensible, and quite free from the so-called 'criticism' of those dull souls who cannot see that only men with some power of imagination could have understood the significance of what they were finding at Troy, at Mycenae, at Knossos, or at Phaestos. By imagination is not meant invention, but the power of visualizing the ancient civilization under investigation as it probably was, which a trained sense of the probable and improbable gives; it is the greatest gift of an archaeologist, without which he is only fit to keep the records and compile the indices of those who have it. A good point of Mr. Burrow's book, which might well be imitated by other writers, is his full recognition of the part which Egyptianological knowledge must play in the work of recovering the lost history of Herod's Greece. Indifference to the Oriental sources of knowledge, and ignorance of their importance, are still displayed by far too many classical scholars, so that Prof. Burrow's complete discussion of the views of the Egyptologists may open the eyes of some. Perhaps, as when in the last allusions (Oct. 1897) he discusses the sex of the body found in the tomb of Queen Ti, or the possible identification of the Exodites with the Expulsion of the Hyksos, he sometimes is too Egyptological, and strays beyond the bounds of his subject; but it is such a novel sensation to find any Greek archaeologist or Mr. Arthur Evans able to be interested in Egypt and what Egypt can tell him, that we can forgive this little fault. Prof. Burrow's discussion of Egyptian dates is extremely good, and should be read with attention. He points out that the Egyptologists are practically all agreed on the date of the Eighteenth Dynasty, contemporary with the Cretan Great Palace Period; the discrepancies begin only with the Twelfth Dynasty. And here there are many signs that the low date of Prof. Eduard Meyer and the German scholars will prevail, and that Prof. Petrie will have to abandon the very high dates lately put forward by him.

The Eastern evidence must be studied by the investigator of prehistoric Greece, which
was an Oriental land as it is again to-day. As Prof. Burrows writes on p. 135: "We are so accustomed to thinking of Classical Greece as the bulwark of the West against the East, that we forget that this attitude of imperviousness is only a short chapter of history. The political aggression of Persia meant that for the 180 years during which our attention is most concentrated on the Greek World it is the frontier fortress of Europe, resisting and not receiving. That all this was changed by the conquests of Alexander is accepted as a commonplace. Greece did not so much give to Europe a Semitic religion, as help the Semites to create one; and the Roman-Greek Empire was a good half Oriental. It is our classical prejudices that hinder us from accepting as true for before Marathon what we do not shrink from after Arbela." And we have not yet altogether abandoned the 'Aryan' superstitions of the days of Max Müller, Gladstone, and Cox, when everything that was not virtuously Aryan was wickedly Phoenician and Semitic. Nowadays between the upper and lower claims of Mediterraneans and Semitieans to have fathered their civilization, the Semites seem in danger of being abolished altogether! When we say that Minoan culture was Oriental, it is not meant that it was Semitic. Even the 'Canaanite' type of religion is Mediterraneans, not Semitic, in origin.

Another good point of Prof. Burrows's book is his discussion of the northern evidence, from Russia and Soria, which is also extremely important as showing the far northern extension of the Aegaean culture from its Mediterranean starting-point. Prof. Burrows accepts this, the usual view at the present time. His criticism of the theories of Northern origin, and also of Prof. Doorly's Carian theory, are very useful. As in Père Lagrange's book, the references and notes are very full and good. Both those books differ from Dr. Mossé's in being scientific works, but Prof. Burrows's is of course far superior to that of Père Lagrange, in that it is critical and original in treatment. We only deplore the lack of illustrations, which, we suppose, were impossible at the price.

Père Lagrange's little book on ancient Cret was published after Dr. Mossé's, so that he is able to utilize some of the latter's conclusions in his final chapter. "Les Origines." His book is a useful summary of the results of the excavations in Crete, which has this one advantage over Prof. Burrows's similar work, that it is well illustrated, though some of the drawings by Père Vincent are rather crude; the coloured reproduction of the 'Cupbearer,' which acts as frontispiece, is frankly hideous in colour, and not at all 'like.' To French readers Père Lagrange's book will be of great value, as giving them an idea of what has been done in Crete during the last ten years.

Necessarily there is not much that is original, strictly speaking, in the book; and in the one case in which the author does broach a new and original theory, we fear it is one that will not hold water, as when he compares Minoan with Proto-Elamite antiquities, and dreams of a possible Elamite conquest of Crete before 2000 B.C., or at least of a racial connexion between Elam and the Aegaeans (pp. 87, 111). On this point the author does not seem to have revised his work very carefully; this idea contradicts other passages in which we are given the usual theory of the non-Aryan Mediterranean character of the Minoans. If they were Mediterraneans, who probably came originally from Africa, they can hardly have been Elamites.

It may be that Père Lagrange thinks the Mediterranean were nearer akin to the Indo-Europeans than they really were, but the pro-Aryan prejudice is one not easily shaken off. He emphasizes the European character of Cretan art and culture, and (up to a certain point) quite correctly; but European does not mean 'Indo-European,' and for the Minoans means in reality only 'Greek': Europe was not invented in their day, and, while themselves the originators of Greek ('European') civilization, they are, according to the usual theory to which we have already referred, probably to be traced to Africa.

In dealing with art and religion Père Lagrange's work is succinct, well argued, and often suggestive. But we doubt not that he much exaggerates the supposed symbolism of Mycenaean art, even going so far on p. 108 as to give a qualified adhesion to the fantastic ideas of Homers and his 'Théogories de la Grèce à Mycènes.'

The author shows a little and rather dangerous acquaintance with Egyptian lore. We marvel at his serious quotations of the Napoleonie 'Description de l'Egypt,' as a scientific
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authority, and still more at his reproduction of one of its pictures (p. 91) which shows a late, stylized, and mongrel headdress of a goddess, with three hawks above it, of absolutely no archaeological authority, and with no possible applicability to the author’s argument.

To English readers the book will be of use as giving more illustrations of the Italian results in an accessible form. The delay of the Italians in publication is regrettable, and they cannot be surprised when one of their own countrymen (Dr. Moses) anticipates them in publishing the “King and Warrior” vase from Agia Triada, and Pérez L Lagrange in giving a sketch of the famous sarcophagus from the same place (p. 81). It is very regrettable that Prof. Burrows could not obtain leave to publish the vase, if Dr. Moses was able to do so.


This book represents the principal life’s work of the late professor T. D. Seymour of Yale. In a long introduction he takes note of the Homeric Question in all its bearings; literary, philological, and archaeological, but decides that, for the purpose which he has in view in the text, he must treat the Iliad as whole, and indivisible. This is reasonable, since “Homer,” as it is put now into the hands of students at universities and schools, is a fixed text-book, and a Companion to Homer must take account of the whole text as receptus. He then proceeds to coordinate and set out all the information to be derived thence as to the contemporary life, with comments drawn from Mycenaean discoveries. So far as Homer goes, this book supplies an extraordinarily full and complete concordance, and the archaeological material is brought into play wherever it is in any way appropriate; but the latter is regarded in an uncritical spirit and without much distinction into locality or epoch. In fact, even as “Mycenaean” seems to be accepted as an adequate designation for all the Aegean remains, so all these are spoken of as though products of one homogeneous period. The value of this volume, therefore, lies rather in its purely textual reference, in its collection of all passages bearing on such subjects as the Homeric State, Dress, House, Food, Property, Slavery, Trade, Crafts, Sea-faring, Agriculture, Fauna, Gods, Religion, and War. The book may be summed up as the latest and best example of a rapidly disappearing class of Homeric commentary.


This edition is enlarged by the addition of about 60 pages of text and 75 new illustrations, the most important additions being a description of the Cretan palaces, and a new restoration, by the author, of the great vaulted tomb at Mycenae. What is even more satisfactory is the careful revision which has corrected almost all the errors of detail that impaired the value of the first edition. In its new form the book can be recommended without reserve. The new illustrations are also most valuable.


On such a theme as this it might well seem that there was nothing new to be said; but Professor Petersen, by a careful discussion of all the evidence, has reached some new results which will have to be considered in all future works on the subject, though some
are uncertain and few are likely to be undisputed. He maintains that the earliest temple consisted of a double shrine on the site of the present Erechtheum; and that the representation of this shrine formed part of the same pediment as the group of gods with the apotheosis of Hercules. He regards the earliest worship of Athens as antiqmv, superseded under Homeric influence first by the standing image with brandished spear, which later came to be regarded as primitive, and later by the seated type originated by Poseidon. Further discussion of the nature and affinities of Erechtheus associates him with his shrines with a potev and hall in the roof above it marking the falling of a thunderbolt. Finally we have a discussion of the Erechtheum itself, and the contents and relations of its various parts; and here also new light is thrown on well-known difficulties.


This pamphlet is an architect's study of the fragments in the British Museum, derived from Wood's excavation of the temple site at Ephesus. The early temple is lightly dealt with, since the evidence of the new excavations was not available. In the discussion of the Hellenistic temple the author dissents from Mr. Murray's well-known arrangement, which made the square sculptured piers to make bases for the sculptured drums, rising from the staircase, and having their upper surface level with the stylobate. Mr. Lethaby makes the piers, the drums, and the Ionic bases serve as corresponding members of the first, second, and subsequent rows of columns, as counted from the end. The stone beneath the base in the British Museum, which Murray regarded as part of the stylobate, is used here as a plinth, similar plinths being postulated under each of the three forms of base.

Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek. Billedtavler til Kataloget over Antike Kunstværker. 73 Plates. Copenhagen, 1907.

Likewise Ameling's Vatican Catalogue, the present work is an attempt to illustrate an entire collection by photographic methods. It consists of about 850 admirably executed half-tone blocks, printed on 73 plates. The letterpress consists only of number, title, and dimensions under each subject. An inscription announces that the work was published on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Museum, Nov. 3, 1907. Its seventy-three plates give an impressive idea of the growth of the collection during the comparatively brief period of its existence.


The Danish painter Skovgaard published in 1905 a discussion of the arrangement of the western pediment of the Temple of Zeus at Olympia. He based himself on the last-issued restoration of Prof. Treu (submitted as a loose leaf to the forty-fourth congress of Philologists at Dresden), but proposed the transposition of the two groups of combatants on each side of the central trio. Instead of Treu's order (Ε-Ρ) of Skovgaard status ΕΠΟΚΛΔΜΑΣΣΩΡ. In the present paper Treu proves, by actual experiments made within the pediment frame at Dresden, that Skovgaard’s scheme is inadmissible.

M. Collignon has made a study, with characteristic delicacy and subtlety of criticism, of the sculptors of the first three quarters of the fourth century B.C. After discussion of the period of transition from Phidias to Scopas, two chapters are devoted to Scopas and his works; two chapters to Praxitèles. A chapter is given to the contemporaries of Scopas whose names are known to us, especially to the artists of the Mausoleum. Another chapter describes some of the extant works, such as the Demeter of Umlas, that appear to belong to the period. The book is completed with a notice of decorative work done at Athens during the fourth century, and a running-up of the whole character of the sculpture of the time. It is supplied with a chronological table, a sufficient bibliography, and an index, and is adequately illustrated.


The author starts with the psychological thesis that the primitive artist does not consciously copy natural objects. He seeks rather to express the generalized mental image which he retains of an object. This image will always be the one which shows the form with the property that differentiates it from other forms, makes it thereby most easily distinguishable, and presents it in the greatest clearness and completeness of its constituent parts. Accordingly, it will usually be coincident with the form’s greatest expansion—e.g. that of a quadruped will be a side view. The essay examines how far this fact conditions the earliest forms of art, and how far its effects can be traced, even in works comparatively advanced, long after the period when the introduction of foreshortening and perspective proves conscious reproduction of observed objects.


Louis Vulliany (1790–1871) made a tour in the Mediterranean countries in 1818–21 as a travelling student of the Royal Academy. He published in 1825 his Examples of Ornamental Sculpture in Architecture, as a folio work, with copper engravings by Henry Moses, of admirable draughtsmanship. A selection of twenty of the original copper plates has now been reissued, with the necessary commentary by Mr. Pierre-Spier. The ornaments chosen for illustration are mainly variations of the palmette, and the acanthus.


In this new edition a thorough revision has been necessitated by the appearance of many important contributions to our knowledge of the subject, notably Dörpfeld and Reich’s Griechisches Theater and Furtwängler’s Griechische Bühne. These and other recent literature have evidently been carefully considered by Mr. Pickard-Cambridge, and have led to considerable additions and modifications; but it is to be noted that the editor finds himself able, after weighing them all, to retain Haigh’s theory of a low stage in the fifth century. As to more obscure technical details, such as the probable restoration of the Lycurgan
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stage, it is still necessary to go to other books, especially the two just cited. A summary of the arguments of Dorpfeld and Puchstein on some of these matters would have been welcome, and also a larger number of plans.


The volume before us is the first published by the Società Italiana di Archeologia e Storia dell’ Arte, which was founded at the end of 1905.

The first half of it consists of interesting and important original articles by some of the most eminent of Italian archaeologists and art critics, among which may be specially mentioned that by Oref, on the (up till now) somewhat scanty traces of Mycenaean commerce in the pre-Hellenic cemeteries of Sicily; that of Comasotti upon an inscription from Cumae belonging to the fifth century B.C. and marking the burial-ground of the members of the Dionysiac siarse of the city, and noteworthy as being considerably the oldest inscription of the kind; that of Brixio, in which he maintains that the statue of a youth found in the ruins of the Villa of Nero at Subiaco, and now in the Museo della Terme, is a representation of one of the sons of Niobe; that of Nogara, in regard to the so-called Byblus of Tor Marancia—a painting which does not really belong to the series of Greek heroines at all, but was found near the Via Nomentana (cf. Papers of the British School at Rome, III. 89); that of Tosca on some bronze objects of the Lombard period (7th cent. a.D.) found in a tomb at Luco; that of Signorina Caccia on the last period of Gothic sculpture at Rome; that of Lanciani, who publishes various new documents relating to works of 16th century artists in Rome; and that of Ghislanzoni upon the original position of the decorative bronze heads (Herm, wolves, and Medusa) from the ship of the Lake of Nemi, in which he proves that they were arranged along the upper part of the hulls.

The rest of the volume is devoted to notices of recent excavations (Crete, Etruria, Rome—the former paper being by Pernice, and dealing in part with his own work at Phaestos and Prinià), a lengthy critical bibliography arranged by subjects (pp. 125–185), reviews of recent publications and paragraphs of news. The volume is well got up and freely illustrated, and the editor, Prof. Mariotti, and the society to which it is due may be congratulated upon making such a good beginning to what we may hope will be a long and useful series of publications.


M. Nicole has done a useful piece of work in devoting a well-illustrated monograph to the study of the artist Medias, whom, following M. Pottier, he regards rather as the master of an atelier than as the actual painter of the vase bearing his name, now in the British Museum. He collects all the vases which can be assigned to the school, including four unsigned hydriæ which may fairly be regarded as produced by Medias and his pupils. But the very late date which he assigns to this artist (the first half of the fourth century) seems somewhat open to question; Furtwängler places him about 420–409 B.C. A useful chapter is devoted to the discussion of points of style, and the writer sees in many details the influence of the sculptor Alcamenes.

This Catalogue differs in one important respect from any previously published by the authorities of the British Museum: it includes not only the Greek, Etruscan, and Roman finger rings which are to be found in the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities, but also those rings which, although Greek and Roman of the classical period, have, for various reasons, been placed in other departments of the Museum. The advantages of this new departure are obvious: it has enabled Mr. F. H. Marshall to deal with the subject as a whole, instead of omitting large groups of rings merely because they were found in Great Britain, in Egypt, or in Assyria. The resulting volume cannot fail to be of the greatest use, both to the student and to the collector, who will find in the fifty pages of introductory matter not only all that can be gleaned from ancient authors as to the use to which rings were put, the way they were worn, the people who were entitled to wear them, the materials of which they were made, etc., but also the results of Mr. Marshall's own study of these subjects.

One of the most valuable sections deals with the different types of rings in the collection, Egyptian, Mycenaean, Phoenician, Greek, Etruscan, Graeco-Roman, and Later Roman. The types are fully illustrated, and this section alone would make the volume indispensable to every collector, for it gives him in a small compass a vast amount of hitherto inaccessible information, and should save him from most of the expensive pitfalls which beset the path of the beginner. The Trustees would earn the gratitude of the educated public if they would reprint in pamphlet form not only the Introduction to this particular Catalogue, but those to many others. Much original work is lavished on them, but their existence is unknown except to the few who have professional occasion to consult the Catalogues of which they form part.

Turning to the Catalogue itself, we find that the rings are grouped under classes, in which they are arranged according to types, and as far as possible in chronological order. The first group contains gold rings with designs engraved on the gold, a series which starts from Egyptian and Mycenaean times, and ends with Late Roman work of the fifth century a.D.; the gold rings with designs in relief, begins with Ionian and Graeco-Etruscan work of the sixth and fifth centuries B.C.; it includes some fine Greek specimens, and ends with Late Roman rings, many of which have coins set in the bezel. These are invaluable as giving a terminus ante quem for the various shapes of hoop and bezel. The third group contains gold rings set with scarabs, engraved stones, paste, or cameos. The fourth includes all the rings, mostly of Roman date, in which the inscription forms the principal feature; these are of various kinds: some are addressed to the recipient, as Duca; others have the name of the giver, Saba; one of the owner, Sabinus; others are prophylactic, as, for instance, a Greek legend which contains the frequently found phrase "Sparta" (wrongly spelt) and the "Names of Power," Sabino; Ashdod, Michael. The rest of the gold rings fall into two groups, those with plain inset stones, and the plain gold rings. The classification is then repeated for rings of silver, bronze, iron, glass, stone and other materials, of which the collection contains 635 as against 1,000 of the more precious metal.

In addition to 160 illustrations in the text, there are 35 excellent plates reproducing the more important specimens described. The volume is completed by a bibliography of the subject, five full indexes of localities, subjects, inscriptions, materials, and the topics dealt with in the Introduction.


This paper, from a study of the inscriptions preserving the names of the priests of Asklepion, who were selected in the official order of their tribes (with certain exceptions which are
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explained by historical circumstances, establishes the dates of some inscriptions (such as J.C. ii. 235 and Add. 373 b) and of a number of arcades, chiefly of the third century. The breaks in the order of the tribes of the priests, as also of the prytany-secretaries, are satisfactorily explained.


This book is a collection of examples of spiral decoration, more especially as it occurs on columns, from the Minoan period to about 400 A.D. An appendix deals with some examples of a later date. The spiral has been supposed to have a religious significance, but M. Chapot, though admitting that this is true in the case of the Creto-Mycenean spiral column, rightly maintains that in most instances it is simply-decorative. The Greeks avoided this form of column as one which would appear to lack strength, and reserved the spiral decoration for small objects, notably their jewellery. The spiral column becomes exceedingly common under the Roman Empire. M. Chapot thinks that the type is indigenous in Italy, and not borrowed from the East; in this point, therefore, giving no support to Prof. Strzygowski's theory. The book would be more useful if it were furnished with an index.


This second edition of M. Collignon's well-known book appears just twenty-six years after the first, and in the interval many things have occurred which make it more than a mere revision. The results of recent excavations are naturally more strongly emphasized than usual, and the bibliographies have been brought up to date. But the old form has been kept throughout, and the book has not been greatly added to in size, notwithstanding the mass of new material and the increased number of illustrations. Attention may be called to the immense superiority of the photographic process, even if the blocks are not the best of their kind. Changes have of course been made in the treatment of the Mycenean period, but perhaps most progress has followed from the new light cast upon archaic sculpture by the excavations at Athens and Delphi; and in the whole subject of vase-painting. Apart from its value as a handbook, the new edition offers an instructive retrospect upon the work of the last generation.


Mr. Gomme has earned the gratitude of all archaeologists by the publication of this admirably and laboriously compiled volume. For the classical-archaeologist indeed its value may not be so great as for others, but it contains the articles in the Hellenic Journal down to 1890, as also those in the Numismatic Chronicle, Archaeologia, and other journals in which classical articles occasionally appear. The arrangement is exclusively alphabetical under authors, and we are glad to learn that the work will eventually be supplemented by a subject-index covering the same ground.
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This book is too well known to readers of the Journal of Hellenic Studies to need any but the briefest notice. The new edition is little modified, except by the alteration of a few statements that are obviously antiquated, and a few additions—partly in notes—to bring in more recent discoveries. As to details, it may be noted that the Dr. Reisch associated with Prof. Dörpfeld in his book on the theatre is not Dr. Emil Reisch, and that the workmen who restored the Daphne mosaics were not German but Venetian.


Mr. Marden’s book is an account of a busy summer, for the most part through the regions of Greece and the Aegean most accessible to the enterprising traveller. The writer makes no pretence of scholarship or literary finish and gives no information of value that cannot be obtained from ordinary sources.


This is the third edition of the “Eastern Mediterranean” guide. Half the volume is occupied by the section on Greece, where the main tourist-routes are described, and a further quarter is given up to Constantinople. New features are the brief descriptions of Selinum and Athens. Part I (Greece) has been revised by Mrs. Ernest Gardner, and Asia Minor by Mr. D. G. Hogarth. Dr. Evans and Professor van Vlietigen have checked the descriptions of Crete and Constantinople respectively. A handy book of this size—no other single volume covers the same ground—is of course designed primarily for tourists (particularly “conducted” and archaeological tourists) in Aegean waters and for yachtsmen, to whom are devoted nineteen pages of notes on the anchorages and sport of the coasts described. The archaeological side is treated in great detail. Professor E. Gardner contributes a sketch of the History of Greek Art, plans of the more important sites (including Caunous and Sparta) are generously distributed, and the contents of museums are described at some length; we note, however, that the growing collection at Bruss—a branch of the Imperial Museum—is not mentioned. The index is not very satisfactory, and some statements, such as those about the disaster to Naus Mont in Calos, and the present state of Corone, seem to require correction.


This guide-book, of old established reputation, has been “revised, largely rewritten, and augmented” under the capable editorship of Mr. H. R. Hall of the British Museum, himself a successful explorer in Egypt. The archaeological interest of the Nile valley is insisted upon, but, naturally, Greek and Roman remains occupy but a minor place. Hellenists will turn to the sketch of the Ptolemaic and Roman periods in the introductory matter, and find it very brief indeed—too brief, to our thinking, seeing that we know far more of these periods than of any others, largely owing to recent discoveries of papyri.
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Alexandria is very adequately treated, however, except perhaps in regard to its Museum, the account of which is hardly up to date. The Antonines' collection, for instance, is not a recent acquisition, compared with others, but was almost the original nucleus of the Museum. A new and praiseworthy feature is the notice of the Greco-Roman sites of the north central Delta, about which Mr. Hall knows all the latest data. As for Naukratis, a doubt, surely needless, is expressed as to the correctness of Prof. Petrie's identification. It would have been well to warn tourists that there is practically nothing to see on the site now. Of other places, interesting to classical scholars, e.g., the Fayum, Edfum, Amun, Antinoopolis, Coptes, and Syene, a very good account is given; but, in the first case, the ease and the attractiveness of the excursion are rather obscured by depreciation of the hotel accommodation at Medina, and insistence on difficulties of transport, which, so far as we know, are by no means the rule. The Hotel Karim is considerably better than what is usually understood by a 'Greek locanda.' This guide-book went to press, apparently, in July, and in certain matters, e.g., the resignation of Lord Cromer, the discovery of the Tel tomb, and the explorations at Der-el-Bahari, is well up to date. In others, and unfortunately here and there in very important respects, e.g., hotel accommodation and means of transit, it is not. For example, no mention of the railway to the Great Oasis occurs, though it is marked on a map; yet it was in building a year ago or more. The two latest and best hotels at Alexandria are not named, and there are no indications of the comparative quality of the rest, though they differ widely. At Cairo, on the other hand, certain hotels are starred; but why this distinction is withheld from Shepheard's and given to the New Continental, denied to the Semiramis and accorded to the Anglette, we know not. The Ramleh railway has long been extended beyond San Stefano, and there has been, for a year, a second hotel at Khartoum. These are minor blemishes, however, in a vastly improved guide, the archaeology of which is particularly sound.


This fine volume has been compiled, at the request of the Director General of the Egyptian Department of Antiquities, by the chief Inspector for Upper Egypt, a British archaeologist, who received part of his training from Professor Flinders Petrie. For the purposes of his survey he spent eight weeks in Nubia in the winter 1906-7, and this Report sums up the observations made then and on previous visits. It is confessedly a rapid piece of work designed to call attention to the different classes of remains between the First and Second Cataracts, but not to provide an exhaustive record of them. The special reason for this survey was, of course, the impending submergence of a great part of the lower Nubian banks by the projected extension of the Nile reservoir. The Egyptian Government intends first to explore thoroughly all the territory about to be flooded (extending as high as Maharna), and needed to know the extent and kind of the remains with which it must deal. Mr. Weigall's preliminary survey is, however, valuable not only to his government, but to all scholars. So well trained an archaeologist, whose attention had, moreover, been directed especially to the 'pan-grave' culture of the lower valley, could not traverse Nubia without discovering a good deal that was new—in particular several Greek graffiti and remains of the Roman occupation and of the small native kingdoms, from that of Egyummas onwards. Nor, in view of the rapidity with which destructive agencies have worked of late in Nubia, can we be other than thankful for a record of what was extant in the beginning of 1907. Mr. Weigall's Report will be largely superseded by the systematic exploration to be directed by Dr. Reimer and Captain Lyons; but the chapter of accidents is so voluminous in Egypt that we are very glad to have as full a record as this to go on with.
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This is a volume of twenty-six essays upon historical and topographical problems connected with Italy, Sicily, and Sardinia in ancient times. They give evidence of an immense amount of learning and original research, and are calculated to stimulate all students of ancient history, though the probability or improbability of most of the conclusions arrived at must inevitably be left to the decision of specialists. The points raised in some of the more important of these essays may be briefly indicated. Such is the question as to the origin of the Ausoniens, and the extent of Italy inhabited by them. Professor Pass finds indication from literary allusions and survivals of place names that they were spread over the whole of Southern Italy, and that a large proportion of them at least came from Epirus. Another essay deals with the sites of various cities (such as Morgantina) on the Hersean plateau in the south-east corner of Sicily. In this connexion an interesting archaic Greek relief, found in 1837 near S. Mauro above Gela, is illustrated; for the first time. It represents a frieze of dancing satyrs above two sphinxes placed back to back. The position of the Assinaro, which witnessed the final overthow of the invading Athenian army in 413 B.C., is also discussed; the identifications suggested by previous authorities are rejected, and the river is held to be the same as the modern Tellaro. Perhaps the most important of all the essays is that which seeks to show how largely the Greek cities of Sicily influenced the early history of Rome. Many incidents, such as the first secession of the plebs, are held to be simple repetitions of events in Siceliot history. The tribunes of the plebs are regarded as equivalent to the archontes ex deme of the Greek cities in Sicily. However much we may be inclined to doubt some of the 'duplications' avouched, we may feel confident that Syracuse, from the victory of Hieron at Cumae in 474 B.C. to the fall of Diumatos II. in 337 B.C., exercised a far greater influence on Rome than is usually supposed. Her artistic influence on Etruria was certainly considerable. The final essay discusses the date of the Historical Geography of Strabo, and an attempt is made to show from internal evidence that the work was written at a time previous to 7 B.C. in a literary centre (Rome or Alexandria), and that it was subsequently revised hastily about 18 B.C., when Strabo, then about eighty years old, was living in retirement in Asia Minor. The translation of the book from the Italian appears to have been well done.


This interesting, if somewhat rambling book, is intended to replace the author's Greek World under Roman sway. The condition of the Greeks under Roman rule is justly regarded as an unhealthy one. It is true that they were treated with a scornful indulgence, but they were never considered the equals of the Romans, or given opportunity to exercise the higher functions of citizenship. Deprived of political responsibility, the Greeks showed but too frequently that moral weakness which, even in their best period, is sometimes noticeable. The interesting chapter on the Hellenism of Cherson and his friends demonstrates how little real respect even the philhellenes among the Romans had for the Greek character. The most inspiring products of Greek thought in this period are to be found in the stern practical philosophy of the Stoics, and the high, if rather mystical, ideals of revived Pythagoreanism. The extracts from Strabo and Dio Chrysostom given in the book are welcome, in view of the fact that these authors are not so widely read as they deserve to be. The rhetorician shows that the Greek cities of Asia Minor were in a flourishing condition towards the end of the first century A.D. One or two remarks may be made regarding points of detail. Dio Chrysostom severely upbraids the Rhodians for their cheap way of honouring distinguished persons by inscribing their names on statues
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which had nothing to do with them. This practice is perhaps illustrated by a statue recently acquired by the British Museum, and published in the present number of this Journal. Here the name P. Maximus Sestill Clementis has been inscribed on the base of a statue of a woman, which the best authorities assign to the fourth century B.C. To the instances of the title of θρησκίας given to chief magistrates of towns (p. 116, n. 1) may be added some from Kos (e.g. Paton and Hicks, 94 and 125). A protest should be made against the careless proof reading, which leaves the book disfigured by numerous misspellings and errors. The result is somewhat curious in certain instances, e.g. on p. 296, where we are told of 'a Sicilian bandit whom Strabo publicly executed at Rome,' and on p. 309, where it is stated that certain Greek prose novels are published in a volume called the "Love-Tale Writers." A feature of the book worthy of special commendation is the frequent introduction of apt illustrations from modern life.


In prehistoric Britain there is little derived immediately from the Hellenic world, and it is significant that in the index to this most comprehensive work there are but three references to Greeks and Greek letters, all of secondary importance. Though the Druids used Greek characters in official documents and private correspondence, it was mainly from Italy that our early civilisation was derived, and the reader will find almost everything but Hellenic lore in this admirable volume. There are, however, certain problems in British archaeology which may eventually be solved by reference to the early civilisation of Greece and the Mediterranean islands; and in view of the Achaeans controversy it may be of interest to state the position taken up by Mr. Holmes with regard to the Celts. The earliest Celtic invasion of Britain took place six or seven centuries before the Christian era, and the invaders were Goths, speaking an Aryan dialect represented in modern times by Erse, Manx, and Highland Gaelic. They were tall in stature and either mesaticephalic or dolichocephalic, thus contrasting with the Alpine or Grenelle race (also represented in Britain), which was characterised by a round head, short stature, and dark complexion. The latter people were of Neolithic descent in Gaul, and formed the substratum of the population of Gallia Celtica, the Celtic language being introduced there about the eighth century B.C. by a dominant race from the east. The Celts properly so called were a tall stalwart people with fair or red hair, apparently not far removed from what is generally considered the Germanic type; and in this view Mr. Holmes is in substantial agreement with Prof. Ridgeway, who writes thus: "a body of tall fair-haired immigrants came into Greece from the Danubian and Alpine regions somewhere about 1500 B.C., and this people, known to us as Achaeans, were part of the great fair-haired race of Upper Europe termed by the ancients the Keltoi, and now commonly described as Teutonic. This people brought with them the use of iron, they burned their dead instead of burying them as did the aborigines, they had garments of a different kind, which they fastened with brooches, and they brought with them a peculiar form of ornament, which is commonly termed geometrical or Dipylon." The services rendered to British archaeology by Dr. Arthur Evans and other Hellenists are fully appreciated, and should inspire others to develop the connexion between Ancient Britain and the Mediterranean. Several pages are devoted to the derivation of our first coinage from Greek types, but Mr. Holmes omits to mention an interesting point with regard to the British substitutes for coins. The iron bars mentioned by Caesar as a form of currency and found in the central area of southern England find an analogue in Greece itself. Prof. Waldstein has published the discovery of a bundle of iron bars on the site of the Heraeum at Argos, which he very reasonably identifies as the 'beleles' offered to Hera by Phaidon on his introduction of a coinage; and it has yet to be explained why this peculiar form of currency should have been adopted nowhere but in

Accounts of cities and countries connected with St. Paul are, too often, apt to read like eloquent expansions of the Dictionary of Classical Geography. Prof. Ramsay’s descriptions are of a very different order, based on minute personal research, yet always vivid and suggestive and singularly informing to the student of ancient city-communities.

In the present volume five cities are dealt with in detail, namely Tarsus, the Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Derbe, and Lystra; all cities of Eastern Asia Minor which offer, even apart from their connexion with St. Paul, an instructive study in amalgamation between European and Eastern races. At Tarsus, for instance, the harmony of Greek and Asiatic was particularly noticeable.

An admirably written introductory chapter sketches in bold outlines the position of Paulinian in the Greek-Roman world. Paul is regarded as a shaping force in history and not only in religion. A lover of idolatry—the chief characteristic of Pagan religion—he is yet a lover of old Hellenic freedom and ready to discern even in Paganism a certain perception of divine truth. If there could be no truce with the popular cultus of the divine Augustus and his successors, the Imperial scheme of things could still be viewed with equanimity as furnishing the high political idea of a world-province—a unity which Paulinian Christianity might hope to vitalize—a great field in which the universal religions of Christ might be sewn with promise.

Del agriculturne estâ. The Mediterranean world was decaying and degenerate: all was fluid and changing and there were infinite opportunities of growth and development. Like the author of the Fourth Echlogue (on which an interesting commentary is offered), Paul places the Golden Age not in the past but in the future. The fairest hope came from the more easily christianised provinces of the East; but when, at length, Constantine threw in his lot with Christianity, it was too late for the social and moral resuscitation of the ancient Empire of the West.

The illustrations from photographs and drawings are interesting and unhaunted, and numerous coins (of which much use is made in the text) are reproduced, drawn on an enlarged scale. This method of enlargement, if not always desirable in a purely numismatic treatise, has much to commend it. In another edition the author will, we hope, add an index.


The second edition of this book, which supersedes the first after a year’s interval, contains much new matter: notably a chapter on ‘Sacred Men and Women,’ a section on ‘Influence of Mother Kin on Religion,’ and three appendices. But the whole of the work shows signs of a careful revision, many references being added where the actual text is untouched. The new chapter deserves careful attention (pp. 30-38); among interesting suggestions we may note Mr. Frazer’s explanation of the burial of young children at Geras, who have been considered to be sacrificial victims. Mr. Frazer believes that they were buried by their parents in the sanctuary with the hope that they might be reincarnated. In discussing the influence of Mother Kin on Religion, the author adopts a middle position: he
rightly rejects the extreme theory that, under a system of Mother Kin the women rule the men and set up goddesses for them to worship, remarking that such a view scarcely deserves the serious attention which it appears to have received. On the other hand, he thinks that Mother Kin is favourable to the growth of goddesses.

In the Appendices we may especially notice the discussion on the significance of children of living parents in ritual. It is usual to explain the choice of such children as due to ideas of pollution from death. Mr. Frazer suggests that a child of living parents was originally preferred as being endowed with a higher degree of vitality than an orphan. The vitality of a sacred minister would be important, whether to ensure the fertility of the crops or to avert danger of death and other calamities.


Mr. Dobbie's little book is a sound and useful summary of the data relating to his subject; although a really satisfactory treatment of it would require somewhat wider acquaintance with the literature than the author seems to possess.

The following books have also been received:


Lethaby (W. R.), Greek Buildings represented by fragments in the British Museum, II. The Tomb of Madosa. Pp. 37-70; Figs. 30-57. London: Batsford, 1908. 2s. 6d. net.
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SALINAS (A.). Das Tasto di Rillevi Funebri Attici rinvenuti in Sicilia [Miscell. di Archeol. di Storia e di Filologia].


WHITE (J. W.). Enoptic Metre in Greek Comedy. Chicago, 1907.


TWO CYRENAIC KYLIKES.

The intrinsic interest of the two Cyrenaic kylikes, which I am now able to publish owing to the kindness of the authorities of the National Museum at Athens and of the Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge, is not very great, but the desire to complete so far as is possible the list of the extant vases of this class is sufficient apology for making them known.

The Fitzwilliam kylix (Fig. 1a) is said to have been found near Corinth and hence, though a very poor specimen of the Cyrenaic style, has some interest as coming from Greek soil.

![Fig. 1a.](image_url)

The dimensions are: Ht. 106 m.; diam. 195 m. x 100 m.; ht. of foot 639 m.

The clay is the usual hard variety, in colour light brown with a slightly pink tinge.

The decoration is very simple. The black of the inside is only relieved by a line on the lip, another below the lip, three circles lower down, and a circle and a dot at the centre, all reserved in the colour of the clay. The decoration of the outside is shown in Fig. 2a, where the hatched lines represent purple; the characteristic creamy slip, considerably frayed, covers the lower part of the cup between the outer purple bands.

There are here neither lotus buds nor pomegranates, but the thin rays rising from the foot and the double row of leaves between the handles are patterns as characteristic of the Cyrenaic style as is the partial use of slip.
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The simplicity and carelessness of the ornament, especially to be noted in the rude travesty of a palmette on either side of the handles, the splash of paint which takes the place of a lotus flower below them, the irregularity of the ray pattern, and the absence of a branch between the rows of leaves, place the vase in Dugas' fourth class, the class of decadence. This is confirmed not only by the unusual thickness of the clay (0.006 m. at the rim), but also by the proportions between the height of the bowl and the foot (17:1), and between the diameter and the height of the bowl (29:1). This shows a lowness of foot and a depth of bowl characteristic according to Dugas of the fourth class.

The Cyrenaic kylix in the National Museum at Athens (Fig. 1b), for permission to publish which I have particularly to thank Dr. Staats, the Ephor of the Museum, was seen by Thiersch at a dealer's shop in Athens in 1901. Unfortunately there is no knowledge of where it was found.

The dimensions are: Ht. 1.22 m.; diam. 1.83 m. x 1.92 m.; ht. of foot 0.052 m.

The outside decoration (Fig. 2b) bears a close resemblance to that of the Cassel kylix. The offset rim is painted black but for a bare line where the characteristic pinkish clay is contrasted with the creamy slip covering the rest of the bowl. I know of no other Cyrenaic Vase with a crescent pattern resembling that on 'Fikellura' ware except that at Cassel.

On the inner side of the rim are two lines reserved in the natural colour of the clay. The centre of the bowl has a man's head on a white ground framed by two purple and three thin brown circles (Fig. 3). He wears a purple band across his hair, the outline of which is undulated to indicate curls. The profile is very finely drawn, but the artist has been

---

careless over the incisions marking the curls on the forehead and the ear. The notice in the inventory of the Museum suggests that an Ethiopian is intended, but I do not know if this can be upheld.

The breakage unfortunately makes it uncertain whether the hair was here also worn long in the fashion shown on other vases of the class, but this is, I think, indicated by the incised line rippling back from the ear.

The shaven lips and the beard clearly follow the fashion in vogue on most Cyrenaic vases. But as this head is on a much larger scale than

---

Cf. the figure of Arsimas, the seated figure on the Munich kylix, and the figure of Zeus on the kylix in the Louvre. Studniczka, Kyrene, Figs. 1, 3, 7.
any other on a vase of this class it is not unreasonable to take it as a
criterion of what that fashion really was.

It is now clear that the beard was merely kept rather short on the
cheeks and trimmed neatly to a point. I think, indeed, that Studniczka's 9
description of the Boreades on the Cyrene kylix as having 'ägyptisch

FIG. 5.

stilisirte Bärte' is as misleading as Hauser's 7 comparison of them with the
openwork bronze plaque from Crete published by Milchhoefer. 8

There is not much difficulty in giving this vase its place in the Dugas'
classification. The good profile, indeed, brings to mind the third group, but

---

9 Studniczka, Kyrene, p. 17.
8 Milchhoefer, Annali, 1880 T.; Abh. 1886, p. 198.
the carelessness shown not only in the incisions marking the curls, the neck, and the ear, which is particularly gross in a drawing on so large a scale as this, but also in the lotus pattern on the outside, combines with the laziness betrayed by the excessive use of black in the interior, and the rudeness of the handle palmettes, to put the vase in the fourth group.

As in the case of the Fitzwilliam vase the thickness of the clay (006 m. at the rim) tallies with this, as do the comparative shortness of the foot, and depth of the bowl; for the proportion between the height of the bowl and that of the foot is $1:34:1$, and that between the diameter and the height of the bowl $2:01:1$.

Both these vases show a peculiarity in the foot (Fig. 4), namely a band reserved in the natural clay just below the cushion on which the bowl rests. This band is moulded into three or four rings in low relief.

Among the Cyrenaic sherds found at the excavation of the Heraeum of Argos, which I may add to the very complete catalogue given by Dugas, are ten broken kylix stems which also show this peculiarity. Eight of these, it is true, can only be assigned to the class by the characteristic clay but two retain sufficient of the inside of the bowl to make the attribution certain. The same trait occurs on a Cyrenaic kylix stem found in Samos, and the stem of the Cassel kylix shows a somewhat similar decoration.

In view then of the comparatively late date of our two kylikes it is, I think, reasonable to look on these ridges as the expression in a degenerate period of the taste for a decorated stem, to which witness is borne at an earlier date by the painted purple rings which are found in the same place on the stem of the Arcosiaias vase.

J. P. Droege.


[Fig. 4]
INSCRIPTIONS FROM ASIA MINOR, CYPRUS, AND THE CYRENAICA.

The following inscriptions, with the exception of No. 7, were copied during the cruise of Mr. Allison V. Armour's yacht 'Utowana' in the Eastern Mediterranean in the spring of 1904. The copying was done by Mr. D. G. Hogarth, of Magdalen College, Oxford, Mr. Richard Norton, Director of the American School of Classical Studies in Rome, and myself; and in preparing the material for publication I have had the benefit of Mr. Hogarth's advice and assistance. The inscriptions Nos. 1 and 25, as well as the three stelae from Larnaca mentioned under No. 30, are now at the American School in Rome; No. 21 is in America.¹

ASIÆ MINOR.

Halicarnassus.

1.

A stele of white marble purchased in Budrûm, and now at the American School in Rome. The part preserved measures 0.46 x 0.33 x 0.07 m. Letters 0.009 m. high. Broken R, lower corner. Read by A.W. Van Buren.

ΔΑΥΣΕΝΕΡΩΝΠΡΟΣΑΛΑΜΠΕΑΣΙΚΕΘΟΚΩΤΑΣ
ΜΟΙΡΩΝΕΠΚΑΣΤΟΘΝΗΜΑΣΙΝΑΝΤΟΧΕ
 ΑΙΔΕΣΩΕΙΝΑΘΩΝΟΝΙΜΩΝΚΕΙΑΝΑΡΙ
ΤΥΓΩΡΟΣΙΦΕΡΟΙΣΚΕΥΘΕΙΣΙΔΕΞΑΜΕΝΑ
ΑΓΑΝΤΙΟΧΕΙΑΝΑΙΤΙΑΝΣΕΤΟΝΑΚΡΟ:
ΜΥΡΕΤΕΙΩΝΕΝΤΡΟΦΕΓΥΜΝΑΣΙΩΝ
ΤΟΙΟΝΕΚΤΕΡΙΣΑΝΘΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣΑΙΝΕΤΟΝΑ
ΣΑΛΩΝΕΝΙΩΝΑΙΣΑΓΑΘΟΣΕΚΦΕΡΕ

¹[Mr. A. E. Hausman is to be thanked for suggestions have been made also by the Edlins a revision of the metrical epilalia. Certain of the Journal.—D.G.H.]
5. περίτροπ. Ἀντίφροις ταλαμωτριταν σε τὸν ἄγραν μὲν μιρέτ ἐοτι, ζωάτον ἔντροφε γυμνασίουν τοῖς τε κτερίσασι Διονύσου αἰετῶν ἔργου ἡμεῖς ἴδοις έκφερεν ταί.

Ἀμφιθαύρων Ὀρχοῦ.

L. 4. τυφειρ. lapicide's error for κρυφειρ.
L. 7. Mr. Housman suggests ἔργον, remarking that ἔργον ἔκφερται = ἐς κ. ζ. φερεται, i.e. 'wins glory from the deed.'

Τελευτέων (Μακρί).

2.

A small round altar in the house of K. Paulides. Read by R. Norton.

Fig. 1.

Horsemam, mounted.
galloping to right.
Kantharos, between two serpents.

Φιλέταρυς
Οἱμεροφόρου Ἐρμόλυκον
Τον ουπροῦ ἀδελφὸν
Ημωα.
This altar is of considerable interest in its relation to primitive hero-worship and its survival at a late period. The deceased was worshipped as hero, and on this monument is represented in both human and serpent form, the serpent regularly being considered the embodiment of a chthonic divinity. The representation of two serpents may be due to considerations of symmetry or convention, or to a certain vagueness in the mind of the dedicant.

For the hero as serpent, see Miss J. E. Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, pp. 326-332, note especially the altar illustrated there on p. 331, after A. Conze, *Reis in der Insel Lesbos*, Pl. IV. Fig. 5, cf. p. 11. See also Gruppe, *Gr. Mythol.* u. *Religionsgesch.* pp. 807 ff.


3.

On a stone in the wall of a house below the western group of graves. Read by D. G. Hogarth and R. Norton, from a tissue-paper rubbing.

TIIICE
MONICEI . OUDEMI (complete)
ΔΕΙΝΟΤΗΝΟΥΟΚΑΝΠΟΣ
ΤΙΜΑΠΕΝΑΝΤΙΟΥΚΕ/
5 AMEIΟΥΗΝΙΝΑΚΑΜΑΡΑ/
ΚΕΕΠΕΓΡΑ+Α//'ΕΤΕΕΑΝΒ
ΛΕΥΚΟΜΕΤΙΝΑΠΟΤΕΤΩΝΕΜ/
ΝΕΤΙΖΩΧΗΜΟΥΟΚΙΝΑΙΤΙΝΑ (complete)
ΕΙΔΕΤΙΚΕΜΕΤΑΤΑΤΑΤΑΤΟΛΛΗ//
10 CIANYΣΕΚΕΕΝΩΑΥΕΤΙΝΑΜΕ
ΤΑΤΗΝΜΗΝΗΤΕΛΕΥΤΗΝΔΩΣC
'ΙΣΠΡΟΚΟΤΙΜΟΥ . ΟΥΓ
['}Εγό ἐ δείνα κα-]
τ[']ε[]εκευεα υπέρ αυού
μόνον, ἐ[τέρ]ον ἐ δύ μη.
δεινα την οὐσιν με τε του ετ-
tη μα' ἀκένατι τοι κερ-
αμείνυν, Ἰτίνα καμπα[r
κε ἐπεραφα, [δ]οτε, ἓν βιν-
λεύσαμε, τετι τοῦ το[υ]
v ἄτι ζωομες μου θεια ὑμα.
The inscription is illiterate as regards spelling (καὶ = καὶ l. 6; Βουλευταὶ = Βουλευταί l. 7; θῆναι = θῆναι l. 8; τολμήσει αὐξύς καὶ ἔνθαψε = τολμήσει αὐξύς καὶ ἔνθαψε l. 9); vocabulary (καμὴρα ἤγ. cubileum l. 5); and syntax (πρὸ ἦτη ματ. l. 3, cf. Moschian 114: τὸ ἀλέγας ἢμέρας, quoted ap. Sophocles, Οἰ. Λέξις τοῦ Βούλου, and Byz. Periods, s.v. πρὸ 3; Johannes Moschus ap. Migne, Patrolog. Gr. vol. 87, 2985 ε.: πρὸ ἦτη εἴκοσιοῦ, and the modern Greek idiom; the irregular gen. absol. ἦτη ἐξοσθήσει, and the redundant τίνα l. 8).

Patare.

4.

On a smallopus in a wall just E. of the city gate. Copied by D. G. Hogarth and R. Norton.

ΖΩΟ
ΟΣ
Ω
ΚΝΜΟΝ
ΩΝΜΝΕ
HMHCNE
KEN

Ζωσίκος γιὰ τὸ βιοτηνιόν μηθέως μεκεῖ, ημεῖς ἑξεκεν.

Ζωσίκος seems best taken for Ζωσίκος, a perfectly possible form, although it does not occur elsewhere. Both Ζωσίμας and Ζωσίκος occur.

5.

The fragments of an inscription on a building near the shore, published C.I.G. 4297 and (partly) by Benndorf and Niemann, Reisen in Lykien u. Karien, p. 117. We found fragments 1 and 7; also 2 and 5, which we read thus:

2.

ΟΠΑΙ
Ь
ΣΕ;

ΓΑΣΕ

[These words cannot be regarded as certain, having been read only from a tissue-paper rubbing. It is very strange that the date should be given so precisely, and that κατ' ΑΤ] should be left to be inferred from the subsequent clause. But I cannot suggest any better restoration. — D.G.H.]
We found also this fragment:

8. 

ΟΥΚ

Xanthus.

6.

On a small rectangular block of stone N.E. of the theatre, between the wall and the river; it has probably fallen from the wall. Copied by D. G. Hogarth and R. Norton.

$$\text{Ιμβραίμιες} \text{Ιάσω-}$$
$$\text{νος τού Ιμβραί-}$$
$$\text{μος Ξάνθιος}$$
$$\text{ιερασίμενος}$$

5. $$\text{Πατρωουθεο}$$
$$\text{Ξανθούτοναν}$$
$$\text{Δριανταξυνθ}$$
$$\text{Βασιέκτωνίδι}$$

Cf. the similar Xanthian inscriptions C.I.G. 4275, add. 4269 c.

L. 1. The root of the name Ἱμβραίμιος occurs in a number of proper names from western Asia Minor and vicinity; cf. Pape-Benseler s.v. Ἱμβραίμος, Ἱμβράδιος, Ἱμβρακος, Ἱμβρος, Ἱμβρος.4

L. 4. ιερασίμενος from ιεράμοι = ιερεύνοι or ιερατεύνοι. Beside these Xanthian inscriptions, the word occurs in many others, as in one from Delos, B.C.H. vi. (1882), p. 20, l. 158; p. 33, ll. 43, 44, 45; cp. also Dittenberger, Or. Gr. Inscr. Sel. Index viii, s.v.

7.

The inscription [Ε]ανθιον η Μουλη ε.τ.α. in honour of Q. Veranius Thopolemus, published by Cagnat, Inscr. Gr. Rom. iii. 628, "ex schedis Instituti archaeologici Vindobonensis." This was read by D. G. Hogarth, during a previous visit to the site, Apr. 17, 1897. It is on a slab of white marble, on the upper slope of the river bank, broken at the bottom, and worn on the left; fine lettering. Hogarth’s reading varies as follows from that published by Cagnat:


4 Also Ιμβρος (Petersen and von Luschan, Reisen in Lykien, ii. p. 100), and the Lydian positives ῬΟΜΑ and ΧΡΙΩΜ. (B.M.C. Lycia, p. xxxvii f.).
Chimaera:

8.

On a broken block, presumably a fragment of a statue base. Read by R. Norton.

\[\text{\ ΠΕΙΜΟΣΕΡΜΑΓΣ} \quad \text{Σωτέμος Έρμαγρος Τρβερ[...\]}

\[\text{ΘΕΟΣΗΣ} \quad \text{υλόν φιλοστοργιάς}

\[\text{ΑΙΜΗ} \quad \text{ε[... έκκεν.}

L. 1. The name \[\text{Σωτέμος}\] occurs in \text{C.I.G. 4321 c; "Αρτέμος, another possibility, in \text{C.I.G. 4321 d. Both these inscriptions were found in the same part of Lycia as the Chimaera.}

[\text{Ιμβραίς, \text{C.I.G. 4321 c, \text{C.I.G. 4321 d, and note there.}}

L. 2. \text{Θεστρ[... \text{the restoration is uncertain. The only name known to me beginning in \text{Θεστρ[... Θεστρ[πον also might be suggested, but more letters are needed to fill the space. Perhaps one might read \text{Θεστρ[πον, or \text{Θεστρ[πον.}

9.

In the wall of a church. Published by \text{Le Bas 1340, with some variants. Read by D. G. Hogarth. We can give more exact readings than \text{Le Bas in the following instances.}

\text{Ομηθι has the form \(Ω\). L. 1, \text{ιαδρα. L. 2, \text{γαθώνυμ. L. 7, \text{εικοδιασαίς.}

L. 7: One would have expected \text{ιξεδιασαί (= οψανθ), ουσικ. elsewhere = collect. An error of the stone-cutter is possible.

10.

\text{Petersen, Reise, p. 142. We read \text{YENYBA Thom.}}

Phaseias.

11.

On a rectangular block of stone over 450 m. high. Letters about 0.35–0.38 high. Copied by R. Norton; a squeeze was also used. Published \text{C.I.G. 4336, 'ex schedis Mülleris Beaufortiana.' Our reading is more exact in some respects, although some of the letters recorded in \text{C.I.G. are no longer visible. Our reading:}
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ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑΤΟΡΙ
ΚΑΙΣΑΡΙΤΡΑΙΑΝΩ
ΑΔΡΙΑΝ ΣΣΕΒΑ
ΠΑΤΡΙΠΑΤΡΙΔΟ
ΟΛΥΜΠΙΩΣΩΘ
ΟΥΚΩΣΜΟΥΥΠ
ΗΣΕΠΒΑΣΕΩΣ
ΑΥΤΟΥΑΚΑΛΙΣΕΩ
ΗΒΟΥΛΗΚΑΙΟΔΗΝ

Αυτοκράτορι
Καίσαρι Τραίανω
'Αδριανω Σσεβαςτω
πατρι πατριδοι

ΟΤΟΥ ΚΩΣΜΟΥ ΕΠΙΡΟ
ΤΗΝ ΕΠΙΒΙΑΣΕΩΣ
ΑΥΤΟΥ 'ΑΚΑΛΙΣΕΩΝ
Η ΒΟΥΛΗ ΚΑΙ Ο ΔΗΜΟΣ.

Date, 129 A.D. or a few years later; for Hadrian's visit, see Pauly-Wissowa, i. 509 f.; for the epithet δημοσος, c.e. l. 500, 5.

L. 8. ΑΚΑΛΙΣΕΩΝ. C.I.G. ΑΚΑΛΙΣΕΩΝ was given by E. A. Gardner, from Cockerell's papers, in J.H.S. vi. (1885), p. 343. Bérard, who apparently had not seen Gardner's article, stated in B.C.H. xvi. (1892), p. 442, that he was unable to find the stone at Phasellis, but conjectured 'Αλ[αλ]εσσον. Our reading confirms Cockerell's copy and Bérard's conjecture.

The inscription commemorating Hadrian's visit in 129 A.D. (see note on No. 11), published C.I.G. 4837, 'ex schedis Mulleri Beaufortians,' with corrections iii. add. p. 1157; and, with further corrections, by Bérard, B.C.H. xvi. (1892), p. 442; and, following him, by Cagnat, Inscr. Gr. Rom. iii. 737 (where C. fails to indicate that ll. 1–3 are restored). Total height of the stone, at least 420 m. Letters 040 m. high. Read from a squeeze. Our reading differs from Bérard's as follows:

L. 4 (of C.'s numbering), the r. and bottom hastae of Δ are visible before Ο. L. 6, the r. haste of Μ is visible before ΟΥ. L. 8, the reading ΚΟΡΟΙΔΑΛΛΕΩΝ is certain; before the Α, the two upper hastae of Δ are visible; Bérard's ΔΑΛΛΕΩΝ is obviously a misprint, as he has [ΚΟΡΟΙ]ΔΑΛΛΕΩΝ in his transcription and commentary.

On a broken rectangular block of stone. Copied by D. G. Hogarth. Published, with variants, in C.I.G. 4835, 'ex schedis Mulleri Beaufortians,' and after C.I.G. by Cagnat, Inscr. Gr. Rom. iii. 759. Our reading:

ΟΕΟΥΤΡΑΙΑΝΟΥΠ.
ΤΡΑΙΝΟΙΔΑΡΙΑΝΩΙ
ΔΗΜ., ΧΙΚΗΣΕΣΟΥΣΙ
///ΥΜΠΑΝΟΤΟΣΩΣΜΟ

ΟΥΠΙΛΟΘΕΟ\.\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\n
5

ΤΕΤΡΙΗ., ΝΟΝΑΓΟΡΑΝ
INSCRIPTIONS FROM ASIA MINOR, CYPRUS, ETC. 187

[Aυτοκράτορος Καίσαρε]

[ινα] [παρθηκή] [ποιον] [τε] [τε [τε] [τε] [τε]

και την παρθηκή ποιον θαυμάζει ο[μ]πορεί ο[μ]

Τουκρηνος Σεβαστός κ.τ.λ.

Date, 118 A.D., if the above restoration is correct; but 131 A.D. (C.I.G. 4335) seems a more natural date for the erection of such an inscription at Phaselis.

14.

On the hill above the theatre; broken on the right. Read by R. Norton.

ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑΤΩΡΚΑΙΣΑΡ

ΓΙΩΡΕΟΥΤΡ

ΨΟΝΟΚΕΟΥ

ΓΕΑ

Date, 138-161 A.D.

15.

The inscription published, with minor variants, by Cagnat, Inscr. Gr. Rom. iii. 761, "ex schedis Institutii archaeologici Vindobonensis." On the hill above the theatre. Read by D. G. Hogarth, as follows:

Λογοκρίτωρ Καίσαρα, θεοῦ Αδριανοῦ νιός, θεοῦ Εράτοιο Ποσιδίκου νιόν, θεοῦ Νερών έργασος, Τιτόν Αλλων Αδριανος Αυτοκρατορα "Σεβαστος κ.τ.λ.

Date, 138-161 A.D.

16.

The double inscription of the Voconii Sexae published by Bérard, L.C.H. xiv (1890), pp. 643 ff.; and, after him, by Cagnat, Inscr. Gr. Rom. iii. 763, and Dessau, Inscr. Lat. Scl. 8828. Copied by D. G. Hogarth and A. W. Van Buren, and also read from a squeeze. We were unable to read all the letters seen by Bérard, especially at the extreme right. Our readings differ from Bérard's in the following instances:

Sigma always has the form Σ in the left-hand inscription, and Σ in the right-hand one. In the right-hand inscription, l. 1, the fourth and following
letters after ΚΟΥΚΩΝΙΟΝ are ΟΥΥΙΩΝ. L. 3, the TH of στρατηγὸς forms a ligature. L. 5, ΒΕΙΩΝΙΑΙ. L. 7, ΟΥΛΕΡΙΑ - - (sic). L. 8, ΤΙΕΒΟΥΡΤΕΙΝΗ (sic). L. 8, ΑΥΤΟΙΣ; this reading bears on the curse honorum of C. Voconius Saxa Fidus.

17.

The inscription published, with considerable variants, in C.I.G. 4332, after Beaumont, and, following C.I.G., by Cagnat, Inscr. Gr. Rom. iii. 764 C.I.G. iii. add. p. 1156 gives the reading of Barth from Rhein. Mus. vii. (1850), p. 252, No. 6. Barth could read only comparatively few letters in each line, and used the expression 'folgende sehr unleserliche auf einer in höchst unglücklicher Stellung im Gebüsch liegenden gut gearbeiteten Basis.' It is on a rectangular block of stone on the road from the harbour towards the theatre; the top, with most of the first five lines, is broken off. Read by D. G. Hogarth and R. Norton, using Norton's copy and a squeeze.

///ΣΗΛΕΙΤΩΝΗΒΟΥΛΑΗΚΑΙΟΔΗΜΟΣ///ΟΝΔΙΟΥΟΙ///Α
ΤΙΠΙΑΝΙΚ///
ΜΑΙΟ ///ΤΕΝ ///ΝΟΝΚΑΓ ///
5 ἸΣΟΥΣ ἩΜΑ ///ΪΣ ///
ΙΚΟΣΑΠΡΟΤΕΥΣΑΝΙΑ
ΣΚΡΙΤΟΥ///ΗΣΩΗΣ ///ΡΧΙ
=ΠΕΥΣΑΝΤΑΤΗΣΠΡΟΚΑΘΕ ///
ΙΟΣΤΗΣΠΟΛΕΟΣΘΕΑΣ ///
10 ///ΙΑΔΟΣΚΑΙΤΩΝ ///ΔΩΣ ///
ΤΩΝΠ ///ΤΑΝΕΥΣΑΝΤΑΦΙΟ ///
ΜΩΣΥΠΟΦΥΛΑΖΑΝΤΑ ///
ΕΘΝΟΥΣΘΕΚΑΘΕΚΑΣ ///
ΤΕΤΕΙΜΣΘΙΑ ///
83 ΠΟΛΕΟΣ ///ΠΟΛΛΑΚΑΙΜΕΓΑ
ΛΑΠΑΡΕΣΧΗΜΕ ///ΟΝΘΙΠΑΤ ///
ΕΝΤΩΘΣΘΩΣΘΕ ///
ΚΑΙΜΕΣ ///
20 ///ΟΤΑΣΘΠΑΤΡΙ ///
Α ///ΕΘΡΙΑΣΚΑΙ ///ΑΝΘΜΟΣ ///
Ε ///ΕΚΕΝΘΣΙΑ ///
25 ///ΠΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΣ ///
Behind the basilica; on the hem of the himation of a female status; in rather small letters. Copied by R. Norton.

ΜΟΣΧΟΣΜΟΣΧΟΥΟΚΑΙΚΑΛΛΙΠΠΟΣΣΥΝΔΕΥΣ

Méschus Mónchou é kai Kalíppos Synndéus.

Cf. the artist's (?) inscription Méschus C.I.G. 6970; and the metrical epitaph from Piræus, I.G. iii. 1360, beginning Συνναδέων θεάτων 'Απολλώνιος θεόβικε Μόσχου.

On a marble block over the gate at the north corner of the theatre; published, with variants, after Beaufort, in C.I.G. 4360, cf. add. p. 1164; and Cagnat, Inscr. Gr. Rom. iii. 807.
ΕΠΙΑΝΘΥΨΑΤΟΥ
ΤΙΒΕΡΙΟΥ ΚΛΑΔΙΟΥ
ΒΙΘΥΝΙΚΟΥ

Date, after 135 A.D. according to Procopos. Inv. Com. s.v. Ti. Claudius
Bithyniens, q.v.

20.

A large marble base, having figures, etc., carved on the sides. On the
front, two draped male figures with an omphalos between them; a tree
on the left and a tree (?) on the right. On the left side, four dancing figures;
similar figures on the right side; on the back, two bigae. Length of side
1.24 m.; of back 2.45. α, β, copied by R. Norton; γ, by D. G. Hogarth;
δ, by A. W. Van Buren, from a photograph and a rubbing.

(a) On the left side (this inscription is chipped on the right).

ΣΧΗΜΑΤΙΖΕΝΤΗΝΑΓΝΩΤΑΝΕΡΙΣΚΕΠΙΑΜΦΙΒΑΛΟΥ
ΛΙΔΟΙΝΕΙΧΙΩΝΕΤΑΙΝΕΤΟΝΕΡΓΟΝΑΥΣΑΛΑΙ
ΠΑΝΤΙΝΟΝΩΝ. ΒΙΣΥΤΑΛΕΥ. ΒΙΝΑΘΕΟΙΣΙΝ
ΑΛΕΝΟΠΙΤ///ΤΟΠΕΡΙΦΡΑΔΕΩΣΥΤΕΛΑΦΣ

(b) On the band across the omphalos.

ΙΕΡΑΠΥΘΙΑ

(c) On the front.

.ΟΓΘΙΟΙ.Κ. .ΙΟΙΛΕΥ.Κ. .Α.Υ. 2021
.ΟΣΣΕΛΕΥΚΟΣ.ΚΑΙΜΑΡΚΟΣΑΥΡΗΛΙΟΣ.ΣΕΛΕΥΚΙΑΝΟΣ...
ΚΟΣΤΕΡΑΚΙΝΕΟΣ
ΥΙΟΣΒΟΥΛΕΥΤΑΙ.ΤΟΝΒΩΜΟΝΚΑΤΑΣΚΕΥΑΣΑΝΤΕΣΚΑΙΡΥΣΩ.
ΣΑΝΤΕΣ.ΑΝΕΘΕΣΑΝ
ΣΥΝΤΗΒΑΣΕΙ.ΑΓΩΝΟΣΑΓΟΜΕΝΟΤΟΡΙΟΠΟΥΟΙΟΥΜΕΝ.
ΙΚΟΥ.ΙΣΟΡΠΘΟΙΩΝΑΝ
5 ΛΩΝΙΟΥΕΚΕΧΕΙΡΙΟΥΕΙΣΕΛΑΣΤΙΚΟΥΕΙΣΑΠΑΣΑΝΤΗΝΟΙΚΟΥ
ΜΕΝΙΝΑΓΝΩΣΘΕΤΟΥΝ
ΤΩΝΜΕΤΑΔΗΜΙΟΥΡΓΙΑΝ.ΟΥΣΤΙΑΝΟΥΠΟΜΠΩΝΙΑΝΟΥΚΛΑΥ
ΔΙΑΝΟΥΔΙΟΓΕΝΟΥΣ.ΙΠΠΙΚΟΥ
ΚΑΙΛΑΥΡΗΛΙΟΥ.ΔΙΦΙΛΙΑΝΟΥ.ΔΙΦΙΛΟΥ.ΙΠΠΙΚΟΥ.ΑΛΥΤΑΡ
ΧΟΥΝΣΟΣ.ΔΕΚΜΟΥ.ΙΟΥΝΙΟΥ
ΑΙΚΙΝΝΙΟΥ.ΤΙΤΙΑΝΟΥ.ΥΙΟΥ.ΤΙΤΙΑΝΟΥΦΙΛΟΔΟΞΟΥ
Inscriptions from Asia Minor, Cyprus, Etc.

(o).

On the right side (this inscription is chipped on the right).

\[\text{ΩΥΣΙΑΠΝΑΙΣΕΣΘΕΙΚΕΚΑΣΜΕΝΟΣΕΙΔΕΑΤΑΣ} \]
\[\text{ΕΠΙΤΡΑΒΗΡΗΔΕΝΟΩΠΕΡΙΑΜΠΕΛΙΑΙΓΗ} \]
\[\text{ΚΑΙΣΕΘΕΟΙΤΟΥΣΙΚΙΕΚΤΕΛΕΟΥΣΙΝΕΕΔΩ} \]
\[\text{ΟΤΤΙΚΕΝΑΡΗΣΕΟΣΟΦΗΡΕΙΝΙΜΕΤΡΙΕΙΔΩ} \]

\[\text{Σὺν ἄρετον ἄρμον, πέμποντες ἀμφίβαλον ὅσα ἀλλαὶ, μελλόντων τε καὶ αὐτῶν ἄρμον ἀνύσαι.} \]
\[\text{παρὴ μὲν ἔπεισαν τοὺς ἀλευριανοὺς νόον ἀλευριανὸς νοὸς ἀλευριανὸς τίτιν τὸν ἐφευρισκόντων ἡλευριανὸς νοὸς ὅσους.} \]

Iera Pòsia.

(b).

\[\text{folios Σέλενος καὶ Μάρκος Λύριλος Σελενιανὸς} \]
\[\text{τῶν -datepicker ὄ} \]
\[\text{λοις Βαυλευκαὶ τῶν Βούκων κατασκευάσατε καὶ χρυσώσατε ἀνέθησατ} \]
\[\text{σῶν τῇ βασίζῃ, ἀγόριος ἀγόριον τῷ τρίτῳ ἱερῷ οἰκομηνικῷ ἱπτικοῦ} \]
\[\text{Ἀπόλ.} \]

5 λοιπὸν ἐκχειρίων ἐισαλτικοῦ εἰς ἀπαγαγὸν τὴν οἰκουμένην ἄγωνοβενοντας μετὰ ὑμμορίαν Ὀδυσσείου Πομπονίαν Κλαυδίανον Διογένος ἱπτικοῦ καὶ Λύριλον Διβλίανον Διβίλικον ἱπτικοῦ ἀλυτορχίστικος Δέκαρ Λουκίου

Lambdaion Titiianou ἵον Τίτιανος Φιλαδέφως.

(c).

\[\text{Ὀδ στιλπναίος ἕσθησε κεκασμένος εἰδέα τόξῳ} \]
\[\text{θητος, καθαρὸς ὅ} \]
\[\text{ἡ νῆν περιλαμπται ἄγυρη} \]
\[\text{καὶ σε θεοὺς τίνος καὶ ἐκτελέσαυσιν εἴδος ὅστις καὶ ἀργάπων σοφὴ βρεθεῖται μέτρια εἰδώλῳ.} \]

(c), line 1. The line is too incomplete to make a restoration in full possible. One may conjecture

\[\text{—to—} \]

\[\text{Σάλεεες Λύρη λι[α]ν [ε]ν [ο]]} \]

* [Restorations here mainly due to Mr. Hoummar.—D.G.H.]

H.S.—VOL. XXVIII.
3. Ἰσοπεδίων cf. Ἰσολύμπιος, Ἰσονίμεος. See Dittenberger, Syll. 2nd ed., Indices, s. v. The meaning is made clear by, e.g. Dittenberger, Syll. 2nd ed., 206. 16. τὸν μὲν μονοτείνον Ἰσοπ[εδίων], τὸν δὲ γυμνοκο[παν] καὶ ἱππικον Ἰσονίμεον ταῖς τε ἀλλικεῖς καὶ ταῖς τιμαῖς; id. 206. 25; id. 260. 22 ff., καὶ τοῖς μυχισμοῖς Χαλκ[ε[δ[έην] β[ο[ν] ἄγων τούτοις διδο[ν] καὶ τὰ Ἰσο-

Διόπτες διάτοροι, διάτοροι (καὶ τά) Πύθια μυχισμοί ἢ καὶ τοῦ μόνου καθηκόντο.[η] διδο[θα][ι]. Cf. also the coin of Ancyra in Head, Historia Numorum, p. 629, with the inscription ΑΓΩ(νας) ΙΚΟΠΥΘΑ. Note also in this connexion the omphalos in the relief on the front of our stone.


L. 5. ἀγωνιθετοῦν του μετὰ δημοταριμμαν. I do not know of this expression occurring elsewhere. For ἐμυ. at Side, cf. No. 21 and note there.

L. 7. ἀνταρχικῶν: apparently an important office at Side; cf. Pauly-Wissowa, s. v. Ἀλλοτρίῳς.

These games at Side are, I believe, not mentioned elsewhere on stones or in literature; but they are referred to on coins of Side by the words ἘΡΟϹ, ΠΥΟΙΟϹ, ΜΥΣΤΙΚΟϹ, ΟΛΥΜΠΙΑ ΟΙΚΟΥΜΕΝ., ΟΙΚΟΥΜΕΝΙΚΟϹ (Head, Hist. Num., p. 587). Apollo is a frequent coin-type.

[The era, from which the numerals heading texts Α and Β are reckoned, is possibly that of Hadrian's visit to Asia (129 A.D.). The names in text ε imply a date towards the end of the second century at earliest; and therefore one cannot reckon from the Cilician provincial era (74 A.D.), still less from the Claudian provincial organisation. Unfortunately neither coins nor inscriptions of Pamphylia inform us about local eras.—D.G.H.]

21.

On a slab of marble purchased by Mr. C. D. Curtis, and now in America.

[ ]

ΔΗΜΙΟΡΡ

[δ]ημιουργο[γ]υγαντ[ι]

ΚΑΠΙΑΣΑΣ

α] καὶ πάσας [ἀ]ρχ[α]ς

ΕΛΕΙΤΕΥ

π]ολειτευ[σ]άμενον

ΗΤΟΙΣΠΑ

κα] τοῖς πα[σίν

ΥΡΕΟΥΣ

ἀργυρ[ι]ο[ὺς] [στεφάνι-

ΕΝΑΥΤΟ

οι] ἐν αὐτῷ[εν]

L. 1. ἐςμ. cf. Pauly-Wissowa, inv. 2858 fl., resp. 2861. 32 ff. The office was already known as existing in Side, C.I.G. 3437.

Same coin, 117 (Gallienus; inscription ΕΡΟϹ ΜΥΣΤΙΚΟϹ ΚΙΔΗ ΤΩΝ ΝΕΟ-

ΚΟΡΩΝ), 118 (Gallienus), 121 (Salonina). [Valerian I.], 101 (Gallienus; Athena is on the
Marble block in the yard of a house, probably complete on all sides though worn at the edges. The text is, however, obviously not complete on the right, the last portion having been cut on another block. Fig. 2.

Σέρονελλίου καὶ Ρούτειλία ἡ γυνὴ ἐκ τῶν ἱδίων κατασκευάσαντες τὴν στήλην καὶ τὰ ἔργα ἐξουθενάντες ἔτοιμον τὴν ἐπαναστήμην σφοδροῦ σῶν τῇ βούλῃ καὶ διὰ ἐποίησις ἑορτᾶς ποιήσεως εἰς εὐθυγχανὸν ταῖς τῇ Ρούτειλίας ἐνδυμασίας ἐν τῇ τῆς ἀναστάσεως δαπάνῃ!

[For the number of letters lost in each line on the right there is no guide except the very probable restoration of line 1. The last legible character in l. 3 is certainly iota, and the last in l. 4 is a haste which, if not iota, could be part only of etai, nu, nu, pi, or rho. The oblique line, apparently joining the two hastae in the photograph and making a μω after εται, is deceptive. On an untouched print it appears as a flaw in the stone continuing up into the line above. For the phrase ποιεῖν ἑορτὴν see Thuc. ii. 15.

Since l. 3 ends on the stone with iota, the restoration of the sequel, given above, is almost unavoidable. A sarcophagus raised up on a high pedestal (βάσις) must be in question. I suggest στήλην in l. 2 because this text is actually cut on a slab, not on a sarcophagus. For the use of the second singular of the future in the final injunction cp. our No. 3.

—D.G.H.]
23.

On a rough stone set in a wall. The second line is entirely erased.
Copied by R. Norton.

\[\text{ΕΝΠΡΟΠΑΙ} \quad \text{[---]}\]
\[\text{ΘΟΥΞΑΚΗΓΕΝ} \quad \text{[---]}\]
\[\text{ΕΠΘΗΚΕΝ} \quad \text{ΕΠΕΘΗΚΕΝ}\]
\[5 \quad \text{ΣΥΜΟΥΝ} \quad \text{Σύμουν}\]
\[\text{ΚΛΑΥΒΟΥΑΙ} \quad \text{Κλαύβουαί}\]
\[\text{ΑΛΑΜΑΙΣ} \quad \text{Αλαμάις}\]

24.

On a marble slab, 305 m. long by 18 m. high, broken at the end. At the L. end is carved a basket-like object.
Copied by R. Norton.

\[\text{ΛΙΕΝΔΟΣ} \quad \text{κατά ξένος}\]

a. (sloping across the basket (?))

\[\text{ΟΠΥΘΩΝ}\]

Perhaps a should be read ο ξένος; cf. the inscription in Lane-Korotov.,
\[\text{Studia Pamphylicia n. 186, No. 108.}\]

25.

Seven fragments of a slab of white marble; 013-016 m. thick; the largest is 180 m. long; height of letters 030 m.; the minimum of the letters is partially preserved. Now in the American School in Rome, having been donated by Mr. A. V. Armour. (No. 123 of the School's inventory.) None of the fragments join, and none of the words can be made out. Fig. 3.

26.

On a slab near the sea. Letters are 0-11 m. high.
\[\text{ΣΑΦΗΝΗ-\,\,\,\,ΣΑΑΙ} \]

27.

On upright slabs S.W. of the theatre, in the Street of Columns.

a. \[\text{Η-} \quad \text{ΠΑΛΙΠΑ}\]

b. \[\text{ϕΑΙ\,\,\,\,Α} \]
Probably a fragment of a dedication to Trajan, Nērōjā idou.

On a marble slab.

-κετ φροντιστή τῆς ἀγωνίας, πρῶτης συναγωγῆς ἕτην εἰσ-νυμφής, καὶ ἀνεπλήρωσε τὴν μαρμάρωσιν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀμβόνος δῶς τοῦ σίμη, καὶ ἐσμησα
5 τὰς δύο ἑπταμέχους καὶ τὰ δύο κινοκέ- φαλα, ἵθελεν (κύρων) εἰ' μην' τοῦ θ'.
L. 1. - - - ]xv: There is so little of the inscription lost on the left that this must be the end of a (Jewish) name, rather than of τολάκης, δεκάδης, or the like.  

.phiunos: cf. Grenfell and Hunt, Οἰκονομικός Πυργὸς i. No. Liiii.:  
IG. xiv. 715 (Naples); id. 759 (Naples), II. 3, 8, 22. ὁ φρατραχὸς ἴοι το χαλκαλόγιον ὁ φροντιστής ἴοι δο[φ]ηταῖ ἴοι ἄλλοι τινι τοις φορτιάς τις ἄρματαιν κτλ. I can find no exact parallel for the use of the word in connexion with a synagogue; but cf. C.I.L. iv. 190 (Aegina), (b) Θεοδόροι νεώ(ς) ὁ φροντίζων κτλ.; (b) Θεοδόρος άργυσσὸν θυματίων θυματίων εἰς τάσσεσα | ἐὰν θεμελίων τοῦ συναγ[ευμ]νοῦ οἰκοδομήν κτλ., which makes it not unlikely that the φροντίστης of our inscription = ἄρχοντος ἄργυρος.  

.τὴν ἄγοντος πρώτην συναγωγήν: this method of distinguishing two or more synagogues as 'first,' 'second,' etc., seems to be unknown elsewhere. Nowack, Lehrbuch der hellen. Archäol. ii. p. 86, Ann. 2, speaks of the use of emblems (the vine-brunch, etc.) for this purpose; one of his examples is quite doubtful; see S. Reinach's article in B.C.H. x. (1886), p. 329, where other methods of designating synagogues are also enumerated.

L. 4. By ἄμβων must be meant the reading-desk and platform, θίμα. I know of no other instance of the use of the word ἄμβων in connexion with synagogues; it is not used of the θίμα, suggentus, pulpitum, of the Christian church until the fourth century. [Prof. H. Hirschfeld says that it is used for 'pulpit' in Syriae.—D.O.H.]

L. 4. σίμα: a recognized Byzantine variant for σῖμα. A portico shaped like the letter σῖμα is meant, cf. C.I.G. 8623 (Bostra), ἐκτίσθη ἐκ θεμηλίων τὸ τρίκογχον σίμα, and the note there, 'σίμα πορτίου ἐν την εἰδίμονα τοῦ σίμα τοῦ ἄμβου τῆς συναγωγῆς.' I am unable to consult Du Cange, Const. Christ. lib. ii. p. 112, referred to in C.I.G. For the designation, cf. also C.I.L. vi. 10284 (=Dessau 7947), διαβος in gamma porticibus; C.I.L. vi. 11913, porticus adiuncta in γαμμα unius productus, where si]mα seems a possible restoration. If the form ἁ is meant, σίμα would probably be another way of saying διαβος in gamma porticus.

The σίμα must be the portico at the front (entrance) of the synagogue. S. Reinach, B.C.H. x. (1886), 327 ff., and Rec. des Études Juives, xii. 236 ff., shows that the Greco-Jewish synagogue consisted of the synagogue proper—a roofed building—and, in front of it, a court, open to the sky, and generally surrounded by colonnades. If, as is natural to assume, the ἄμβων stood

---

8 Nevertheless I believe we have here the end of a numeral; the name ought to have occupied a larger space than was available here; it was probably cut on an upper block. [D.O.H.]
near the back end of the synagogue, the phrase ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀμβώνος ἐως τοῦ σίμα is equivalent to the entire length of the synagogue.

L. 5. The seven-branched candlesticks, as furnishings of synagogues, were known before.

The purpose of the ὕδω κινοσκέφαλα may perhaps be explained by specialists in Hebrew antiquities.¹

L. 6. The year and month of the indiction are given, but not the number of the indiction itself. This is the usual form. As the origin of this method of chronology cannot be placed earlier than the time of Constantine, this gives a terminus a quo for this inscription.

This inscription is of considerable interest as throwing light on the Jewish community at Side and their synagogue. It gives the following items of information:

(1) There were at least two synagogues at Side or in the vicinity (τῆς ἀν. πρώτης αὐτ.).
(2) The epithet ἀγιωτάτη was used.
(3) In the First Synagogue there was an official styled φιλονιστής.
(4) This building had a marble pavement (μαρμάρωσις); it must therefore have been a structure of some dignity.
(5) It had apparently near one end a reading-desk (ἀμβών), and
(6) at the other a portico shaped like the letter σίμα.
(7) It contained two seven-branched candlesticks, and
(8) ὕδω κινοσκέφαλα.
(9) We may infer from the above that the Jews of Side were numerous and well-to-do.


CYPRUS.

Larnaca (near Citium).

30.

At the house of K. Karemphyllaki, On a columnar stele of the well-known local type.² Copied by A. W. Van Buren. Lettering irregular.

¹ [Hail these ὕδω κινοσκέφαλα anything to do with Solomon's JalsA Tiếp and ἀμβών with their pomegranate capitals! See I. Kings vii. 15, 21; II. Chron iii. 15, 17.—R.G.H.]
² Similar steles are published or described by Ceccaldi, Brev. Archäol. sac. ii. 57 (1874), pp. 79 ff.; 29 (1875), p. 84, note 3, pp. 95 ff.; and by Perdrizet, in R.C.H. xx (1884), pp. 343 ff. Perdrizet's Nos. 11 (which has Ξ not Ξ)
A W. VAN BUREN

ΑΦΡΟΔΕΙ Αφροδεί
ΣΑΧΡΗΣΤΗ αὐχρηστῆ
ΧΑΙΡΕ χαίρε.

Cf. B.C.H. 20 (1896), p. 344. No. 20, 'Αφροδίσια | χρηστῆ | χαίρε. A name 'Αφροδίσια or 'Αφροδίσια is not found elsewhere; here it may be the stone-cutter's mistake for 'Αφροδίσια.

Τερψιχ Ναος.

31.

On a fragment of a marble architrave, circ. 1.50 m. long, lately excavated in the yard of the house of K. Ioannis Hadjipapagiorgi. Copied by R. Norton.

ΚΑΙΤΩΝ ΤΙΩΝΑΤΟΤ Μ. ΑΤΙ
ΑΜΑΤΑΚΑΙΤΑΣΑΝΟΔΟΤΣΚΑ
καὶ τῷ νῦν αὐτῶν Μ. Αέρησιν — — — — ἄργαλαμα καὶ τὰς ἀνθόσεις καὶ τεσσακάτα.

Date, 196-211 A.D.

32.

Cut on a step in the native rock at the back of the house of K. Ioannis Hadjipapagiorgi. The Π is 0.16 m. high.

ΓΟ.

33.

On a block in the wall of the new church.

ΦΑ

Cyrenaica.

Apollosa.

34.

A red granite slab, 91 x 95 m. broken to left, serving for a step before the guest-room of the camp; lettering, 15 m. high, much defaced.

S-ΤΝΙΒ

It is possible that this belongs to the same inscription as the fragments C.I.L. iii. 12. They apparently had to do with an aqueduct.
35.
On a frieze over the door of a tomb.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ΑΜΜΩΛΙΟΥ} \\
\text{ΠΥΘΑΤΟΣ}
\end{array}
\]

L. 1. 'Αρμωλίου for 'Αρμωνίου
L. 2. Πυθατος pet-form for Πυθάρετος

36.
a. above the door; b. at the l. of the door of a tomb.

a.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ΑΥΛΟΥΑΓΕ} \\
\text{ΕΛΗΝΟΥ}
\end{array}
\]

\[\text{και Έγγογη τ[α] Λουκά.}\]

In a. Αὐσοληνοῦ is a peculiar name; but I have no other suggestion as to the reading.

b.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ΚΑΙΕΓΛΟΗΤ} \\
\text{ΛΟΥΚΑ}
\end{array}
\]

37.
Over the r. corner of the cornice of the door of a tomb. Copied by R. Norton.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ΔΙΩΔΟΤΟ} \\
\text{Διώδοτος}
\end{array}
\]
38.

On the l. of the door of a tomb.

| ΙΕΡΑ | Ιερὰ Π. |
| ΑΡΙΝΑ | ἀρινά |
| ΜΑΡΙ | 'Αρι- |
| ΑΝΤ | αντ. |
| ΟΣΕΤ | ὕσ. ἐτ. |
| Ν | ὑν |

L. 1. Παρινά for Παρινά.
L. 3. Αριαντος for Αριαντός.

39.

In the necropolis W. of the harbour. On a panel (65 x 34 m.) above the door of a rock-cut tomb. Very roughly and irregularly cut. Copied by R. Norton.

| ΜΥΡΑΙΤ | Μυρώ Πτ- |
| ΟΛΕΜΑΙΟ | αλεμαίο- |
| ΥΑΝΥΝΗ | ν 'Αλυνη- |
| ΟΣΕΤΩΝ | ὕσ. ἐτῶν |
| Ο | ν. |

40.

Above the door of a tomb. Letters are about 11 m. square. Copied by R. Norton.

ΓΑΡΙΑ

Παρια.

41.

Over the door of a tomb; much weathered.

ΤΑΠΛΕΓ\\
ΝΔΑΝΟΠ\\
ΟΓΚΛ ΝΑ

ΤΑΠΛΙΜΓ
On a panel over the door of a tomb. There are traces of four lines.

The above inscriptions from Apollonia can hardly be those referred to by Letronne in Rev. Archél. v. (1848); speaking of a letter from M. Vattier de Bourville, who was travelling in the Cyrenaica, he says: 'D'autres inscriptions, trouvées à Sousset el Hammam à l'ouest d'Apollonie, sont informes, et ne contiennent que des noms propres altérés.'

A. W. Van Buren,
THE FLEET OF XERXES.¹

Two extreme views obtain as to the numbers of this fleet. Many modern writers⁸ have unaffectedly accepted, sometimes with conviction, the 1,207 (or 1,327) triremes of Herodotus. In sharpest contrast, we have Prof. Hans Delbrück’s estimate of not over 300 triremes for Xerxes’ fleet at the outset, or anyhow at Artemisium.² Delbrück discards all Herodotus’ numbers as equally worthless, and sets out to deduce the true figure from criticism of the naval battles and of probabilities; it leads to the result that at Salamis the Persians were actually outnumbered, which is the point that really matters. Several intermediate views have also been put forward: Dr. H. Welzhofer⁴ and Prof. J. Beloch⁵ have taken the figure as 1,207 ships, not warships, Welzhofer putting the warships at something over 400; Prof. J. B. Bury⁶ and Dr. J. A. R. Munro⁷ have suggested 800 triremes at the outset; while Dr. E. Meyer⁷ gives 600-800 to start with, not all triremes, and 400-500 at Salamis, the fleet being brought up by transports, etc. to the popular figure of 1,000. Naturally, most of these figures are guesses from the probabilities of the case; but Dr. Munro has recognised the crucial fact of the four divisions of the fleet.

I hope it is not inconsistent to believe that Herodotus was sincerely anxious to tell the truth, and at the same time to sympathise with Delbrück’s

¹ [Dr. R. W. Macan’s Herodotus, Books VII.-IX., was only published after this paper was already in the editors’ hands. I have seen no reason to make any substantial alterations beyond the addition of a few notes, distinguished by square brackets; but I must apologise for the brief notices of Dr. Macan’s theory of Salamis, a full discussion of which would occupy much more space.]

² Russel, Gr. Gesch. i. 672, n. 4, ‘geradehoch’; A. Hauvette, Hérodote, 318; Th. Noldeke, Aufsätze zur griechischen Geschichte, 44; A. Basser in Jahrbuch, vol. iv. (1901), p. 94, very emphatic; Dr. O. R. Grundy, The Great Persian War, 219, ‘no solid grounds for doubting it’; H. Rauss, Die Schlacht bei Salamis (1904), to name only the most recent. It is curious to see how Rauss’s really learned pamphlet ignores Delbrück and Meyer, and still talks of the Greeks not being heavily outnumbered at Salamis; only by some 200 ships! In fact, the authentic fleet is as many as 700 in antiquity can almost be numbered on one hand. [Dr. Macan gives 1,390, divided (arbitrarily) into these squadrons of 400 each, but suspects there may be some exaggeration.]


⁵ Geogr. Gesch. l. 365.

⁶ Hitt. of Greece, i. 287.


⁸ Gesch. d. Alterthumes, iii. § 317.
method. On the latter point, however, one cannot help feeling that Delbrück's two chapters on the Persian fleet are among his least happy efforts. His calculations appear to be based on two assumptions: one, that Xerxes may have been ignorant of Themistocles' shipbuilding, which I find incredible; the other (implied, not expressed), that one trireme was as good as another, irrespective of nationality, which surely all naval history to date refutes. Nevertheless, it is a great thing that someone should have taken the Persian fleet seriously. As to Herodotus, granting (as everyone now grants) his sincerity, the only assumption which we require to make is that among his patchwork of sources there was at least one which did know the real strength of the Persians, surely no particular mystery. I start then from the point that, while a fleet of 1,207 triremes is (to me) incredible and absurd, still we are not justified in jettisoning all Herodotus' numbers and taking to guesswork unless and until we have made every effort to extract sense from them. As I do not like to patch the fifth-century evidence with that of the fourth, I do not propose to use Diodorus-Ephors as argument, though I cannot help it if the argument itself brings us round to Diodorus.

This paper, by a different method from that of Delbrück, arrives at a somewhat similar result; in the main battle of Salamis, as fought, the Persians were probably outnumbered. I hope I need not apologise for the investigation of figures in §§ 1 and 8; it seems to me that one must first settle on a numerical basis (so far as possible) before one can form clear ideas about any war whatever.

§ 1. — The Numbers.

We possess three formal totals for the Persian fleet.

(a) 1,000, Aeschylus, Pers, 341-3. Some have doubted whether Aeschylus does not mean 1,207; but the messenger is surely clear enough. The number of ships that Xerxes led was 1,000; that I know, ἀλὰ — a thing that could be seen, counted, and there were 207 surpassing swift: thus says report, ἀγάρος — a thing that could not be seen or counted, but had to be told. I take the distinction between ἀλὰ and ἀγάρος to be conclusive that the 207 were included in the 1,000, as the Schol. ad loc. understood.

(b) 1,207, Herod.; the number of the Persian fleet at Doriscus, without, be it noted, the ships of Abydos. The relation of this number to that of Aeschylus, and its source, will be considered later.

(c) 1,327, Herod.; the number of the Persian fleet at Thermæ, arrived at by adding 120 ships from the Hellenes of Thrace and the contiguous

---

* I assume that Prof. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff has sufficiently shown that the account of Salamis in the Persia of Timotheos is merely a sea-fight at large of Timotheos' own time, whatever corrections may ultimately be made in interpretation of details.

* I do not know what this 207 means. One is familiar with the later Athenian navy with ships reckoned as first-class, ἄρα, but for a fleet in large part newly built, 207 each is a highly improbable number; cf. u. 82.
islands to I.207. It does not appear what has happened to the ships of Abydos.

Now Herodotus has a stereotyped figure for a Persian fleet, 600; so on Darius' Scythian expedition, 4, 87; so at Lade, 6, 9; so under Datis and Artaphernes, 6, 94. This figure reappears again in the fifth-century Athenodographer Phanodemos as the number of the Persian fleet at the Eurymedon.\(^{11}\) It has often been pointed out that the Persian loss in the two storms, 400 + 200, looks like an attempt to reduce their fleet of 1,207 to 600.\(^{12}\) I believe it was so meant; only it does not work, for the number before the storm was not 1,207 but 1,327. Herodotus has forgotten all about the 1,327; it is then no real number; the addition of 120 to the 1,207 is just a misunderstanding of his own, and has nothing to do with his sources. No source gave 1,327; on the contrary, his attempt to reduce 1,207 to 600 shows that these are the two numbers between which he has got confused, and that the extra 120 has nothing to do with the case at all. If so, there was a second source, or group of sources, that gave Xerxes not 1,207 ships but 600. From the fleet of Xerxes this number 600 became transferred to other and less famous Persian fleets.

We can now begin from the two points fixed by Herodotus. The first is that the Persian fleet which was at Doriscus was commanded by four admirals; it was therefore in four divisions;\(^{13}\) for there is no hint of the four admirals being other than equal in authority. Two of the admirals were sons of Darius; of these, Ariabignes commanded the Ionians and Carians, Achaemenes the Egyptians. The other two, Megabazos and Prenaspe,\(^{14}\) men otherwise unknown, commanded 'the rest.' That is to say, on Herodotus' figures the two brothers of Xerxes commanded 370 ships, the two commoners 837; a sufficient absurdity. But the commands of Ariabignes and Achaemenes give the other fixed point; the divisions were territorial. Now it is obvious that, on any territorial arrangement, the third admiral must have commanded the Phoenicians; that they were the most important part of the

\(^{11}\) Pint. Clases, 12.

\(^{12}\) Several writers—e.g. Busolt, ii, 694, n. 6: Welhoffer, Die Geschichtbe bei Solanes (Hist. Teutschd., 1892, p. 48); Meyer, G. d. A. iii. § 217; Manro, loc. p. 299; C. F. Lehmann-Haupt, Kleis, vol. ii (1892), p. 338, n. 2 [and Musaii in H. 8, 88]—accuse Herodotus of raising his figure for the fleet again after the storm to its original strength by supposing that reinforcements from the islands, etc., balanced the losses. Fortunately, he never said anything so foolish. What he does say (8, 66) is that Xerxes' men, both those that marched overland and those who came on shipboard, were as numerous at Phalerum as before Thermopylae; for the losses of men in the storms, at Artemision, and at Thermopylae, were balanced by reinforcements. There is not a word about ships. The Boeotians turned out πολιτείαι, except the men of Plataea and Thespiae; if we reckon them at 8,000-10,000, the latter being one half of their total levy at Delium (see Beloch, Grisch. Aufgaben ii. in Kleis, vi. 1896, p. 35), and add another 2,000 for the Malians, Dorians, Locrians, and islanders, then H.'s statement is soberly itself, provided that (as regards the fleet) he is reckoning the loss in fighting men only and not in towers, i.e. the loss as it affected the Persian army, of which the Persian marines formed part.

\(^{13}\) Aeschylus gives as total 1,000 ships, and later on a division of 220 (Peri. 323); it looks as if we had another alignment here to the four divisions.

\(^{14}\) If Megabazos' father be the Megabates of H. 5, 32, he was a collateral of the royal house. It does not appear if Prenaspe was related to the well-known Prenaspe of Cambyses' reign.
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fleets qualitatively is clear on every page of the story,
for the fourth admiral two separate groups of ships, separated by
the Iono-Carian group, viz.: (1) those of Cyprus, Cilicia, Pamphylia, Lycia,
and (2) those of Aeolis and the Hellespont, 160. That one admiral
commanded both groups is, on a territorial arrangement, out of the question.
The total Persian fleet therefore was not in four divisions but in five, viz.: (1)
Egypt; (2) Phoenicia; (3) Cyprus, Cilicia, Pamphylia, Lycia; (4) Ionia
and Caria, including of course the 'Dorians of Asia'; (5) Aeolis and the
Hellespont, or rather everything north of the northern boundary of the Ionian
fleet, whatever that was. I shall refer to each of the five groups as *fleets*;
and shall call (3), (4), and (5) the central, I onian, and northern fleets
respectively. Probably each of the five was in fact a separate fleet with a separate
organisation. Herodotus' national numbers are worthless, as often noticed.
There were only four fleets at Doriscus. The fifth, then, if employed at all,
joined after the expedition left Doriscus. Now Herodotus says that the ships
of Abydos were not at Doriscus; they were guarding the bridges. The only
object of this was in case a Greek flying squadron should appear; and in
that event the ships of Abydos alone would have been of little use. The
fleet then that was not at Doriscus was the northern fleet, left to guard the
bridges, its own waters. Now Herodotus says that Xerxes was joined later
by these 120 ships from the Hellespont and the contiguous islands. Everyone has seen that these had not the remotest chance of supplying 120
ships, if indeed they could supply any at all. We have seen too that these
ships were some sort of misunderstanding on the part of Herodotus, which
he promptly forgets all about again, when reducing the 1,207 of his first source
to the 600 of his second. This 120 then does not come from the same source
as the 1,207, i.e. from the source which exaggerates; and it may therefore be
a correct figure. There is only one thing that it can represent; it is meant
for the northern fleet, which (and which alone) joined Xerxes after he had
left Doriscus, no doubt picking up on the way its contingents, if any, from
towns west of Doriscus. The name of its admiral is unknown.

---

18 One of one's difficulties is the constant use of 'Phoenician' for a Persian fleet generally.
See, e.g., for Herodotus, the proceedings of that fleet after Lade; for Thucydides, 1, 150 (the
Eurymedon campaign).
19 The total of the Ionian and northern fleets is 360, i.e. the 353 of Lade in round figures. Most of the exaggerations falls on the
less known Attic contingents. [Dr. Macou

20 treati

21 Hauvret, *Hérode* 214, justly points out, not the expanse of provisioning the army
must have preceded the towns of Thessaly and Chalcidice from doing much else. They also
furnished land troops.

22 Diodorus has an extraordinary figure here. His total for the first four fleets corresponds
with that of Herodotus, though he makes the
Ionian fleet 20 larger, the central 20 smaller, than does the latter. But Aeolis and the Helles-
pont do not correspond; H. gives 180 for the
two, Diodorus 233. D. then makes the surplus on to the islands. I draw no deductions from
this: but see § 9. I see, however, little to
warrant the conjecture of A. von Mrose, Unter-
61, pp. 380, 390), that Ephoros, here used, in
addition to Herodotus, a (supposed) navy list of
Ctesias giving a total of 1,000 ships, and conse-
quently smaller separate contingents. See also
n. 117.
Now if we have five territorial fleets, which in Herodotus' second source total 600; and if one of these fleets is 120-strong, a number which in any rate does not come from the first source; then the second source probably presupposed the following: the Persian fleet was organised in five fleets of 120 ships each, totalling 600. I think, we shall see every reason for believing this to be correct. 600 would be the proper strength on a general mobilisation; but in 480 B.C., if ever, the fleets were at paper strength. A fleet of 600 triremes would, I suppose, be quite unmanageable in fact, but five separate fleets of 120 each would not.

§ 2.—The Composition of the Fleets.

Before proceeding to examine Herodotus' record in the light of the above supposition, it may be useful to analyse the composition of the fleets a little further.

The sea-coast of the Persian empire was not all acquired in one way. Egypt, Ionia, Caria, were conquered by force. Cilicia treated with Cyrus as an independent state, and came in on favourable terms at a time when Syene's co-operation was vital.28 Phoenicia also came in of her own free will, on what terms we do not know, but the acquisition of the Phoenician fleet without fighting for it was so tremendous a gain to Persia that the terms for Phoenicia must have been good ones. It is probable enough that both Phoenicia and Cilicia would bargain for a fixed limit to their military (or rather naval) service. Now Herodotus says (3, 19) of Cambyses πάς ἐκ Φοινίκης ἡμέρας οἱ στρατεύματα: all his navy depended on, or 'was hung upon,' the Phoenicians. This does not mean that he had only Phoenician ships; he had Cilician, Cyprian (8, 19), and Ionian as well. It means that the Phoenicians were the principal part of the organisation; that the rest were organised round or upon them. If then Xerxes' navy was organised in fleets of 120, and organised upon the Phoenicians, the number would seem to be due to this, that 120 was the agreed limit of Phoenician naval service. I shall return to the question of why 120 (§ 8). The actual organisation of the fleet as it appears under Xerxes must be due to Darius and be connected with his general organisation of the empire, involving doubtless the abolition of the old 'sea-province' of Cyrus.29

---

* No other power in antiquity ever collected a fleet of 600 warships. Ottomans may have controlled 800, partly borrowed from Antony, and organised as two distinct fleets in different areas, at the beginning of the campaign, which ended with Naulochus. In that year, 38 B.C., there were about 1,500 ships in commission in the whole Mediterranean. In 480 B.C., apart from the Greek and Persian fleets, totalling together almost 1,000, we have those of Carthage, Tarentum, Syene, Cilicia, Marseille. If we take Kromayer's view, that in the stril were the fleets, excluding in quinquennales and Libyans, came out at about the average power of a fleet of triremes of the same total, we must rank the total sea-power of the early part of the fifth century extraordinarily high. It seems possible, however, that the south of Mediterranean sea-power would have to be placed about 250-300 B.C.

** See J. V. Prückel, Grund der Macht und Power, § 215.

*** See Prückel, op. cit. 225, 228. If the Phoenicians terms were as I suggest, 120 men-
Now if the Phoenicians were the kernel of the fleet, and its best material, why (allowing that Achaemenes of necessity commanded the ships of his satrapy) did Xerxes' other brother Ariabignes command the Ionians, while the Phoenicians were under an admiral of less importance? The answer is not difficult. The real admiral of the Phoenicians was the King himself, Xerxes, while commander-in-chief of the whole fleet, was in particular admiral of the Phoenicians, precisely as a modern admiral in command of a fleet will in particular command the battleship squadron. With the Phoenician fleet was Xerxes' own flagship, the Sidonian galley on which he embarked to review the fleet at Durium, and to see Tempe, and on which, says Herodotus (7, 128), he always did embark; and his pleasure when the Sidonians won the race at the regatta (5, 44), otherwise meaningless, becomes natural enough when we realise that they were his own personal command. But as his duties with the land army, the superior service throughout antiquity, prevented him from actually sailing with his fleet, the Phoenicians were in fact under the orders of one who, in theory, can only have been Xerxes' second in command in the Phoenician fleet; while to the Ionians was given a commander of the highest possible consequence, in view of the jealousy between their fleet and the Phoenician which appears so clearly at Salamis.

The Persian admirals were not really admirals as we understand it. They were generals of marines, of τὸν μαντικὸν στρατόν στρατηγοῦ, commanding the land troops on board; a fact which comes out most clearly at Mycale (§ 6). An ancient sea-fight took a double form, according to whether the ship herself, or her epitites, were for the moment the weapon in use. As regards the ship herself, Artemisia (H. 8, 67) expressed a candid but rash opinion that the central and Egyptian fleets were of no use, a remark...

H.S.—VOL. XXXVIII.
perhaps reflecting the temper of the Ionian fleet which no doubt thought itself as good as the Phoenician. As to the Egyptian fleet, prior to the Ionian revolt, we know that Apries fought with the Tyrians and that Amasis conquered Cyprus; but we do not know how far their fleets were manned by mercenaries. Of the central fleet, we only know that the Lycians centuries before, had a fine reputation as pirates; and that the Cilicians were at a later date, to astonish Rome with what they could do in that line; while the Cypriotes were either Phoenician or Greek, good fighting stock. And, after all, the Phoenician reputation itself, prior to the fifth century, has to be taken on trust. We may suppose that the ships of the central and Egyptian fleets were not quite up to the standard of the other two; further than this we need hardly go. As to epistates, all the fleets but the Egyptian carried, either solely or principally, Persians, Medes, and Sacae, and were therefore on a level. The Egyptian carried, either solely or principally, native marines, hardly perhaps of Persian fighting quality, but with the great advantage of a heavy armament. If we reckon Caria with the Greeks, then as regards rowsers two of the fleets were Greek, two Asiatic, one (the central) thoroughly mixed. 'The strength of the fleet lay in speed, seamanship, and courage; its weakness, in the divided command and in the root fact that the bow had no chance against the spear.

---

29 Mr. H. R. Hall, The Oldest Civilization of Greece, 85; Prof. F. Hommel, Grundriss d. Geogr. u. Gesch. d. altert. Orients, I, 52, 58.

[As Dr. Muir thinks there were native epistates throughout the fleet, I must give my reasons for this statement. The navy list (7, 96) says that all the marines were Persians, Medes and Sacae. Persian epistates on a Nebuchadnezzar ship (7, 161 compared with 8, 92). This is again borne out by 8, 160; see p. 236 post. But 7, 184 (the chapter of the great evacuation) refers to native as well as Persian, etc. epistates. One might discard this as an obvious means of working up a large figure; but we hear of Egyptian epistates (9, 83), heavy-armed troops (7, 88). To my mind, two sets of epistates on one ship is impossible; the ships of this epoch did not carry, probably could not carry, many epistates. I can only conclude that four fleets carried Persians, etc., and the Egyptian fleet natives. I do not say that the four fleets varied in native epistates; but if they did, these were few and unimportant. On the contrary, the Egyptian marines were a substantial body, or Mardukians would hardly have landed them; e.g., these have been little if any room for Tyrian marines in the Egyptian fleet. It will be seen, I hope, that this fits the story extremely well.] Now thrasy epistates in each trireme is too high. Meyer properly cuts down the rowsers to 150, and twenty is ample for the epistates; the Greek ships, if we like to follow Plutarch, carried eighteen, but the regular Athenian number was ten. Four hundred and eighty ships at twenty epistates each = 9,600 men, or with officers say a round 10,000. I cannot help suspecting that the total Persian army on mobilisation was not 220,000 in six corps of 30,000, but 90,000 in six corps of 15,000, one complete corps being assigned to the fleet. [Dr. Muir does not see why it should give the armament of each of the nations that contributed to the fleet unless they sent epistates. But on the analogy of any other fleet, e.g., the Roman, the rowsers must have had their arms with them; and this is expressly stated of the Samians, 9, 99.]

30 H. 8, 10. The Greek ships were heavy by comparison, 8, 80. Plutarch (Them. 14) says the Persian ships were tall, with hefty prows, compared with the Greek ships, which were much lower in the water. It is a pity that theories have been built on this, for it is more misleading, the less similar statement about Alexium, the just sense must have the smaller ships. The gallery on the fourth century coins of Sicyon and Alcibiades are not in the least like Plutarch's description; and his reference to Arimaspian fighting, saven arx todes shows that what he has in mind is not the fifth century stuff, but the rectangular of the first century.
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except under its own conditions. It was therefore vital for the fleet to have plenty of sea-room and never to be compelled to close against its will (H. 8, 60) to have free play for the archer and the ram; unluckily for itself, it was to meet an antagonist of genius who soon mastered this fact.

The ships were all triremes. Aeschylus in 472 B.C. could never have made the Persians wall for the three-holed ships that had betrayed them, τρισκάλιαν κάνεκ ἀνέστη, had it been otherwise. Now the ships lost by Mardonius at Athens in 492 were all or chiefly pentekonters, as is shown by H. reckoning seventy men lost to each, his reckoning elsewhere for a pentekontor being eighty (7, 184). No doubt there were some triremes before 480, but not many; the point of Darius' preparations for three years was, that he was 'scraping' his pentekontors and building triremes. The pentekontors, with a few old triremes, were utilised for the bridges over the Hellespont; chiefly the former, as Herodotus talks of the gaps left in 'the pentekontors.'

One of the really noteworthy points is that triremes did the scouting for both sides, as appears by the engagement of scouts off the Magnesian coast. The Persians therefore had no light craft, and certainly they had no pentekontors, for the bridges must have absorbed every pentekontor in Asia. The 3,000 'trikontors, pentekontors, currici, and horse transports' of Herodotus 7, 97, which by 7, 184 have grown to 3,000 pentekontors, with crews calculated accordingly, are all a mere legend, sprung no doubt from the supply ships.

No figures in antiquity are so hard to check as those of naval transport or supply. Fortunately we possess trustworthy figures for one well-equipped fifth-century expedition, the first Athenian to Syracuse; and they come out at about one supply or service vessel to each warship. If we do not see how one is to give to the finely-equipped fleet of Xerxes less than one supply vessel to every two triremes, perhaps rather more. In this case we at once get the popular or Aeschylean total of 1,000 for the whole armada.

In conclusion, I note two detailed figures. (1) Paphos sent twelve ships. If this is correct, Cyprus sent a good half of the central fleet. This may be right; for the Cilician contribution must have been, for the reasons given above, a small one, and, to judge by the coins, Pamphylia can only have had two towns important enough to send ships, Aspendus and Side. Phaselis in Lycaon may have sent a substantial contingent, from the gallery on its coins and Lycaon's old reputation for piracy. (2) Artemisia brought five ships. This startling figure is given as the contingent, not only of Halicarnassus, but of the important islands of Cos and Calemmus, which were wealthy enough. It appears to me to preclude absolutely any higher figures.

[Maxim reads: ΤΟΙϹ ΠΕΝΤΕΚΟΝΤΟΡΙΤΕΙΝ ΚΑΙ ΓΡΑΒΑΤΕΙΝ, but this last word is merely an exclamation. It is not very material.]

Thom. 8, 42: 184: triremes and the pentekontors to 133 supply and service ships; many volunteer merchantmen also accompanied the fleet for the sake of trading. This last may be true of Xerxes' fleet also.

227 If we like to assign eighty to each fleet, we get not only Aeschylus' 1,000, but the 290 ships per squadron so common in H. and later writers.

228 B.M.C. Corcor, Introduction.
3.—The Storm.

I will now briefly go through the story of the expedition after it left Doriscus.

At Therme (7, 124) the marines were camped by the Axios, at Therme, and at the cities between: the fleets were therefore at separate stations, and moving independently. After leaving Therme, the story goes that the whole fleet sailed from Therme to the strand which is between the city Casthamaea and C. Sepias (Dr. Grundy calls it 120 miles), in one day; the strand not being large, they anchored in eight lines; in the storm ships were wrecked, some at Ipini in Pelion, some on the strand, some on C. Sepias, some at the city Meliboea, some at Casthamaea. After the storm the Greeks capture fifteen ships under Sandoces. The Phoenician, Egyptian, Ionian, and central fleets all appear again in the story; of the northern fleet we hear no more. These are the main points; and I cannot find that the story told in H. 7, 188-195 has ever been properly analysed.

The first thing necessary is to get some clear idea of that part of the coast-line which stretches from the mouth of the Penaeus to Kato Georgi (commonly called C. Sepias) opposite Skiathos, and which is roughly divided into three sections by the capes of Kissabo (Ossa) and Pori (Pelion). Meliboea is Thanitu; epigraphic evidence fortunately renders this certain. According to the Admiralty chart (No. 1,085) there is a long stretch of beach here. Casthamaea was identified by Mr. H. F. Tozer with Georgiades with some ruins on the cliffs below Keramideli; but Georgiades adduces no evidence beyond that of Herodotus, while the reason which Tozer gives, viz. that Casthamaea is the only town besides Meliboea mentioned by Strabo as being on this side of Pelion, is a mistake; Strabo merely says that Casthamaea was under Pelion, and it may just as well be Zagora, or

---

* Of the ancient writers, Strabo 9, 442 is best, though he complains that he could not get information. The modern authorities are given by Mr. A. J. B. Wace in J.H.S. 26 (1906), p. 116, The Topography of Pelion and Magnesia; and I am much indebted to him for further information as to this coast-line, and some references, which he most kindly sent me in reply to some questions. The accompanying map has been drawn by Mr. F. Anderson from Admiralty chart no. 1,085, reduced to 1 inch, with some alterations in the way of names for which I am responsible. It has not been possible on the reduced scale to indicate the little bays, in the manner done in the chart itself.

* Researches in the Highlands of Turkey, v. 104.

* Antiquitates, first edition (1889), pp. 212, 213. I regret that I have been unable to see the second edition, as my quotations must stand subject to corrections.

* Kastorinis kapros ev Tis Haliadon chronica.

* Mr. Tozer makes that the learned men of Zagora claimed that that place was Casthamaea, and supported their claim by the abundance
even the port of the latter, Khorefto, which is the only village now actually on the shore, south of Tsagesi. As Zagora, according to the Admiralty chart, lies right under the highest point of Pelion, 5,340 feet, while Keramidi is far to the north under overlying spurs of the mountain, none of which are over 2,772 feet, it seems obvious that Zagora best suits Strabo's description; but the actual position of Casthanea can only be settled by epigraphic evidence. As to C. Sepias, the ordinary view is that it was the heel of Magnesia, Kato Georgi, opposite Skinathos. Mr. Wace has attempted to show that it was C. Pori, but I cannot feel convinced by his arguments; I will, however, consider both alternatives.

of chestnut trees in that neighbourhood, while there are none near Keramidi. According to Georgiadis, Zagora is the most important place in the neighbourhood.

**J.H.S. 26, 146. If C. Sepias had been Kato Georgi, why did not the Persians put to sea and run round the corner, out of the wind? I fancy that with a gale blowing on shore this would be easier said than done with galleys; however, I hope this paper will answer the question; the fleets were strung out in detachments at least as far north as Thamith (Moliboes). This leaves only a passage from Apollonias Rhodes, an unsatisfactory passage (see Georgiadis) in an unsatisfactory geography, and it is only a deduction at that. The
Now as to the strand where the Persian fleet is said to have anchored before the storm.

If Cesthasa be Keramidhi and C. Sepias be C. Pori, we have between the two a coast of rugged cliffs, where no strand is or ever could have been, and the whole story of this strand is a myth.

If, however, Cesthasa be either Keramidhi or else Zagora (or Khorefto) and C. Sepias be Kato Georgi, the Admiralty chart shows a beach at Khorefto, a place which Mr. Waare tells me does a good trade; but from the chart this beach cannot be very large, and, moreover, can hardly be described as between Cesthasa and C. Sepias, if (as I suppose) Cesthasa be Zagora or Khorefto. Going down the coast, we find a small beach at the Granicha river, and a bay at H. Athanasius. Mr. Waare tells me that the latter, which he has visited, would not he thinks, hold more than seventy-five large canoes with comfort; and that the Granicha beach looks no bigger; that there is a small sandy beach at H. Georgikos (round the corner from the cape), used by sponge fishers, and a small harbour below Zangaradhes called Koraβostasia. Georghiades mentions another little harbour at Kissos.

This then is a coast of rocks and cliffs from Keramidhi to Kato Georgi, broken here and there by a small beach or a small anchorage. There is no locality that can represent a strand at which the whole Persian fleet can have anchored. Mr. Waare tells me that the sea has gained on the land at Kato Georgi and is thought to have done so at Keramidhi; and it is, I suppose, just conceivable that 2,000 years ago there may have been a large beach, now submerged; but nothing probably could determine this except a geological survey expressly made with this object in view, and it is clear that, having regard to the nature of the coast, the burden of proof would be on anyone who should assert that the 'Sepeud strand' ever existed.

The topography then lends no support to Herodotus' narrative.

We can now, however, see that that writer's account combines two irreconcilable stories: stories, I may add, that would be equally irreconcilable were the 'strand' located somewhere under water to-morrow. One is that, when the storm broke, the Persian fleet as a whole was huddled together...
πρόκροςσατι 43 close inshore, a position in which a N.E. gale must have sent every ship that got wrecked straight on to the beach. But then follows the statement that wrecks came ashore at a number of places from Meliboea to C. Sepias, two of which, at least (Meliboea and Castanae), were N.N.W. of the supposed 'strand' on any theory, and Meliboea perhaps some considerable distance N.N.W. A N.E. gale cannot carry wreckages in a N.N.W. direction; even Boreas the Preserver could not blow both ways at once. Of these two conflicting accounts, the second implies, either that a fleet was wrecked out at sea, or that different detachments were wrecked in different places, or both.

I take it to be clear that the Persian fleet did not all sail together as a whole. 42 The five fleets sailed separately, at least, with scouts thrown out far in front; possibly the supply ships were all under convoy of the nearest divisions; but more probably with their own fleets. Whether therefore the storm broke on them afloat or ashore, I regard it as pretty certain that they were caught in different places. The storm got up in the morning, after giving the usual warning, which doubtless plenty of the sea-capains understood. 43 The triremes would be got ashore wherever they were at anchor, strung out along the little beaches, at Khoreto, at Meliboea; possibly many were not yet past the flat coast at the mouth of the Peneus. But in the absence of harbours the supply ships must have suffered; and their wrecks came ashore at a number of different places. All this is quite consistent.

To turn now to the other story. It is simply a poetical invention. The fleet together moves from Thermus to somewhere near C. Sepias in one day (7, 183), perhaps 120 miles. Dr. Grundy has defended this; but it seems a wild impossibility. 44 To credit it would amount to believing that,

42 Aristarchus ad Hi. 134 8 42, διήλθαν τιν αδηλους παρεξορισμος, δεσποτις ναυσικας κατειστης, which Dr. Leckie explains as de othek, each projecting somewhat beyond the other, like the steps of a staircase. I take this to mean that, in Aristarchus' opinion, the stairs of two were to be between the pieces of raw one, and so on, to save as much space as possible. Homer is certainly describing some method of getting more ships ashore than the shore would hold in the ordinary way, as the context shows. This assurance which Huschke means διαλεγμενος, Suida, however (II. 1, 185), explains διαλεγμενος as parallel lines of ships, right deep, such as perpendicular to the line of coast. I prefer Aristarchus myself, as Suida's explanation would hardly involve the number of ships ashore; but if I am right in what follows, it is not very material.

43 This follows from their dispositions at Thermus. But even the first Athenian expedition to Syracuse, 136 warships and about as many supply ships, sailed in three separate divisions.

44 Herod, 7, 188, 42, διπλωμα τιν αυτος παρεξορισμος τιν αδηλους παρεξορισμος. Meltt. P. 4, 1906, note: "wind;" the north wind blows with much force, even in summer. Summer gales are almost always preceded by calms with a dark appearance round the horizon.

45 Great Brit. War, p. 327, a. We have little real evidence of the pace of triremes; and even so, single ship voyages are an evidence for a fleet, tied to its slowest member, and moving at an economical rate, i.e. using its oars in relays of one-third at a time. Haier has frequently and justly pointed this out. We rarely know the conditions of any recorded voyage, or even if the sail was being used. A lot of such evidence as exists is given by D brogen in Huxley's Lab. 4, 206; the best is Xen. Hol. 1, 1, 12 (on which Homer relies in his account of Salamis), Alcibiades with eighty-six ships, going fifty miles, takes all night in late autumn and up to thirty or more nights.
through a long summer day, a fleet of triremes, lame ducks and all, could, at their economical rate, maintain some ten miles an hour, that is, pretty nearly the economical rate of a fleet of modern battleships. Three days would be nearer the mark; it may be here that the difference of two days between the journals of Artemision and Thermopylae comes in. If only one day really elapsed before the storm, then the bulk of the fleet was certainly not south of Meliboea.

Next, the fleet arrived at a beach too small for it. What does a fleet do when it gets to a beach too small for it? The author (I do not mean Herodotus) does not know; he therefore turns to the fountain-head of all wisdom, and finds in II. 34 that the Greeks in a similar predicament drew their fleet ashore in an arrangement called πρόκροσσα, while under the sterns of the row furthest inland they built a wall because of the Trojans. Our poet, however, must needs improve on Homer; he makes the Persian fleet anchor in the formation called πρόκροσσα, an impossible feat if Aristarchus' explanation of the word be correct, and I doubt if Stein makes things much better; one need scarcely remark that ships at anchor in line, triremes or other, must have room to swing and room to turn. Our poet has not troubled about this. The eight rows might perhaps show that he has some idea of four fleets or divisions, each in double line, but he does not reflect, when he comes to the storm, that a line of (say) sixty triremes at anchor on a beach implies a length of beach that would suffice for several times that number of ships in a line ashore, with their oars unshipped.

Lastly, as Homer has a wall, he must have a wall; and the crews accordingly (7, 191), it is hypothesi a great many thousand men, all armed, build a τάρα of wreckage to keep off—whom? Shall we say with our poet, the (medizing) Thessalians or a few 'wreckers' from some village on the hills?

All that we know then for certain is that a storm, big or little, broke on the fleets strung out; and that we hear no more of the northern fleet. 47 Κρήτη, the northern fleet was at sea, and perished. And if so, it was the northern fleet that was sent round Euboea. 48 I need not attempt to add to the

46 Stein justly remarks, 'Die ganze Stelle ist merker dem Vorhalte von II. 33 ff. geschrieben,' but unfortunately goes on to say that II. interpolates Homer.
47 Welkeher, Neu Jäbke, J. Phil. and Phil., 145, p. 560, rightly discounts this passage. Is it perhaps a real reminiscence of using wreckage to make a breakwater?
48 Themistocles' explicit appeal to the Ionians and Carian (8, 19 and 22) quite precludes the idea that any other large body of Greeks was still with the fleet. Neither is it possible that the northern fleet were sailed at all, but remained at the Hellespont; the story presupposes that the bridges were not guarded, and it does not appear (as it would have to) either at Mycale (where the number of Persian στρατηγοί is conclusive; see note) or after.
49 The ayrar expedition of Μύκης and Alalakos and Χελεγερες, 6, 98, Datis to Eucrat δαυτικα and Ταθανατο Αλαλάκας.
50 It is certain that the Persians, after elaborately organizing their fleet, would not proceed to disorganize it by picking out the ships to go round Euboea 'from all the ships' (8, 71). A definite squadron, accustomed to work together,
reasons given by Prof. Bury,\textsuperscript{26} which I fully accept, for sending off these ships from somewhere north of Skiatos. Whether they were all wrecked in the first storm\textsuperscript{27} or whether some got round, rallied in the Hollows, and were wrecked in a new storm from the S.W., is a matter on which, as Meyer says, certainty cannot be attained. They never appear again.

Herodotus says that he knew several versions of the Persian losses in the storm, the smallest making it 400 apart from the 200 ships sent round Euboea. Fortunately he has preserved indications of a very different story. In this, the Persians after the storm merely launched 'the ships' (7, 193), not, as we should expect, the remnants of them; and the Greeks, who had expected (7, 192) to find the Persian fleet sadly diminished, are amazed when they see what good plight the barbarians are really in.\textsuperscript{47} There is no trace at Artemision of the Persians being either disorganised or demoralised, and they had no time to put things right. We have got to suppose that the loss, apart from the northern fleet, was small, and fell chiefly on the supply vessels; but there was some loss of triremes, as shown by the Persians numbering their fleet at Aphetae.

We may assign the heavy storm-loss with confidence, to the same poetical source that we have already commented on, and I have no hesitation in also ascribing to the same source the loss of eleven out of twelve Paphian ships in 7, 195, which must belong to a version that gave a very heavy storm-loss. The question of the fifteen ships under Sandokes, hyparch of Cyme (7, 194), is more difficult. τόν ἐσφαλέους Ἀμπάρχης, says Herodotus. Elsewhere he keeps the term ἐσφαλέως for the admiral, I lay no stress on this: but even if we suppose that Cyme was included in the Ionian and not in the northern fleet, and that consequently it is conceivable that Sandokes had under his orders a dynast of Caria (Ardolus), it is absolutely impossible on any ground that he can have commanded a dynast from Paphos in Cyprus. We might suppose that these were storm-tossed ships, separated from their fleets, of which Sandokes had de facto taken command; but with a N.E. gale, blowing on shore, this is impossible. Neither is it likely that the main fleet, with the Greeks so close, would have left Sandokes to collect along the coast and bring in any ships left behind to repair slight damages, which would be making a present of them to the Greeks. A ship of Cyme too should have been with the

\textsuperscript{26} E.S.A. ii, 88. In his history, Prof. Bury sends these ships off from Aphetae. Has he abandoned his earlier view (which Dr. Meier has adopted)?

\textsuperscript{27} Bury in E.S.A. ii, and Munro, i.e. p. 210. Note that in 8, 96 H. knows only of 'the storm'; he must have had two versions at least before him. D. Müller, 

\textsuperscript{47} 1907, 89, treats the whole storm-incident as a duplicate of the storm that destroyed Mardonius' ships at Athens in 402. If I am right about the fleet, this is impossible. I note that the Mediterranean Polis, in its Athens table (the nearest), gives an average of three days' gale for August, more than for any month but January and February. (Dr. Meier treats the two storms as certainly one, lasting for three days.)
northern fleet; though it is always possible that one or two stragglers from that fleet got back [or that (as Dr. Macan suggests) Sandeas was not on a ship of Cyme at all]. Possibly the Greeks captured fifteen ships somehow; but the details I look on as quite untrustworthy, and as belonging to the same source as the loss of the eleven Paphian vessels.

The fleet was 'numbered' at Aphetae, which I take to mean that the ships from the islands, which had now joined, were told off to their squadrons. We see this clearly from the story of the Samothracian ship at Salamis, which fought in the Ionian fleet, but as epibates carried Samothracian δικοντισταί, not Persians (8, 90). She was therefore no part of the Ionian fleet as originally organised; and it is indeed the whole point of the story that the Ionian good name was saved by the exploit of a ship which had nothing to do with Ionia. The same appears, in the case of the ships of Naxos, Lemnos, and Tenedos that deserted to the Greeks; had they carried Persian epibates they could not have gone over, a point on which Themistocles had no delusions when he realised that 'strong necessity' might prevent the Ionians from deserting.²² I cannot help thinking that the seventeen προσωπα of H. 7, 93, a figure and a contingent quite out of place where it occurs, represent the island reinforcements, but it is not very material.

If we take it then that the Persians lost 120 ships in the northern fleet, with perhaps fifteen captured and three wrecked on Myrmex, received a dozen or so reinforcements and lost a few in the storm, say twenty or thirty, I think we may put it this way: that at Aphetae they cannot well have had over 450, and may of course have had a great many less. But I think that 450 as a highest possible is safe to work with: it will appear presently why I want to consider the outside possible figure.

§ 4.—Artemision.

The Greek fleet the first day was 268 triremes (three lost scouting) and nine pentecontors. We have got to explain how it came about that the Greeks had rather the best of it against the superior Persian numbers.

One explanation has been suggested by Prof. Wilcken in publishing the recently discovered fragment of Sosylus, viz., that this was the occasion on which Heracleides of Mylasa so brilliantly countered the Phoenician diecphus. F. Ruchl has objected to this, that, if so, the total silence of Herodotus, who must have known of Sosylus's narrative, is very extraordinary; and he suggests that Heracleides' feat belongs to some (unknown) battle of Artemision in the Ionian revolt. To which Wilcken replies that, if so,

²² B. 8, 22: νῦν δὲ διανοομένα μὲν ἔχουσα καὶ τῆς ἀκριβείας.
²⁴ Ὁδοῖν, p. 352.
²⁵ Ἡερμ. 42 (1907), p. 312. But for the name Artemision, it would fit in well enough with the battle off Cyprus in H. 9, 112, in which the Ionians defeated the Phoenicians, for there must be something behind H.'s statement that that day the Ionians were 'at the top of their form,' ἐν τοῖς προσωπή, having learnt how to meet the diecphus, they then, before
the silence of Herodotus is still every bit as extraordinary, and that such a victory can hardly be fitted in with Herodotus’ account of the Ionian revolt. I may remark, perhaps, that though, if the story comes from Scylax, we are in a difficulty either way, still there is no certainty that it does; Sosylos does not profess to be citing Scylax, neither does he suggest that the Massilian knew anything about Heracleides; he may be quoting some commonplace book of naval tactics, in which the manoeuvre was of more importance than its correct attribution, the sort of book that we possess at fourth hand in the naval portions of Polybius. And it does not do to forget that Polybius called Sosylos a mere chattering. While reserving the possibility of Wilcken proving to be right, I do not see how we can use Sosylos for Artemision till a good deal more light has been thrown on the matter, attractive as it would be to do so.

Putting Sosylos aside, I believe that Ephorus hit on the key to what happened when he described the Persians as issuing from different anchorages. Their four fleets were, as usual, at separate stations. The Greeks waited till late afternoon, and then attacked one of the fleets, the idea being to do what harm they could before the rest came up in support. Hence the late afternoon, to give the Persian fleet, when combined, little time for operations. It was no μακρὰ; the strategical position compelled the Greeks to attack; they were only holding Thermopylae to enable the fleet, their best arm, to strike a severe blow, if so it might be. The scheme answered pretty well; and on the other fleets coming up the Greeks managed to hold on till dark without receiving too much damage, retreating in convoy with their prows to the enemy and occasionally charging them. The ships they took must have been taken before their retirement. From the reference to the capture of Philon’s ship we may suppose that the central fleet was the one they attacked; probably it lay nearest to the Greek position.

The next day the Greeks put out still later, attacked the central fleet.

Lack, try to practise it themselves. — But though there were many Artemisions and Dianisms all about the Mediterranean, I cannot find one in these particular waters, or nearer than the one in Caria which Rusell gives.

Welshers (L. C.) in his excellent study of Artemision, came to much the same conclusion: the Greeks overwhelmed a portion of the Persian fleet before the rest came up. Ephorus perhaps had the same idea; but Diodorus does not actually say so, though he comes rather near it: 11, 12, τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐποίησαν ἐπηρεάζονταν (before we have ἐποίησαν καὶ ἔπιστρεψαν ᾨδισ), to ηπατῶν οὖν τινα τὴν θεσπομενὴν ἐπηρεάζοντα τεῖς Περσῶν ἐπιτίμακαν ταῦτα μὲν τοῖς εὐτεχεστέρα κ.τ.λ. 42 This new seems a fixed point: Th. Luschnath, Archiv. f. d. Gesch. 1904, p. 195. 43 Muus ii. 361 and 270.

By μακρὰ means the same as the Corinthian tactics against Pharnace in the gulf of Corinth. The line probably became an arm, as they would be overlapped.

[Dr. Mace’s view is, that when the Persians rounded C. Sestus the Greeks were holding the Ocean channel, in case the enemy should try to force it; the Greeks did not attack the main Persian fleet as it made for Aphidnae, but managed to cut off the rear-guard under Sandross, capturing according to the Asiatic version fifteen ships, according to the Greek thirty; this was the first day of Artemision. This is a wide departure from the tradition; nor do I see how ships of Paphos and of Caria could really be in one squadron. But I have already dealt with the Sandross story, and cannot think that it has anything to do with the first day of the battle of Artemision.]
again shortly before dark, and sank some of the Cilician ships. There was no time for the others to come up. Diodorus, who has possibly here got hold of a genuine bit of the lost Phoenician tradition, makes Artemisia a two-days' fight only; to the Phoenicians it was. The Greeks had this day been reinforced by fifty-three ships which had been guarding the Euripus. I have felt much difficulty over these fifty-three ships, because the number will not fit in with any possible squadron-arrangement, and of course the 200 Athenian ships had a definite squadron-arrangement; I conclude, however, that the story implies an Athenian squadron of fifty ships, and three others, not necessarily Athenian, sent to act as scouts.

It was evident that this sort of thing could not go on; the Persian fleet, against Persian policy (which was to strike with their best arm, the army), received definite orders to attack. The Greek numbers were now well over 200, the Persians not much over 400 at the very outside; the latter attacked in full force, and the Greeks got a very rough handling. No doubt it was a hard-fought day, and the Persians too suffered; but that it was a Persian victory there can be no doubt whatever. The real proof of this is the effect on the mind of Themistocles. He, who had previously been content that battle should be given in open water, now saw that it was life and death to the Greeks that the next fight should be fought in waters where the Persians could not manœuvre and had to come to close quarters; and he risked everything, his fair name included, to bring this about. Beside this, no other argument matters. Delbrück, for instance, lays stress on the Persian failure to pursue; but is there a single case in ancient history of a pursuit really pressed where the beaten fleet had a line of retreat and was not forced ashore? Rovers are not engines; also we do not know how far the Persian supply was disorganised by the storm, and we do know that it was their invariable policy that army and fleet should move strictly pari passu.

More to the point would be a query, why the Persian fleet, if really superior in numbers, did not do more damage than it did. The answer is to be sought in those limitations to which I referred above. Given equal courage, a lighter fleet that dare not either board or man man to prow could not make very rapid progress; one would think, whatever its skill. Herodotus' writers of the ordinary books on naval tactics were familiar with the idea of handling a fleet in small sub-squadrons.

9. A consideration quite neglected by those writers who seem to look on every number as suspect unless it be a surd. Given a town with a large fleet, this was bound, when at peace, to be an easily subdivided or round number. How far subdivision went we do not know; but there is an interesting story by Polyæus iii. 4, 2 of Pharamis proposing a fleet in small squadrons of five ships each (or seven) as units; which shows (whether true of Pharamis or not) that at a later time the Pharamids were not kept by the Athenians.
reference to the Egyptians as doing best on this day may be perfectly correct; their heavy-armed marines were not compelled to avoid a πελώσασσα, as were the Persian archers. And Themistocles had the genius to grasp the Persian limitations for future use.

One last point on the third day of Artemision. If some 400 triremes on one side were really engaged with over 300 on the other, then this was far and away the greatest sea-fight, as regards numbers of ships, ever fought in the ancient world. Taking a trireme as about 5 m. wide, with oars 3-3 m. outboard (Schmidt's calculation), we have a total breadth of about 12½ yards. The rather common reckoning of 100 triremes in line abreast to a mile gives each vessel about 17½ yards, which seems to me far too little, as it gives no possibility of turning; however, on this figure, and in double line, the Persian line of battle was at least two miles long; perhaps it was much longer. Two consequences follow, of importance when we come to consider the sources. Even in the absence of smoke, a man at one end of the line can have had little idea of what was happening to the bulk of the fleet; and, as a fact, the battle must have broken up into several independent actions. We see this happening clearly, to much smaller fleets, both at Ecnomus (Polybius) and at Salamis in Cyprus (Diodorus); most clearly of all at Chios (Polybius), which was really two separate battles.

§ 5.—Salamis.

The first thing is the Greek numbers. The 310 triremes of Aeschylus cannot well be wrong; he must have known the numbers of the fleet he fought in. Apart from Aeschylus, we can see that the 380 triremes of Herodotus are wrong for Salamis, as he presupposes that the larger contingents, Athens, Corinth, Megara, were in the same force as at Artemision, which is absurd. I take it that Herodotus' figures are campi scissors totals, the sum total of the individual ships of each state commissioned during the summer of 480 B.C. 46

46 Much of the criticism of these figures is rather perverse. Rakot's condemnation of them as round numbers. 300 Athen., 200 the rest, has been sufficiently met by Hauvette (Herodote, 591-3), who pointed out, first, that H. 's figure is not 320 but 229, plus two deserters really 374 + 6 deserters, i.e. 380. Nemesis is included, and secondly that we cannot neglect the pentekonta. I hope I have said enough already about round figures (p. 21), and as doubtless Themistocles' as was a fleet roughly equal in power to the rest of Greece. More decisive is the criticism of R. Adams, in Herodotus (1913, 8). I think there was something in it (C. d. 17, 54, 12). By counting the twenty ships lost to the Chalcidians—or rather manned by Athenian ierarchs—Adam makes Athens furnish half the fleet, the other states half, excluding the deserters; next by adding two of the deserters, he makes the Peloponnesians furnish half of the latter half; and so on, ending in complete incoherence. This is supposed to prove that H. invented his figures on a scheme. We can all agree anything with any set of figures if we cast juggle with them like this. I regret I have not been able to see Leib's, Studien in Herodotus, where, I believe, holds that many of H.'s figures are mere calculations. If any reader still for a year at two keep count of the curious coincidences met with in the figures that he comes across in daily life, he will become very shy of rejecting figures as 'duplicitas' or 'schema.'
I accept that emendation of the lacuna which gives Aegina forty-two ships.\textsuperscript{46}

I take the Artemision figures as correct: 325 triremes (of which 200 were Athenian and 1 a Lemnian deserter) and 9 pentekontors. It is obvious that Athens, Corinth, and Megara were bound to send their full fleets; and the fact that the remaining northern state, Aegina (which was equally interested in sending its full contingent), is represented as not doing so adds considerably to one’s sense of Herodotus’ veracity. 200 is correct for Athens; 100 built under Themistocles’ law, and the other 100 made up of pre-existing ships and the later building mentioned by Herodotus.\textsuperscript{46} The 20 lent to Chalcis were presumably manned by Athenian settlers. Meyer has shown that Athens could at this time have easily manned 180 triremes, allowing to each 150 rowers, 14 hoplites, and 4 archers;\textsuperscript{47} no doubt, too, the usual methods of manning the fleet were suspended, as before Arginusae,\textsuperscript{48} and all men of military age, including the eunuchs, had to serve if and so far as required. I may add that plenty of boys under 18 can pull an oar well enough.

No severely damaged ships could be repaired between Artemision and Salamis. The reinforcements received were as follows, according to Herodotus: Lacedaemon 6, Sicyon 3, Epidaurus 2, Hermione 3, Ambracia 7, Leucum 3, Aegina 24 (assuming 12 Aeginetan to fill the lacuna between the total of 378 and the addition of the several contingents), Cythnos 1, Croton 1, and 4 Naxian and 1 Tarentan deserters; total 55 triremes; and 7 pentekontors against 9 at Artemision, Loeri with 7 having medised in the interval. Taking triremes only, 310 at Salamis less 55 reinforcements = 255, the total remaining after Artemision. Total before Artemision 325. Losses at Artemision therefore 70 triremes, which is the difference between the Salamis total of Aeschylus and the campaign total of Herodotus. This may well be about correct. With losses proportionate to contingents, the Athenian loss would have been 48; but perhaps Findar\textsuperscript{49} is evidence that Athens bore the brunt of the fighting, and if so her loss could not well be under 50. We may perhaps say that Athens, including Chalcis, furnished some 150 ships at Salamis, nearly half the fleet.\textsuperscript{50}

We cannot well put the Persian loss at Artemision lower than the Greek. If we call it also 70 (+), then, taking the highest possible figure before the battle as 450, we get somewhere about 380 (-) as a highest

\textsuperscript{46} [Dr. Mean conjectures for Aegina 42 ± 18 on guard at home = 60, which one would like to believe.]
\textsuperscript{47} J. H. 114; see W. Kolbe, de Ath. re navali (Philol. 28, 1890), p. 399, etc. I may add that 200 would be four times the number (50) furnished by the acephala (with the Euboeans and Samians). This equation of fifty appears in H. 6, 59. If Prof. Boyer be right about Aristides being σπαραγων at this time, with the command afloat (\textit{cf.} \textit{Er.}, x. 414), it is tempting to suppose that at Artemision each of the other nine σπαραγων commanded twenty ships, the remaining vessels, which should have been Aristides’ command, going to Chalcis.
\textsuperscript{48} G. d. A. II. 223; \textit{Eurip.} 1. 143.
\textsuperscript{49} Xam. Hell. 1. 6, 34.
\textsuperscript{50} Ap. Flor. Thom. 8 de gemina \textit{cfr}, 7 de Hevel. scholi. 34. Cf. H. 8, 18.
possible for the Persian fleets as they entered Phalerum. Now Herodotus (8, 13) says of the storm, that it was sent by divine power to equalise the two fleets; this afterwards got turned into a statement that at Salamis they were equal. It looks very much as if Herodotus' better source gave him a number for the Persians at Phalerum, and that number not far off the Greek total as he conceived it; and as if therefore one were right in working on the highest possible Persian number. But of course 380 (±) may be very considerably too high.

Happily I need not go into the vast literature relating to the topography of Salamis and the positions of the fleets; for it really hides fair to secure a definite result. There seems a pretty general agreement now that the old view of Leake and Grote, which Boswell adopted, viz., that the Persian fleet sailed in by night and took up a position along the Attic coast, is not only indefensible in itself, mean or no mean, but is not even Herodotus; and that what happened, as deduced from Aeschylus and confirmed by Herodotus, was that the Persians sent ships overnight to block the Megara channel, and that at dawn the rest of their fleet was drawn up from Cynosseum to Munychia, outside (i.e. S. of) Psyttaleia. There is fortunately no need to support this conclusion by quoting later writers, though it does in fact agree with the deductions drawn by Ephorus. In order to get at what happened, I assume this result to be correct.

First, what ships were sent round Salamis? As the Ionians and Phoenicians were in the main battle, the choice lies between the central and Egyptian fleets. We can, I think, see that it was the latter, though not because Ephorus says so. Of the four Persian admirals, Aribignes was killed in the battle, and Pireesas and Megabates superseded after it, but Acharnemnes was not superseded, as far as we know, for he was still satrap of Egypt at the time of Ionnas' revolt (H. 3, 12; 7, 7). This can have had nothing to do with his being Xerxes' brother: that ruler was not over-tender of his brethren, as the story of Massistes shows. It is that for some reason a distinction was drawn between the Egyptian and the other fleets: the former was not included in the disgrace of the defeat.

When were the Egyptians sent off? Here comes in the really grave difficulty of the circumnavigation theory. Dr. Bauer, who supported the old

---

79 E.g. in Plutarch, Thes. 15: τοῦ Βαρυκλέους ἑκατόνδεκα τοὺς πλῆθος. 80 Reference aside Mayor: Rass. op. cit., with full bibliography; F. Canot reviewing Rass. in Wiss. f. Alke Phil. 1906, 34. 35 (a substantial contribution); Prof. W. W. Goodwin, Battle of Salamis, (Hackett Studies in Class. Phil., vol. 17, 1909), p. 78, very full and giving a new explanation, after Lian. Rhododendron of the Greek navy, of the home desperation καὶ ἔναν ἔλεγον τίνα, which Canot thinks cannot be made sense of on any view.

81 Aeschylus' reference to the main Persian battle as ἐν σχηματισμῷ ἑπτά ἱμάτια ἑπτά ὀρμών, not 'flocks,' but 'divisions,' as Prof. Purvī (Hist. 47, 201) has taken it.

82 See under Mysale, pass.

83 If Aeschylus bases on the question at all (see Goodwin, ib., p. 38) he only proves that the Egyptians were in action somewhere. Mardonius' speech (H. 8, 100) proves nothing at all; if it did, it would prove that the Ionian fleet was not in action. At best it is mere rhetoric.
view, brought forward the objection\(^7\) against the circumnavigation of Salamis that, if the ships sent were not sent till after the receipt of Themistocles’ message, there was no time for them to get round to Leros (Nem), and that if they merely reached the bay of Trupika their presence there would not have been sufficient. According to him, it is 53-5 kilometers from Piraeus round to Leros, and he relies on Xenophon’s account of Alcibiades with 86 ships taking some 18 hours to do 50 kilometers.\(^7\) I feel the full force of this objection. So does Raase, who consequently halts the ships at the bay of Trupika. But I think Muir has shown that on the day of Salamis the Corinthians fought with the Egyptians;\(^7\) and if so, the latter were more probably at Leros, for it is very unlikely that the Corinthians could get to the bay of Trupika, fight, and return εἰς Ἑλλάδα\(^7\) anyhow, we must at least have a theory which will suit either event and not preclude the possibility of the Egyptian fleet blocking the strait at Leros.

We have therefore to count on the possibility of the Egyptians being sent off the preceding afternoon, before the arrival of Themistocles’ message. But nothing, I suppose, is clearer now than that, but for Themistocles’ message, there would have been no fight at all. Why then were they sent off?

I would suggest that what happened was somewhat as follows.

The Persian council of war was divided. One party, appearing in the tradition as Demaratus and Artemisia,\(^8\) wished to ignore the Greek fleet and sail for the Isthmus, obviously the correct strategy. The other, represented in the tradition by the Phoenician kings and other naval leaders, wished to attack the enemies’ fleet. The Phoenician leaders, who were really loyal to Persia, are hardly likely to have given such advice; they knew the disadvantages of a fight in the narrow; no doubt what they did was to profess a general readiness to fight the King’s enemies at any time and anywhere.


\(^7\) No doubt the point reached by the Corinthians was the temple of Athena Skiras; but we do not know where it stood. Raase, loc. cit., p. 23, has a useful list of the writers who think that the Egyptians must have gone past Trupika to Leros.

\(^8\) Demaratus’ advice (I. 7, 228), given, as it noted, after Thermopylae, must belong here, i.e., after Artemisia. I take Artemisia’s speech at the council (II. 8, 68) to mean the same thing. Parts of this speech must be spurious (see Welcker and Meyer); or, if not, Artemisia’s own, must at least represent the opinion of Artemisia; one sign of accuracy is the tabitation of the central and Egyptian fleets, but not of that of the traditional enemy of the Eastern Greeks, the Phoenicians; for a contemporary would have seen the absurdity of running down the Phoenicians, however hated. Another is the amazing ‘quotation’ from Aeschylus: ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς ἱερίδος ἥλθεν ἐτεκνήσεται ἡ πόλις: Περσ. 725. τὰ περὶ τοῦ διαλέγει τῶν βιβλίων τοῦ Ἱστορίων. (I have not seen this ‘quotation’ before; just even by Dr. Maen*), though Part, ed. reality. II. 38 has some curious observables.) As H. was not really likely to make his heroins quote the lost known, and least true, line of the Persia, we must suppose that Aeschylus himself was quoting a well-known saying; and as no one can have coined a phrase so remote from facts after the battle of Plataea, it may well have been a prophecy, traditionally attributed to Artemisia, though reflecting little credit on her judgment. It is true that the Scholiast of Pers. 725 interprets τὰ περὶ τοῦ διαλέγει τῶν βιβλίων τοῦ Ἱστορίων, but the context are quite clear to show that neither Aesch. nor H. means this So a moment.
Unfortunately for the fleet, Xerxes, or his staff, took half measures only.\(^2\) The army was sent off toward the Isthmus (H. 8, 71); and one fleet, the Egyptian, was sent to turn the Peloponnesian defences by occupying a harbour in the friendly Argolid.\(^2\) Doubtless the Egyptians were selected because their heavy-armed marines might be more useful for a brush ashore, when unsupported by cavalry, than Persian archers. Possibly too Achaemenes really opposed the scheme (H. 7, 236); and it would therefore appeal to a despot’s sense of humour to select his command to carry it out. It was calculated that on the news the Greek fleet would break up, and the Persians could pick them up in detail; or if not, then that the main fleet could hold the Greeks in position long enough to give the Egyptians a sufficient start. On the afternoon before the battle, therefore, the Egyptians started; and the rest of the Persian fleet made its demonstration in force, to hold the attention of the Greeks.\(^8\)

The passing of the Egyptians was of course reported to the Greek admirals at Salamis. It might mean one of two things, according as their objective was the Argolid or Leves. But the more possibility of the former raised (as the Persians intended) commotion in the minds of the Peloponnesian leaders: when Herodotus (8, 74) says they feared for the Peloponnesians’ sake and wanted to go home, he is literally correct. Themistocles therefore, on the fateful night, had to solve not one problem, but two. He had of course to induce the Persians to fight; but he also had to prevent the Peloponnesians from going off to defend their homes, precisely as Herodotus says. His message to Xerxes must have sounded to the King as follows: ‘The Peloponnesians are going home; the Athenians are ready to medise;’\(^4\) block the straits and attack, and you can end the war in a blaze of spectacular glory.’ Xerxes fell to the bait, a swift ship, or fire-signals, diverted the Egyptians; and at the critical moment Aristides, chased by them through the bay of Trupika,\(^6\) was able to report to the council at Salamis that it was too late for anyone to go home.

The Persian fleet therefore, as it put out again in the darkness, must have expected anything rather than a battle. This seems to me to be the crucial point of the whole thing. The only possible explanation of that fleet fighting at all where and how it did is that Xerxes was completely taken in by Themistocles. The Persians must have expected a more or less complete Athenian surrender, and the mopping up of a few scattered detachments; and, says Aeschylus dryly, ‘they were disappointed of their

\(^2\) Du Saun, Histoire de la mer, l. 110, suggested that the Persian action at Salamis must have been the result of a compromise.
\(^3\) The principal argument used by Delbrück and Meyer to show that the Persians were not stronger, or appreciably stronger, than the Greeks at Salamis, is that, if so, they must have divided their fleet and sent part to the Argolid. But suppose they did?
\(^4\) I need not recapitulate the shifts to which different writers have been put to account for the Persians drawing out their fleet the day before the battle. Of course Aeschylus does not mention it; but he is writing drama, not a diary.
\(^6\) Muir, p. 331.
\(^6\) So Rase. The arguments seem irresistible. It explains why the Tenian deserter, which of course came the other way, was required to confirm truthful Aristides.
expectation. It was not their numbers that hampered them—that is a Greek legend—but lack of sea-room. They had put themselves in a position where they could be, and were, brought to close quarters whether they would or no; Themistocles had won the battle before a blow was struck.

As to the battle, Herodotus is clearly right on three points: on the Persian right were the Phoenicians, Xerxes’ command; on the Greek right the Spartans, Eurybiades; and as Athens and Sparta could not be together, the Athenians formed the Greek left. We may therefore believe Herodotus, that the Ionians formed the Persian left. The other Dorians who were present, including Aegina, were of course with Sparta. Herodotus conceives of both lines as in two divisions only; no definite centre is mentioned on either side. The Ionians broke first (H. 8, 90), though the Phoenician accusation of treachery is groundless; strong necessity, as Themistocles called the Persian troops on board (H. 8, 22), saw to that. The battle then was decided by the Aeginetans breaking the Ionian line—hence their prize for valour—and taking the Phoenicians, who had perhaps successfully resisted the Athenian attack, in flank. Athens may well have felt that to her had fallen the harder and less showy task; hence the later stories (not in Herodotus) which show jealousy of Aegina. The Phoenicians probably felt the same; they had held the Athenians, while the Ionians had broken before the Dorians. We have also got to remember that the Phoenician tradition is lost, that we have only the account of their bitter enemies, and that it is only the fair-mindedness of Herodotus ὑποψηφιονος which enables us to do any justice at all to that silent race. The discredited story of Xerxes beheading the Phoenician captains is absurd; a revolt in Phoenicia was the last thing that he could afford at the time; while the story of the Ionians being saved by the exploit of a Samothracian ship, which did not really belong to the Ionian fleet at all, is part of the same impossible legend. If this last incident took place at all, it happened, like Artemisia’s exploit, at the latter stage of the battle, when it had become, as Themistocles desired, a mere mêlée.

And the central fleet? It is not once mentioned. Whether, if the Persians entered in one column between Psyttaleia and Attica, it formed the tail of the column and never got into the bay; or whether, if the Persians entered in two columns, one on either side of Psyttaleia, it formed the centre and was crowded out, much as Hauvette supposed; or whether it was deliberately held in reserve, οἱ ἰονίων τετραμαζομένοι of H. 8, 89, as is perhaps most likely, seeing that the Persians did not really expect a fight and that the waters were narrow: it is at any rate reasonably clear that it took no part in the battle. If then the highest possible total for the

---

88 Fest. 292, γραμμα ἐκφοβαινον.
89 See Bury, Hist. 1, 7, 202. (If the Persians were roughly on the line Aigaleos—Psyttaleia or Aigaleos—Cynoza, see n. 92, this would bring the Aeginetans across their line of retreat, and account for the story in H. 8, 91.)
90 See p. 316.
91 Mardonius’ speech is no evidence, as I have pointed out above. All Herodotus’ details refer to two fleets only, the Ionian and Phoenician; and the fact that after the battle
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four Persian fleets at Phalerum be 380 (+), and allowing that the central fleet had suffered most at Artemisium, the total of the two Persian fleets actually in action in the main battle cannot have exceeded 200 and may well have been less. Even then if we allow that Adeimantus had a few ships with him besides the Corinthians, say some 50 all told, the Greeks had some 260 in the main battle; they therefore in the actual fighting thoroughly outnumbered their enemy. It appears therefore that on the point that matters we have come round, by a very different path, to a view rather similar to that of Delbrück. It also appears why I have tried to work with the highest possible Persian numbers.

Adeimantus, however, unlike the Athenians, really may have fought against odds, even supposing that the Egyptians' orders were merely to hold a line on the defensive and let no one pass. No wonder that Corinth hated Athens, especially as the accusation that Adeimantus would have run away, if he could may, as we have seen, have contained just that amount of truth that makes a lie peculiarly bitter. It was hardly his fault if his heroism was partly due to circumstance.

The Persians, then, with a probable slight numerical superiority, contrived, by using half measures and by changing their plans at the bidding of Themistocles, to have a numerical inferiority at the decisive point, employed under conditions the worst possible for themselves. Bad generalship is hardly a strong enough term to use in such a connection. To Aeschylus, the only explanation was a madness sent from heaven. The opinion of Themistocles on the point is not recorded. 69

One question remains, to my mind the worst of all the problems connected with Salamis, yet generally taken for granted: the Persians on Psyttaleia. If the Persians expected a hard fight, then, having regard to the constant desire of an ancient fleet to fight with its back to its land troops, one can see some sense in men being landed there; but the Persians did not expect such a fight—till it began. What men were they? Aeschylus speaks of them in terms that might fit the Persian general staff, at least. This no doubt is pure poetry. They were not land troops; the army had started for the Isthmus before Themistocles' message came, and could never have been recalled in time. 70 Herodotus merely says, that on receipt of that

69 In spite of his words in ii. 3, 109 (spoken for a purpose), we might none well have doubted whether he himself did not consider a live Themistocles more useful than any number of dead ψαρεί. Yet we have lived to see the merit of another Salamin ascended to the dead than to the living; receipt of the Emperor of Japan after Tewshun. 'The result is due in a large measure to the benign spirits of our ancestors as well as to,' etc.—ψαρεί ψαρεί.

70 I am assuming that the Persian land forces were strictly limited in number.
message the Persian admirals disembarked (ἀπεβαλλαν τοὺς στρατιωτικούς) on Psyttaleia 'many of the Persians,' i.e. of the marines. Again (8. 130) he says that in the spring of 479 most of the Persian and Median marines were on board the fleet, i.e. some were not. The inference is, that it was part of the marines who were landed and killed on Psyttaleia. Yet it is incredible that an attacking fleet should have denuded itself of part of its chief weapon. The only explanation I can see is that the central fleet, held in reserve, and seeing that (contrary to expectation) it was indeed going to be a battle, landed part of its marines after the fighting began. In some way the central fleet was connected with the general Persian failure, as we know by the supersession of its admiral. But the whole thing is so difficult that one is sorely tempted to believe that it is all a mistake of our anti-Themistoclean tradition, and that the only contribution made that day by the just Aristides to the cause of Greek freedom was the butchery of a few shipwrecked crews.

The Persian loss cannot be estimated. It was enough to make the Persians resolve not to tempt fate again on the incomprehensible sea; but not very great, as the Greeks expected another attack.30

30 [Dr. Mauz thinks that H. only meant that the majority of the marines were Persians and Medes, and that an allusion to the original Medo-Persian epithets would be far-fetched. Why! It would be a natural enough allusion for any source which regarded the fleet as an organised force and not as a mob.]

31 [Dr. Mauz's theory of Salamis is very brief, as follows: The Persians, on the day before the battle, decided to blockade the Greeks in the bay of Salamis; they therefore sent the Egyptians round to the Megara channel; the main fleet to the Psyttaleia and thus avoided the time difficulty for the Egyptians, and also accounts for the Peloponnesians wanting to go home, 8. 74, when they heard of the Egyptians passing, though Dr. Mauz does not notice either point; it also accounts for the Persian fleet drawing out the day before the battle. On receipt of Themistocles' message they alter their first plan and sail in not expecting any battle (it will be seen that I agree with both these points). On the morning the Persians sail in be column of three lines (ἐν ἄρεισι ἁπάντη) between Psyttaleia and the mainland; the Athenians take the head of the column in flank and break it, deciding the action. The Persians on Psyttaleia were either landed during the action, or else belong to the first (abandoned) plan and were meant to invade Salamis.—While there is much to be said for this, I adhere to what I have written above, on the few points where I differ. (1) Dr. Mauz admits that the Persians, if they meant to fight (first plan), were bound to try to get the Greeks into open water; why then blockade them? A blockade would have given Themistocles just what he wanted; the Persians could not have avoided close quarters. (2) Even if Themistocles' message reached not Xerxes (Amesch.), but the admiral (H.), it is clear that the latter could not change the whole plan without consulting their commander-in-chief, as the army and fleet were co-operating; the fleet then must have been back at Phalerum when the message arrived in the early part of the night, and put out (already) that night, as Amesch says. Consequently, the movement of the fleet on the day before was a demonstration only; and what became of the blockade? (3) Dr. Mauz has to treat the objective of the arm as the Megara channel, to co-operate with the Egyptians. But, after all, H. says the Ithomans; let us keep what of tradition we can. (4) The battle must, I think, have been fought in line; Dr. Mauz (II. 315-6) cannot explain the Aeginaan αἵπεια. No doubt the Persians entered in column, either one column or two; but (supposing now with Dr. Mauz that it was one column) they could never have been caught in column by a fleet coming across from Salamis, when a mere half-hour by each ship would have brought them into line abreast facing the enemy; and we cannot press Aischylos' ἀἵπεια to prove the contrary. Two hundred triremes in column of two lines, 100 in each line, would cover about a mile from end to end; the whole column would be in the bay in six to seven minutes, or even less. (Finley's trireme did nine miles an hour; and the Phoenixes might...
§ 6.—Mycale.

After Salamis, the Egyptian fleet handed over its marines to Mardonius (H. 9. 32) and went home. In the spring of 479, what remained of the other three fleets was at Samos, under three new admirals, Mardontes, Artaytes, Ithanitres; as only Ariabignes is recorded to have been killed, we see that the admirals of the central and Phoenician fleets had been superseded. Tigranes was at Mycale with land troops. The Persian commanders decided not to fight at sea: they therefore sent home the Phoenicians, and no doubt the central fleet also, though this is not expressly mentioned. But the στρατηγοὶ of these two fleets disembarked the Persian marines before sending off the ships, and kept them with Tigranes; this illustrates very clearly the fact that the Persian "admiral" of a fleet was really only the general in command of the division of Persian troops acting as εἰρήνατοι on that fleet. The Ionian fleet could not be sent home, the crews being disaffected; neither could it face the Greek fleet of 110 ships: its numbers by now must have been considerably less than 110. The ships were therefore drawn ashore; and in the ensuing land battle we find all four Persian στρατηγοὶ, i.e., the three admirals commanding the marines of the

I am afraid that the presence of three admirals at Mycale disperses the view; no fleet could keep the sea without its marines. Moreover, Lecrysheides could not possibly have sailed for Samos with a strong Persian fleet, unopposed, on his flank and rear, and we can hardly suppose that the Greeks had a second fleet at sea, plus the army at Plataea.

This follows, as to the Phoenician fleet anyhow, from the στρατηγοὶ remaining after the ships were sent off.

Hence the fleet is a στρατηγὸς and its camp a στρατωρίδος (H. 7, 128, etc.). One is reminded of the fleets of the Roman Empire. Unfortunately we have no information as to the relations, on a Persian ship, of the triarch to the commander of the marines, that terrible crew of the later Roman fleet. Artemisius appears as mistress in her own ship; yet, though the marines were few compared with those on a Roman vessel, they were of an alien and dominant race. One would like to know how Darius solved the problem. The fact that Artemisius, after sailing his Egyptian marines, took his fleet home, may show that his position differed somewhat from that of the other στρατηγοὶ, and that he so a setup was not merely a general of marines. But it might also mean that he shipped Persian troops in their place, with a view to possible disembarkation in Egypt.
Ionian, central, and Phoenician fleets, and Tigranes. It is hardly worth remarking that Leotychides must have known, before he sailed for Mycale with 110 ships, that all the Persian fleets but one had been sent home.

§ 7.—Other Battles.

It seems then that the numbers adopted in this paper fit in well with Herodotus' narrative. If they be correct, we can see that the figure of 600 Persian warships for the Scythian expedition, Lade, and Marathon is mere transference; also that the various attempts made to deduce the Persian army at Marathon from the number of ships are waste paper. We can also, without going into the questions connected with the Ionian revolt, understand better two obscure statements in Herodotus' account. Hecataeus' advice to the Ionians to get command of the sea becomes practical; had they secured all of Greek blood they would have had about two and a half of the five fleets (counting the Carians as with them), and the temple treasures of Didyma would have done the rest. And the nervousness of the Persian commanders before Lade is based on the fact that they were very likely outnumbered: they had the Phoenician, Egyptian, and central fleets, i.e. 369 less their previous losses, and with the Cypriotes still untrustworthy, possibly much less than 300 effective ships; the Greeks, who had manned every craft that would float, should have had 300 anyhow.

The battle of the Eurymedon, too, falls into its proper place. The success of Cimon's operations consisted in this, that he succeeded in preventing the junction of the Phoenician and central fleets, capturing the latter, 100 (+) strong, at the Eurymedon, and the Phoenician (80 ships) in Cyprus later. Thucydides' figure, 200 'Phoenician,' i.e. Persian, ships, then refers to the campaign, the 300 of all later writers to the actual day of the double battle. These numbers, alone, ought to be conclusive against the popular exaggeration of the numbers of Xerxes' fleet.

§ 8.—The Divisional Numbers.

The question, however, remains, why 120? As we do not suppose that Darius took 600 as a likely number, cut his coast-line into five sections, and divided 600 by five, we must conclude that 600 grew up round a nucleus of a

---

80 Taking the 130 Greek ships at 150 towers and 18 machines, they could land some 18,000 troops of all sorts. If we take each of the three Persian fleets at 80 ships (they can hardly have been stronger by now), we get, at 30 marines per ship, 4,800 troops, or say 4,000, for some were not there (H. 8, 130). Tigranes had what remained of his army corps, perhaps originally 10,000 (n. 27; not 60,000, as H. says), and the Persians were encumbered by some 12,000 armed and disaffected Ionian revolters. The extreme weakness of their position is apparent.
81 Hauvette, i.e. 195, has shown that H. did not get his figure here from Darius' table on the Borzumus.
82 See Meyer's reconstruction of the narrative of Callisthenes of Olympos in his Prechsagen, II. pp. 1 sqq., Die Schlacht am Eurymedon.
fleets of 120 furnished by a district of roughly one-fifth of the power of the whole, in this case undoubtedly Phoenicia. That is to say, the number that Phoenicia engaged to furnish was reckoned on the sexagesimal and not on the decimal system, and was obviously two divisions of sixty ships each. The coins appear to show that the sexagesimal system only obtained a partial footing in Phoenicia, notwithstanding its grasp upon Western Asia generally; and it may be that, as some have supposed, the engagements of Phoenicia to Cyrus merely repeated her former engagements to Babylon. Be this as it may, the hypothesis of a Phoenician naval organisation in divisions of sixty can be checked. For there was another navy which inherited the tactics and traditions of that of its mother-land; and if this hypothesis be correct, we ought to find that the Carthaginian navy was organised upon a sexagesimal system. We do.

We get at Carthage the following set of figures: *Alalia* 542 B.C., 60 ships; 480 B.C., 200 (doubtless too high); 409 B.C., 60, 406 B.C., 120 against Dionysius I. and again against Timoleon, 200. In 311/10 B.C., against Agathocles, 130 (Diod. 19, 196, 2); sent to Rome as a help against Pyrrhus, either 120 (Justin 18, 1, 2) or 130 (Val. Max. 3, 7, 10); 278 B.C., probably 130; *Corinth* at the opening of the first Punic war, 130 (Pol. 1, 23, 2). I have, I hope, shown that in the wars with Rome 200 ships meant a supreme Carthaginian effort.

Now in 480 B.C. a battle fleet did its own scouting (above, p. 209). But by 260 B.C. a fleet was accompanied by regular scouts. The Romans, who were copying Carthage, used *lenbi* for this purpose; whether the Carthaginians used *lenbi* or *triremes* or what not is immaterial so long as they did use scouts. We see then that the Carthaginian navy works out as follows. In 542 B.C. and 409 B.C. it consisted of one division of 60; in 406 B.C. of two such divisions; in 311 B.C. its two divisions had become 65 ships apiece, i.e. 60 ships of the line plus 5 *scouts* (Justin omits the scouts) and so remained till after the shock of Mylae. In time of great stress a third division was mobilised. The figures of 200 ships in the fourth century might be round figures; but for the Punic wars they are exact, the third division consisting of 70 ships, i.e. 60 plus 5 *scouts* plus an extra 5 ships, either fleet scouts or reserve ships. We have an express mention of this third division in Polybius (1, 53, 2); after Drepana, where Adherbal had probably something under 123 ships (two weak divisions), Carthage reinforced him with 70 ships. I may also refer to Polybius' account of Ecnomos, where the Carthaginian fleet is in three divisions, against the four divisions of the Roman.

---

106 For recent discussions of this system see F. X. GinaiI in *Eoko*, vol. i, pp. 334-335, and C. F. Lehmann-Haupt in *scito*, pp. 334-335.
107 Soyles is at least evidence for this much, when, in referring to the Carthaginian navy, which he knew, he says that the *Phoenicians always do so and so*.
108 I am indebted here to the chapter on the Carthaginian navy in Malfet, *Com. de Carth.* vol. ii, and for what follows I refer once for all to my paper in *J.H.S.* xxvii. (1907), 15.
109 This is only a combination (Malfet, ii, 234), but a good one.
110 Polyb. 1, 53, 2.
111 My conclusion (J.H.S. xxvii. 57), that the [successful] object of Rome in the first Punic
In the second Punic war, the Carthaginian figures are at first irregular and small. Carthage undertaking raids with small squadrons only; but in 215 they mobilised their two divisions, given as sixty each (Livy, as not infrequently, omitting the scouts), consequent upon the intervention of Philip in the war; and they again and for the last time, in 212, mobilised two divisions, given as 130, in a vain effort to save Syracuse (Liv. 25, 27). (The fleet of Spain was separate.) After this, the figures represent what they could, not what they would.

We are, I think, entitled to look upon it as a fact, that the division of sixty ships of the line formed the basis of the Carthaginian naval organisation; and it can hardly be a coincidence that a similar arrangement of the Persian fleet, arrived at merely by following out Herodotus, is supported by Carthaginian figures partly expressly given in the tradition and partly arrived at merely by following out Polybius without a thought of such a thing as the sexagesimal system.\(^{100}\)

§ 9.—Sources.

It remains to consider very briefly, some points about the sources. We have traced a thread of what looks like accurate information running through Herodotus' narrative of the Persian fleet. The number 120 for the northern fleet, the number 600 for the whole, the four admirals at Doriscus, Xerxes' personal command of the Phoenicians, the separation of the several fleets at Thermus and on the voyage down the Magnesian coast, the storm falling on them so separated, the loss of the northern fleet, the small storm-damage otherwise, the late attack on the first two days of Artemision, the Persian demonstration the day before Salamis, the number of Artemisia's squadron, the Persian number at Salamis (this last doubtful)—these are some of the points we have seen reason to think accurate, apart from matters such as the general arrangements at Salamis, which I omit as having been fully thrashed out by

---

\(^{100}\) In case anyone should think the whole question of these divisions fanciful, I append a few figures from the Roman navy, taken from the mass of material in Livy, Polybius, and Appian. From 215 to 214 a Roman division (as in the first Punic war) fluctuated between 60, 55, and 50. In 213 Rome answered the Carthaginian mobilisation of 215 with a decree for a (standing) fleet of 150 quinquерemes in home waters (Livy 24, 8), and henceforth the Roman division was 50 ships of the line. The two standing fleets from 214 to 206 were, Sicily 190, Adriatic 50. In 208 two additional special squadrons of 50 quinquерemes each were formed for Italy and Sardinia. After 206 Rome laid up ships fast, and the figures fall. War against Philip (197): 100 hectae, 50 aperies (probably allies), and Ioniki (Livy 32, 21). Against Antiochus, first 190, then 50, quinquéremes ordered; not all built; at sea in 191, one division (50) under Livius, with a half-division (25) taken over from Atilius, and allies (Livy 38, 41). Against Perseus, 50 quinquéremes ordered (Livy 42, 27). Against Carthage in the last war (App. Liv. 75), 50 quinquéremes, and allies. A complete analysis of the second Punic war is really conclusive. Livy omits the scouts from the divisions, or gives them separately, as being generally allies.
others. On the other hand, we have found two stories that stand on a different footing; the number 1,207 for the Persian triremes, with the concomitants of this number, such as a heavy storm-loss and the overcrowding of the Persian ships at Salamis; and the story of the Sepiad strand, with its accompanying incidents, also including a heavy storm-loss.

Now this last is pure poetry. If the difficulty of date can be overcome, one would be inclined to assign it to Choerilus of Samos, though I have not the qualifications for determining this; the fact that Herodotus in this connexion gives the story of Boreas and Oreithya, which occurred also in Choerilus, is strong, as Mulder pointed out. I have already given my reasons for thinking that the story of the Sepiad strand, whether from Choerilus or some other poet, is ultimately taken from Homer.

The figure 1,207 does not, I think, come from any definite source at all; certainly it must be a Greek figure, and would hardly come from Dionysius of Miletius or any other Asiatic Greek, who must have known the facts. I take the genesis of this number to have been somewhat as follows. The original total at Athens for Xerxes' armada was the round 1,000, including triremes both ordinary and ταξιάμενα and supply ships; this was accurate enough. The next step was 1,000 warships, including ταξιάμενα (Aeschylus), but excluding supply; then 1,000 warships, excluding the 207 ταξιάμενα, = 1,207 warships (Herodotus). Meanwhile supply, separated from the warships, grew at pleasure, and is still fluid in Herodotus, as we see by the 3,000 'trikontors, pentekontors, euriki, and horse-transport' of 7, 97, which in 7, 184 become 3,000 pentekontors, with crews calculated accordingly. All this is the mere talk, or self-glorification, of the man in the street at Athens.

To turn now to Herodotus' more accurate information. No doubt a good deal of this—the numbers 120 and 600, Xerxes' command and organisation generally, the arrangements before Salamis—was known to and may well be derived from either Demaratus or more probably Megabyzus. But this cannot apply to that part of the story of the fleet that lies between its departure from Thersam and its arrival at Phalarum; for here array and fleet were separated throughout. Consequently we get the striking, but I think unnoticed, phenomenon that at Salamis we are (more or less) in the Persian councils, while at Artemision we are not; we do not know what the Persian headquarters were about in that three days' fighting. Herodotus' informant, then, as to the voyage down the Magnesian coast, and Artemision, was not in the councils of the leaders; but the voyage shows clearly that he was with the fleet. As the details of the μαθήματα at Salamis are all given from the point of view of the Ionian fleet; and

---

110 Prag. 8 in Kinkel, Βικτορία, Grecce fragments.
Also Choerilus in Φαντομονή, Women (Bethe).
112 What Aeschylus' unlikely figure of 207 for these means can hardly perhaps be maintained. It may relate to something else and have got transferred.
113 Mr. J. Wells, The Persian Friends of Herodotus (J.H.S. xxvii, 1907, p. 37).
114 The speech of Demaratus and Achaeans belong after the battle.
as the precise information as to the number of Artemisia's ships, and her conduct, can only have been of interest to, or derived from, Halicarnassian; it is easiest to suppose that Herodotus' ultimate source for the actions of the Persian fleet between Thermopylae and Phalerum was not merely Ionian, but was someone in the Halicarnassian squadron, perhaps on Artemisia's own ship. And this is not rendered unlikely by his very scanty information as to Artemisia. Artemisia says that she fought bravely in this battle (and we may grant that if the lady was in action at all the adverb is superfluous); but the Ionian fleet may (as we have seen) have only got into action very late on the first day; on the second day it probably was not engaged at all; while as to the great battle of the third day, I have already tried to show that no one ship could have known much of what was going on except in its own immediate neighbourhood. Herodotus may well have despaired of any attempt to describe the third day, when he laments that he could not even get information about the confined fight at Salamis.

One word as to Diodorus. It seems to me unlikely that anyone, who tries to understand the naval operations of 480 B.C., should accept the ordinary view that the Diodorus-Ephorus narrative is a mere working-up of, or deduction from, that of Herodotus (I refer to the naval portions only). The fact is, that, with much rubbish, Diodorus (or Ephorus) is in some important respects the more understanding of the two; and on one matter, the Egyptians at Salamis, the world has been forced to come round to what he says. The best instance is the first day of Artemision; here, although on the question who attacked Herodotus is right and Diodorus is wrong, still on the actual fight Diodorus writes clear sense (though not the whole sense), while Herodotus is conscientiously groping about. Now it is perfectly possible to deduce Diodorus' account of this day from that of Herodotus and from general tactical and other considerations, except on one point, viz., the όρος θεών of the Sidonians on both days of the battle; and this last may be a mere guess: in the dark, based on the general reputation of the Sidonians in Herodotus. All this is possible; still, the common sense of the matter is, that Diodorus on the first day of Artemision, and perhaps elsewhere, may represent, however imperfectly, a better tradition than that of Herodotus. And if the information of Herodotus here (where not Greek) be Halicarnassian, or otherwise drawn from the Ionian fleet, a better tradition could, as I have already hinted, be derived ultimately from one source only, the version preserved by the Phoenicians. Have we here, in Ephorus, some echo from that association of Athens and Phoenicia which culminated in a Phoenician fleet under Conon.
restoring the Long Walls of its erstwhile rival. Be this as it may, it has a very definite bearing on the important fact that Diodorus does give 120 as the number of the northern fleet. Whether Ephorus is likely to have deduced this figure from Herodotus, as is done in this paper, I must leave to my readers to answer.

W. W. Tarn.

It is always possible that the number of the northern fleet was preserved in the traditions of Cyprus, and that Ephorus, with his known local patriotism, adopted that tradition. This would explain his radical divergence from Herodotus over the sea fleet.
THE MARQUISEATE OF BOUDONITZA (1204-1414)

Of all the feudal lordships, founded in Northern Greece at the time of the Frankish Conquest, the most important and the most enduring was the Marquisate of Boudonitza. Like the Venieri and the Viari in the two islands of Cerigo and Cerigotto at the extreme south, the lords of Boudonitza were Marquesses in the literal sense of the term—wardens of the Greek Marches—and they maintained their responsible position on the outskirts of the Duchy of Athens until after the establishment of the Turks in Thessaly. Apart, too, from its historic importance, the Marquisate of Boudonitza possesses the romantic glamour which is shed over a famous classical site by the chivalry of the middle ages. What stranger accident could there have been than that which made two noble Italian families the successive guardians of the historic pass which is for ever associated with the death of Leonidas?

Among the adventurers who accompanied Boniface of Montferrat, the new King of Salonika, on his march into Greece in the autumn of 1204, was Guido Pallavicini, the youngest son of a nobleman from near Parma who had gone to the East because at home every common man could hate him before the courts. This was the vigorous personality who, in the eyes of his conquering chief, seemed peculiarly suited to watch over the pass of Thermopylae, where the Greek archon, Leon Sgourus, had fled at the mere sight of the Latins in their coats of mail. Accordingly, he invested him with the fief of Boudonitza, and ere long, on the Hellenic substructures of Pharygai, rose the imposing fortress of the Italian Marquesses.

The site was admirably chosen, and is, indeed, one of the finest in Greece. The village of Boudonitza, Bodonitza, or Mendenitza, as it is now called, lies at a distance of three and a half hours on horseback from the baths of Thermopylae and nearly an hour and a half from the top of the pass which leads across the mountains to Dalal at the foot of Parnassus. The castle, which is visible for more than an hour as we approach from Thermopylae, stands on a hill which bars the valley and occupies a truly commanding position (Figs. 1 and 2). The Warden of the Marches, in the Frankish times, could watch from its battlements the blue Malia Gulf with the even then important town of Styliada, the landing-place for Zetounion, or Lamia; his eye could traverse the channel up to, and beyond, the entrance to the Gulf

* Litta, Le famiglie celebri italiane, vol, v, Plate XIV.
of Almiro, as the Gulf of Volo was then called; in the distance he could
deserly two of the Northern Sporades—Skiathos and Skopelos—at first in the

![Image 1: Boudonitza: The Castle from the West.](Image)

hands of the friendly Ghisi, then reconquered by the hostile Byzantine forces.
The northernmost of the three Lombard baronies of Euboea with the bright

![Image 2: Boudonitza: The Castle from the East.](Image)

streak which marks the baths of Aedeipsos, and the little island of Panaia, or
Canaia, between Euboea and the mainland, which was one of the last
remnants of Italian rule in this part of Greece, lay outstretched before him; and no pirate craft could come up the Atalante channel without his knowledge. Landwards, the view is bounded by vast masses of mountains, but the danger was not yet from that quarter, while a rocky gorge, the bed of a dry torrent, isolates one side of the castle. Such was the site where, for more than two centuries, the Marquesses of Bondonitza watched, as advanced sentinels, first of 'new France' and then of Christendom.

The extent of the Marquisate cannot be exactly defined. In the early years after the Conquest we find the first Marquess part-owner of Lamia; his territory extended down to the sea, upon which later on his successors had considerable commercial transactions, and the harbour from which they obtained their supplies would seem to have been simply called the skala of Bondonitza. The Pallavicini’s southern frontier marched with the Athenian seigneurie, but their feudal relations were not with Athens, but with Achaia. Whether or no we accept the story of the ‘Chronicle of the Morea’ that Boniface of Montferrat conferred the suzerainty of Bondonitza upon Guillaume de Champlin, or the more probable story of the elder Sanudo, that the Emperor Baldwin II. gave it to Geoffroy II. de Villehardonin, it is certain that later on the Marquess was one of the twelve peers of Achaia, and in 1278 Charles I. of Naples, in his capacity of Prince of Achaia, accordingly notified the appointment of a bailie of the principality to the Marchioness of that day. It was only during the Catalan period that the Marquess came to be reckoned as a feudatory of Athens. Within his dominions was situated a Roman Catholic episcopal see—that of Thermopylae, dependent upon the metropolitan see of Athens. At first the bishop resided at the town which bore that name; on its destruction, however, during those troublous times, the bishop and canons built an oratory at Bondonitza. Even there, however, the pirates penetrated and killed the bishop, whereupon in 1209 the then occupant of the see, the third of the series beggad Innocent III. to allow him to move to the abbey of ‘Communio’—perhaps a monastery founded by one of the Cathari—within the same district. Towards the close of the fourteenth century, the bishop was commonly known by the title of ‘Bondonitza,’ because he resided there, and his see was then one of the four within the confines of the Athenian Duchy.

Guido, first Marquess of Bondonitza, the ‘Marchosopoulo,’ as his Greek subjects called him, played a very important part in both the political and
eclesiastical history of his time—just the part which we should have expected from a man of his lawless disposition. The "Chronicle" above quoted represents him as present at the siege of Corinth. He and his brother, whose name may have been Rubino, were among the leaders of the Lombard rebellion against the Latin Emperor Henry in 1209; he obstinately refused to attend the first Parliament of Ravenika in May of that year; and, leaving his castle undefended, he retreated with the still recalcitrant rebels behind the stronger walls of the Kadmeia at Thebes. This incident procured for Boudonita the honour of its only Imperial visit; for the Emperor Henry lay there one evening—a certain Wednesday—on his way to Thebes, and thence rode, as the present writer has ridden, through the clover, or pass, which leads over the mountains and down to Dadi and the Bocotian plain—then, as now, the shortest route from Boudonita to the Boeotian capital, and at that time the site of a church of our Lady St. Marna de Charnio, the property of the abbot and canons of the Lord's Temple. Like most of his fellow-nobles, the Marquess was not over-respectful of the rights and property of the Church to which he belonged. If he granted the strong position of Lainia to the Templars, he secularised property belonging to his bishop and displayed a marked unwillingness to pay tithes. We find him, however, with his fellows, signing the concordat which was drawn up to regulate the relations between Church and State at the second Parliament of Ravenika in May, 1210.11

As one of the leading nobles of the Latin kingdom of Salonika, Guido continued to be associated with its fortunes. In 1221 we find him acting as bailiff for the Regent Margaret during the minority of the young King Demetrius, in whose name he ratified a convention with the clergy respecting the property of the Church.12 His territory became the refuge of the Catholic Archbishop of Larissa, upon whom the bishopric of Thermopylae was temporarily conferred by Honorius III., when the Greeks of Epirus drove him from his see. And when the ephemeral kingdom had fallen before them, the same Pope, in 1224, ordered Geoffrey H. de Villehardouin of Achna, Othon de la Roche of Athens, and the three Lombard barons of Eupeoa to aid in defending the castle of Boudonita, and rejoiced that 1,300 hyperpotes had been subscribed by the prelates and clergy for its defence, so that it could be held by "G., lord of the aforesaid castle," till the arrival of the Marquess William of Montferrat.13 Guido was still living on May 2, 1237, when he made his will. Soon after that date he probably died; Hopf14 states in his genealogy, without citing any authority, that he was killed by the Greeks. He had survived most of his fellow-Crusaders; and,

11 Epistolae Honorii III., ii. 261-2, 284; 477, 233-7; Honorii III., Opera, iv. 441.
12 Raynauldus, Anales Byzantinici (ed. 1747), L. 492.
13 Regesta Honorii III., ii. 16, 167, 297, 333.
14 Chroniques grecs-russes, 473; and op. cit. Eck and Gruber, Allgemeine Enzycklopädie, lxxv. 276.
in consequence of the Greek reconquest of Thessaly, his Marquisate was now, with the doubtful exception of Larissa, the northernmost of the Frankish feuds, the veritable March of Latin Hellas.

Guido had married a Burgundian lady named Sibylle, possibly a daughter of the house of Cicon, lately established in Greece, and therefore a cousin of Guy de la Roche of Athens. By her he had two daughters and a son, Ubertino, who succeeded him as second Marquess. Despite the feudal tie which should have bound him to the Prince of Achaia, and which he boldly repudiated, Ubertino assisted his cousin, the ‘Great Lord’ of Athens, in the fratricidal war between those prominent Frankish rulers, which culminated in the defeat of the Athenians at the battle of Karydri in 1258, where the Marquess was present, and whence he accompanied Guy de la Roche in his retreat to Thebes. In the following year, however, he obeyed the summons of the Prince of Achaia to take part in the fatal campaign in aid of the despot Michael II. of Epirus against the Greek Emperor of Nicaea, which ended on the plain of Pelagonia; and in 1263, when the Prince, after his return from his Greek prison, made war against the Greeks of the newly established Byzantine province in the Morea, the Marquess of Boudonitzas was once more summoned to his aid. The revival of Greek power in Euboia at this period, and the frequent acts of piracy in the Aitolante channel were of considerable detriment to the people of Boudonitzas, whose food supplies were at times intercepted by the corsairs. But the Marquess Ubertino profited by the will of his sister Mahilia, who had married Azzo VII. d’Este of Ferrara, and bequeathed to her brother in 1264 her property near Parma.

After the death of Ubertino, the Marquisate, like so many Frankish baronies, fell into the hands of a woman. The new Marchioness of Boudonitzas was his second sister, Isabella, who is included in the above-mentioned circular note, addressed to all the great magnates of Achaia by Charles I. of Anjou, the new Prince, and notifying to them the appointment of Galeran d’Ivry as the Angevin vicar-general in the principality. On that occasion, the absence of the Marchioness was one of the reasons alleged by Archbishop Benedict of Patras, in the name of those present at Giarentza, for the refusal of homage to the new baili. So important was the position of the Marquisate as one of the twelve peerages of Achaia.

The Marchioness Isabella died without children; and, accordingly, in 1286, a disputed succession arose between her husband, a Frank settled in the East, and the nearest male representative of the Pallavicini family, her cousin Tommaso, grandson of the first Marquess’s brother, Rubino. The dispute was referred to Guillaume de la Roche, Duke of Athens, in his capacity of bailiff of Achaia, before the feudal court of which a question


\[17^*] Fontis Rerum Austriaevarum, Abh. II., 201, 214, 215, 225.

\[18^*] Ritter, C.C.

relating to Boudonitza would legally come. Tommaso, however, settled the matter by seizing the castle, and not only maintained himself there, but transmitted the Marquisate to his son, Alberto.19

The fifth Marquess is mentioned as among those summoned by Philip of Savoy, Prince of Achaea, to the famous Parliament and tournament on the Isthmus of Corinth in the spring of 1305, and as having been one of the magnates who obeyed the call of Philip's namesake and successor, Philip of Taranto, in 1307.20 Four years later he fell, at the great battle of the Kephissos, fighting against the Catalans beneath the lion banner of Walter of Brienne,21 who by his will a few days before had bequeathed 100 hyperperi to the church of Boudonitza.22

The Marquisate, alone of the Frankish territories north of the Isthmus, escaped conquest by the Catalans, though, as at Athens, a widow and her child were alone left to defend it. Alberto had married a rich Enobcan heiress, Maria dalle Carceri, a scion of the Lombard family which had come from Verona at the time of the Conquest. By this marriage he had become a hexarch, or owner of one-sixth of that great island, and is so officially described in the Venetian list of Greek rulers. Upon his death, in accordance with the rules of succession laid down in the Book of the Customs of the Empire of Roum, the Marquisate was divided in equal shares between his widow and his infant daughter, Gugliehna. Maria did not, however, long remain unconsolated; indeed, political considerations counselled an immediate marriage with someone powerful enough to protect her own and her child's interests from the Catalans of Athens. Hitherto the Wardens of the Northern March had only needed to think of the Greek enemies in front, for all the territory behind them, where Boudonitza was most easily assailable, had been in the hands of Frenchmen and friends. More fortunate than most of the high-born dames of Frankish Greece, the widowed Marchioness had avoided the fate of accepting one of her husband's conquerors as his successor. Being thus free to choose, she selected as her spouse Andrea Cornaro, a Venetian of good family, a great personage in Crete, and Baron of Skarpanto. Cornaro thus, in 1312, received, by virtue of his marriage, his wife's moiety of Boudonitza,23 while her daughter conferred the remaining half, by her subsequent union with Bartolommeo Zaccaria, upon a member of that famous Genoese race, which already owned Chios and was about to establish a dynasty in the Morea.24

Cornaro now came to reside in Enobcan, where self-interest as well as patriotism led him to oppose the claims of Alfonso Fabrique, the new viceroy of the Catalan Duchy of Athens. His opposition and the natural ambition of Fabrique brought down, however, upon the Marquisate the

---

19 Hopf, opus Ehrich and Graber, Allgemeine Encyclopädie, iii, 92. The original document has now been rendered illegible by the damp.
20 Le Livre de la Conquête, 465; Livre de los Poetas, 114.
21 (col. 120); Hopf, Chroniques grecs-européennes, 177; Sanudo, op. cit. 123.
22 D'Arbois de Jubainville, Vignes topographiques dans le Département de l'Ande, 237.
23 Sanudo, loc.
24 Archivio Veronese, xx, 87, 89.
horrors of a Catalan invasion, and it was perhaps on this occasion that Bartolommeo Zaccaria was carried off as a captive and sent to a Sicilian prison, whence he was only released at the intervention of Pope John XXII. It was fortunate for the inhabitants of Bondonitza that Venice included Carnaro in the truce which she made with the Catalans in 1319. Four years later he followed his wife to the grave, and her daughter was thenceforth sole Marchioness.

Guglielma Pallavicini was a true descendant of the first Marquess. Of all the rulers of Bondonitza, with his exception, she was the most self-willed, and she might be included in that by no means small number of strong-minded, unscrupulous, and passionate women, whom Frankish Greece produced and whom classic Greece might have envied as subjects for her tragic stage. On the death of her Genoese husband, she considered that both the proximity of Bondonitza to the Venetian colony of Negroponte and her long-standing claims to the castle of Larmena in that island required that she should marry a Venetian, especially as the decision of her claim and even her right to reside in the island depended upon the Venetian bailie. Accordingly, she begged the Republic to give her one of its nobles as her consort, and promised dutifully to accept whomsoever the Senate might choose. The choice fell upon Nicolò Giorgio, or Zorzi, to give him the Venetian form of the name, who belonged to a distinguished family which had given a Doge to the Republic and had recently assisted young Walter of Brienne in his abortive campaign to recover his father’s lost duchy from the Catalans. A Venetian galley escorted him in 1335 to the haven of Bondonitza, and a Marquess, the founder of a new line, once more ruled over the castle of the Pallavicini.

At first there was no cause to regret the alliance. If the Catalans, now established at Neapatrias and Lania, within a few hours of Bondonitza, occupied several villages of the adjacent Marquessate, despite the recommendations of Venice, Nicolò I came to terms with them, probably by agreeing to pay that annual tribute of four fully equipped horses to the Vice-General of the Duchy of Athens, which we find constituting the feudal bond between that state and Bondonitza in the time of his son. He espoused, too, the Euboean claims of his wife; but Venice, which had an eye upon the strong castle of Larmena, diplomatically referred the legal question to the bailie of Achaea, of which both Euboea and Bondonitza were technically still reckoned as dependencies. The bailie, in the name of the suzerain Princess of Achaea, Catherine of Valois, decided against Guglielma, and the purchase of Larmena by Venice ended her hopes. Furists at her disappointment, the Marchioness accused her Venetian husband of cowardice and of bias towards his native city, while more domestic reasons increased her indignation. Her consort was a widower, while she had had a daughter by her first marriage, and

\[\text{[See Appendix.]}\]
she suspected him of favouring his own offspring at the expense of her child; Marullo, in whose name she had deposited a large sum of money at the Venetian bank in Negroponte. To complete the family tragedy played within the walls of Boudonitza there was only now lacking a sinister ally of the angry wife. He, too, was forthcoming in the person of Manfredo Pallavicini, the relative, business adviser, and perhaps paramour of the Marchioness. As one of the old conqueror's stock, he doubtless regarded the Venetian husband as an interloper who had first obtained the family honours and then betrayed his trust. At last a crisis arrived. Pallavicini insulted the Marchess, his feudal superior; the latter threw him into prison, whereupon the prisoner attempted the life of his lord. As a peer of Achaea, the Marchess enjoyed the right of inflicting capital punishment. He now exercised it; Pallavicini was executed, and the assembled burgesses of Boudonitza, if we may believe the Venetian version, approved the act, saying that it was better that a vassal should die rather than inflict an injury on his lord.

The sequel showed, however, that Guglielma was not appeased. She might have given assent with her lips to what the burgesses had said. But she worked upon their feelings of devotion to her family, which had ruled so long over them; they rose against the foreign Marchess at their Lady's instigation; and Niccolò was forced to flee across to Negroponte, leaving his little son Francesco and all his property behind him. Thence he proceeded to Venice, and laid his case before the Senate. That body warmly espoused his cause, and ordered the Marchioness to receive him back to his former honourable position, or to deliver up his property. In the event of her refusal, the bailie of Negroponte was instructed to break off all communication between Boudonitza and that island and to sequestrate her daughter's money still lying in the Euboean bank. In order to isolate her still further, letters were to be sent to the Catalans of Athens, requesting them not to interfere between husband and wife. As the Marchioness remained obdurate, Venice made a last effort for an amicable settlement, begging the Catalan leaders, Queen Joanna I, of Naples, as the head of the house of Anjou, to which the principality of Achaea belonged, and the Dauphin Humbert II, of Vienne, then commanding the Papal fleet against the Turks, to use their influence on behalf of her citizen. When this failed, the bailie carried out his instructions confiscated the funds deposited in the bank, and paid Niccolò out of them the value of his property. Neither the loss of her daughter's money nor the spiritual weapons of Pope Clement VI could move the obstinate Lady of Boudonitza, and in her local bishop, Nichardus of Thermopolis, she could easily find an adviser who dissuaded her from forgiveness. So Niccolò never returned to Boudonitza; he served the Republic as envoy to the Servian Tsar, Dushan, and as one of the Doge's Councillors, and died at Venice in 1354. After his death, the Marchioness at once admitted their
only son, Francesco, the 'Marchesotto,' as he was called, now a youth of seventeen, to rule with her, and, as the Catalans were once more threatening her land, made overtures to the Republic. The latter, glad to know that a Venetian citizen was once more ruling as Marquess at Boudonitra, included him and his mother in its treaties with Athens, and when Guglielma died, in 1358, after a long and varied career, her son received back the confiscated property of his late half-sister.\(^8\)

The peaceful reign of Francesco was a great contrast to the stormy career of his mother. His Catalan neighbours, divided by the jealousies of rival chieftains, had no longer the energy for fresh conquests. The establishment of a Servian kingdom in Thessaly only affected the Marquess in so far as it enabled him to bestow his daughter's hand upon a Servian princelet.\(^9\) The Turkish peril, which was destined to swallow up the Marquisate in the next generation, was, however, already threatening Catalans, Serbs, and Italians alike, and accordingly Francesco Giorgio was one of the magnates of Greece whom Pope Gregory XI. invited to the Congress on the Eastern question, which was summoned to meet at Thebes\(^10\) on October 1, 1373. But when the Athenian duchy, of which he was a tributary, was distracted by a disputed succession between Maria, Queen of Sicily, and Pedro IV. of Aragon, the Venetian Marquess, chafing at his vazals' indecision and thinking that the moment was favourable for severing his connexion with the Catalans, declared for the Queen. He was, in fact, the most important member of the minority which was in her favour, for we are told that, 'he had a very fine estate, and we know that he had enriched himself by mercurial ventures. Accordingly he assisted the Navarrese Company in its attack upon the duchy, so that Pedro IV. wrote in 1381 to the Venetian bailiff of Negroponte, begging him to prevent his fellow-countryman at Boudonitra from helping the King's enemies. As the Marquess had property in the island, he had given hostages to fortune. The victory of the Aragonese party closed the incident, and the generous policy of the victors was doubtless extended to him. But in 1388 the final overthrow of the Catalan rule by Nero Acajani made the Marquisate independent of the Duchy of Athens.\(^11\) In feudal lists—such as that of 1391—the Marquess continued to figure as one of the temporal peers of Acajani,\(^12\) but his real position was that of a 'citizen and friend' of Venice, to whom he now looked for help in trouble.

Francesco may have lived to see this realisation of his hopes, for he seems to have died about 1388, leaving the Marquisate to his elder son, Giacomo, under the regency of his widow Euphrosyne, a daughter of the famous insular family of Senza playing the organ in the workshops, etc.,

---

\(^8\) *Memoria,^{a} scriptione, &c.*

\(^9\) *Pedrell, Compositions,* ii. 141; *Marti, xxiii.* f. 20; *xxviii.* f. 20.

\(^10\) *Cebula, Jour. Roy. Soc.,* 271.

\(^11\) *Reynolds, op. cit., viii. 224,* *Jenna, Histoire générale des royaumes de Chipre,* etc.

\(^12\) *Regia,* ii. 489, 499; *Curia, lib. iv.* f. 89."
But the young Marquess soon found that he had only exchanged his tribute to the Catalan Vicer-General for a tribute to the Sultan. We are not told the exact moment at which Bajazet I imposed this payment, but there can be little doubt that Boudenitzza first became tributary to the Turks in the campaign of 1393-4, when ‘the Thunderbolt’ fell upon northern Greece, when the Marquess’s Servian brother-in-law was driven from Pharsala and Domokó, when Lamia and Neopatra were surrendered, when the county of Salonik, founded at the same time as Boudenitzza, ceased to exist. On the way to Salon, the Sultan’s army must have passed within four hours of Boudenitzza, and we surmise that it was spared, either because the season was so late—Salonik fell in February, 1394—or because the castle was so strong; or because its lord was a Venetian. This respite was prolonged by the fall of Bajazet at Angora and the fratricidal struggle between his sons, while the Marquess was careful to have himself included in the treaties of 1406, 1408, and 1409 between the Sultan Suleyman and Venice: a special clause in the first of these instruments released him from all obligations except that which he had incurred towards the Sultan’s father Bajazet.45 Still, even in Suleyman’s time, such was his sense of insecurity, that he obtained leave from Venice to send his peasants and cattle over to the strong castle of Karyates in Euboea, of which his brother Niccolo had become the lessee.46 He figured, too, in the treaty of 1405, which the Republic concluded with Antonio I Acciaioli, the new ruler of Athens, and might thus consider himself as safe from attack on the south.47 Indeed, he was anxious to enlarge his responsibilities: for he was one of those who bid for the two Venetian islands of Tenos and Mykonos, when they were put up to auction in the following year. In this offer, however, he failed.48

The death of Suleyman and the accession of his brother Murat in 1410 sealed the fate of the Marquess. Early in the spring a very large Turkish army appeared before the old castle. Boudenitzza was strong, and its Marquess a resolute man; so that for a long time the siege was in vain. ‘Giacomo,’ says the Venetian document composed by his son, ‘preferred, like the high-minded and true Christian that he was, to die rather than surrender the place.’ But there was treachery within the castle walls: betrayed by one of his servants, the Marquess fell, like another Leonidas, bravely defending the military Thermopylae against the new Persian invasion. Even then, his sons, ‘following in their father’s footsteps,’ held the castle some time longer in the hope that Venice would remember her distant children in their distress. The Senate did, indeed, order the Captain of the Gulf to make inquiries whether Boudenitzza still resisted and in that case to send succour to its gallant defenders—the cautious Government added—with as little expense as possible. But before the watchmen on the keep could desyer the

44 Thomas and Prudelli, Diplomateria Pisana Latinitatum, ii. 292; Actes de l'Obèisement, p. 369, 362.
45 Sallust, Magna Gallia, I, 220, 320.
46 Prudelli, Commentarii, iii, p. 210 (gives in full by Lampros, Ἐγγράφα ορισκονδέα τῆς ἐποικισμένης Ἰταλίας τοῖς Ἀθηναῖοι 399).
47 Sallust, op. cit. ii. 145.
Captain sailing up the Atalante channel, all was over; both food and ammunition had given out and the Zorzi were constrained to surrender, on condition that their lives and property were spared. The Turks broke their promises, deprived their prisoners of their goods, expelled them from the house of their ancestors, and dragged young Niccolò to the Sultan's Court at Adrianople.69

Considerable confusion prevails in this last act of the history of Bondonita, owing to the fact that the two leading personages, the brother and eldest son of the late Marquess, bore the same name of Niccolò. Hopf has accordingly adopted two different versions in his three accounts of these events. On a review of the documentary evidence, it would seem that the brother, the Baron of Karystos, was not at Bondonita during the siege, and that, on the capture of his nephew, he proclaimed himself Marquess. Venice recognised his title, and instructed her envoy to Musa to include him in her treaty with the Sultan and to procure at the same time the release of the late Marquess's son. Accordingly, in the peace of 1411, Musa promised, for love of Venice and seeing that he passed as a Venetian, to harass him no more, on condition that he paid the tribute established. Not only so, but the Marquess's ships and merchandise were allowed to enter the Turkish dominions on payment of a fixed duty.68 Thus temporarily restored, the Marquisate remained in the possession of the uncle, from whom the nephew, even after his release, either could not, or cared not to claim it. He withdrew to Venice, and, many years later, received, as the reward of his father's heroic defence of Bondonita, the post of châtelain of Ptolemais, near the mouth of the Gulf of Volo, the last Venetian outpost on the mainland of North-Eastern Greece—a position which he held for eight years.64

Meanwhile, his uncle, the Marquess, had lost all but his barren title. Though the Turks had evacuated Bondonita, and the castle had been repaired, he felt so insecure that he sent his bishop as an emissary to Venice, begging for aid in the event of a fresh Turkish invasion and for permission to transport back to Bondonita the serfs whom he had sent across to Karystos a few years before.62 His fears proved to be well founded. In vain the Republic gave orders that he should be included in her treaty with the new Sultan, Mohammed I. On June 20, 1414, a large Turkish army attacked and took the castle, and with it many prisoners, the Marquess, so it would seem, among them—for in the following year we find his wife, an adopted daughter of the Duke of Athens, appeasing to Venice to obtain his release from his Turkish dungeon.60 He recovered his freedom, but not his Marquisate. In the treaty of 1416, Bondonita was, indeed, actually assigned to

---

69. Recueil de l'Orient latin, vi. 110; Sâthas, op. cit. iii. 431; Monuments antiquitatis historiarum Selectiorum, ii. 90-91; Math. xviii. ff. 143, 148.
68. Recueil de l'Orient latin, iv. 513; Thomas and Procelli, op. cit. 293.
64. Recueil de l' Orient latin, vi. 110; Sâthas, op. cit. 439-1.
62. Sâthas, op. cit. ii. 276-1.
60. Sanudo and Navagero, opus Mosanto S.R.I. exil. 890, cxxiii. 1050; Comencini di Amelio Valier (Cod. Cleon, X. 297), ii. f. 259; Recueil de l'Orient latin, iv. 548.
him in return for the usual tribute; but nine years later we find Venice still
vainly endeavouring to obtain its restitution.\textsuperscript{44} He continued, however, to
hold the title of Marquess of Boudonitzza with the castle of Karystos, which
descended to his son, the \textquote{Marchesotto}, and his son's son,\textsuperscript{45} till the Turkish
conquest of Euboea in 1470 put an end to Venetian rule over that great
island. Thence the last titular Marquess of Boudonitzza, after governing
Lepanto, retired to Venice, whence the Zorzi came and where they are still
largely represented.

Of the castle, where for two hundred years Pallavicini and Zorzi held
away, much has survived the two Turkish sieges and the silent ravages of
five centuries. Originally there must have been a triple enclosure, for

\begin{figure}
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\caption{Boudonitzza: The Keep and the Hellenic Gateway.}
\end{figure}

several square towers of the third and lowest wall are still standing in the
village and outside it. Of the second enceinte the most noticeable fragment
is a large tower in ruins, while the innermost wall is strengthened by three
more. In the centre of this last enclosure are the imposing remains of the large
square donjon (Fig. 3), and adjoining this is the most interesting feature of the
castle—the great Hellenic gateway (Fig. 4), which connects one portion of this
enclosure with the other, and which Buchon has described so inaccurately.\textsuperscript{46}

\textsuperscript{44} Strada and Navegno, \textit{Sidere}, xxii. 211. \textsuperscript{45} Strada, xxii. 1981; \textit{Revue de l'Orient Turc}, v. 198.
\textsuperscript{46} Bouchon, \textit{La Grèce médiévale}, i. 211-31.
It is not 'composed of six stones,' but of three huge blocks, nor do 'the two upper stones meet at an acute angle'; a single horizontal block forms the top. Buchon omits to mention the Byzantine decoration in brick above this gateway. Of the brick conduit which he mentions I could find no trace, but the two cisterns remain. The large building near them is presumably the Frankish church of which he speaks; but the window which he found there no longer exists. Possibly, when the new church in the village was erected, the builders took materials from the chapel in the castle for its construction. At any rate, that very modern and commonplace edifice contains several fragments of ancient work. Thus, the stone threshold of the west door bears three large roses, while on the doorway itself are two stars; and the north door is profusely decorated with a rose, two curious creatures like griffins, two circles containing triangles, and a leaf; above this door is a cross, each arm of which forms a smaller cross. As usually happens in the Frankish castles of Greece— with the exception of Geraki—there are no coats of arms at Boudonitsa, unless this composite cross is an allusion to the 'three crosses,' said to have been originally borne by one branch of the
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Pallavicini. The "medieval seal" in the possession of a local family dates from the reign of Otto; The Marquesses have left behind them neither their portraits—like the Palatine Counts of Cephalonia of the second dynasty—nor any coins—like the French barons of Salona, to whom they bear the nearest resemblance. One of their line, however, the Marquess Alberto, figures in M. Rangabès's play, The Duchess of Athens, and their castle and their ottimes stormy lives fill not the least picturesque page of that romance which French and Italian adventurers wrote with their swords in the classic sites of Hellas.

W. MILLER.

APPENDIX.

I.

1335 DE XVLI ANNAS.

Captia. Quod vir nobilis Ser Nicolaus Georgio, cum sua familia et laudes armatis possit ire cum valete nostris unionem. Et committatur Captaneo, quod cum concludat Nigropontum, et si poterit sem forsce depopulad Bondonitza, sine armis armatis faciat inde siuet et invadatur. Deas de parte.

Mist. xvi. i. 97 v.

II.

1345 DE 21 SEIEL.

Captia. Cum dominacio ducalis et debita tenenabatur eis cives in certum norbis et honores eum justissima conservare et dominus Nicolaus Georgio, Marchio, Bondonitze, sit in uiribus et exist, et Marchionatu suo per eum uxorem imbolito molestatos, et dignum sit, subventur eodem in eo quod cum honore domini unius consilii dato potest, idem vis et examina tenebit ipsum marxhein, et noxum et diligenter deliberatione pro habita, consensui constebit vix nobilis, dominus Benedictus de Molino et Pangracius Justianum, quod committatur consiliario iturum Nigropontum, quo postquam illuc applicaretur vadat ad dominum Marchiamus, uxorem dicti dominii Nicolai per ambassatore, exponendo eodem, quo modo am din ipsam ad dominacionem missa eorum prouternrs et ambassatores potens sitib per dominacionem de eis nobilium sutorum pro marito providit, et valorem dominaciou sua semplacitus complecsero, consensit quod ipsa dominus Nicolaus carnet eum ad eum etam, quum ipsa dominu receptam, sustendit id habere multum ad bonum. Et quoniam in hoc scaper Ducale Dominium prantium et favorabili exhibuit ad causas quas unum et eorum securitatem respeteret et augmentum, tenuisse quam plurimum confirmando et opportuna alia factendi. Sed cum imporium per relationem ipsius dominii Nicolai viri au dicendis magnificentia audiendum sit deductus de morte cumsem Pallavicini inequitas causas occurrit qui mortuum fuit in culpa sua, ait postmodum exigit manifestum, quia duni ipse Marchio coram omnibus universis congregatus, de sit et consensu ditie domine exponeret ret geste sermon. Ab ipsa habuit in responsam quod ipsum Pallavicin dignum penam frett propter folium summa, et melius est, quod ipse, qui excalvis erat mortium fessis ipsum dicto suo domino iniuriam aliquam intelligent, quod secum ipsa domina in presence dictorum burgernum ratificavit. Unde consideratis predictis relliti amore dominij, ipsum dominum Nicolaum honoris pristino restitutione, quod si fecerit, quamquam sit instar et homines nobis plurimum complacuir, et crinem eis consedel strictius obligati. Verum si dicta domina dubitaret,
de recipiendo ipsum dicit et expostulat ambassator prefatus, quod firmiter dominacio hanc rem super se assumpsit et taliter imposevit cibo suo quod minimem poterit dubitare. Quo omnis si dicta domina acetabili bene quidem, si vero non contentaretur et ipsum recipere non vellet, prosecute habere et obtinere omnis bona dicit Marchio qui seum scripta portet antedictus ambassator et al ipse ea bona dare neglexerit, dicit quod: bona sua et suorum ubi quisque intramiti factum est, et protestet urn notario, quern scem temptaret dicere, quod tantum interium, quam dominacio seum proprium reposit, non poterit sustinere, sed proinde in remedii opportunis situm honorum suis et intimi salutis sui videtur convenire, firmiter tenens quo id situm sempere dominacio ad suum conservacionem et suorum exhiberit se praeuncia favorabilium et benignum, sic in similibus reperiet ipsum autem, agradando factum eum ille et alii verbis ut videtur convenire. Et reliquae Nigropontum omnia, que gesserit, fecerit et habuerit, statuer velociter dominionem per suas liberis demotare. Vereum si dictus consiliarius iturus tardaret ire ad regimen suum, quod baudnullus et consiliarius Nigropontis determinatur quis consiliarii deinde ad complectendam predicta ire debebit.

Et scribatur baudnullus et consiliarius Nigropontis, quod si habudant post redditiu dicti ambassatoris, quod ipse domus est, dura nec velit, ipsum dominum Nicolai proprius, quod possit si aut videtur habere et ordinare quod homines Bondani non veniam Nigropontum et quod homines Nigropontis non vadant Bandidianam.

Trem prefati baudnullus et consiliarius sequestrationem factum de aliqua pecunia quantitate que pecunia est damnatile Murulli ille dicit domine firmam tenere desinent, donec predicta fuerint inforrnata, paulatim vel diffinita, vel donec alii ad mandatorem diurne.

Et scribaturus ille ille de la compagna, quae domus baudnullus et consiliarius presentant vel presentari fatiant, cum us videtur, rogando dicentes de compagna, quod cum alioque desiderio veneundi inter virum nobilium dominum Nicolai Georgii et ensis a eoque Marchioskii se in aliquo facto dicte domine intramittere seu velint quod possit civi nostro contrariare ad vennendam ad suum intentissimam.

De non 14—Non sinceri 13.—Alii de parte.

Misti, xxii. l. 26.

III.

1345 DIE V APRAESTI.

Cap. Quod respondentur domine Marchioskii Bandidianae ad suas literas substantiendo nos civi nostri Nicolai Georgii, cum illis verbis que videtur sequando ad quod captam fuit pridie in loco consilio in favorem civis nostri.

Misti, xxii. l. 29 v.

IV.

1346 DIE XXIV JANVARI.

Cap. Quod scribatur nostro Baudo et Consiliarius Nigropontis prae Seu Maiorath Gradoconsulius consiliarius, vel alius siue videtur Baudo et Consiliarius, in nostrum ambassatorum ire debet ad dominium Marchioskis Bandidianis, et sihi expostulat pro parte nostra quod attenta hactena et rationabilis requisitione nostre quod sibi fueri factum per virum Nobilum Johanum Justiniano nostro con iurisdictione Nigropoti, que ad eum protrahere in nostrum ambassatorum transemissae super reformatione scandalis orti inter ipsum et virum nobilum Nicolai Georgii eius virum in reconciliacione ipsum cum dico vero suo: Et intellec ta responsum quod super premesisse fecit nostro ambassatori prelato gravamen et talia necesse sint merito possimus et dolemus, de modo quem ipsum sevexavit et sese orta dictum virum sustinu. Nam sihi pleas potent et debeat sufficeri remissio et reconciliationi cum [no] facta causam nobis per dictum eius virum, secundum nostrum mandatum, et secuto suo in nostra presencia constituto de omni offendit et minor sibi facta, et debeat esse certa quod prosequito idem Marchio in nostra presencia et ex nostro
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mandato promittet qualis affectualliter observasses. Et quod volentes quod bona depositio dicti viri sui et paciencia nostra de tanta iniuria facta civi nostro, silis plenius innotescat delibetviumus iterato aliam nissere ipsum in nostrum ambassatorum ad requisiverum et rogandum ipsum quod debet reconciliare cum dicto viuo suo et quiu recipere ad honorem et statum, in quo erat antequam inde recederet, nam quasvis hoc sit libitum et conveniat pro honore et bono suo, tamen erit gratissimum menti nostrae et ad conservacionem ipsius marchionissae et suorum avidius nos disposet et circa hoc abs dixit aute pro bono facto videoit opportune.

Si vero dicta marchionissae il facere recusaret nec vellet coecessamere nostrae intentioni et requisitioni predictae, dictus Ser. Moretus assignat terminum dictae Marchionissae unius mensis infra quem debet compleverie cum effectu nostrum requisitione promissae. Et si expresse dicit, quod elapsus dicto termino nulla alia requisitione sibi facta, omnem nostrum dicto civi nostro in tanto suo intire devere, instituam inremitti personas et hominum suorum et suorum ab insania in fuerro nostro poterunt repromire. Et ultima hoc prorogabimus in dicto facto de omnibus favoribus et remissioni, quae pro bono et conservazione dictae civis nostri videmus opportune. Et si proprius premiis dictae Marchionissae ipsum recipere at reinteragere voluerit bene opinemum aut eos scripturae dicto haudio et cessillis quod elapsus termino dicti mensis et ipsa marchionissa promissa facto recusante militat ad nos per circum ab aliquo periculo iurisperi et commissis, vel cures, in quibus quod sunt Thoma Lippomannum et Nicolaum de Gandulfo, quod pecuniam Veneesorum Sinestos et providentiam de ipsa sibi dominionis videmus esse instans.

Captis. Primo quod scribatur domino Delphino Vihennensi et illis de Compagnia su favorem dicti civis nostri et recommendando si tue et sustineam ipsum in illa forma et cum illa verba ut dominorum pro bono facti utilia et necessaria videmur.


V.

1348 BUG XI PERVERSII PRIME INDUCIONE

Captis. Quod possint scribunt domino Pape et aliquibus Cardinalibus in recommendacione urbe domini Nicolai Georgio marchionii Bondinii nostri civis ut forma inferioris statuet.

Domino Pape.

Sunt in meo pater pro civilibus meis contra Deum et inimicam aggressati, Sanctitati Vestrae suppliciies meas pro rigo cum reverentia speciali. Unde cum nobilibus vir Nicolai Georgio Marchio Bondinii honorabilissimis civis meus, iam duodecim annis nati enim interesser cum domino Marchionissae Bondinii predicto et cum ne affectione maritalli permissaret habens ac in filium legitimum, qui est annum undecim, ipsa dominum Marchionissae in presidiis anum sine Dei timore postsepito ipsum virum suscum recepit recipere, et sustineam Bondinii et alia bona spectantia viro suo viro tue menti et indebito occupata in grave domum civis mea predicta et Dei iuxtanm manifestam precipitentia, ut quos Deus committere facio non separat: Unde Sanctitati Vestra humilis supplici sequantum Clementi Vestrae placet dictum civis meus habere in suo iure favorabiliter commendatum, ut dicta domino usu tamen virum legitimum recipiat et affectione maritalli portaret sanctum ura Dei precipitum, atque volunt, et sine annumrum, etiam ut expectet. Cum ipsum civis meus sit parum ac sua parte ipsum dominum pro axore legitima tractare pacifice et labore.

Miatio. xxiv. f. 45.

Note.—The 'Miatio' are cited throughout from the originals at Venice; I have corrected the dates to the modern style.

W. M.
THE OLYMPIAN THEATRON AND THE BATTLE OF OLYMPIA.

**Note.**—This article was placed in the hands of the Editors by the author shortly before his untimely and deeply-regretted death. They feel that the best tribute which they can pay to his memory is to print the essay with only the most necessary modifications, such as they suppose he would have himself desired to make. Their thanks are due to Mr. E. Norman Gardiner, who, having at Mr. Pley's own request agreed to write certain additional notes (here distinguished by his initials), has further undertaken to prepare the MS. for press and to read the proofs. The note on ἄξυρος, which the author would probably have developed into a separate article, has been transferred to a more convenient position in an Appendix.

**Edin. J.H.S.**

Once only—seven years after the battle of Leuctra—there was actual fighting within the sacred precinct, the Altis, of Olympia,—in the 104th Olympiad (364 B.C.). From time immemorial, before and since that year, the inhabitants of Elis, as Polybius (iv. 73) phrased it 200 years later, "enjoyed on account of the Olympian games" so unique and privileged a dispensation that Olympia and the whole of Elis was a Holy Land, and feared no ravages of war. The Eleans, by the same token, were ideally conceived of as living consecrated lives (μετὰ Βίος), and enjoyed immunity from battle and sudden death. In his account of the one and only battle of Olympia, Xenophon—writing after he had lived for twenty-three years within an afternoon's stroll of the Olympic Altis—alludes in passing to the ἄξυρος, by way of explaining just where the fighting took place. Although

1 Xenophon lived in retirement at Scillus from just after the battle of Coronea (394 B.C.) to just after the battle of Leuctra (371 B.C.). The closing years of his life were spent at Corinth. When first he settled upon his small estate there, the new Dromo at Olympia had been in use for rather less than sixty years. Spectators presumably flocked the stepped terraces in order to witness contests in the Dromo at the eighty-third celebration of the Olympic (B.C. 444) four years before the probable date of Xenophon's birth (B.C. 444). It is accordingly natural—if the local Olympian application of ἄξυρος was finally driven out of currency by the multiplication in Greece of stone theatres—that Xenophon should have remembered what Plutarch, Pausanias, and others of the first two centuries A.D. could never have heard of—an obscure but perfectly clear application of the word ἄξυρος, chiefly turned before full-fledged stone theatres had come to play a conspicuous part in Greek civic and religious life. Pausanias' silence is most significant since his account of the Olympic Altis is the most carefully and successfully melange of all his topographical dedications. The Olympic guides with whom he conversed, the Peloponnesian antiquaries whom he consulted (VII. xxviii., VIII. xxiv.), and the authors referred to by him in his two books on Elis (Anaximenes VI. xviii. 2; Aristobulus, 6. viii. 6 f.; Aristarchus, V. xx. 4 f.; Philistus, 6. xxiii. 6; Theopompus, VI. xviii. 5; Theopompos, 6. xii. 8), all of them failed to suggest to him the idea that there was or had been a theatre at Olympia.

2 I have recently come across another late reference to a ἄξυρος at Olympia in Johann Christensen, De Novo, Hist. p. 851, sulc. Sparr.
there exists no other mention whatever of a θέατρον at Olympia. Xenophon's unrivalled familiarity with the site fully justified the expectation that, when Olympia should be excavated, remains of a theaτrė similar to those elsewhere in Greece would appear. But, after the most thorough search in all the annals of archaeology, no vestiges of such a theatre have anywhere appeared. Eleusis, hardly second in importance to Olympia, offers a similar and even more perplexing puzzle. Although inscriptions found on that site speak of a θέατρον, no traces of any theatre have been discovered, and nothing of the kind was seen there by Pausanias. And at Eleusis, as at Olympia, there is no site adjoining the precinct where such a theatre might plausibly be located. The meaning of θέατρον in Eleusinian inscriptions is doubtful, but can hardly differ very materially from that of θέατρον in the well-known (but, I venture to think, universally misconceived) passage of Herodotus.

Dr. Dorpfeld (Anc. Stu. ii. 276) argues from the placing of the Stadium or the place where athletes competed. The stands were subdivided into two parts; (1) the stands for the judges, and (2) the surrounding accommodation for spectators, called the θέατρον. This view is adopted by Dr. Philes (J. H. x. xx. p. 268) in correction of his original account of an Eleusinian inscription (Bull. Arch. ii. 538). Hicks and Hill, Hist. Anc. 184, containing the words to θέατρον τῆς τοῦ σταδίου. That the word θέατρον in both these inscriptions must and does refer to places for spectators in the Panathenian Stadium and the Stadium at Eleusis respectively is clear. This, however, was simply because θέατρον was at this time still a comparatively vague term, not yet the technically fixed designation for stone theatres, which had yet some time to prominence and were only just building. When these were built and constantly used throughout Greece, the term θέατρον ceased to be current for any part of a stadium or for places like the Olympic terraces or colonnades. Before their advent θέατρον applied to any στρατηγον ημερας shaped, e. g. (1) to the seating of the Panathenian Stadium at Athens, (2) to the seating of the Eleusinian Stadium, (3) to the terrace of the Olympic treasuries before 450 B.C., (4) to that terrace, supplemented after 450 B.C. by its southern extension, the Painted Colonnade, and the West Colonnade of the South-eastern Building. Just such another spectatorial was that of the Spartan Agora, from which Demosthenes departed to high dudgeons (v. 385 B.C.) according to Herodotus (vi. 37). Excavations yet to be made may enlighten us further as to the exact application of Herodotean word θέατρον in this passage, but even now we know (a) from Pausanias III. xi. 3 that the most magnificent monument there to be seen was the Persian Colonnade, (b) from Themistocles that there were no ἀσπασμος ὀλυμπιακος in sports at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war. It is obvious therefore that Pausanias is "heeding" when, having described the Persian Colonnade as ἀνεπάφης τοῦ ἐπείτη τὸν Ἐδεσσας, he straightway adds: ἀνὴρ ὁ πάντοτα ἡμέραν ἔστη τῆς τοῦ τοῦ πάντου ἀσπάσμασαν. The gladiatorial combats and elaborations of the Persian Colonnade were plainly of much later origin than the times just after the Persian war. Thus the θέατρον, from which Demosthenes so shrilly withdrew, certainly comprised in its plains and most primitive dimensions what afterwards was improved into the stadium and somewhat grotesque fabric seen and described by Pausanias.
There the recently deposed Demaratus, while witnessing the festal dances of the Spartan Gymnopaidai in the Dancing-place (χοροί), which was another name for the ἄγων, received from King Leotychides a taunting message, and, after an anxiously threatening rejoinder, veiled his head and went his way εἰς τὸν βέβηρον εἰς τὰ ἱσυτόν αἴλια. Here βέβηρον cannot mean a stone theatre, because we know there was none such anywhere in Sparta until many generations after the beginning of the Peloponnesian war. This

in the Peloponnesian war (2) became Herodotus, the only contemporary authority as to the triumphal progress of Themisteles, knows nothing about it. In fact Herodotus (ii. 124), after detailing the honours paid to Themisteles at Sparta, ends with a guard of honour which accompanied him to Tegos on his way back to Athens, whereas the Plutarchian story implies that he went from Sparta to Olympia, in which case he would have been escorted not to Tegos, but up the valley of the Eurotas to the headwaters of the Alpheius (i. 67). Neither Themisteles (ii. 74) nor Diodorus (vi. 27) knows anything about the olation to Themisteles at Olympia, although they are quoted along with Hell. vii. 123 f., asouching for this fragment of latter-day enthusiasm by Dr. Westermann, in Pauly's Realencyclopaedie, s. v. Themisteles. How the tale of Themisteles at Olympia came to be invented is shown by Pausanias' mention of it (VIII. 50. 5) as an illustration of the olation to Philopoemen at Nemea. Pausanias does not search for its truth, since he introduces it with τοῦτος, "I heard of it." The common source from which Plutarch and Pausanias derived it was presumably popular report. It was a tale popularly invented as a pendant to the historical epiclese of Philopoemen at Nemea. Such tales invented themselves among Greeks.

3 That there can have been no stone theatre at Sparta at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war is clear from Thucydides (I. 2). Description of the insignificance of Spartan monuments at that time οἱ μεσαναίοι πολιτείαι (Pausanias iii. p. 497 n.), at least, but this whole discourse about Themisteles at Olympia is of late invention, and entirely apocryphal. (1) because the festival at which it must have taken place would almost certainly be the 79th (474 B.C.), which came just after the organisation of the first Athenian Confederacy at Delos—a consummation not popular
passage therefore illustrates the primitive and comparatively indeterminate use of *stairpas* to designate any place of vantage, however shaped or built, commanding an altar, which afforded room for spectators of dances, dramatic performances, or sacrifices.

Not only was there at Olympia no stone structure of semi-circular tier of seats built at any time early or late, but there was nothing there until about 450 B.C. that could be called either a running-ground (δρόμος) or a full-fledged stadium. The Olympic Stadium—in the final and completed shape which alone deserves that name—dates from Macedonian times after Chaeroneia. Even then there was no provision for seats. The spectators there, apparently, witnessed athletic events, straining the while on slopes, more or less grassy, that surrounded a quadrilateral running-ground (δρόμος), sloping away from it at a convenient gradient, and running parallel to its sides and ends.

Dr. Borrman (2); Text, p. 28) represents the base of the southern slope as so far extended that the new and steeper slope measured 40 metres from the running-ground up to its top, the old spectators' field having measured 30 metres, i.e., the breadth of the running-field adjacent. The new area was of 26,000 square metres, and on the southern slope alone nearly

---

6 Not till the fourth century B.C. did even by that time, was Greek social life of any kind so far divorced from ritual observances as to admit of provision for celebrations in places where there was an altar. Indeed the ancient altar of Artemis Orthia at Sparta, as lately excavated (E. Reusmer in R.S.A. xii. pp. 309-319) admirably illustrates the traditional centering of sight-seeing crowds around altars of immemorial worship. It was not until the reign of Casmalla (c. 214 B.C.) that a stone theatre—not to be confused with the larger one described in the previous note mentioned by Pausanias III. xiv. 4. Athinaion iv. 136 (e) and Lucian, Ananias 28, but not by Herodotus 67—emerged this altar of immemorial service, where was focused a "continuous cult of the goddess . . . for at least 1290 years" (R. M. Dewkis, Proceedings of the Classical Association 1907, p. 59). What exactly was the provision for spectators before Casmalla's time is not yet known (R.S.A. xii. p. 310). There certainly was no stone theatre of Hellenic or of Hellenistic date either here or in the *stairpas* where the gymnastadial were celebrated (Paus. Ill. xii. 9) and frequented by crowds of strangers (Nest. Mosch. 2. ii. 33). Plutarch is quite alone in the erroneous statement—as the preceding note—that the festival was held *παρ' *stairpas (Aphthonios 29). When there was a proper stone theatre at Sparta—in Imperial days, various performances, none of them connected with the gymnastadial, took place there, such as are alluded to by Athenaeus (iv. p. 130 a) and by Lucian, Ananias 28.

[Professor A. E. Gardner points out to me an excellent illustration of provision for spectators round an altar at Oropus. Close to the Amphithéâtre is an altar and above it is a miniature theatre consisting of some semi-circular tier of steps. At Eleusis too there are not only steps all round the achos itself but the steps extend outside it along the face of the rock and, there are other steps here and there commanding the sacred way. When we remember that the theatre proper entered round the altar of the orchestra, we are surely justified in attaching a religious meaning to the word *stairpas*, and in using the word of the provision for spectators at Oropus, Eleusis, Sparta, and Olympia. A further indication of the religious association of *stairpas* may perhaps be found in the use of the cognate words *στήριγμα* and *στήρι* of the representatives sent by cities to the great festivals.—E.N.D.]
40,000 spectators could stand—fully 10,000 more than were possibly accommodated before the enlargement.

At its best, then, when, in the days of Philip and Alexander, the space overlooking the quadrilateral running-ground had been mounded up and extended for the convenience of spectators, the Olympian Stadium was anything rather than what would now be called 'up to date.' Before Chaeroneia it was indeed a primitive affair. Between the years 450 B.C. and 338 B.C. there was (1) the running-ground for actual contests, and (2) a field for spectators south of it where onlookers could stand. Like the running-ground north of it, this field had an area of an acre and a half, more or less. It was also, like the running-ground north of it, not far from

8 It has been not unnatural to suggest that bales of wood must have been provided for spectators at Olympia, but the fact remains that, except in the Palaestra, which was not built before Macedonian times, and presumably in the Gymnasion, which was built still later, arrangements for sitting were everywhere conspicuous by their absence at Olympia. The hardships of travel in early days effectually prohibited from attendance the old and infirm, and the young would not scruple to lie down on the ground when tired. Certainly no traces appear of any normal contrivances for seating spectators, whether in the Stadium or elsewhere. This was clearly no place to sit down in the Kleosous Taulachion. Wastepapers appear to have set as little in witnessing Olympic Games as in viewing Kleosous mysteries. Athletes' training and clothes that hampered the limbs far less than those of the present day appear to have made continuous standing far easier for the frequenters of the Olympia than we imagine. Socrates and his contemporaries were used to a life in the streets and porches of Athens which was the very reverse of sedentary. Hence Alcibiades' after-dinner story of Socrates at Pothinae (Plato, Sympos. 220). He began one morning to think about something and continued till noon from the break of day. After supper in the evening, certainIonians slept out in order to see him all night. This he did till the following morning, when, with the return of light, he offered his prayer to the sun, and went his way. Probably Alcibiades' tale, like other after-dinner stories, is not to be taken too literally, and Socrates did not stand continuously for twenty-four hours. But after all the point of the anecdote is well put, unless one realizes that Alcibiades and the Ionians did not wonder at his standing for so long a time—what really amazed them was that he was riveted by thought about something he could not resolve, and would not give the puzzle up.

9 Sitting was regarded as a distinct habit. In Xenophon's Symposium x. 10, the ambassador tells his host not to sit down like a slave, but to stand over his slaves, like a master directing and correcting them, and to walk round the house to see what was wanted. Again in the Memorabilia iii. 13, a Xenophon tells us that an Athenian walks three or six days as far as from Athens to Olympia. —E.S.

The western end of the running-ground was so much lower than the eastern end that an independent source of water-supply for the latter was required (cf. Thuc. ii. 174 b). The water-supply of the northern and eastern sides of the Altis and of the western half of the Dromos derived, before the improvements of Herodes Atticus, from a tank north of the north-western angle of the Heraeum. An open conduit started from there and then skirted the north side of the Heraeum and the bottom step of the terrace until it reached the way down into the running-ground. There it branched (1) into a major conduit which went along the northern retaining wall (supplemented by the northern support of the barrel-arch in Roman days) down into the Stadium, and (2) a minor conduit which turned southward, crossing the way into the Stadium overhead, i.e. above a hypothetical postern gate which then led eastward into the Dromos. See Graec. (Of. Suppl. II. p. 171), Dove (Of. Suppl. I. p. 77), and Burmann (Of. Suppl. II. p. 77). This overhead communication appears to have been supplemented—probably at the time of the Macedonian extension of the Stadium, demolition of the first Colonnade of Echo, and reconstruction of it farther west—by an underground conduit, which, however, did not work well. Thus the earlier overhead water-supply connected with the tunnel discovered along the bank wall of the first Colonnade of Echo, where its course slanted from an altitude at the northern end, corresponding to that of the postern gate, to a much lower level near the
level, its gradient being about 1:13. Exactly what chance for onlookers there may have been on the three other sides of the quadrilateral Dromos is not known, except that there was nowhere so much space as in the southern field just mentioned. Dr. Bormann has estimated that about 20,000 spectators could view from these various fields adjacent the athletic events of this very primitive arena. Primitive though it was, this was the only arena known to Xenophon, and to this he applies the name Δυσοί. It will accordingly be convenient to reserve his own term Dromos for the running-ground, which Xenophon knew, and to restrict the practically equivalent term Στάδιον strictly to the perfected and extended arena of Macedonian or later date.

southern end of the Colonnade, where traces of it have been discovered (cf. PL. i. iv. ii). The hypothetical western gate was presumably suppressed at the time of the Macedonian extension, and supplanted by some underground conduit connected with the open runway, still visible to us, along the bottom step of the reconstructed western Colonnade of Echo. It is important to bear in mind that these two successive schemes of water-supply for the two successive Colonnades of the Echos both connected at the terraces of the treasuries with the open runway which ran along the footstep of the stepped terrace. The major conduit above mentioned (as leading down into the Stadium, distributed water into a series of shallow basins set at intervals of 15 metres around the western half of the running-ground.

A low-lying stretch of ground, quadrilateral and all but rectangular, the Olympic running-field lay, 74 m. below the mean level of the terrace of the treasuries, and so, 33 m. below the stylobate of the two great temples. Its boundary lines figured what might be called a parallelogram with obtuse, since its breadth at the east end was 29.70 m. but 29.70 m. at a point lying 12.73 m. west of the eastern starting line, 28.60 at the western starting line and 25.60 at the western end, next the Altis. It extended from the eastern extremity of the terrace and treasuries 213 odd metres northeastward, skirting the foot of Mt. Cynisca. Its breadth was 29 odd metres. It is not known what changes were made in the running-ground proper when the spaces adjoining it for the use of onlookers were cut down and moulded up (Paus. VI. 22. 8) in Macedonian times, but the Olympic Stadium certainly was anything rather than a washed-out area like that at Ludolf on the Lyceum. Before the Eleans built what they called the Painted Colonnade—the name of "Colonnade of Echo," conventionally given to the later colonnade built further west in Macedonian times and rebuilt in Roman times—is properly, the Pisan temple applied successively to both (Paus. V. 21. 27 and Antiquity, the whole region of the Dromos from the Altis, there were presumably in this region several centres of specifically Pisan origin. His suggestions of those local cults, whose shrines would naturally bristle on the site of the masked tribe centre of the Pisans, survive in Pausanias' mention of Demeter Chamae and the Pisan king Chamaean, and, of his location of the sanctuary of this ethnome kult in the Dromos (VI. 21. 1). Demeter's priestess had a seat of honour in the Stadium (Paus. VI. 21. 19), a peculiarly significant fact, in view of the otherwise despotic exclusion of women (Paus. V. vi. 7) as well as in the naming of the Colonnade of Echo (cf. Paus. II. 22. 19. V. 21. 7 and on the period shops on 632-635. For the remains of the gorgeous shrine of Demeter Chamae of which, Regilla, wife of Hercules Atticus, was priestess see Od. 1. 9. 406. They were used by the builders of the early Olympian Basilica.

Dr. Bormann (cf. Text II. p. 158) states the enlargement approximately in the middle of the first century B.C. or a little later—an exceedingly late date, in view of (a) of the crowds which reacted to Olympia and must have required additional room, and (b) of the fact that the first century B.C. was by no means a brilliant epoch for the Olympic games, as is made plain by the fact that Olympia was plundered by Sulla, and by the general helplessness that characterized Greek circumstances in this period. There is even a tale representing that Sulla summoned all the adult competitors at Olympia to grace his triumph at Rome in 87-86 B.C. so that Epaminondas of Argos, winner in the boys' running race the only recorded victor at Olympia for the 175th Olympiad (cf. Paus. VIII. 8. 5产出, Aristotle and Appian of B. 390). Be that as it may, Dr. Bormann
Where then stood the spectators, and where took place the contests prior to 450 B.C.? Go back to the prehistoric time when there was no building on the Altis—only the Grove and the mounded Barrow of Pelops with the chief altar just north of it. At that time, if games there were, these are likely to have taken place north of the altar—on the site afterwards covered by the Heraeum—and may have been viewed from that southwestern footspur of Mt. Cronius, which in the seventh century A.D. overwhelmed the Heraeum. In the first quarter of the fifth century B.C. this same spur of Mt. Cronius showed nine low and shallow steps running parallel and close

argues that the constantly rising level of the running-field—always a receptacle for the surface water of the Altis (which was not far from 12 feet above it) by reason of the gentle downward slope which began as far west as the Metron—forced alterations of an extensive character and not confined to the running-ground. He dates from about 50 B.C. an elaborate scheme which was carried out completely within a generation of that date. This scheme comprised: I. the building of a new Echo Colonnade west of the old one; II. the extension of the western slope of the stadium so as to cover the space previously occupied by the old colonnade hemmed inwardly dismantled; III. the tunnelling of the kithera open way leading down to the running-ground; IV. the construction of a monumental gateway in front of III. Dr. Bormann convincingly argues that IV. must have been built about 175 years before the 226th Olympiad, when the two Zanes flanking it on either side were set up [Iunna. V. ext. 15]; i.e. ca. 50 B.C. He argues not quite so convincingly that III. the tunnel, and II. the eastward extension of the stadium slope, must have been part of one and the same scheme, because the amount and weight of work required to stand up the western slope to the top of its new retaining wall (6) metres high) required a tunnel, if there was to be direct access from the Altis to the running-ground. The tunnel being according to his view of Roman usage, it follows then that the extension of the slope was also a part of the Roman scheme, to which, then, the building of the new colonnade must also be added, since it cannot be separated from the extension which dismantled the earlier colonnade. There are, however, three serious objections to conceiving items 1-IV. as such and all of Roman date, and these are met by concluding that IV. and III. the Gate and the Tunnel are of Roman date, while I. and II. the rebuilding of the colonnade further west and the extension of the slope are of the Macedonian era (ca. 330 B.C.) after Chaeronea. The first objection is that the sill of IV. is laid so high that its foundations extend over those of I. in such a manner as to preclude their forming part of one consistent scheme of improvements. The second is that in the walls of II. have been found—notably in the northern wall of the tunnelled way—the materials standing which walls of an earlier passage-way running to about the height of the spring of the Roman barrel-arch, which may well have served from the date of the Macedonian extension to the building of the Roman Gate (I.) and Tunnel (II.) as a means of direct access to the running-ground. Along the southern retaining wall of this earlier passage-way may be a stone bench, remains of which were found in situ. The third objection is that Dr. Uerfeld has pointed out several detailed features, which the new Colonnade of Echo has in common with the Philippeum, and the date of the Philippeum is unquestionably ca. 330 B.C. These features are: (1) the elaborate and workmanlike treatment of the steps and of the stylobate; (2) the use for the steps of coarse-grained white marble, pores being used for: other parts; (3) the use for the steps of block-shaped chisels, while the drum of the columns and the blocks of the stylobate are finished together with thick wooden dowels (Gil. Text R. 259). The numerous architectural fragments of Roman workmanship belonging to the site of the Macedonian Colonnade must, therefore, be attributed to extensive Roman repairs, while the western or second Colonnade of Echo must be dated as contemporaneous with the Philippeum, and with the extension of the western slope of the primitive Tholos, which made it into a full-fledged Stadium.

12 This very notable flight of steps occupies practically the whole of the north side of the Altis, 150 m. in extent. Only the Prytaneum with its shrine of Hertha intervenes between the west end of this lavishly broad flight of very shallow steps and the later western wall of the Altis. It is hard to believe that these steps were thus extended merely as a convenient means of approaching the several terraces and as an especially safe retaining wall to the north.
to the northern colonnade of the Heraeum and designed partly to protect it from just the catastrophe that was destined finally to overwhelm it, and partly to provide accommodation for spectators. These nine steps were built contiguously with those which ran along the whole eastward stretch of the long terrace of the eleven treasuries so called. When the Heraeum and the shrine of Hestia just north of it were newly built, the altar of prehistoric observance of Aphaia, being crowded in between the new Heraeum and the old-world Barrow of Pelops, fell into neglect, and the great Ash Altar of daily sacrifice located just east of the barrow usurped its more ancient importance. The building of the Heraeum may thus be supposed to have crowded spectators and athletes alike to the east, where the latter had a new Αγών east of the Great Ash Altar, the former a new θεσπορέων or spectatorium overlooking it on the site where later were built the eleven Olympian treasuries.

Such was the posture of affairs when—as the most tangible indication that the Olympic games attracted more than the provincial resort of Pisatis, Arcadia, Triphylia, Messenia, and Elis—the Geloans came from the far west about the year 610 B.C., and built the curious Old-Geloans' ark remodelled a century later into something more like the other treasuries so called. Ten of these sprang up alongside of the ancient ark of Gela in the course of the sixth and the first quarter of the fifth century B.C. Pausanias, describing this by no means effective crowd of Communal Houses or Chapels huddled together in a monotonous row—more like one side of a suburban street than anything else of to-day—says: there is in the Altis a terrace (κρήνη) made of porous stone; back of it and north of the Heraeum extends Mt. Cevains... on this terrace are the Treasuries, just as at Delphi some of the Greeks have made Treasuries of Apollo. His words just as at Delphi σάθα δή και ἐν Δέλφοις require much qualification, to supply which is easy, now that both Olympia and Delphi have been so thoroughly excavated. Pausanias, without asserting it, leaves us to imagine that the location of treasuries at Olympia and Delphi respectively is similar. As a matter of fact there is almost every possible contrast in that respect between the two sanctuaries. There is also a striking contrast as to the dates at which Olympic and Delphian treasuries were founded. At Delphi treasuries perished here and there and were scattered, often singly, along the steep.

of the Heraeum. Under the Roman emperors lordly flights of steps and royal approaches of various kinds were multiplied in Greek lands, but these terraces-steps are too shallow to make a fine effect. The point seems to have been to have as many as possible, that spectators might perch on them in as great a number as possible.

[Various traditions connect games with altars. In ancient Greece the altar or the funeral pyre was the natural place for the finish of a race. In the Iliad the footrace must have finished at a place of sacrifice: for Ajax slipped just before the finish 'where fifty were strewn from the slaughter of the bullocks on which Achilles slew in honour of Patroklos,' Iliad xxiii. 775. The chariot race between Oenomaus and Pelops was from the altar of Poseidon at the Isthmus to Olympia. The torch-race of course was always ended at an altar. Finally the traditional connexion of the races at Olympia with the altar is proved by the account preserved by Philostratus of the origin of the various races, Gym. viii.-x.—E.N.G.]
They occupied every ledge available from which some segment of the Sacred Processional way was visible. At Olympia the eleven treasuries were huddled together in a row, as if nothing preoccupied their builders so much as to find and occupy some few square feet of ground from which to view advantageously the treeless arena, the Homeric 'Aγων, at the eastern foot of the Great Ash Altar. At least three of the Delphian 'treasuries'—the Cnidians' Lesebe, The Treasury of Brasidas and the Arcadians, and the Thebans' Treasury—were dedicated long after the dedication of treasuries at Olympia had entirely ceased. There must have been reasons peculiar to Olympia which dictated the crowding together in one long line of all the Olymian treasuries ever dedicated, and also especial and local reasons to account for the sudden and entire cessation of new dedications after the end of the first quarter of the fifth century B.C. Even when all available space on the terrace was occupied, sites could certainly have been found elsewhere and treasuries would have been dedicated elsewhere on the Altis, had not a great crisis supervened in the management of the Festival—the assumption by the Eleans of the sole presidency of the Games and the inauguration of plans for new buildings and dispositions for sight-seers effectively superseding the old eisvaisses-tuisses policy of which the dedication of treasuries or Communal Houses had been the outcome. If, at Olympia as at Delphi, one of the chief objects, if not the only aim, in dedicating a treasury had been to secure a view of sacrifices and processions, the location on the terrace of the eight treasuries last built—built that is to say before the great crisis just alluded to—could hardly be accounted for. Only the three treasuries first dedicated—the Odeans' (xii. 610 B.C.), the Metapontines' (x. 590 B.C.), and the Megarians' (xi. 590-85 B.C.):—occupy sites chosen on their merits and suitable for solid foundations. The next three—the Cyrenaecs' (vii.), the Sybarites' (vi.), and the Byzantines' (v.) built about 550 B.C. west of the Altar (viii.)—stand upon a subsoil so insecure that, when (about 530 B.C.) the Selinuntines appeared upon the scene, they felt compelled to crowd their Communal House (ix.) into the last available space east of the altar. Why then did not they build elsewhere? Why were the four treasuries subsequently dedicated (iv, iii, ii, and i.) built on the western extremity of the terrace and not elsewhere? How account for the pains submitted to by the Sicyonians in laying the foundations of their treasury—worst of all—to which alone its comparative stability is due? Alike the solidity of the Sicyonian treasury (i.), the dilapidation of the six treasuries just east of it, and the cramped position of the Selinuntines' House, betoken one and the

18 It looks indeed as if the interest so long maintained by private communities in their several 'treasuries' at Olympia had died down after the laying out of the Drome and the building of the earlier Colonnades of Echo—see undeniably public-spirited, if not of the Eleians, analogous no doubt, in the motives which prompted it, to the building by the Athenians of their 'Marathonian' Colonnade at Delphi. This last indeed, whether stated with M. Homolle (loc. cit. 616 n.7) or with Dr. Körte (490 n.7), of Hist. vi. 92 or with Moeser, Hausmeither, Hicks, and Duttenberger (1469-1459, n.5), may have suggested their Colonnade of Echo to the Eleans.
same cardinal fact. Built, all of them, before the Eleans seized undivided control and planned the earlier Colonnade of Echo and the Dromos, the location of each and all these houses, as well as their cramped and ungracefully grouping, tells of the time when Pisa shared control with Elis, and no specially devised arena for athletic events was deemed requisite. Running, wrestling, boxing, javelin and discus throwing—all contests in fact not requiring the Hippodrome or its primitive equivalent—took place east of the Great Ash Altar in the ancient 'Ayyow, and were witnessed from the terrace of the treasuries, the early βιαρρων of the Olympian Altis. Each treasury built there was, so to speak, a privileged point of vantage, and its porch was a sort of Royal Box from which those dedicating it could view not only processions and sacrifices at all times and as long as the Olympia lasted, but also before 450 B.C. all such athletic events as after 450 B.C. were transferred to the Dromos.

The sudden and entire cessation at Olympia of the building and dedication of new treasuries has, however, quite as much to do with the Eleans first Colonnade of Echo and front Colonnade of the Hellanodicaeum as with their scheme for a Dromos. The only possible sites for new

---

13 Though the terrace remained at all times a choice position whence sacrifices and processions were viewed, it was not, after 450 B.C., the only one. Suggested no doubt by the accommodations for spectators recently provided at Eleusis in the Telesthenion, and at Delphi by the Athenians' colonnade, the Eleans' first Colonnade of Echo and the front Colonnade of the south-eastern building were probably planned within a generation of the memorable Pan-Hellenic Olympiad of 478 B.C. The first Colonnade of Echo was ready in 448 B.C. and commanded a view of sacrifices on the Great Ash Altar nearly as well as the terrace and the porch of its several Treasuries. That the Terrace was a centre for crowds on the Altis is proved for times even later than Pausanias' visit to Olympia by two facts: (1) The construction of the monument intercalated the 'Exedra' of Herodes Atticus on that portion of the Terrace just east of the Heraeum. It cannot properly be called an Exedra, since no human being ever sat there, and the statues which adorned this mausoleum or into effecting were all standing. No doubt it served as a monumental façade or grandiose terminus of the generous later-day system of water-supply. But it would have been absurdly incongruous, standing as it does beside the ancient Heraeum, if there had not been a ceremonial justification for it, harmonizing to the inner eye at least its garish perspectiveness with the religious observance to which it was dedicated, whilst the treasuries east of it and the temple west of it. This ideal justification was to be found in the fact that it contained upwards of twenty-two life-size statues of spectators—eight or more members of the Imperial family and fourteen of the house of the pious founder and of Regilla his wife. These figures stood looking out over the Altar and viewing processions. By this to note on the terrace all frequenting worshippers were reminded of the permanent interest felt in Olympian observance by the great people of the earth. That Herodes built his generous tanks on a site frequented by crowds is further proved by (2) an episode in Lucian's De Monte Pergami xxix. ad fin. Pergamum raised at the effulgency promoted by the luxurious water-supply of Herodes, and was consequently mobbed 'while in the act of benefiting by it,' (καταβλαστεως τας θυελλας) says Lucian. Indeed it was only by hastily taking sanctuary at the Great Ash Altar near by that the pretexts cynical got off alive—for the ἔτος καταφεύσαι ὕστερον ἐφιστατο τοῦ ἐποίητου.

14 [As I point out in a later note, there is no evidence to prove that events like wrestling and boxing were ever transferred to the Dromos, or even to the Stadium. Cp. J.H.S. xviil. p. 57, n. 13: Martin Faber's arguments to prove that they were transferred [Philologus l. 455] are all unsatisfactory, and I should here and now to the opinion that they had not been transferred when Xenophon wrote the Hellanodicae and probably were never transferred. V. ang. n. la. —E.N.O.]
treasuries, which might have been located within eyeshot of processions and sacrifices, were preempted by the all-embracing Elean projects. These resolute administrators provided in their colonnades for the general Hellenic public, against whose prior claims no individual stateankering after a site for a new treasury could expect to prevail.

The dedication of Olympian Treasuries ceased at the end of the first quarter of the fifth century B.C., because—though none of them were yet built—the Dromos, the first Colonnade of Echo, and the front Colonnade of the Hellanodikeaeum were then projected. Meanwhile the ancient Homeric Ἀγορᾶ was in front of the treasuries continued in use. Certainly this old arena was used at that great Pan-Hellenic celebration of the Olympia which took place in 476 B.C.—the opening year of the 76th Olympiad—just after Thermopylae, Artemision, Plataea, and Mycale. This 76th celebration was the Olympiad of Olympiads, and marks for Olympia the intensest moment of Pan-Hellenic fervour. It came just the year after the formation of the Athenian Confederacy at Delos—a consolidation made necessary by the still menacing power of Persia, but not one at which all Greeks could rejoice as one man. Not at Delos therefore but at Olympia was held the universal festival of rejoicing after the invaders were gone. The volleys of glorification which greeted the victors in these absolutely unique and ideally Pan-Hellenic

18 The lists in the triangular treeless plain east of the Great Ask Altar at Olympia and commanded by the terraces and the 'treasuries' were at the foot of the barrow of Pelops, just as the Ἀγορᾶ where Achilles held the games of Iliad, was at the foot of the barrow of Patroclus (Iliad xxiii. 255-258, 619), and the Pylian megalon and prototype of the Olympia is described (Iliad 650-648) by Nestor in his reminiscence of the funeral games of Amarynios at Iphitaur. Throughout the Twenty-third Iliad, where it occurs eleven times, the word Ἀγορᾶ means a contest but an arena, the place of the lists of the games (Iliad xxviii. 278, 445, 451, 493, 507, 617, 654, 694, 729, 847, and 886). In the same sense exactly Ἀγορᾶ applies to the arena of the Phaeanian games in Od. viii. 260, 338, and 336, and xxiv. 86. Exactly what the word means in Od. viii. 229 depends upon whether Ἀγορᾶ or Ἀγορᾶς is read. Four MSS. there read Ἀγορᾶ, and if their reading is adopted, the word has the same sense of arena attaching to it in the very next line (260) as well as in the fifteen cases above cited. In Iliad xxviii and xxiii. 370 Ἀγορᾶ still means a place, the temple of Ἀρεώς of the gods—a sense in which it would be applicable to the Olympian arena in question. Thus in nineteen Homeric cases Ἀγορᾶ means a place and not a contest, one to the meaning of context known to the Iliad or the Odyssey. Twice and twice only (Iliad xxiv. 1 and xxiii. 258) it means the people assembled for the games, and it probably has this sense also in Od. viii. 260, if Ἀγορᾶς is read in place of Ἀγορᾶ. The only remaining examples of the word in Homer occur in the Iliad (Iliad xv. 428, xvi. 239 and 259, xii. 320, and xvi. 33). In these five places Ἀγορᾶ σεῖα means an assemblage of ships. Homer only used Ἀγορᾶ four times (Th. 91 and 925, Iliad 204 and 2114), everywhere in the sense of an arena. It is therefore plain enough that Homer and Hesiod had no knowledge of Ἀγορᾶ in the sense of contest but used it in the sense of lists or arena for contests. How firmly the Homeric associations clung to the word Ἀγορᾶ even when it came to be used of suits in the law courts is shown by the metaphors of the arena involved in some of the most common-place of current idioms: cf. Lycurgus l. 117 ἐπικεφαλής γὰρ Ἐνετος ἀνθρώπων, see also the elaborate metaphor in Odyssey 14. 47, cf. Lycurgus 1. 16 ἐν ἀγορᾷ της Αἰγύπτου στὶλος, also Od. II. 704, 705, and 712 with Bauschius l. 150. Two cases where Ἀγορᾶ has the sense of contest, like the Homeric Ἀρεώς, occur in the Homeric Hymns (vii. 19 and vii. 480). "Ἀρεώς appears to have the meaning of the Homeric Ἀγορᾶ in Pl. Laws 848 e δύνασθαι δὲ Ἀρεώς τε καὶ ἐλλατινὰ τε τὸ ἑλληνικὸν πᾶσαν μουρατον καὶ ὁ 805 : ἀρεώς τοῦ ἄλλου φελλώντος χεῖρος μηνίας, μοὶ δὲ ἐλλατινὸν καὶ ἐπὶ ἀγοράς μου ἐπὶ ὅπως ἐπὶ ὅπως μου ἐπὶ ὅπως ἐπὶ ὅπως μου ἐπὶ ὅπως μου ἐπὶ ὅπως μου.
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Olympia were never paralleled either before or after 476 B.C. Both Pindar and Bacchylides hymned in Odes unexcelled by either poet on any other occasion that year's victory, won for his owner Hiero of Syracuse by the good horse Phereclus. Vying in splendour with this his first Olympian Ode is Pindar's second, composed like his third in celebration of the chariot-victory of Theron the Agrigentine, won in this same year. Asopichus, an Orcho-
menian youth, victor this year in the boys' foot-race is the theme of Pindar's last Olympian, while his tenth and eleventh Olympians celebrate the triumph,—also in these games of 476 B.C.—of a boy boxer from Locris in the far west, Agesidamus, son of Archestratus. Just six, one less than half, of Pindar's Olympians thus deal with victories won at this celebration of celebrations during which for a brief moment all Greeks stood together in the presence of Zeus as members of one Pan-Hellenic communion. It is above all in these six Odes that Pindar's intimate affection for the actual site and soil of the Olympian Altis finds fullest expression.

It is from one of the six Odes that may be derived, I think, the absolute certainty that in 476 B.C., athletic events were fought out in the Άγων east of the great Ash Altar of Zeus, a full view of which was commanded at that time only from the terrace of the treasuries, which indeed had lately been stepped for the convenience of spectators. There,—possibly on one of the nine steps of the terrace—Pindar finally alights, ending as follows his tenth Olympian Ode:

'Whensoever, Agesidamus, a man who has compassed deeds of honour must go unsung to Hades' homestead, that man with vain breath over his toil wins thereby but fleeting joy. But around thee the sweet expressive lyre and mellifluous pipe shed charm. The Pierian daughters of Zeus foster thy wide-flung fame, while I, with zeal like theirs fervently fold in my embrace the Locrions' famous clan, bedewing with honey a commonwealth of stalwart men. I glorify Archestratus' son whom I saw prevailing by the vigour of his arm beside the Olympian Altar in that memorable hour' οἷον.
scnta χριστορ), comely his frame and dowered with such flash of dawning prime as erst from Ganymedes leant off grim death by favour of the Goddess Cyprus-born. Patriotism wide enough to embrace all Greeks dictated the eloquent argument of this tenth Olympic Ode, a subtly conceived lyric by means of which Pindar contrives as it were to extend the right hand of Pan-Hellenic fellowship to the remotely dwelling and unfamiliar Bruttian Colonists of Epizephyrian Locris, first championed in the Olympic arena by the redoubtable Enthusiasms winner of the boxing match in 484 B.C.—eight years before. At the end of this Ode, which I have just attempted to translate, Pindar folds in his embrace the Locrianus famous clan, bedewing with honey a commonwealth of slumber men; but at its beginning, he hints that he has barely heard of them. 'Do ye read me not,' he says to the man in the street, so to speak, 'that Olympian victor's name,—the son of Archestratus,—where it is writ in my mind, I forget I was owing him a sweet song.' Then begins one of these genial mystifications about the price of his praise, in which Pindar's humorous vein so abounds. He beseeches the Muse, daughter of Zeus, and Ἀλκεία, Candour, to keep him straight and fend off reproach for broken truth. Far-off to-morrow took him at-mannes—found him bankrupt through arrears of debt. Only payment with usury can clear his honest name. 'Look how the breaking wave shall dash the soothing shingle down and how we too will pay down a generous accounting of grace for our friend and his kindred.' This humorous pretexts of bankruptcy serves the poet's turn, for it carries his audience with him to the unfamiliar home of Agessadamas. There dwells Truth,—not Candour, Ἀλκεία, such as Pindar has appealed to in acknowledging his bankruptcy, but plain dealing, Ἀρείστατος, who makes bankruptcy unthinkable. 'Hercules himself was once worsted in combat with the Locrian Olympus' the poet instantly adds, by way of linking Locris to the traditions of Olympia, and of hinting at the same time that young Agessadamas has not always come off victor as now. This last point is driven home straightway. 'Agessadamas won at last, let him thank Ias, his

(N. vi. 31). These five periphrastic mentions of Olympia as on the Alpaeus, can be matched with the five periphrases in which Mt. Cronus is alluded to. Undoubtedly the far seen and perfectly conical silhouette of Mt. Cronus played its part in focusing just at Olympia and nowhere else in the valley the primitive observances of the grove sanctuary. (a) Pindar is come to the side of the wondrous Cronus τοῦ στίβου ἅλος Κρονοῦ (O. i. 111). (b) Epharmostos and his reveling comrades lead off the victor’s strain Κρονὸς τοῦ κυρίου (O. vi. 36 f.). (c) Aristotle would have owed glory upon Ἀθηναίας τοῦ κυρίου Κρονοῦ, at Delphi and at Olympia (N. vi. 25). (d) Zeus made Alexandria victor τοῦ Κρονοῦ λόφου (O. viii. 17). (e) Alkmidas and Polykleitos lost two Olympic crowns through the ‘madman, let Κρονὸς τοῦ μανήτ Ν. vi. 105 f.), at the precinct of Mt. Cronus. These two passages exhaust Pindar’s circumlocations for the Olympian site, excepting where he designates it as the whole of Oenomaus and Pelops (O. v. 9 f.), or where it is identified with Pan (O. xiv. 22 f.).

[The Alpaeus and Mt. Cronus formed the natural boundaries of the ἄπασις at Olympia as opposed to the artificial boundaries of the Alte or grove, cp. Pindar O. xi. 48-51]. Pausanias tells us that women were not allowed to cross the Alpaeus during the Olympic (v. 9, 7). Similarly at Ephialtes, though there seems to have been a holy of holies, the whole valley including the stadium and theatre was sacred. What was the Eastern and Western boundaries at Olympia, is uncertain; the Western boundary certainly extended up to and beyond the Chaste, Xen. Hell. viii. 4.—Ε.Ν.Ο.]
trainers. Without too few indeed can win the gladness of victory to be a light at the forefront of the life of achievements.

Here the Θεῶν flash down upon our poet, the Ordinamce of Zeus rivet his mind upon the Αγών Ἐναέριος, the Premier Arena laid out by Heracles near the old-world Barrow of Pelops in the Olympic Altis. Pindaric Commentators of recent days, with the notable exception of Professor Gildersleeve, have not perceived that this Ἐναέριος Ἀγών founded near the tomb of Pelops, and described by Pindar as embracing six altars, Ἀνάψοις Ἐναέριος, must be a place, and can only signify a contest by implication. Just so in English we imply fighting when we speak of the lists or the field of honour. Here, and in eight other equally clear cases, Pindar uses the word Ἀγών, as Homer habitually and Homer always used it before him, and Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides occasionally used it after him, to designate the arena of contest. Pindar means quite unambiguously the place near the altar of Zeus in the Olympic Altis at which he stands gazing when the ode now in progress ends from the Olympic Θεάτρον of the 76th and earlier Olympiads.

Returning to the poet whose mind has, by inspiration of the Ordinamce of Zeus, riveted itself upon the Premier Lists of Olympia, and their inauguration by Heracles, we find his fancy expatiating first of all on the legendary struggle of Heracles with those uncanny Siamese-twins of Old-Elean folk-lore, the Molionids. Their final overthrow at Cleonae made room for his foundation of the Olympic arena. Next he enters with enthusiasm into all the minutiae of the Herculean foundation itself. Heracles, he avers, with his marshalled hosts from Pisa, measured off the consecrated grove for his sovereign father, and having set boundary marks around the Altis, he laid it off, in a clear space, while the plain round about he appointed for feasting. The fates stood over him when he proceeded to found the games, and Time was on his right hand. Oenomaus of Midea won the Stadium race, Echenius of Tegea the Wrestling Bout, Doryclus of Tyrins the Boxing match. In the Chariot-race, Samus the Mantinian was victorious, Phratio and Nikes in the Javelin threw and the Hurling of the stone, and the banded fellowship of our gave peals of thunderous applause... then upon the fall of excelsis gleamed forth the glorious brightness of the moon's full shining face.—ἀλεξάντων τινα πέντε—while all the hallowed ranges rang with gladsome songs, familiar in our hymns for victors of to-day. With these strains our poet brings us at last into the very midst of the Altis. Then he adds a word about his own procrastination, and the pealing triumph of his song, likened to those heroic hymns that thrilled the Grove on founder’s day, is hushed while he stands in ecstasy, where we have seen him—gazing at Ageaidamus winning at the Altar’s side.

Imperialism,—if that hardworked word may be rudely pressed for archaeological duty,—is writ large in all the six lyrics of Pindar commemorating, along with victories and victories in the 76th Olympiad, the universal

---

38 See Appendix.
Pan-Hellenic glorification of the great triumph over invading Persia. It is therefore, I venture to think, no mere chance that five of these Odes magnify victors from the antipodes, so to speak, Hiero of Syracuse, Theron of Arcas, and the plucky boy Agesidamus, from Locris in the West. Agesidamus was the only one of the three who could possibly feel himself a stranger. It was therefore peculiarly fitting that the Ode celebrating Agesidamus should, above all the others, abound in intimate details of the Sanctuary, and thus as it were confer upon its hero the freedom of the Altis. The splendour of Pindaric song was, in fact, but the lyrical expression of what, for lack of a word more suitable, we must term Pan-Hellenic imperialism,—a universally prevalent impulse prompting for that brief hour all Greeks, while the thrill of remembered perils was yet upon them, to sally forth from their ranks. Consolidation, organization were the watchwords of the hour. At Delos a confederation offensive and defensive had just been formed. At Olympia the newly-organized state of Elis was called to a similar work. Shamed on the stricken field of Plataea,—where they arrived too late—the villagers of Hollow Elis resolved to set their house in order and while the Athenians were busy at Delos these Eleans organized their scattered villages into a city-state. This done, they determined to manage the Olympia without the countrified Pisatans, to extend the duration of the Games; and to increase the number of the Hellanodicea—managers—from two to nine. But their new programme of organized efficiency went further. The Terrace of the treasuries, which had been but newly stepped for the greater safety of the more recently and precariously footed treasuries, and also for the better accommodation of the steadily swelling crowd of onlookers, was obviously inadequate.

A careful consideration of the dates attaching to improvements carried out, and buildings erected at Olympia after 476 B.C., forces one, I think, to recognize that the Eleans—perhaps with advice from competent frequencers of the 76th festival—projected a vast and thoroughgoing scheme of improvements—which included six main items.20 Taken in the order in which they

---

20 There is sufficient evidence for dating the construction of the Colonnade of Echo late in the first half of the fifth century B.C., and the building of the Hellanodicea early in the last half of the same century. Of the front-colonnade of the last-named building few remains were identified, but fortunately enough to arrive at the approximate date just mentioned. For the name of the Colonnade of Echo, Pananias is our authority. Speaking of the reconstructed (later) colonnade he says [V. xxi. 17] ἐν τῷ Ἐχοναῖῳ ἄθροισι τελευτησεν ἔστω ἂν ἐν τῷ ὑπαρκτῷ ναῷ, and Στέμφλικας ἔστω ἂν ἐν τῷ ναῷ, and then mentions the sevenfold echo. This suggests that the Eleans called it the Painted Colonnade, while the Pisatans persisted in calling it the Colonnade of Echo. Since there was a sevenfold echo, it supplied the Eleans with a good reason for the popular alternative for their official designation, and covered the awkward fact that various rhythmic elements in this neighbourhood had been suppressed when the Dromos was laid out after the building of the great temple of Olympian Zeus (see above, notes 5 and 8). The same Colonnade of Echo was evidently applied equally to the earlier and the later colonnade. The building of the great temple of Zeus would naturally harmonize with the suppression of more primitive rhythmic observances, and the fact that the earlier colonnade was built either just after or during the thirty years of the building of Libon's temple (468-435 a.C.) is clearly demonstrated. (a) Stones plainly derived
were carried out in the teeth of an intense opposition offered by the Pisatans, who remained villagers even to the last ditch, these six items were:

(1) A new South wing, called the Ἱπποδρομία and meant as business quarters for the nine Hellanodicea, which the Eleans added to the Council-House between 476 and 474 B.C.; (2) The building (468-456) of Libon's Temple of Zeus, only begun after a life and death struggle with Pisa; (3) The running up (ca. 456-452) of an eastern wall for the Altis, primarily designed as part—the back wall that is—of the first Colonnade of Echo, whence spectators could view sacrifices at the Great Ash Altar and processions between the two great temples, not to speak of any athletic events which from time to time might still be contested in the ancient arena, now superseded for such uses by (4) Xenophon's Dromos. This was laid out either simultaneously with the Painted Colonnade or, immediately afterwards (451-450); (5) The laying out of the Hippodrome with the ἄφαντος of Cleoctas (ca. 450 B.C.); (6) The long front Colonnade of the Hellanodiceum, which was built after 450 B.C., as a dwelling house for the newly increased board of Hellanodicea or managers. Its front Colonnade formed a southward continuation of the Painted Colonnade, and afforded a view of the formal distribution of crowns to the victors, which took place just opposite in the eastern or front end of Libon's Temple. 380

The Eleans' two projected Colonnades—an enormous amplification of the old

from the demolition in Macedonian times of the earlier colonnade show marks of ——-shaped clamps used in fastening together stones of the stylobate of the later colonnade. (b) Cast-off triglyphs made for the great temple and then rejected were found in the bottom course of the north-eastern foundations of the earlier colonnade. These were used for the water-course (see above, p. 254, n. 9). The same back wall also yielded fragments of drums made for Libon's temple. The whole of this water-course must have been built after the Terrace of the Treasuries was stepped (ca. 475-77 B.C. or a trifle earlier), since it hugs the lowest of the terrace steps from the north-west corner of the Heraeum to the entrance of the Dromos, where it bifurcates. In fact cast-off triglyphs from the temple also appear in the masonry at the foot of the terrace steps. The date of this water supply in fact gives a terminus post quem both for the laying out of the Dromos and for the building of the earlier colonnade. The Great Temple must have been practically completed before these improvements were made. Here is not the place for the intricate and voluminous arguments which quite definitely determine the date of Libon's building as B.C. 468-456. That date being accepted, the stones which Libon's builders rejected became the top and corner stone of Olympian chronology. They fix the date of the earlier Colonnade of Echo and determine the time when Xenophon's Dromos was laid out, ca. 450 B.C. The south wing of the Council House alone remains to be dated. Its architectural details, when compared with Libon's Doric, are so unmistakably earlier so to make it imperative to suppose an appreciable interval of time between the two. This necessity is accentuated by similar detailed comparisons with the Doric of the Skythianon and Megarianon 'treasures' (see my 'Details of the Olympian Treasuries', J.R.S. vol. XXXI, p. 44, n. 1). The south wing must therefore be very definitely dated ten years more or less before Libon's temple. The more so because it is now plain (see my 'Olympian Council House and Council', Harvard Studies, vol. xviv.) that the Eleans were straining every nerve in a 'social war' during that interval.

380 [The place of the distribution of crowns is a point which I never discussed with Mr. Dyer. Miss in Quinquennia Ateniaca states that the crowns were presented immediately after each event. This view is accepted by Roberts and in the article on Olympia in Duc. Sup. The evidence is hardly sufficient to enable us to decide the point. But if the crowns were presented immediately after each event they must have been presented at the spot where the event took place, i.e. in Pinder's time by the altar of Zeus, in later times in the Stadium for all events which took place there.—E.N.S.]
Olympian Θέατρων of the Treasuries and one which stretched away from its eastern end at right angles—extend practically along the whole east side of the Altis southward as far as the Council-House beyond. Meanwhile the projected Dromos provided the amplest accommodation—such as it was—for onlooking bystanders at the athletic contests—banished henceforward presumably from the old Άγας where Oenomaus of Midae, Echemus of Tegae, and Doryclus of Tiryss won their crowns, on founder’s day.

Remembering that this Homeric ἄγας, and with it something of the simplicity of Homeric funeral games, elung to the Olympia as long they were governed jointly by village-dwelling Pisatans and Eleans, and that the old arena was in use until about 450 B.C. turn now to the details of Xenophon’s description of the battle of Olympia in 364 B.C. In that summer the Arcadians and the Pisatans laid violent hands on Olympia. The Arcadians, says Xenophon (VII. iv.), ‘not dreaming of attack, went on with their conduct of the festival assisted by the Pisatans. The chariot-racing was over, as well as those events of the Pentathlon that require the use of the Dromos,’—τὰ δρομικὰ τοῦ Πεντάθλου, words which may, however, mean The running that formed part of the Pentathlon. ‘Then the Dromos was vacated,’ says Xenophon, ‘and those still competing entered upon the wrestling-bout between it and the great altar.’ Where, let it be asked, were now those who had stood in the Dromos outside witnessing the four first events of the Pentathlon? Obviously they had followed the Pentathletes and were either on the stepped terrace or on the steps of the Painted Colonnade. The wrestling-bout of the 104th Olympiad certainly took place where Pindar saw Agessidamus winning the Boxing match of the 76th Olympiad—βοῶν παρ’ Ὀλυμπίου, alongside the great altar and in front of the stepped terrace.11

At this moment,’ says Xenophon—meaning the moment while the wrestlers were grappling, and the onlookers were standing on the steps of the terrace and Colonnade—the Eleans in battle array were in the precinct.’ Then followed fighting at the Cladens in which the Arcadians were routed. ‘When the Eleans had carried victorious pursuit’—here I again translate Xenophon’s actual words—‘into the space between the Council-House, the Shrine of Hestia and the Θέατρων’ (Spectatorium, let us call it) adjoining these buildings respectively—τοῦ πρὸς ταύτα προσήκοντα θεάτρων—they were exposed to a shower of missiles from the Colonnades, the

11 It is impossible to ascertain from Xenophon’s language whether the transference of the wrestling to the space near the altar was ordinary or exceptional. But from this very doubt we may feel sure that the holding of the wrestling by the altar was not unprecedented, as Xenophon must have runched his readers many explanation. Either it was the usual custom or a reversion to an older custom which existed almost within living memory before the permanent θέατρων was made in 459. Certainly it must have been the custom in Pindar’s time.
Council-House and the Great Temple. And, though they maintained the combat, and bore back their opponents toward the altar; their losses were heavy, and Stratolaus himself, captain of the 300, was slain. At this juncture they drew off to their encampment. In spite of this retreat, the Arcadians and their friends were so nervous about the next day's fighting that they did not close an eye during the night, but occupied themselves in pulling to pieces their elaborately constructed quarters and making a stockade of the materials. When the Eleans advanced the next day, and saw a stout rampart confronting them, and the roofs of the temples strongly manned, they went home again. Thus ended the ingloriously famous battle of Olympia so as to verify someone's older dictum that in a Greek battle one army always runs away, and sometimes both.

And here should end this discussion, were it not advisable to say a word or two of the only two accounts of the Olympian θεάτρον surviving—Professor Frazer's (Pasaeias, iii. pp. 636 f.), and Dr. Dörpfeld's (Ol. Text. ii. p. 79). Though agreeing with Professor Frazer exactly in our translation of all and every other word in the passage of Xenophon just read, we, Mr. E. Norman Gardiner and the writer, join issue with him in his translation of θεάτρον as Theatre; if, as he plainly thinks, a stone semi-circular fabric of the usual kind must in that case be supposed to have been before Xenophon's eye. That being insisted on, I for one would boldly coin the term Spectatorium to designate the place at Olympia, where spectators from time immemorial had congregated, and where they actually were congregated at the moment of Xenophon's narrative. Professor Frazer is not, however, in the least degree positive in dealing with this whole question—his main difficulty being one fully shared by Mr. Gardiner and the present writer, i.e. the wholly unconvincing account of the Olympian θεάτρον ingeniously offered by Dr. Dörpfeld. Demanding, as the only alternative then before him, a stone Theatre of the usual kind, and that being sternly refused by the site as known, he somewhat hesitatingly denies what everyone else admits, that the Council-House is what it certainly is, and suggests that it may possibly lie still unexcavated somewhere to the north-west of the Shrine of Hestia, with the equally unexcavated Theatre somewhere near by (Pasaeias, iii. pp. 636 f.). This solution, if solution it can be called, unfortunately withdraws from human comprehension the whole of the

---

2 At the meeting of the Helmholtz Society, February 18th, 1908, where the substantive points of this paper were read by me, it was made quite clear that the conclusions here presented had been independently arrived at on other grounds of proof by Mr. E. Norman Gardiner, who gave his argument at that same meeting.

3 If Dr. Dörpfeld is right in his conclusion that θεάτρον could be both of the arrangements for spectators in the stadium which at Olympia had neither a semi-circular ending nor stone seats, it follows a fortiori that the word could be used of the far more elaborate arrangements in the Altis either of the steps of the Terrace alone, or of the steps and theandalone, especially as these commanded a view of the altar. His contention that the steps are too narrow to have been used for spectators to sit or even stand upon can be readily disproved by experiment. The steps are 36 cm. in depth. Many readers will be able to find stepscases in their own homes the steps of which are no greater or even less in depth; urgently resect. — R.N.0.
detailed account of the battle of Olympia. Dr. Dörpfeld on the other hand understands the whole of the battle as we do, but entirely at Xenophon’s expense. He requires us to believe that in bounding the battle-field, Xenophon was momentarily bereft of his usual common-sense, bereft also of his habitual gift of simple, lucid, and consistent diction. Dr. Dörpfeld’s explanation of the word θέατρον as meaning in this context that western part of the Dromos meant to be occupied by spectators which adjoined the triangular treeless area at the foot of the altar, implicates Xenophon’s established reputation in two very serious particulars. Are we to suppose, when Xenophon has just told us that the wrestling took place not in the Dromos, but in the space between it and the Altar, he will immediately relate how the pursuing Eleans entered that same space, now described as between the Council-House, the Shrine of Hestia, and that western part of the Dromos (meant to be occupied by spectators though actually vacant of them) which adjoined—ταύτα! In this explanation the meaning of ταύτα hangs hopelessly in mid-air. Also Xenophon, if Dr. Dörpfeld’s meaning for θέατρον was his, would have said that the wrestling took place not ‘between the Dromos and the altar’ but between the θέατρον and the altar. Moreover, as Mr. Gardiner has suggested, it is absolutely incredible that Xenophon while in his senses should have neglected to mention, in bounding the battle-field, the long Colonnade of Echo which stared both him and his pursuing Eleans in the face, and loomed up along the whole eastern side of the field throughout the battle. Could Xenophon or any one else think to gain in clearness by overlapping this Colonnade and talking about an embankment which it completely masked?

LOUIS DYER

APPENDIX.

ON THE MEANING OF ἄμεσα, ἄμεσος, etc.

(1) In interpreting Pindar, the prevalent explanation of his word ἄμεσα has most unhistorically derived from the later and post-Homerica meaning attached to that word in the dramatists. Thus not only have numerous Pindaric passages been misunderstood where ἄμεσα is used after the Homeric manner, to designate not a contest, but the arena of a contest, but also the same has happened to numerous passages where Pindar uses ἄμεσά meaning a contest but also the arena of the contest, the two ideas being inextricably combined. These last—when the example of the Homeric poems is born in mind—can be most conveniently translated by arena or lists. When all the passages thus indicated have been subtracted, the remaining ones, where ἄμεσα not only means contest, but also is best translated by contest, are surprisingly few. The general soundness of this view is borne out by Pindar’s use of the adjective ἄμεσος.

1. The following are all the places in Pindar where ἄμεσα clearly means arena or lists and cannot, however, be understood as meaning contest: (a) Ο. ντ. 79: οἱ Ἡράκλει [Hermes] ἄμεσος ἔχει μάρμαρο ὑπόθεσιν. (b) Ο. ντ. 44: οἱ ἄμεσοι οἵτως θεάτης ἄμεσα. (c) Π. τ. 13. 44: ὡς ἄμεσος μὲν χαλκοτριχον ἀκρόφθ' ἄμεστον ἄμεσα βολείς ἥκω. (d) Π. λκ. 114: ἀνασυνέχθη τὸ ἄμεσον χρόνον ἐν τέρμασιν ἀνέκτη ἄμεσα. (e) Π. ντ. 11-17: ἀπεπελογεῖ Θέατρα ἓν ἄμεσον ἐν τέρμασιν ἔτη ἄμεσα. (f) Π. κτ. 41-47: ἀπεπελογεῖ Θέατρα ἓν ἄμεσον ἐν τέρμασιν ἔτη ἄμεσα.
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There are four passages where Pindar uses ὃψαι in the sense of assembly (cf. B. xxyv. 1) : N. x. 32, O. iii. 36, P. x. 39, and P. xi. 228 (Christ)—232 (Bergk) : τιτικάμοι ἔργαι πρῶτοι (cf. Plut. Α. κ. Ν. 191 a, τεδείσιν τε ἐποιεσιν, τετειλαίαν, διότι καὶ τὴν ὅψαν ἔργα, ἅλως ἐπεκελεύετο, γενόμενοι ἐκ ἑαυτῶν, ἔτι τετοιο μὲν. [In the first two passages the meaning of lists is equally applicable. — E.N.G.]

III. These are three passages where Pindar uses ὁψα, so distinctly in the sense (unknown to Homer) of contests that it would be forcing matters to translate it as: O. viii. 76 and ix. 98; P. xii. 24.

IV. There remain eight passages where it is not very easy to say whether ὁψα means αὐτοῖς or contest because it means contest in the αὐτοῖς. Here the most satisfactory rendering is αὑτοῖς or lists, because these words so often definitely cover the idea both of the contest and of its results: O. i. 8: ἕτοι γὰρ ἑαυτοῖς ἔστωσα, and contexts are referred to just before αὐτοῖς : P. vii. 78 f. : εἰς Μεγάραν ὅ έστιν γέραν, κἀκεῖ γὰρ τὸν Ἐννυμένον, Ἡρακλῆς ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ μετατείνοντες διάμασαν ἔργα, P. xi. 46-51: where Ὁλυμπία ὕψωσεν πολλάφως ἔργα ὅπως ἐκτίνος means, with the line preceding, 'Anciently in the chariot race they won the swift laud of glorious victory on the far-famed lists at Olympia'; N. ii. 3-5: where καταβαίνεις ἐρῶν ὅψα means the first foundation of victory in the sacred lists ; N. iii. 64-67 : where ὅπως δὲ ἐρῶν means 'these are the lists' ; N. iv. 87, vi. 61, and x. 22 f. In this last (ὅπως τὸ χάλλων ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐρῶν ἐν κυρίαν) mention of the 'lists of the Iacon shields' is followed by that of the issue of contests, so closely and so pointedly that a local sense for ὅψα is practically necessary.

Thus every case where Pindar uses the word ὅψα with the exception of three comes under the dispensation of Homeric usage, whereas the meaning prevalent in the dramatists is recognized only three times by our Boeotian poet. Doubtless the Boeotian use of ὅψα for ὅψα influenced Pindar's adherence to Homeric precedent.

This suspense is confirmed by Pausanias' evidence (IX. xvii. 2) that Pindar dedicated near the temple of Ariesias Eudoxus at Thebes (cf. Jeph on Soph. O. R. 181) a statue of Hermes ὅψανος. Since Pindar nowhere uses the word ὅψανος, but once mentions Hermes ὅψανος (P. i. 10) and once Hermes ὅψανος (I. i. 60), and twice describes Hermes as preceding over the ὅψα (N. x. 51, 0. vi. 79), it is quite clear (a) that this Hermes statue is to the god of the ὅψα, and (b) that the old Boeotian identification of ὅψανος and ὅψα in its dedication. What Pindar conceived poetically and pleasingly the nature of the ὅψα to be, can further be gathered from I. vii. 20 where the αὐτοῖς ὅψανος are alluded to (cf. 0. xiii. 3), and from P. v. 87 (here ὅψανος stands for the place of ritual proceedings, where was ὅψανος the tomb of Eteocles-Aristocles, just as Pelops was buried in the forefront of the Olympian ὅψα as well as from Ν. iii. 14 (ὁ πολιτικός ὅψανος) from which passages Rauchstenheim and
Kayser have endeavoured to expunge the word ἄγος in spite of the MSS. and Scholias (cf. also P. iv. 53 (Bergk). 74 (Christl.). In addition to these four places where Pindar idealizes the ἄγος, he once (P. iv. 85) refers to it in a more conventional and poetical vein, but this is only a periphrastic way he adopts for fixing the time of day for Jason's appearance ἄγος ἀληθέστατα ἄγος = ἀληθέστατα ἄγος. Note finally that in N. iii. 14, untampered with by text reformers, ἄγος ἀληθές, i.e., the scene where the Punishment was fought out.

2) As to the use of ἄγος by Aeschylus, the word occurs only eight times in his extant plays and thus appears to be less conspicuous in his vocabulary than in Pindar's. All of the four meanings found in Pindar are also found in Aeschylus.

I. The prevalent Homeric meaning of ἄγος or lists appears once only, but very clearly in Agam. 1848 ff.—a passage where unfortunately little else is clear. Whether you read there with conservative editors, ἄγος ἐπὶ παιδίς, or, with those willing to consult with moderns, ἄγος ἐπὶ παιδάκι, in all cases the ineffective antithesis of ἄγος γιγάς vanishes, if the meaning of context is thrown into the shade and that of ἄγος παιδίς or lists is allowed to assert itself. Furthermore as a result of this locative meaning attached to ἄγος, the dramatic point of the line next following is made clear. "The lists of victory long deferred" (ἄγος ἐπὶ παιδίς ἐξήγηθεν παθόν) give point to the ἐπὶ τοῦτον ἐπὶ τοῦτον of Clytemnestra's next line. "τοῦτον καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦτον ἐπὶ τοῦτον." If it were allowable to extract with Dr. Verrall from the combined effect upon the ear of παιδίς and μανάζ, a punning reference to wrestling, which would of course be helped by the associations of ἄγος, then the whole passage would be cleared up by insisting on the Homeric and Pindaric meaning for ἄγος, and could be translated:

These lists I long since schemed to wrestle in
Triumphantly, have come, though late, at last:
I stand even where I stabbed, my work is done.

II. The secondary meaning of Homer and Pindar is also found for ἄγος (but only once) in Aeschylus Agam. 819, where καρδία ἄγος χειρός τε παρρησίας | δικαιοπροσθέτει evidently calls for the meaning of assembly.

III. Aeschylus, like Pindar, yields three passages (Pers. 407, Eumen. 647 and 714) where ἄγος unhesitatingly means "contest," the locative implication having all but completely evaporated.

IV. The three remaining uses of ἄγος in Aeschylus, like the last eight in Pindar, require for it the meaning of "contest" or the lists, and are also best translated by καρδία or lists, since these words imply the contest quite as definitely as the word ἄγος. The passages are: 1) Chor. 715-716, where ἄγος χειρός ἄγος χειρός mean lists where the shield (not the discus or the javelin for the glory of victory) is wielded for destruction. Hermes χειρός and χειρός is accordingly invoked instead of Hermes σαλπάτης; 2) Chor. 379 ff. where ἄγος χειρός in practically the same implications just noted in (1). In both cases these implications are in keeping with plentiful passages throughout the Chorophanes and the Eumenides where the tragic vengeance which Orestes has in hand is represented as an athletic event for which he requires training such as that for the lists (Chor. 230 l.; Eumen. 350; Chor. 446). The third passage being from the Eumenides (674 f.) has this same athletic "atmosphere," and ἄγος ἄγος ἄγος means much the same thing as ἄγος ἄγος χειρός ἄγος or ἄγος ἄγος. But perhaps the most instructive passages in Aeschylus for the understanding of the full sense attached by him to the word ἄγος are his five mentions of the ἄγος έις (Agam. 496, Zeus, Apollo, and Hermes; Supp. 185, 208, 337, and 350; Zeus, Poseidon, Apollo, and Hermes). In spite of the attempt of Dr. Verrall (see the latter's note on Agam. 496=518) to make out that ἄγος έις in the Supplices certainly, and in the Agamemnon probably, means έις in assembly and is derived from the very rare secondary meaning of ἄγος as έις assembly, it is demonstrable that Aeschylus attaches to ἄγος practically the same
meaning attached to it by Pindar, providing over the sacred arena, which is most cases is identical with the ἀγών (cf. Schol. in Pind. P. ii. 10: ἀγωνίας καὶ ἦ Έσνα τοῦ ἀγώνος τιμοτίρης. Thus ἀγών meant to Aeschylus as to Pindar the same thing as ἀγών, and when Aeschylus apostrophizes Hermes as ἀγώνεις Μανα καὶ σὺ Ἕσνα (Fr. xcvii. 387), his meaning is not substantially other than Pindar's when he describes Alecmides, the Aegianetan boy-wrestler as τοῦ ἀγώνος (N. vi. 13), and the god thus apostrophised is the self-same Hermes ἀγώνεις to whom Pindar dedicated a statue at Thebes. How ideally conceived was Aeschylus' Zeus ἀγώνεις may be gathered from Εσνα, 331 ff., where Athena proclaims aloud that the strife as to who shall confer most benefits inhumaned as the consumption of the ages is the triumph of Zeus ἀγώνεις: ἔννε ἀγώνεις Ζέες ἀγώνεις ἔσει, ἐπό γὰρ ἄφθονος ἵνα ἱερήσῃ διὰ παντός. That the epithet ἀγώνεις has here the force of ἀγώνων and implies a contrast between the fraternal emulation of the arena, and the ἀληθινοὶ κόσμοι στάσει mentioned in the line next following (ἵνα ἀληθινὸς κόσμος μένῃ οὖσα κατὰ πολλὰ στάσει τοῦ ἀγώνου) is self-evident, since the Eumenides give their solemn pledge in response to Athena's proclamation that Zeus ἀγώνεις has prevailed at last. Since the difficulty raised by Dr. Verrall (note on Αἰας, 499 = 518) concerning the ἀγώνεις θεοί of the Suppliant women gives plausibility to the contention that the ἀγώνεις θεοί of Αἰας, 449 are not the gods of the athletic ἀγών or arena, the only question remaining is whether Dr. Verrall and Westkem are right in assuming that ἀγώνεις (Suppl. 219) of the Suppliant women in not in an ἀγών (=[ἁγών]), but in a lonely place near the sea.

Three facts must be recognised at the outset: (1) Argos lies on rising ground not more than two miles from the sea; (2) at Sparta (Plut. Λέοντας vi.) and various Thessalian towns (Aristot. Pol. vii. 11, 2, and Χαλκ. Χρήματα. I. ii. 3) there were two ἄγαμοι, ταῦτα (ὕλικά ἄγαμοι) for meetings of the people, another for more usual trafficking. Now, since a similar arrangement existed at Cyzicus (I. I. G. 3657—ἱερὰ ἄγαμοι. Theophrast. Χαλκ. ii. 2, and Menander cited by Polyb. x. 18—γεναυεῖος ἄγαμος) which like Argos (Suppl. 57) was a πελώρια πόλις, it is a violent inference to conclude that Aeschylus knew of two ἄγαμοι at Argos—one where was the joint altar of Zeus, Poseidon, Apollo, and Hermes, restored to by Danaus and his suppliant daughters—the γεναυεῖος ἄγαμος—and the other the ἄλλοτρος ἄγαμος in which King Pelops convened the people and obtained their consent to harbouring the Suppliants; (3) the whole scene of the Suppliant women is the earliest drama extant, is extremely vague and cannot fairly be criticized with any sort of strictness. All this being granted, the fact that the Suppliants are not sooner in a position at the altar than the king of the land appears to question them, certainly favours their being in the ἄγαμος rather than in a lonely place by the sea. That Danaus sees the ship from a point near the altar offers not the slightest difficulty. Nothing but the ἄγαμος can be implied by line 339 addressed to the king by the Suppliant: ἀμείωτον ἐν ἐοίησι τιμώσα γάρ τινας ἀκμήν. Indeed the absurdity of having the παιδὶς παῖς—whether the reference be to the gods or to their common altar—in a lonely place by the sea is too obvious to require further comment. Here was the place where all strangers in distress placed suppliant boughs (cf. vv. 357 f.). It must have been in the ἄγαμος. The only ground for doubting is removed when we conceive, on the strength of reasonable evidence, that there was another, and a separate ἄγαμος where the king convened the people. The play as it stands requires this, but it also requires that the altar of the ἀγώνεις θεοί should be anywhere rather than in a lonely place—in fact that it should be on the ἀγών γεναυεῖος in the πόλις of Argos. That being firmly established, there is no further call for the wildly improbable suggestion that Pindar meant one thing and Aeschylus quite another by the ἀγώνεις θεοί. Above all we are rescued from the extremely uncomfortable necessity of spinning out reasons for Aeschylus' chemical distinction between the Hermes ἀγώνει of Fr. 387, who must be the god of the arena, and the ἀγώνεις Hermes of Suppliants 185 (cf. 216), 298, 327, 330, and of Αἰας, 496 (cf. 501).

Sophocles employs the word ἄγαμος in sixteen places and his extant works yield an example of each of the three senses found in Pindar and in Aeschylus.
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Thus it appears that Euripides might have used ἔρημος—assembly, though no case of it has survived.

III. There are 51 cases where ἔρημος means contest, as follows: Hera. 229; (2–10) Orestes 333, 491, 847, 861, 888, 1124; 1223, 1244, and 1537; (11–16) Phoen. 238, 787, 867, 1060, 1590, 1487; (17–19) Med. 235, 336, 463; (20–21) Hippol. 496, 1910; (22–26) Alc. 899, 904, 848, 1026, and 1141; (27–28) Androm. 233, 328; (29–35) Suppl. 71, 316, 427, 665, 706, 754, and 814; (36–37) I.A. 193, 1254; (38) Rheus 165; (39–41) Herod. 116, 101, 992; (42–43) Helena 329, 849; (44–45) Ion 657, 909; (46–47) Her. Furt. 789, 1189; (48–49) Elect. 695, 751; (50) Fr. Antiope 189 (Stob. 82, 2); (51) Trosades 363.

IV. Seven cases remain, parallel to the last five enumerated in the preceding note on Sophocles, to the last three cited in the note on Aeschylus, and to the last eight of the note on Pindar's use of ἔρημος. These passages are: (a) Phoen. 388; (b) Iob. 237; (c) Heb. 1233; (d) Her. Furt. 811 (cf. Ath. Obs. 547 f.); (e–f) Fr. 68 (Stob. 8, 12).

L. D.
A GRAECO-ROMAN BRONZE LAMP.

[PLATE XXXIII.]

The beautiful bronze lamp, of which two views are here given, was recently acquired by Mr. T. Whitcombe Greene in Frankfort-on-Main. It is 146 mm. long, 76 mm. high, and is said to have been found in Switzerland.

The lamp is in the form of a boat, the raised bow of which contains the hole for the oil. There are two projecting nozzles on each side of the boat, pierced with holes for the insertion of wicks. Their position suggests that they are intended to represent the rowlocks. A border of small circles with centre-dots is engraved round the top margin of the lamp; five waves are incised on each side of the bow, and another wave at its point. Three pairs of engraved lines run under the boat, one pair along the line of the keel, and one on each side. Within a shallow depression at the stern end of the boat is a nude figure of the infant Hercules in a half-reclining attitude, with his right leg slightly drawn up. He is strangling the two serpents sent, as the story goes, by Hera to attack the new-born infant. He grasps them tightly by the necks, and their bodies pass in a series of sinuous windings in front and behind him respectively. The lamp was clearly a hanging lamp, once suspended by means of chains attached to the end-loops formed by the windings of the serpents. It was originally silver-plated; for considerable traces of the silver can still be observed.

The representation of Hercules strangling the serpents in a boat seems to be a new one. The boat finds no place in the legend, but was probably adopted by the artist because it was a favourite shape with lamp-makers. A terracotta lamp in the British Museum closely resembles the present one in form, though it has three nozzles on each side and a flat bottom to enable it to stand. The Theocritean version of the serpent-strangling described Hercules as sleeping in the shield of Amphitryon, while Findar does not mention the cradle at all. The position of the figure on the lamp is pretty closely paralleled by several extant statues or statuettes. Among these may be mentioned a bronze group in the British Museum,7 which perhaps ornamented the top of a cista; several marble statues;3 and a marble relief from Athens of the Roman period, where Hercules is represented in a posture very similar to that of the figure in the present lamp.4

F. H. MARSHALL.

---

1 Findar, Nom. i. 50 ff.; Theoc. xxiv.
2 Cat. of Bronzes, 1243.
3 Clases, Pl. 304, No. 1933, and Pls. 781, 782.
THE STRUCTURE OF HERODOTUS, BOOK II

It has long been recognised that the Egyptian history given by Herodotus is confused; but it is scarcely known that a single transposition will bring it into order. Before we assume that his information was wrong, we may at least consider how far it is likely that either the author or an early transcriber had made an accidental transposition of the rolls of manuscript.

From well known Egyptian history we can see that the correct order in Herodotus should be as follows:

— sect. 99, account of Egypt and Menes. Dynasty I.
124–136; the pyramid kings. Dynasty IV–VI.
100–123; 330 kings. Dynasty VI–XXV.
137– Sabacon. Dynasty XXV.

The inversion therefore is that 100–123 is interchanged with 124–136. This is the more likely as the catch words are the same.

The section 100 begins, μετὰ δὲ τῶν κατέλεγον . . . .
section 124 begins, μετὰ δὲ τῶν βασιλευσεντα . . . .
section 137 begins, μετὰ δὲ τῶν βασιλευσεν . . . .

These are not exactly at the beginning of the present sections 124–137, but at the beginnings of the subjects where division is likely in the rolls. This transposition was suggested in 1898 by B. Apostolides in L'Hellénisme Égyptien. Now if this hypothesis be taken, we should find that the lengths of the rolls required to agree with it ought to be approximately regular.

For a unit we will use the lines in Sayce's Herodotus I–iii. From sections

1-99 there are 1338 or 6 × 223 lines
124–136 . . . 207 . .
100–123 . . 446 or 2 × 223 .
137-end . . 668 or 3 × 223 .

These divisions are so nearly commensurate that it is clear how one roll containing 124–136 might be slipped in after two other rolls containing 100–123. Thus the lengths of rolls as indicated by this hypothesis agree with the probability of such a transposition, as indicated by known history.

But we reach thus the conclusion that there was in at least two instances a division of subjects between rolls which were approximately commensurate. This would only occur in the original writing, or in a
drastic editing. How far can we trace any such divisions in the other parts of this book? It seems that we can observe the following breaks in the subjects:

Rolls α, β, γ, 1–45, to worship of Herakles, 677 lines ... 3×226.
Roll δ, 46–63, worship of animals to festivals ... 223.
Roll ε, 64–83, religious purity to divination ... 218.
Roll ζ, 84–99, medicine to Menes ... 220.
Roll η, 124–136, pyramid kings ... 207.
Roll θ, 100–115, Sesostris and Proteus ... 222.
Roll ι, 116–123, Helen and Rhampsinitus tales ... 224.
Roll κ, 137–150, Sabacon to Lake Moeris ... 236.
Roll ζ, 151–163, Psammitichos to Apries' war ... 207.
Roll λ, 164–end, castes to end ... 225.

Even the end of the book is no better as a natural division than some of the divisions of rolls noticed here. Cambyses already comes in ii. 181, and there is a continuity of Egyptian affairs on to iii. 29. The Persian interference starts book iii, but that is quite equalled by such divisions as between rolls σ–ξ, η–θ, ι–κ.

We conclude then that Herodotus here formally worked up to a uniform size of roll consciously; just as a modern writer will try to fit each break of his subject to the pages of foolscap, if the writing is to be permanently read in that form. Further, the division into twelve rolls, has somewhat of the same feeling about it as the division into nine books, named after the Muses.

It should, however, be said that this even division does not appear in other books. Book I seems to consist of 14 rolls and a piece; containing 220, 233, 217, 222, 219, 220, 217, 219, 225, 217, 219, 217, 218, and 82 lines, the rolls beginning with sections 1, 18, 34, 53, 67, 79, 91, 105, 119, 133, 152, 169, 185, 196, and 210. Book III seems to consist of 10 rolls and a piece; containing 223, 227, 226, 221, 214, 219, 217, 219, 222, 220, and 107 lines, the rolls beginning with sections 1, 15, 30, 44, 52, 68, 86, 100, 121, 130, and 154. Thus it does not seem that the books each consist of an even number of uniform rolls. Only in Book II: the transposition of a roll points out the size of the average roll, and the fact that 12 such rolls composed the book.

W. M. Flinders Petrie.
THEOPOMPUS (OR CRATIPPUS), HELLENICA.

Since the discovery of the 'Athraiai Politeia in 1890,' the learned editors of the Oxyrhynchus papyri tell us, 'Egypt has not produced any historical papyrus at all comparable in importance to these portions of a lost Greek historian, obviously of the first rank, dealing in minute detail with the events of the Greek world in the years 396 and 395 B.C.' Drs. Grenfell and Hunt are indeed to be congratulated first on having made so great a discovery—a piece of luck which their long and arduous labours, systematically and scientifically conducted, have so richly deserved—and secondly they are still more to be congratulated on the success with which they have picked together and deciphered the text and illuminated their interpretation with clearly written and closely argued introduction and notes. They have not contented themselves, as they well might have done, merely with arranging and deciphering the text—a work demanding the greatest patience and the most exact scholarship—but they have boldly tackled, and with great acumen, the difficult question of the authorship of the work and many historical problems raised both by the fragmentary nature of the text itself and by comparison of its statements with those of other extant authorities.

1.

This historical work is written on the verso of an official document giving a land survey apparently of some portion of the Arsinoite nome. Its date may be assigned to the second century B.C. It is written in two hands and in the extant fragments some twenty-one columns can be distinguished. The first hand is responsible for cols. i.–iv., vi. 27–xxi. and almost all the fragments; the second hand is responsible only for cols. v. 1–vi. 27, with fragment 3 and perhaps 16. In order not to prejudice the question of authorship the editors call the work P. The papyrus, as discovered, is in four sections, separated by gaps of uncertain size. A containing cols. i.–iv., B cols. v.–viii., C cols. ix. and x., and D cols. xi.–xxi. The editors put D last from clear internal evidence. The remains of C are so scanty that the subject with which it dealt cannot be determined. So the only reason for putting it before D is the character of the handwriting on the verso side of the papyrus, but 'its relation to the other sections,' the editors tell us, 'is wholly uncertain.' Whether A should come before B, or B before A is
open to question. To put B first involves only one change of hand, viz. at vi. 27; but for historical reasons the editors prefer their own arrangement, although it involves two changes of hand, citing as a parallel the MS. of the Aristotelian Αθηναίων Πολιτεία. This arrangement in itself seems to me much more satisfactory than the other alternative, but the historical arguments by which the editors justify it are at least open to question. They are (p. 115) mainly three: (1) that the ἔτος δρόσου of iii. 10 must be reckoned from the archonship of Euclides 403/2, a most natural and reasonable year to select for the commencement of a fresh epoch, and not from the archonship of Micon 402/1 in which ‘no incident of particular note took place,’ and that therefore this eighth year must be 396 B.C.; (2) that as in xv. 33 Cleonices is said to have succeeded Pollis in 395 as Spartan ναύαρχος, iii. 21 must have recorded (the passage is fragmentary) the arrival of this Pollis the year before, i.e. 396; and (3) that their view that ‘A concerns 396 has the advantage of allowing more time for the change of policy on the part of the moderate democrats at Athens with regard to a war with Sparta.’

The editors’ argument therefore is that A precedes B because A relates to 396 and B to 395. Now the hypothesis which commends itself to the present writer, viz. that the ἔτος δρόσου is 395 (and not 396) is said on p. 209 to have for its direct consequence that B should precede A and not follow it. Thus the editors regard as so improbable that they describe it as not worth reviewing in detail. But does this consequence necessarily follow?

To take the arguments in order: (1) though of course it is quite possible that ἔτος δρόσου may refer to a definite epoch or event on the analogy of Polybius i. 6. 1—ἐτος μὲν οὖν ἐνεστήκει μετὰ τὴν ἐν Λέροις ποταμοῖς ναυμαχίαν ἐνεκακιδέκατον, πρὸ ἐν τῇ τῆς Ἑλληνωτρις μάχῃς ἐκκακιδέκατον, ἐν ὧν Ἀκαδημαϊκῶν κ.τ.λ., it is equally possible that it may refer to the subject matter of the treatise on the analogy of Thucydides, e.g. iv. 31 ὁ χειμών ἐτελεύτα καὶ ἐσφόνοι ἔτος τῷ πολέμῳ ἐτελεύτα τῷ ὧν Θεοκρίτος ἔφηρε τοῦ δ' ἐπενεγραμμένου θέρους κ.τ.λ.—a possibility favoured too by the occurrence of the dative τῇ μὲν... governed apparently by ἐνεστήκει. In the latter case we have to determine accurately the subject matter of the treatise, and of this more hereafter. In the former case we have to find an event of sufficient importance in the spring of 403 on the editors’ hypothesis (or of 402 on mine), to serve as a chronological epoch. I say advisedly the spring, and not the summer; for not only do Thucydides and Xenophon always use such phrases as τοῦ ἐπενεγραμμένου θέρους, τοῦ ἐπίστωτος θέρους in the sense of the opening of the campaigning season but the other similar marks of time in P itself (xi. 34 τοῦτον τοῦ θέρους, xx. 8 τοῦ πρῶτου θέρους, xxii. 7 χειμάτως, 34 εἰς τὸ ἐπαρχόντος χειμάθα) obviously imply the same
military reference. The editors refer us to the archonship of Euclides; but against this there is the objection that though the expulsion of the Thirty seems to have taken place about February 403, the archonship of Euclides cannot have begun till the ἀπορρία was over, i.e. October 403. In fact there is no known epoch-making event in the spring of 403 any more than there is in the spring of 402. Moreover the text has τῇ μετά..., and not μετά, and so favours, as already said, the subject-matter alternative.

(3) The weakness of their second argument based on the orderly succession of the Spartan admirals is admitted by the editors themselves. The list they propose on p. 213 is as follows: 398/7 (autumn) Pharax; 307 (autumn) to 396 (autumn) unknown; 396 (autumn) to 395 (summer) Pollis; 395 (summer to winter) Cheirisrotes; 394 (winter) Pisander. The irregularities connected with the Spartan ἀναπρότασις are known only too well, and it makes this list but little more irregular to assume, as I do, that Pollis entered on his office in the spring of 395 and was succeeded by Cheirisrotes in the summer of the same year (cf. iii. 21, xv. 33).

(3) The third argument, the more gradual conversion of the moderate democrats at Athens, who just before the opening of the ἐρωτεύων prevailed on the δήμος to disown the expedition of Demæactus, to the war policy of the extreme democrats has not much to commend it in itself. For not only are we told that for a long time previously the extreme democrats had been eager τῇ πόλειντ... ἀναπρότασις, but the definite allusion in ii. 3 to the alliance between the Boeotians, Thebans, Argives, and Corinthians, which was brought about in July or August 395, seems to lose much of its point, if the author is there treating of the events of 396 and not of 395. In fact it needed the ἄνθρωπος of Iasianas and his colleagues to convert the Thebans and other Boeotians—and that with some suddenness—to their own war policy, and the immediate result of this conversion was the alliance between Thebes and Athens.

If, however, the year 396 be abandoned, what can be said in favour of identifying the ἐρωτεύων with 395?

The strongest argument is the order of events in Diodorus’ narrative (xiv. 79–81) which—through whatever channels—is admittedly dependent ultimately on P for many of its details. Its chronological errors are obvious; thus it puts under the same year 396/5 Ageilaus’ three campaigns in Asia and makes it out Pharax to be blockading Conon at Rhodes at the same time that he was commanding (under the transparent ἀλήθεια Pharaohidas) the Spartan contingent sent to help Dionysius the elder in Sicily. But though his chronology is sadly at fault, the order of events in these three chapters agrees strangely well with the order of events in P. Whether the naval war between Sparta and Persia began in 397 or 396 is not of much moment.

---

8 Cf. p. 208.
9 Cf. pp. 208, 210 and my Introduction to Xenophon, Hellenica, pp. 1–4v.
I. 21.
9 ii. 19; xiv. 14.
I. 20.
x. 14–21.
Xiv. 83–79.
The admiral Pharax certainly co-operated with Dercylidas in 397, and Conon, who at first seems to have had only a small fleet—40 ships according to Diodorus—may very well have been blockaded at Cumus first by Pharax in the autumn of 397 and then in 396 and the very early part of 395 by his successors, if we are to interpret literally Isocrates' rhetorical statement. But in the spring of 396 of a large fleet being fitted out in Phoenicia. The arrival of these Phoenician reinforcements is the first point in common between P and Diodorus, who puts it after the revolt of Rhodes from the Spartans. Diodorus states the bare fact of the revolt without details. Androtion, on whose story Pausanias seems to cast some doubt, says that it was due to Conon, who instigated the democrats to revolt. P shows that there were two stages in the process; the expulsion of the Spartans and reception of Conon was followed by a family domination of the Diagorei. P's account of the first stage is lost, but in col. xi. he gives full details of the assassination of the Diagorei and the democratic revolution in the summer of 395. If then we follow Diodorus' order of events, we may presume that P's account of the first stage must have occurred under the seventh year of his history, viz. before col. i. Col. iv. is almost completely lost. But cols. v.-vi.—recounting the spring campaign of Agesilaus in 395, his great victory over Tissaphernes due to the ambush of Xenoecus, and his return march when the omens proved unfavourable—are very adequately summarized by Diodorus in ch. 80. §§ 1–5. Similarly §§ 6 and 7 summarize cols. vii. and viii., dealing with the supersession and execution of Tissaphernes by Tithraustes; and § 8 must have dealt with what followed in P, but is now lost. For col. xviii. 38 alludes to the agreement between Agesilaus and Tithraustes, which forms the subject of this section of Diodorus. Again, col. xi. 1–34, the next decipherable portion of the papyrus, treats of the democratic revolution of Rhodes, which Diodorus, as already pointed out, omits as of no particular importance; but cols. xi. 34–xxv. 32, which relate at great length the Boeotian intrigues with the Phocians in order to make Sparta declare war, are summarized by Diodorus in the first three lines of ch. 81, while the rest of this chapter goes on to events outside the extant fragments of the papyrus, omitting altogether Conon's success in quelling a serious mutiny in his fleet at Cumus and Agesilaus' autumn campaign of 395.

18 Cf. Xen. Hell. iii. 2. 12.
19 Conon entered the Persian king's service at the beginning of 397 or a little earlier (cf. Diod. xiv. 39; Ctesias, 631). Whether he was commander-in-chief or nominally subject to a Persian commander, is perhaps rendered doubtful by the papyrus ill. 11. Cf. the editors' note ad loc.
Hence it appears that all the events, related apparently in their strict chronological order by P., are summarized in the same order by Diodorus in xiv. 79. 8–81, except the unimportant incident of Demaenetus, which occurred just before the opening of the ἔτος ὑδάων. Now in Diodorus nothing occurs between the arrival\(^7\) of the Phoenician reinforcements and Agesilaus' spring campaign of 395. It seems, therefore, a fair inference to suppose that in P. no events of importance were related between the arrival of the Phoenician reinforcements in iii. 24 and Agesilaus' spring campaign of 395 in cols. v.–vi. In other words cols. v.–vi, follow immediately on cols. i.–iv. On this hypothesis then, Diodorus' order of events adheres closely to the chronological arrangement of P.

On the other hand the editors' hypothesis (p. 117) that the ἔτος ὑδάων of iii. 10 is 396 (1) reduces the assumed chronological arrangement of P. to utter confusion; and (2) not only makes Diodorus abandon the order of events in P., but gratuitously assumes a further error in his chronology. For though they interpret the ἔτος ὑδάων as 396, they think it likely that the dispatch of Agesilaus to Asia and the early part of his campaign were described before col. i. (not, as they might be expected to say, in the assumed lost columns between iv. and v. dealing on their hypothesis with 396); and they assume that P. narrated the arrival of the Phoenician reinforcements\(^8\) (which they date in the summer of 396) before the revolt of Rhodes, and not after it as Diodorus relates. The revolt itself, they assume, must have been narrated in the gap between cols. vii. and xi. In other words Diodorus' summary misleads the arrival of the Phoenician reinforcements to 395 and abandons P.'s order of events altogether.

Again, the controversial passage (ii. 1–35) on the cause of the war against Sparta in my view points to the ἔτος ὑδάων being 395. For in the first place the πολεισ ἐπιθυμον ἐχειν of line 6 implies that the interval between the taking of the Persian gold and the conclusion of the alliances between the Boeotians and the άλλαι πόλεις ας προειρημεναι was only a short one. Secondly the plausibility of the theory of P.'s opponents [αὐτα γίνεσθαι τα παρ'. ἐκείνον χρόνα\(^9\) must have depended upon the short interval between the two events. And thirdly Xenophon's mistake (iii. 5. 1) in representing Tithraustes instead of Pharnabazus as the sender of Timocrates is most easily explained, if the mission occurred only a few weeks before the opening of the summer campaign of 395. Indeed the editors themselves admit\(^10\) that the reference in προειρημεναι πόλεις (ii. 4 and 32) seems to be to a not very distant passage, and it is possible that the description of Timocrates' mission in the main narrative occurred shortly before col. i. Moreover the present participle προειρημένος in the passage\(^11\) of

\(\text{Footnotes:}
\)

\(^7\) It is noticeable that both Boeckh ii. 149 and Meyer put the arrival of the Phoenician fleet in the spring of 395.

\(^8\) ii. 35.

\(^9\) Cf. the Spartan accusation against Ismene, Xen. Hell. v. 2. 35.

\(^10\) P. 294

\(^11\) Posidonius 1. 48: 3, Κόρες Φοινικής επιθυμεῖν, "Ἀγαλλιά τὸν Ἀταν προσέγγισεν ἢ τὸν τὸν Πύρον χρόνον πόλεως τὸν ἡμερισμος τοῦ πόλεως τῷ Πάλλακε, καὶ κάθισεν πάλιν τὸν τρόπον ἑκόρεν τὸν πρὸς Ἀπολλόνιον"
Polyaeus, who alone of other authorities speaks of Pharnabazus and not Tithraustes as causing the gold to be sent, favours the year 395. According to him Agesilaus is already in Asia and Pharnabazus wishes to get him out. The gold is sent, the Corinthian war breaks out, and Agesilaus is consequently recalled. But the editors' date, the spring of 396, actually precedes Agesilaus' arrival in Asia, and so makes Polyaeus' story quite pointless.

Taken as a whole therefore the evidence seems to me much to favour 395 as the έτος δύσων of Ρ. The only serious argument to the contrary is the short period—only a few weeks—of Pollis' ναυαρχία. Still, any one who has tried to establish a chronological system on the list of Spartan admirals knows on what a foundation of sand he is building, and in the absence of any definite information as to the fate of Pollis the easiest way out of the many difficulties involved appears to be to curtail the period of his command. With this exception the events which we can decipher in Ρ seem to fall into natural chronological sequence on the 395 hypothesis. Before the fragment begins we must assume Ρ to have treated of the revolt of Rhodes and the mission of Timocrates in the first three months of 395. Then in cols. i.–iii. 9, cire. March, comes the incident of Demaenetus; cols. iii.–iv. 32. 9, c. April, the naval war and the arrival of the Phoenician fleet; cols. v.–viii., c. April, the land war, with Agesilaus' march towards Sardis.

The problem of the έτος δύσων raises, as has been said already, the question of the scope of Ρ's history, and the internal evidence for settling it is very scanty. Taking this eighth year to be 395, we may safely assume that it included the chronicle of the seven years between 402 and 395, but, as the editors say, if its elaborate scale be taken into account, there is nothing to suggest that it went further than the battle of Cnidus in 394. There is, therefore, a good deal to be said for Meyer's suggestion for filling the lacuna in iii. 10 with τῇ μὲν Ἰάκτεαι ἀντικρήσει γεγονομένη, which would imply that it was a history of the Spartan naval empire; or, as so much emphasis seems to be laid on the operations of Conon in the naval war, including the minute description of the adventures of the Athenian Demaenetus (i. 1–25, ii. 35–iii. 9), it may rather have been a history of the gradual recovery of the Athenian naval power. The editors prove that the author wrote after 337 and before 340, indeed, Mr. Walker, they tell us, is prepared to say even before 356 on the ground that a reference to the Sacred War would be expected in xiv. 25 αφη, if it had actually begun.

* Π. 122.
* A slight argument in favour of a very short period is the oblivion into which Ρ apparently fell; posterity may have felt that he treated the history of eight or nine years in too long and tedious a fashion to be worth reading. * Π. 290.
* Π. 122, 124.
But within these rather wide limits there are absolutely no data for determining its terminus ad quem. Can the terminus a quo be more exactly fixed? On my theory it is fixed already to 402, but the editors, arguing from a reference in ii. 27 to a previous description of an incident of B.C. 411, think it probable that P's history comprised that portion of the Peloponnesian War which Thucydides did not live to narrate. In the passage referred to P is recounting three exploits of the Corinthian Timolaus κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον τῶν Δεκελεικῶν: (1) he sacked certain islands in the Athenian Empire (c. 412); (2) he vanquished the Athenian admiral Sicilus (c. 411); (3) he caused the revolt of Thasos from Athens (c. 411 end). Of the second exploit alone P remarks ὥσπερ εἰρήκα τὸν καὶ πρῶτον. Now whether this little victory over Sicilus happened before or after the time when Thucydides' narrative breaks off in the autumn of 411, is pure guess-work. But P makes no such remark about the revolt of Thasos, an event of some importance, about which Thucydides himself in viii. 64 narrates the preliminary stage; so that if P really continued Thucydides' narrative, we should expect to find here a similar reference to his own earlier passage. Furthermore in the three other allusions to the Decelean War xiii. 16, and 30 and xvi. 5 we find no such reference. The passages in xiii. record the long supremacy of the aristocratic party at Thebes and the enrichment of the Thebans through their purchase of the Athenian spoils at Decelea. It is difficult to suppose that if P really continued Thucydides' narrative—fond of digressions as he shows himself to be—he would nowhere have found occasion to deal with these subjects in his story of the last seven years of the war. Still more difficult is it to account for the omission of any reference to his previous work in the last of these passages (xvi. 5) where he illustrates the customary ill-payment of the Persian king's troops by what happened κατὰ τῶν Δεκελεικῶν πόλεμον, remarking πολλάκις δὲν κατελήφθησαν αἱ τῶν συμμάχων τραίτεις εἰ μὴ διὰ τὴν Κύρου προθυμίαν. Surely an author so interested in naval operations as P, if he had really continued the narrative of Thucydides, must already have dealt with the bad payment of the Peloponnesian fleet by the Persian king and his snares in its proper place, and in the present passage would have inserted a reference to his previous account.

In my opinion therefore the natural inference from this series of passages taken together is that P himself had written no continuous history of the Decelean war from 411 to 404, but had dealt with Timolaus' victory over Sicilus in some earlier digression, e.g. in the passage referred to in the προεμεύμενα πόλεις (ii. 4. 32), where he must have mentioned Timolaus in connexion with the Corinthian feeling against Sparta.

If these arguments be accepted we must suppose that P's history began with the year 403 or 402 and went on in annalistic fashion to 394 (a priori its most probable terminus) or, may be, to 387 or 385 or any date not later than 356. This result, as we shall see, a distinct bearing on our next question.
Who was P?

For the solution of this problem the editors with some light-heartedness lay down two conditions: 'The primary condition,' they tell us, which must be satisfied with regard to the authorship of P's work is that the historian whose claims are put forward wrote a continuation of Thucydides on a very elaborate scale. Their second condition is that he must be one of the known historians of the middle of the fourth century B.C. To take refuge in complete agnosticism, they say, is most unsatisfactory, for admittedly P was a historian of much importance who has largely influenced later tradition, and since his work survived far into the second century (A.D.) his name at any rate must be known. Now the known historians living at the time required are Cratippus, Chidemus, Androtion, Ephorus, and Theopompus— or, to be exhaustive, Anaximenes and perhaps Herodicus must be included. Of these Herodicus may be at once dismissed. Aristotle (Rhet. i. 23, 29) quotes a pun of his on the name of the sophist Thrasymachus, apparently his contemporary, and a scholion on the passage simply states Ἀθηναῖος ἰπποδρόμος τόι. Nothing more is known. Chidemus or Clitodemus, the oldest of the Atthidæa, judged by his scanty fragments, does not seem to have treated of any events later than the Athenian expedition against Sicily. Ephorus, in whose favour a priori one would expect much could be said, seems to be justly ruled out by the editors; first, because he wrote a universal history and therefore can hardly have described with very great minuteness the period covered by P; secondly, because P's order of arrangement is chronological, while Ephorus' order was logical; and thirdly, because the characteristics of P differ in almost all respects from the known characteristics of Ephorus. Anaximenes, also a writer of universal history, for this same reason need not detain us.

Of the remaining three the claims of Theopompus are advocated by the editors, supported by Professors von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff and Meyer; of Cratippus by the late Professor Bliss, Professor Bury, and Mr. Walker; and of Androtion by Professor de Sanctis.

Of these the positive evidence is rather in favour of Androtion: for we know from fr. 17 of that he dealt with the capture and death of Hagnias, which is recorded by P, col. i. 30; and Pausanias (vi. 7. 6) tells us that he also dealt with the revolt of Rhodes from the Lacedaemonians and the death of Doricus, the son of Digonors. P, who in col. xi, relates the assassination of his kinsmen at Rhodes, must certainly have done the same. But on the other side it seems impossible to gainsay the negative arguments based on the scope, the scale, and the date of Androtion, which are stated by Mr. Walker in the May number of the Classical Review.

---

* P. 227.
* P. 189.
* Py. 120, 127.

* Ταύτων [i.e. Hagnias] καὶ τούτων οὐ κακρο- 
μακάς πότερον φασίν Ἀθηναῖος ἐν πυευχαῖς τῆς

* Ἀθηνῶν καὶ Φαῖδρονος, ὕπο σκληροτέρα τοι καὶ

* ἐκείνων ἐκ Λακεδαιμονίων.
We are left then with Theopompus and Cratippus. As to Theopompus, while the positive evidence is but scanty, the negative evidence seems to be overwhelming. Here it will be sufficient to summarize the full and lucid statement of the arguments, for and against, of the editors themselves, who after holding the scales with more than judicial impartiality, finally declare in favour of Theopompus. On behalf of his claims their arguments are the following. (1) Theopompus began his Hellenica where Thucydides left off, and ended with the battle of Cnidus in 394: P, they think, did the same. (2) The scale and subject matter of the fragments of Theopompus, books X, and XI, as a matter of fact there are only two extant fragments definitely assigned to these books, one of six lines assigned to the tenth, the other of thirteen lines assigned to the eleventh book), tend to show that all the extant fragments of P, if Theopompus were the author, may very well have been included in Book X. (The next six arguments the editors have adopted from Meyer.) (3) Theopompus' combination of aristocratic leanings with a sincere desire for truth corresponds to the attitude adopted by P, especially in his account of parties at Athens. (4) The extant fragments of the Hellenica—at least when they happen to be ordinary narrative and not rhetorical passages—are not dissimilar in style to P. (5) Theopompus, like P, was extremely prone to digressions. (6) The lucidity, careful collection of materials, wide range of subjects, deep insight into causes, and power of psychological analysis attributed by Dionysius of Halicarnassus to Theopompus, are to be found also in P. (7) Theopompus' works were serious histories like that of P, and no mere rhetorical exercises. (8) Polybius' censure on Theopompus' want of knowledge in describing battles accords with the suspiciously conventional character of the accounts of the two ambushes in P v. 59 and xix. 22. The editors attach weight to the first five of these arguments and also to certain linguistic coincidences between P and the fragments of Theopompus—νυν περίπατεν with a participle in place of a simple verb, παραδότονοι, χωρίον ... κατεσκευασμένον καλός, but lay most emphasis on the use of the verb κατάφησι in the sense of ὁλοῖον (P xviii. 39, Theop. fr. 327), and Καρπαστεύς, meaning a man of Carpasus.

In passing we may remark that argument (1) stands or falls with the question of P having continued Thucydides' narrative. If he did not—as I have argued above—then edid quoque. As to (4), of the nineteen or twenty extant fragments of Theopompus' Hellenica only three contain more than three consecutive lines; and of these three one is only five, another is six, and the third is thirteen lines long. The three indeed are all straightforward narrative, but none of them are long enough or characteristic enough to serve as a basis for an argument either one way or the other. The real difficulty is not that these fragments are as un rhetorical as the narrative of P, but that the ancient critics mark no distinction of style between the Hellenica and the undoubtedly rhetorical Philippica. This at least is

evidenced by the famous passage of Porphyry comparing him and Xenophon, which, long as it is, is worth quoting in full: ἐὰν γὰρ, φησίν οὐ Νικαγόρας, τὸν Ἑλληνικὸν ἐντυχὲν ναὶ τοῦ (Theropompus) τε καὶ τοῦ Ἑρμόφυτος, πολλὰ τοῦ Ἑρμόφυτος αὐτὸν μετατίθεται καταλείπει, καὶ τὸ δείκτω ὅτι ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον, τὸ γὰρ περὶ τὴν Φαραγάζου πρὸς Ἀγγέλαν συνοφοράς δὲ Ἀπολλοφόρους τοῦ Κυπενοῦ καὶ τὰς ἁμραίς πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐνεπούσιν διαλέξειν ἀσ ἐν τῇ τετάρτῃ Ἑρμόφυτον ἁγιασάτε πάντι χαριτών καὶ προποντος ἀμφιβολος εἰς τὴν ἐνεκίνησιν τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν μεταθείς ὁ Θεο- πομπος ἀργὰ τε καὶ ἀκρίτα τε πεποίηκε καὶ ἀπράκτᾳ λόγῳ γὰρ δύναμιν καὶ δίᾳ τὴν κλητὴν ἐξεργασίαν ἐμβάλλει καὶ ἐπιδείκνυσθαι σπουδαῖον βραδύς καὶ μέλλων καὶ άναπλημμένον ευκός φαίνεται καὶ τὸ ἐρώτημα καὶ ἐνεργό τὸ Ἑρμόφυτος διαφέρειν. From this passage it seems to follow that Theropompos at any rate inserted speeches in his Hellenica whether rhetorical or not—whereas perhaps the most marked feature of P’s style is the absence of speeches in passages where they might well be expected, e.g. i.14, ii. 1-35, xv. 7 (cf. Xen. Hell. iii. 5. 7-10, where the causes of the alliance between Athens and the Boeotians in 395 are put into the mouth of the Theban orator). Moreover Theropompos, as a young man, gained the prize offered by Queen Artemisia for a funeral oration in honour of her husband Mansolus (c. 352 B.C.), a fact which shows—if the date of his birth be rightly placed about 376—that he developed his rhetorical powers at an early age. The linguistic coincidences again are not so very remarkable; even the rare use of κατάρας can be paralleled from elsewhere, and Stephanus of Byzantium quotes Καρπασίας and not Καρπασία (xvi. 37) as used by Theropompos in his tenth22 book (alluding probably to the tenth book of the Philippias). The other arguments do not seem to call for comment here, they are so fully dealt with by the editors themselves.

Now, however, let us summarize on the other side the negative evidence collected23 by the editors, which, they admit, shows ‘the existence of a number of weighty objections to the identification of P with Theropompos.’

(1) The most important and the most insuperable is the chronological difficulty. xiv. 25-37 proves that P wrote his history before the end of the Sacred War in 346, which resulted in the destruction of the Phocians. Indeed Mr. Walker’s inference is almost irresistible that P must have written before the beginning of the war in 636, arguing that a reference to the Sacred War would be expected in this passage if it had actually begun. Now if any reliance can be placed on the accepted chronology of Theropompos’ life, his authorship of our fragment is, with the earlier date, out of the question, and with the later date very improbable. For 37624 is accepted as the date of his birth, and we know that he lived in Egypt under Ptolemy Soter (323-285 B.C.) and may even have survived the year 300. But even

23 It is perhaps noticeable that Stephanus in his nine other citations from definite books of the Hellenica while the word Ἑλληνικῶς, but in quoting from the Philippias seems frequently
THEOPOMPUS (OR CRATIPPOS). HELLENICA. 287

with the later date 346 it is difficult enough to suppose that Theopompus had completed the tenth book of his Hellenica before the age of 30, if it began with the year 411 and were a work as detailed and elaborate as that of P. (2) Again, if Porphyry’s accusation is true—he is none too reliable an authority as his mistakes about the plagiarisms of Ephorus in the immediate context show—that Theopompus plagiarized from Xenophon, since the latter cannot have published his Hellenica much before 356, it seems natural to assign a considerably later date to Theopompus’ Hellenica.

(3) The same conclusion seems to follow from Plutarch’s use in his Life of Agesilaus of both Xenophon and Theopompus as his authorities. For Plutarch’s account of the campaign of 395 against Tissaphernes is entirely independent of P, who, as we have seen, is followed by Diódoros. Moreover, if, as most moderns believe, Diódoros’ fourteenth book is based chiefly on Ephorus, and Ephorus in his turn is based on P, it is much easier to suppose that P was some older historian and not identical with Theopompus, who was Ephorus’ fellow-pupil and long outlived him. (4) The editors admit that P’s account of Agesilaus does not accord at all well with what is known of the treatment of him by Theopompus. To Theopompus the Spartan king was μεγατος ὁμολογομένου καὶ τῶν τῶν ἑωντον ἐπιφανέστατον, but P shows no tendency to illustrate the personal character of Agesilaus nor any enthusiasm over his achievements. In fact he speaks more warmly of Conon his arch-enemy. (5) While P in xxii. 11 calls the Paphigonian king Πύθεσ, the name is given as Θωκ in fr. 198 of Theopompus, which appears as Θύτης in Nέπος (Dat. 2), who is here following Theopompus. However, too much weight must not be laid on this discrepancy, because, as Meyer points out, the papyrus is specially weak in the spelling of proper names. (6) Finally, P’s style betrays a complete absence of almost all the characteristics which the descriptions of ancient critics, especially Dionysius of Halicarnassus, would lead us to expect to find in a fragment of Theopompus. In fact the editors are here reduced to postulating—without a particle of positive evidence in their favour—a youthful and bold style totally unlike the rhetorical vehemence by which alone Theopompus was known to the ancients, and in which he certainly wrote as early as 352 B.C., when he was victorious against his old master Isocrates in gaining Artemisia’s prize.

But the editors themselves admit the cumulative force of all this negative evidence, and are well aware that most of the positive arguments that they have marshalled together are vulnerable in many points. On

46 Mr. Walker (Kits, viii, p. 344) in discussing the relation of (a) Panaeas, Polyaeus, and Justin, and (b) Néps and Plutarch to P arrives at the remarkable result that the three former, who exhibit agreement with P, are the writers generally supposed to be dependent on Ephorus, and independent of Theopompus, while the two latter, who fail to exhibit a

single point of contact with P, are the true writers whose use of Theopompus has been most generally admitted.

48 L.t, 10.

49 Plut. i.e. 10.

50 Cf. exp. xviii, 32.

51 Cf. p. 137.
what then do they rely for their final identification of Π with Theopompos? On the direct evidence of Καρμακρώς and κατάμαρας. But of these the first, as we have seen, is not above suspicion; for the balance of probability is in favour of Stephanus quoting from the Philippics and not the Hellenica; and the second coincidence, the editors confess, by itself would not be very remarkable. Even if we add to these the love of digressions and the aristocratical sentiments common to Π and Theopompos, the only common characteristics which the critics have not, as yet, called in question, the case is made but little more plausible. At the bottom of the whole process of argumentation the wish is father to the thought, Π is obviously a reliable historian. He wrote his work about the middle of the fourth century B.C. His version of the events of 395 B.C. reappears in Diodorus (ii. 8 B.C.). He was known and read in Egypt in the second century A.D. He must therefore have been a writer known to fame, and the only writer known to us, who at all fulfils these conditions, is Theopompos. All the arguments against his being Theopompos, however strong, must therefore be minimized one by one, and their cumulative force be finally ignored.

But does Cratippus stand the test better? Shadowy personage as he is—there are only four references to him in ancient literature—yet he has, as compared with Theopompos, four points in his favour, his date, his dislike of speeches, his Athenian citizenship, and as a consequence of his date, his independence of Xenophon. Mr. E. M. Walker in the current number of Klio has dealt with these points so fully and clearly that I need do little more than summarize his arguments. As to his date, he is described by Dionysius of Halicarnassus as οὐχεξακίας with Thucydides, but from Plutarch’s list of the subjects of which he treated he must certainly have outlived the battle of Cnidus in 334 B.C. and the usage of the term οὐχεξακίας is so loose that he may well have survived for several years the changes in the Boeotian Constitution alluded to in P xi. 37—xii. 31, which took place about 387. Such a date for the composition of Π—380-370—not only harmonizes very well with his avoidance of hiatia, which the Peneplous of Ioseates proves to have been in fashion as early as 380, but accounts both for his absolute independence of Xenophon’s Hellenica, which cannot have been published before 360, and for the apparent use of his narrative by Ephorus, who certainly lived to see the accession of Alexander the Great. Cratippus’ dislike of speeches follows from the story about him related by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (vit. Thuc. 16). The absence of speeches in Π may of course be a matter of accident, but it is certain that a more rhetorical writer would have put his account 40 of the causes of the Corinthian war into the mouth of some Theban orator, just as Xenophon, by no means a rhetorician, has done in the Hellenica (iii. 5. 8-15).

That Cratippus was an Athenian may justly be inferred from the passage in Plutarch (de Glor. Athen. i. p. 345), where he is ranked—appar
ently in chronological order—between Thucydides and Xenophon as recording the great achievements of Athenian statesmen and generals. So, too, P seems to show a more intimate acquaintance with Athenian than with Boeotian or even Spartan affairs. In cols. i. 1-25, ii. 35—iii. 9 he enters into minute details about the unimportant expedition of Demaenetus; in cols. i. 25—ii. 1 and ii. 10-14 he professes full knowledge of the motives of the Athenian democrats; and in col. xii. 15-40 he gives curious particulars about the furnishing of Attic houses. Moreover, as already noticed, his account of the exploits of the Athenian Conon seems to be fuller and more enthusiastic than that of the campaigns of the Spartan Agesilaus.

So far there are certainly fewer difficulties to be overcome in identifying P with Cratinus than with Theopompos. The only real difficulty—besides the absence of positive evidence—is the subject of Cratinus’ history. Plutarch (i.e.) represents him as dealing with τὰ περὶ Ἑλλησποντος Ἀλεξανδρέας καὶ τὰ πρὸς Δέσβουν Θρασύβουλος καὶ τὸν ἱππο Θαρμαυσαῖς ἐπιτύπωσιν καὶ Ἰσκενδρίαν καὶ Ἀρχιππον καὶ τοῖς ἀτο Φιλίππος ἰδρυμέναι κατὰ τὴν Ἀρκανὶον ἁγιασμοῖς ἀνασταμάσαι καὶ Κάισαρα πάλαι ἐμπληθοῦσα τὰς Αθηναίας εἰς τὴν βαλλαντίαν, to which we must add from his Vit. X. Orat. ii. 1 p. 834 something about the mutilation of the Hermæ, which, as Mr. Walker suggests, may have been related in connexion with Alcibiades’ return from exile. Dionysius (i.e.) also seems to speak of his having aimed in some sense or other to complete the work of Thucydides—τὰ παραλείπετα ἐν τοῖς ναῖταις (Thucydides) αὐγαγοῖν. Evidently then his work included as many events before 402 B.C. as after. Now if it be a primary condition with regard to the authorship of P’s work that the historian whose claims are put forward wrote a continuation of Thucydides, all this is an additional argument in favour of Cratinus. If on the other hand, as I have argued above, the internal evidence is on the whole against P having narrated any events prior to 402, except by way of digression, then Plutarch’s account of the contents of Cratinus’ work is a strong argument against his being identified with P. As against Theopompos Mr. Walker seems to me to have made out his case in favour of Cratinus. But a dispassionate treatment of the contents of the papyrus apart from any a priori considerations seems to me equally decisive against both hypotheses.

Andronion, Ephorus, Theopompos, Cratinus, being excluded there seems to be no historian left whose claims can be advocated for identification with P. So we find ourselves face to face with that unsatisfactory agnosticism which the editors justly deprecate on the ground that P was obviously “a historian of much importance who has largely influenced later tradition,” and that “since his work survived far into the second century [A.D.] his name at any rate must be known.” The statement is exceedingly plausible, but the history of literary survivals is a strange chapter of accidents—almost as capricious as the discovery of papyri. Cratinus
himself, as Mr. Walker points out, amounts almost to a negative instance. Though read by Dionysius and by Plutarch (ll. 80 A.D.) and ranked by the latter with Thucydides and Xenophon, not a line of him survives, not even a word of his is quoted by any ancient grammarian. Mr. Walker cites Hieronymus of Cardia as a parallel case, and much the same might be said of Antiochus of Syracuse, of whom only some fifteen fragments are left. To this it may indeed be objected that at least their names are known. This of course is true, but they come perilously near to the vanishing point, and in the case of P there is a fairly good reason why P should have gone beyond it. From the scale of the fragment it seems to be a fair inference that the whole work included the history of a few years only—perhaps only nine—and those not of any very surpassing interest. The style of his treatment, though clear and straight-forward, it must be confessed, is dull and monotonous. Then, a few years later Ephorus seems to have skimmed the cream off his work and presented in his universal history a narrative of this period on a scale and in a style more acceptable to the average Greek reader. The fate of P therefore was the same as that of many of the predecessors of Herodotus. Though the basis of many succeeding histories, his own was itself forgotten and neglected, but as the papyrus bears witness, never altogether lost. Who he was we shall never know for certain, till some definite quotation bearing his name is discovered elsewhere. Till then many of us must, I fear, content ourselves with that agnosticism which the learned editors deprecate as so unsatisfactory; at any rate it is less unsatisfactory than belief without sufficient evidence.

G. E. Underhill.

NOTE.

For many of the arguments in this article I must acknowledge my indebtedness to the following:


Professor Busolt, Hermes, xiii., Part 2.

Professor da Sancta, L'Attore di Androsone su un Papporo di Oxyrhynchos.

Mr. E. M. Walker, Classical Review, May, 1908, Klein, vii., p. 356 sqq. Much to my regret my own article was nearly finished before the latter essay appeared.

Dr. U. Wilcken (Hermes, xiii., pp. 477 sqq.), following up a suggestion of Dr. Wilcken, proposes to fill the lacuna in vi. 45 with My πασίν ἀναμηνίσθησθε καὶ κακοθείσης and regards it as the passage mentioned by Strabo, XIII, 329. But the words πασίν ἀναμηνίσθησθε καὶ κακοθείσης contain fifteen letters, where the editors think there is only room for ten, so that I cannot consider Dr. Wilcken's suggestion as very plausible, and fully concur with the judgment expressed in the editors' note on the passage. We attach little weight to the general resemblance between vi. 44-7. 3 and Strabo's allusion to Theopompos as an argument for the identification of the latter author with P.
I include in this paper seven Attic inscriptions, all previously unpublished with the exception of No. 5, which was published, from an incomplete copy, by Köhler in the Corpus (T.G. ii. 89). The first three are in the Athens Epigraphical Museum, the other four in the Acropolis Museum. The latter will be republished shortly in the catalogue of the Acropolis Museum, at present being undertaken by the British School at Athens, but owing to limitations of space I am unable to discuss in its pages the points raised by them with the fulness that is desirable. Nos. 2 and 3 owe their appearance here to their connexion with No. 4, which is a fragment of one of the records of the 'traditiones rerum sacrarum' of Athens and the other deities; for, while studying the other inscriptions of this class in the Epigraphical Museum, I found Nos. 2 and 3, which also belong to it, among the miscellaneous unpublished fragments, and therefore include them together here. The discovery of No. 1 was even more accidental, but the fact, which one could not fail to recognize at once, that it was a fragment of the famous 'Quota-lists' is enough to justify its publication here. I wish to acknowledge the kindness of Dr. Kavvadias, Ephor-general of Antiquities, and Mr. Leonidou, Ephor of the Epigraphical Museum, to whom I am indebted for permission to publish these inscriptions, of Dr. Anton von Frischerstein of the Austrian Archaeological Institute for his ready help and advice, and of Mr. M. N. Tod for reading the proofs of this article and making several important corrections.

1. Pentelic marble, inscribed on face and r. side; broken above, below, and on l., and surface much worn. Greatest height 26; do. width 195; thickness 97. Letters a shade under 01 high. In Epigraphical Museum, unnumbered.

Side (a)  Side (b)

| Τερηθαι | Τερηθαι |
|Καρύστιος | Καρύστιος |
|Κείοι | Κείοι |
|Μυκόνιοι | Μυκάνοι |
|Πάριοι | Πάριοι |
|Εσκανοκε | [Δείς αύτο Κε[ναι] |
| [Δείς αύτο Κε[ναι] |
| [Δείς αύτο Κε[ναι] |

|| (K)A P | H |
| (m) T | H |
A glance suffices to show that this belongs to the well-known 'Quota-lists,' recording the dedication to Athens of one-sixtieth of the tribute paid to Athens by the members of the Athenian league. Internal evidence tells us little more, beyond the fact that on (a) we obviously have part of the Νομίστου φορος, and that on (b), of which the first line is in larger letters (abt. 016 high), we have part of a line containing some preamble or heading, followed by remains of four lines of figures. The order of names approximates to that in I.G. i. 237 more than to any other of the island 'quota-lists': one would not be surprised then if it belonged to the record either of the preceding or succeeding year, I.G. i. 236 or 238, i.e. 444 or 442. This possibility is made a certainty when we notice that the conditions required by our fragment, namely that it should be a stone inscribed on two adjoining sides, with the island tribute recorded in the last column on the right, are only suited by these two numbers (as I.G. i. 237 was ruled out as already containing some of the names found here). The same is found to apply to l.G. i. 236, for we find there the word Ποιηκος already, which also comes in l. 4 of the present stone. But in I.G. i. 238 there is a large gap in the right hand column (in this case column v, in the Corpus), which involves the loss of the names, as we may see from the end of column iv, of the last few of the Carian states, and of all the islands except the following, which are preserved together with the quotas they paid, below the lacuna, Συμπαντο, Μαρκοποιος, Εφησος, Ιστρως, Αιολικας: above the sum paid by the first island are two sums ΗΗ and ΗΗΗ, but the names of the people who paid them are missing.

As the whole angle is broken away, there is naturally a corresponding lacuna in the first column of the adjoining face (I.G. i. 240), of which (b) is a fragment; this involves the loss of the sums paid by the last seventeen of the Thracian cities, and of the names of the last twelve of them (except the last of the eleventh and the last three letters ΤΑΙ of the twelfth). Also of the first three letters of the word ΚΑΡΙΚΟΣ (the heading Καρικος φορος coming naturally at the head of the list of Carian states), and of the sums paid by the first fourteen of these states. We need now go no further to look for an explanation of the much worn but unmistakable letters ΚΑ on side (b) of our fragment. The probability that they were part of the word Καρικος is now made a certainty, and there can be no further doubt that it is here that our fragment belongs: unfortunately it is not large enough to fill the gap, but there is only a space of a little over two centimetres missing between the Α and the 1 of Καρικος, which of course contained the letter Π. On the other face it is not nearly large enough to fill the gap, but the position we have been able to fit it into enables us to tell roughly how much is still missing above and below. For when put in place the name Μεσόνων, which is in a line with the letters ΚΑ on the other face, comes opposite to the name Αδησμος in column iv: though this column is not quite complete, column iii enables us to be certain that Αδησμος comes in l. 27 of I.G. i. 238, i.e. the 25th city in the list, the first two lines being taken up with the number of the year and the names of the γραμματεις and of the senior Hellenotamias.

Of the incomplete names in our list, the first can hardly be any other
than [Τε]υκει, which alone fulfils the requirements, namely: a name of six letters of which the last four are -εις. In l. 8 [Δε]ψε διό Κεφαιοι needs no justification, and in l. 9, though there are only the faintest traces of the seventh and eighth letters to be seen on the stone, 41, this may be restored as [Αθε]ξατ] [Δε]ς [ιες], which alone gives us similar letters in this position, and in the 'quota-lists' of both the year before and the year after (I.G. i. 237, 239, I.G. i. Suppl. p. 72) follows immediately after Δες ιες Κεφαιο.

So far then we have the names of the islands for the year 442 (O. 84, 3) from line 22 to line 30 inclusive: of the sums they paid we have only the remains of the figures, if opposite Γροβας. In the years 451 (under name of Бροβαιος), 444, and 438 we find them paying Διπλιθ (16 ⅔ dr.), and the fact that they pay a sum ending in a similar figure here may enable us to assume that their tribute did not alter during these sixteen years; and further the fact that their name occurs in the list between Carystus and Ceos confirms the suggested restoration of their name in the corresponding position in the inscription of the previous year (i. 237) as the people who paid Διπλιθ. Thus except for confirming the fact that the Γροβας paid 16 ⅔ drachmas (or a total tribute of 1000 dr.) whenever their name is found between the years 451 and 436, this fragment gives no positive evidence as to payments.

Its negative evidence is, however, worth examining: it shows that the two sums in l. 32, 33 of I.G. i. 238, which have no names opposite them, were not paid by any of the states contained in our fragment. But it appears more important when we compare the order of the islands' names in I.G. i. 237 and in the present fragment: in the former, as determined unquestionably by their respective contributions, we have (I. 19 foll.): Andros, Carystus, Gryneis, Ceos, Scyphus (?), Paros, Dius, Athenae Diades; the resemblance to that in our fragment is too close to be accidental, and can be made absolute, if we wish, by transposing [Σιφο]ς in l. 33 with [Μυκήναι] in l. 15, as they both pay the same sum, namely 100 drachmas, and both have eight letters in their names. Secondly, it is not unreasonable to supply Τέων before the restored Αρκες in I.G. i. 237, l. 19, as the island that paid ΗΗΗ, for it immediately precedes Andros in our fragment, and also we find it paying that sum in 450 and 449 for certain, and as restored with great probability in 447, 441, and 436; and no doubt it was recorded on our fragment as paying the same sum in 442. The question still remains, what states paid the sums recorded in l. 32, 33 of I.G. i. 238? 7 The text given in the Corpus and followed by subsequent editors gives these sums as HH and HHH respectively. But after a careful examination of the stone I cannot convince myself that the former sum is certain: the edge is broken exactly across where the bottom of the third figure, if there was one, would come; in fact I thought that I could see on the stone just where the break comes, but as it may be only a mark caused by the fracture of the stone I do not feel justified in saying that there was a third figure there; if there was, it would have begun with an upright stroke (H or Η are the most likely, as we have no case of a state paying any such sum as HHH); but one may safely say that we cannot be certain that the sum was only HH. Again
200 dr. is an exceptionally rare payment in the Island Tribute; it is paid by Seriphos in 451, by Tenos in 489, and by the town of Hephaestia in Lemnos in 421, but we have no other instances. And all these states are excluded here, for Seriphos pays 100 after 449. Tenos appears in l. I. of our fragment, and Hephaestia pays 300 in l. 35 of I.G. i. 238, to which our fragment belongs. As to the latter figure (HHH), the only states paying this amount of which we have any record about this time are Chalcei, Eretria, Hephaestia, Cythnos, Siphnos and Tenos: but the third of these is of course excluded as it occurs in l. 35, and the last occurs in l. 1 of our new fragment. Of the remaining four states, the probability seems in favour of one of the former two belonging here. In both I.G. i. 237 and 239 their names occur together towards the end of the list, followed by Myrma, Hephaestia, Imbros, and Aegina in the former and by Styrm (itself in Euboea), Aegina, and Myrma in the latter, whereas in both these lists Siphnos and Cythnos occur early. If, as I feel strongly inclined on these grounds to do, we restore Chalcei or Eretria in l. 33, the probability is extremely great in favour of restoring the other of these two in l. 32, in which, as I showed above, the sum recorded was not 200 for certain, and may very likely have been 300. Further than this with regard to the last names on the list we cannot go: it is impossible to tell exactly what space there is still to fill between the last line on our fragment and the top line preserved on the fragment below, as it is not certain that the latter is set in its plaster backing exactly in the right place: we should expect, on the analogy of the inscription of the previous year that three names should follow 'Athēnas Δ' μῆς, namely 'Iēnai, 'Peisai, and Σφερες. If this is correct, col. v. will be three lines longer than col. iv., and will contain 40 lines in all; but this is unusual, and further gives us too much space to fill: only two lines are taken up by the heading, and one more, presumably, by the words Ἀθηναῖος φόρος; so we should have to suppose that there were eleven or twelve Carian states at the head of the column (as we know that we have only to expect 23 or 24 islands), which would give them the unprecedented total of 47 or 48. A probable solution is to restore the first ten names of col. v. as Carian states, insert Νεαπότικος φόρος in the eleventh space (l. 13), and suppose that there were 24 islands, as in the previous year, giving a total of 37 lines in all, including headings. This means that the 3 states mentioned will come up to the top of the island list, and that there can only be one, and may be no, space between the last name of our list and the first figure on the existing piece below. But the edge is too broken to enable us to be certain either way, and the mutilated condition of the island-lists for the years immediately before and after 442 prevents exact certainty as to the number we should expect.

With regard to the information given us by the inscription on the other face there is less room for uncertainty. It gives us the sums paid by the first three of the Carian states in B.C. 440 (I.G. i. 240), as follows:

1 In I.G. i. 237 it only pays 100, whether we should restore the name, as I believe, in l. 15 or in l. 23.
Astypalaea had paid 150dr. in 441, but changes to 200 in 436; the Cindyes had paid 100 in 447, but we have no other evidence of their payments after that date. The present fragment shows that they continued to pay the same amount as late as any rate as 440. The Caunii appear in the 'quota-lists' of 452, 451, 447, 443 and 441 as paying the same sum (50 dr.) as they pay here. Of the fourth figure there are no clear traces on the stone, but if the mark indicated above is more than an accidental scratching it would be part of Π or Π, and the latter is the sum paid by the Telandrii where they appear in the lists for 449 and 443 B.C. Thus our new fragment gives us no evidence of any change in the amounts paid, but shows that at any rate the first three and probably the fourth Carian state contained in it paid in 440 the amounts they had paid in the previous years as far as we have any record.

The evidence which this inscription gives us about the island tribute is perhaps worth reproducing in tabular form, to save repetition of the arguments used above. The most important point is of course the similarity in the order of names for the years 443 and 442.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX</th>
<th>B.C.</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>[Σκρίφων]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>[Καρωστία]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>Δ[ί]ς ἀνό Κ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>[Ε]ρετίας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>[Λ]γαντιας</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

probably same amounts as the next year.
J.G. i. 238,  
bc. 442 1. 22  

[Τέμναι]  
Ἀνδριοι  
Καρυάτιοι  

25  
Γραφής  
Κειος  
Μυκόνιοι  
Πάρμιος  

[Δ]ῖ ἐς ἀπὸ Κ.  

30  
[Ἄθηνα] [Δ]ὶ[ίδες]  

One or no name missing:  

[Ἐπετριῶ]  
[Χαλκίδες]  
Σύρ[ιοι]  
Μυ[σιοί]  
Εφ[εσίες]  
Τυ[βριοί]  
Ἄλ[γιεται]  

XXX;  

2. Pentelic marble, broken on all sides and behind; h. 26; br. 14; th. 99. Letters 91 high. Found on the Acropolis; now in Epigraphical Museum (No. 183 of unpublished fragments).
This fragment evidently comes from one of the lists issued by the treasurers of Athens and the other deities of the sacred objects handed over to their successors at the end of their year of office. There is no need to discuss this class of inscriptions here: all those of the period later than the archonship of Euclid 403/2, to which this inscription, as well as Nos. 3 and 4, belongs, are collected and analysed by Lehner, whose dissertation (Über die Athenischen Schatzverzeichisse des vierten Jahrhunderts. Strassburg. 1890) is simply invaluable for this interesting subject. The few inscriptions which belong to this class discovered since the publication of his work but before 1895 are to be found in I.G. ii. 5, pp. 173-182. The history of the administration of these treasures before 405 and after 385, the dates of two important changes in the régime, does not concern us here. Within that period itself there is another change: a very few years after it opens the body of ταιμίων was increased in number from three to ten, but their functions do not seem to have altered. These ταιμίων, to whom was attached a γραμματεύς, at the end of their year of office handed over to the incoming ταιμίων the sacred objects under their charge, and recorded the items, and the weight of each (unless they expressly declared it to be ἀστάθμως) in an inscription. We know, thanks chiefly to Lehner, that they made three lists, engraved on separate stones, at the end of each year, recording the treasures in the Parthenon, the Opiathodomos, and the Hecatompedon respectively, or to give them their official designations, ἐκ τοῦ Παρθενώνου, ἐκ τοῦ Ὥπιοθοδόμου, and ἐν τῷ νεότερῳ Ἐκατομπέδῳ.

Before proceeding to the question, to which of these three classes this fragment belongs, let us see what information lines 1-5 give us. In I. 1 (λ)εσθ'φησι can hardly be any word except [K]λεσθ'φησι, namely nominative, accusative, genitive, or possibly dative (as for ἐσθ'φησι being a not uncommon usage in such datives down to the end of the fourth century), of the name Κλέσθ'φησι: and further the probability is equally great that this man is to be identified with Κλείσθ'φης Ἐκατομπέδων, whose name appears in I.G. ii. 2. 642 as γραμματεύς to the ταιμίων τῆς Ἀθηναίας καὶ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν. The fact that in one place his name is spelt with αι and in the other with ει is no impediment to the identification. The first line, then, probably ran thus: οτὲ Κλείσθ'φης Ἐκατομπέδων γραμματέας.

L. 2. ταυταίς τοῖς ἔτει τοῦ δεσποτᾶς is a natural restoration, in the light of the formula usually occurring in this series; and before ταυταίς no doubt was the word παρεδίδοσαν. Lines 2-5 therefore contain the names of the incoming treasurers for the new year. 'What is their date?' is the next question. That they belong to one of the last two years of the fifth century is proved by the mention of Cleophon in I. 1. But Cleophon's date is uncertain: Köhler in his note on I.G. ii. 2. 642 shows conclusively that it

---

Footnotes:

3 For the importance of these dates see Lehner, op. cit. pp. 17 and 21 respectively.
4 See instances in Meisterhans, Grammatik der attischen Inschriften, p. 68, notes 584 and 585.
5 See instances in Meisterhans (op. cit. p. 21, note 110) of ἐς for ἐσθ' before a consonant. This is common usage in the century 450-350, though not so common as the same usage before a vowel.
must be earlier than Ol. 95. 3 (398/7), but not before the year of Euclid, and that the only years for which the name of the γραμματέως is unknown within this period are Ol. 94. 3 and 94. 4 (402/1 and 401/0). But from our new fragment, we may see just as conclusively that Cleisophus belongs to 402/1, and the ταμαί, whose names occur in a mutilated state in II. 3-5, to 401/0: for the formula must have run thus: [τάδε οἱ ταμαί... ἐπὶ τοῦ δεινοῦ ἄρχοντος... oίς Κ]λ]έσσον ο[ς Ἑσάκων ο[ς Ἐγραμματέως παρέδοσαν τ]αμαίς το[ς]... ἐπὶ τοῦ δεινοῦ ἄρχοντος... oίς οἱ δεινοὶ ἔγραμματεοὶ]. It is perhaps unusual that the words παρά τὸν πρῶτον ταμαί τοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ δεινοῦ ἄρχοντος... oίς οἱ δεινοὶ ἔγραμματεοὶ are not inserted before παρέδοσιν. They occur in almost all the inscriptions of this series; but it is impossible that they should have occurred here, as that would throw the date of Cleisophus back a year too far, as can be shown in a very few words. We know already most of the names of the treasurers of the year Ol. 95. 1 (400/399) from the following inscriptions: I.G. ii. 2, 643, 644, 645. They are clearly different from those of our present fragment; for in this year the last name on the list is Ἰγνεῖος Αρπακτοῦ, whereas in the new list it is οἱ δεινοὶ Ἀγίλειοι: unfortunately the name is entirely lost. Again, if our new list contained the treasurers for the year Ol. 94. 3 (402/1), Cleisophus, secretary to the outgoing treasurers, would necessarily belong to the year Ol. 94. 2 (403/2): but we have already (I.G. ii. 5. 642 b) the list for this year, in which... as Κολλυτός is secretary. Thus the treasurers in the present list can only belong to the year 401/0, and therefore Cleisophus was secretary to the treasurers in the year 402/1: their names occur in a mutilated state in I.G. ii. 2. 642, and they seem to have been only three in number. But in the present list there seem to have been ten, for not only is the last name on the list a member of the Antiochid tribe, which is tenth and last in the order of tribes at this time, but also the restoration of the second half of the inscription, as will be shown below, demands that the stone should have been wide enough to contain 46 letters. It does not follow that there were exactly this number in each line of the first part, but the restoration of the formula demands longer lines than could be filled by a list of only three treasurers; and it is impossible to restore the remains of the names in the list so as to consist of only three. Actual restoration is impossible: we may note that Polyenetus was probably the second name, as there is space for a proper name and a demotic before it, secondly that Diosdotus was the seventh name in the list, and therefore a Cecropid, as the preceding name was that of a member of the Oenoeid tribe, in which was the dème Oē. The name of the γραμματέως is entirely lost, but if we supply his name and demotic and the word ἔγραμματεος after αἰκ and assume that they were the last words of 1. 5 we reach the conclusion that about twenty-five letters are missing on the right of our fragment (allowing 14 for his name and demotic).

Before proceeding to further restoration we may turn to the catalogue of the 'treasure': it is obviously a list of the υἱὰς ἄργυρα δεποτα denote in the Hecatompédon, as such as is found, in this series of inscriptions, in I.G. ii. 2. 660.
If we restore the weights from this inscription as I have done above, it will be seen that they exactly fill a line of 46 letters. The words before πρόφυσις ἐδρίας may be safely restored ἐδρίας ἄγωραί: this gives us exactly 25 letters to the right of the letter Δ, which is exactly underneath the ζ in οικι in l. 5, and 15 letters missing from the left of our fragment. Comparison with the other inscriptions in this series shows that whereas in the catalogue proper the lines are almost always of equal length, in the preamble this is not the case: thus the restoration of l. 2, which is considerably shorter than ll. 6–9, may very well be correct.

We may, now that we have settled the date of Cleisophus and of the list of treasurers, proceed to restore the preamble more fully thus, taking the names of the treasurers of the year 402/1 from I.G. ii. 2. 642 and ii. 5. 642 b, and restoring the archons' names for the two years in question.


The exact division into lines is impossible, but there can be little or no doubt that the sense was as indicated above.

It will be convenient to sum up briefly the information given us by this inscription. It belongs to the end of the year Ol. 94. 3 (402/1), and is the record of the handing over by the treasurers of the sacred objects in the Heptanompedon to the incoming treasurers for 401/0. It also definitely settles the vexed question as to the date of Cleisophus' secretaryship; and tells us without any possibility of doubt that his year was the last of the old régime under which there were only three treasurers, and that the year 401/0 was the first year in which their number was increased to ten.

3. White marble, complete for a few cm on right. Height 265; breadth, average 29, originally about 50; thickness 115. Letters in l. 1, 006; in ll. 2 and 3, 011–012; in ll. 4–9, 01. Now in Epigraphical Museum (No 78 of unpublished fragments).
This fragment, of another inscription belonging to the same series as No. 2, has also some features of interest. In the first place it is the only inscription in this class which is headed by the name of the γραμματέως of the year: there can be little doubt that Μεστέλαος is a genitive and that the name of his son, ending in -ος, is to be restored before it; there was just room on the stone for Φρεάριος, as we may see from the length of l. 7, opposite which we have the right hand edge of the stone preserved for a few centimetres. Restoration of the names of the ταμίαι, who occur also in I.G. ii. 2. 652, 653, gives us a line of about forty letters: the central vertical line of the stone would thus run almost exactly through the τ in Μεστέλαος, which would leave us with the conclusion that there were as many letters before it as after it, namely thirteen: we may conclude then that the name of the γραμματέως of this year consisted of about nine or ten letters, ending in -ος. It is true that in the word ἕγραμματευς in l. 3 there are eleven letters to the right of this line, but as the arrangement is not στοιχημένοι we need not assume that there are so many in l. 2. The name of this γραμματέως unfortunately cannot be restored, but we know to which year he belonged; for in the second of the inscriptions alluded to above, which give us the names of these ταμίαι (I.G. ii. 2. 653), we have preserved the words ἑτί Εὐθυκλέος ἄρχων, and so I have restored them here. Before proceeding to enquire which of the three instidiones is recorded here, it must be confessed that I have no explanation to give of the letters -ς -ι in l. 1: the surface of the stone is damaged, and there may have been another letter after the Ω; and before the I and separated from it by a letter entirely vanished I seem to see traces of Α or Α. The usual heading of these records is ΟΕΟΙ, but that word certainly did not stand here, and it would have been in larger, or at least not in smaller, letters than the second and third lines.

To proceed to the question as to which of the three instidiones is
SOME UNPUBLISHED ATTIC INSCRIPTIONS

recorded here, it is certain that, of the other two records of this year, Ol. 95. 3 (398/7), I.G. ii. 2. 652 belongs to the Heratompodion-treasures, as in ii. 15-16 it reads en ton vnoi ton Ε[κτοντες] . Our fragment then could only belong to the Parthenon or Opisthodomus-treasures. Köhler suggested that I.G. ii. 2. 653 recorded the transmission of the Parthenon-treasures, but a new fragment of the same inscription found subsequently to the publication of Vol. ii. of the Corpus, and published by Mylonas (B.C.H. xii. pp. 159 foll.), Lolling (Sitzungsber. der Berl. Akad., 1888, p. 249), and I.G. ii. 5. 653 k, leaves no room for doubt that Köhler is, for once, wrong. Lehner (op. cit., p. 18) shows, by an ingenious restoration of the first objects in the treasure-list, that they are the same as those recorded in I.G. ii. 2. 645 k, and that therefore they were deposited in the Opisthodomus. Our fragment then can only relate to the Parthenon, and we may note at once that in the preamble the ταμίαι are described as ταμίαι τῶν τῆς θεᾶς instead of ταμίαι τῶν τερών χρυσμάτων τῆς 'Αθηνᾶς και τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν. Now no other record of the treasures in the Parthenon preserves for us the correct designation of the ταμίαι, and though the inscriptions I.G. ii. 2. 645, 655, which undoubtedly relate to these treasures, preserve for us portions of the catalogue of the sacred objects, they lack almost entirely the opening formula. Whether all records of transmissions of the Parthenon-treasures were headed by the name of the γραμματέως θεοτηκής for the year is uncertain; if so, it would seem to imply that they were in some way distinct from the other two classes of records, but the matter must at present remain uncertain.

4. Fragment of greyish marble, complete below and on right. Height 285; breadth 42; thickness 09. Letters 01 high. Surface much damaged especially at right-hand side. In magazine of Acropolis Museum.
Anything like a complete restoration of this fragment is impossible; we may conclude, however, from the style of the writing that it belongs to a date early in the fourth century, and that it contains parts of a catalogue of the 'treasures of Athena and the other deities.' The letters 'Αρ(τιε)υς at the end of l. 6 can hardly be the remains of any word but Αρτεμιδος, and objects dedicated to Artemis Brauronia occur frequently in these lists. This fragment has no exact parallel in any of the existing inscriptions of the series, but from the class of objects it refers to we can see beyond doubt that it contains a list of the treasure in the Hecontapedon. From Lehner's analysis of the inscriptions relating to the objects preserved in the Parthenon (op. cit. pp. 26–28) we see that crowns occur very rarely there, whereas in this small fragment alone we have mention of two, and indications of a third, for the word ἀριστείος, which may be restored without difficulty in l. 1, is always applied to a crown in these inscriptions. And further the treasures in the Parthenon are all sacred to Athena Polias, with the exception of a single ἄγαλμα χρυσοῦ στρέπτου Αρτέμιδος Βραυρονίας, which is mentioned in I.G. ii. 2. 646: the mention of the στέφανος in ll. 2 and 3 makes it extremely improbable that the allusion to Artemis Brauronia in l. 6 should refer to this particular ring. It seems consequently to be a list of the treasures in either Hecontapedon or Opisthodomos.

With regard to the Opisthodomos-treasures we are, unfortunately very ignorant, as inscriptions relating to them are rare and, when they do occur, very fragmentary. It is only after 383/4, the date, as Köhler* shows with all probability, of the change in the constitution of the college of ἀγάλματος, that we get a list of the objects preserved in the Opisthodomos which can be called at all complete. The list compiled by Lehner (op. cit. pp. 75–77), many items in which he identifies with those in lists under the old ρήχος, does not, however, contain any dedications of crowns whatsoever. There can, then, be no alternative to the supposition that our fragment is part of a catalogue of the objects in the Hecontapedon. Unfortunately no single item here can be identified with any item in any other Hecontapedon record, particularly as the damaged surface of the stone leaves the readings of the weights in ll. 3 and 5 uncertain; consequently we cannot restore the original length of any line. The stone is complete on the right, so that we have room for the ε of στέφανος(ος) in l. 3.

In l. 1, we may safely restore [- - στέφανος χρυσόν ο[ς] άριστείον τῆς] θεοῦ. This may be that described in I.G. ii. 2. 652 as στέφανος χρυσῶν άριστεία τῆς θεοῦ, or another iud. 667, l. 28, described as άριστεία τῆς θεοῦ, but it may easily refer to a different one altogether.

L. 3. We may note τοῦτο έκ τούτου, as also τὰ χρόνα for ἡ χρόνον in l. 6 and the third declension genitive in -έος instead of -έον in l. 7; the latter possibly occurs at the beginning of l. 4, though we cannot be certain. The general use of ο for οἱ shows that this inscription must be dated quite early in the fourth century (see note 7 above). The reading of the

* In a note on I.G. ii. 2. 667. See also Lehner, op. cit. p. 17.
numeral is not certain; the fourth figure is apparently Δ, and possibly the next two were both Π, in which case the total will be 82 dr. 2 obols; the seventh and eighth are certainly ι; so we are left either with 80 dr. 4 obols, or 82 dr. 2 obols, but as I cannot find either of these sums attached to objects in the Hecatompedon lists, we cannot restore what the object was, though such a weight is a possible one for a crown; it may refer to the crown mentioned in l. 2, and if this is so the name of the dedicator followed (as evidently the lines in the list were fairly long, not less, e.g. than 40 letters), or again it may be the weight of some other crown.

Ll. 3, 4, 5. We may restore στεφάνος | χρυσός δέ η δίκαια - ήν 'Ομήρος ἄρκτος(δε), στ(τ)αιμον τούτο - -. What objects τωντων in l. 5 refers to is quite unknown; beyond the fact that their weight was over 470 dr. we can tell nothing for certain.

L. 6. The restoration χρυσός άθυμ(α)ν άλλον άλλον άνασα Αρτ(τ)αιμονίας] may be regarded as certain; it seems to be the case here that the possessive genitive of the goddess' name is put after, instead of, as is usual, before the name of the object. Otherwise, if we supposed the word άλλον to be the end of the description of the item, we should be surprised at the absence of any record of weight. What the object which had a golden chain was is quite uncertain, though there is a possibility that it may be identifiable with an object mentioned in I. 13: 2, 660, l. 42, χρυσόν θραυτήδεστος άθυμ(α)ν άλλον άλλον, ην άνασεις Κάλλιος - -; this same object occurs in II. 10-12 of σταθ. 661 d, where it is described as belonging to Artemis Brauronia. This latter piece of evidence strengthens the possibility that it is the same object which we have to deal with in the present fragment, in which case Κάλλιος would be the name of the wife of - - οική in l. 7. If we accepted the identity of the object in this inscription with the golden seal made to imitate worm-eaten wood, which is the meaning of θραυτήδεστος (see I. and S. s. v.), we should restore as follows: χρυσόν θραυτήδεστος άλλον άλλον άλλον άνασα Αρτ(τ)αιμονίας ην άνασεις Κάλλιος - - | (αυ)λίσιον γυν[α], στ(τ)αιμ(α)ν (τ)αι(σ)τις ιτ[ή]-]. But it does not claim to be at all a certain restoration, and least of all should it be used as definite evidence for restoring the length of the lines in this inscription.

5. Slab of Pentelic marble, complete on right and below; a cutting about .012 wide runs across the stone near the top and has destroyed some of the letters in II. 3 and 4. Height 325; breadth 275; thickness 095. Letters 005 high. In magazine of Acropolis Museum.
...ιούσιν ἀδικουμένοις...

5 (κ.) θεοὶ ἰδίαι τῶν δήμων | τῶν Ἀθηναίων καὶ τῶν Ἑρατείων ἐπαινεῖσαν[ε]
[δέοι τῶν δήμων?]... ἤραν καὶ Ἡρακλείδωρον | τοὺς πρεσβεὺς... ὅτι
πρόθυμοι ἦσαν περὶ τοῦ δήμου τῶν Ἀθηναίων καὶ ἐποίησαν ὅτι ἐδούνατο
10 ἠγαθοὶ καὶ ἀνθρωποὶ καὶ ἑρώτων προξένους | καὶ ἐνεργεῖσα τὸ
dήμο τῶν Ἀθηναίων, ἐπαινεῖσα | δέ τοὺς πρεσβεὺς τῶν Ἀθηναίων τὸς
tερμηθέντας | καὶ τοὺς πρέσβεις τὸν ὧν τῶν συνεχῶν, καὶ καλεῖσαι
15 ἐπὶ δεῖπνον εἰς τῷ παντοκράτειον εἰς ἄυριον οὔ ποιοῦμεν δὲ καὶ ἐφοίτησα τοὺς πρεσβεὺς τοὺς τάμιαν τοῦ δήμου εἰς τῷ κατὰ ψυχῆς ματα ἀναλικω-
[μένον τῷ δήμῳ τριμακοῦ τάραχας ἑκάστων α]τ[ραγάζει δὲ καὶ τῷ]
τροφείων, εἰ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ δοκεῖ, τὸν ἀρχαῖον τῆς Βουλής ἐν
20 στήλῃ Λ' [βιθύνη καὶ στήριξε], ἐν ἀκροτέρει δικὰ ἡμεῖς ἐὰν δὲ τὴν
ἀναγραφὴν τῆς στήλης δοῦναι τῶν ταμιῶν τοῦ δήμου εἰκοσὶ δραχμάς
ἐκ τῶν κατὰ ψυφῆς ματα ἀναλικωμένου τοῦ δήμου εἶναι δὲ τοῖς
25 [Ἀθηναῖοι!]... ὑπὸ τῶν ἄκιδων καὶ [θ]ὰ ἐπαγγέλει[λονται?]
The copy used by Köhler in the Corpus (loc. cit.) was made while the stone was still built into a late wall in the Parthenon, destroyed in 1904; in this position the first four lines were invisible, and the copy only gives M. ... ATΩ in l. 5, and EYEI, EPA in l. 6, and omits the first five letters in l. 7. The following differences of reading should also be noted: L. 8: ἔρῳ τονᾶθμ, K.; ἡπεῖτονᾶθμ, A. M. W. L. 9: ΚΕΡΑΙΟΥΝΩ ἘΞΥΜΑΧΩΝ, K.; the first letter is clearly Π and the others are all perfect. L. 10: the Π in προξενία is quite plain, though Köhler prints it as invisible. In l. 13 I see traces of the Υ before the Ε at the beginning: K. reads ΣΥΜΜΑΧΩΝ, but the stone clearly has ΕΞΥΜΜΑΧΩΝ. L. 14: ΘΡΩΥΤΑΝΕΙΟΝ, K.; ΘΡΕΥΤΑΝΕΙΟΝ, A. M. W. (clearly both are mistakes of the lapidary). L. 16: the Ν before παρά is clearly visible, as also are the Ι at the beginning of l. 17, and the Ν before προξενία in l. 18, all omitted by Köhler. L. 20: the top stroke of the Ε is visible before Ν at the beginning, and the line ends with Εί not Ε. L. 21, the Π of παρά is quite clear. L. 22: there are traces of a letter, which seems to be Π before the word δραχμή; but K. leaves a space. L. 23: I see traces of the Ν before the Π at the beginning. L. 24: ΠΗΝΤΟΝΑΚΙΔΩΝ, K.; ΠΗΝΤΟΝΑΚΙΔΩΝ, A. M. W.: Köhler also omits Λ at the end of the line, but it is quite plain on the stone.

These differences in the text are all unimportant, and many of the letters now visible at the edges of the stone were no doubt obscured by mortar. But by the uncovering of the first five lines the importance of the inscription is greatly enhanced, for we see that it records a treaty between Athens and Euboea. In the restoration of l. 6-24 I follow Köhler’s text, which presents no difficulties though the reading in the last line will call for a word or two of explanation.

In l. 1-3, it is impossible to restore the sense in full: we may, however, recognize in l. 2-3: ᾿τιπόν ἄμισσα(μ) ῥογόν, in l. 3: Σᾷπολεύσασθαι: the rest of the line is quite uncertain owing to the damage of the stone, and my squeeze showed nothing.

L. 4. (< - δτος μηριά ἀκοντότα) is plain: we may have the ending of some conjunctive such as [ἔγειρεν γηή] (cf. l. 3), but I have not ventured to restore it. It is surprising to have δτος and not δτος δα, but this usage is found occasionally in fourth century inscriptions 10 (I.G. ii. 1. 115, ii. 5. 574, 6 and 8).

The gap between ἀμισσατι and -α κατ' ᾿η συμμαχία we might fill thus [κατα ταύτη ἐσται τη φιλία κατα], which gives us the requisite number of letters in the line, namely 37; that this number is correct can be seen from the exactness with which the restoration of the subsequent lines fits our requirements. The inscription is strictly στοιχεῖον, except for an occasional letter added at the end of the line, as in l. 11, 12, 20, and 24.

10 Meisterhan, op. cit. p. 254, gives statistics of the relative frequency of the two uses, which show that ἐσται is found oftener than ἐστα: in Attic inscriptions in the first century B.C., after becoming increasingly common in the intervening centuries.
L. 7. It is hard to see what the first name is: ὶρεός is not a name that occurs elsewhere, nor does it seem to be the termination of any known name; it is possible that the lapis lazuli has written Η for ᾶ, and that we have the ending of some such name as Τυμάς ἔρεός. But in any case we cannot restore with safety. ὶρακλεοδῷρος is not found elsewhere in Attic inscriptions, but three persons of the name ὶρακλεοδῷρος are known (Kuechler, Prosop. Att., 6506-8), none of whom, however, is earlier than the second century B.C. But in ancient authors the latter name occurs more than once; 15 Aristotle (Pol. vii. 3, § 1303 a, 18) alludes to ὶρακλεοδῷρος of Oreus of Euboea, who revolved against the local oligarchy which favoured Sparta and set up a pro-Athenian democracy; this event took place in c. 377, 16 and one is tempted to wonder whether this is the actual occasion of the alliance recorded in our inscription. Henceleodorus may quite well be spelt with or without an iota, 17 and there are not likely to have been two prominent Euboeans of the same name living about the same time. But the date of our inscription is against the identification of these historical circumstances. Köhler on the evidence of the style of writing dates it to the 106th Olympiad (356-352), and this fact, coupled with the fact that the alliance recorded here is with the Euboeans in general and not with Oreus alone, makes the identification extremely improbable. But there is no valid reason why the same man should not appear some twenty years later, if we can find an occasion for the appearance of an Euboean embassy at Athens treating for an alliance. The occasion is easily found; it is the settlement of the Euboean cities after the successful Athenian expedition of 358/7 B.C. There is no need to cite here all the authorities of whom Diodorus is the most detailed, as they are collected by Grote (ch. 86); "Athen, he says, "fully accomplished her object; rescued the Euboeans from Thebes . . . . the Euboean cities, while acknowledged as autonomous, continued at the same time to be enrolled as members of the Athenian confederacy . . . ." But since Grote's day we have acquired another piece of evidence bearing on these events, namely the inscription 18 recording the honours voted to the Athenian envoys who went to Euboea to convey the terms on which the cities of Carystus, Chalcis, Eretria, and Histiaia were to re-enter the Athenian league. This inscription is dated by the mention of Agathocles' Archonship, which fell in the year 357/6. It would only be natural for a return embassy to be sent to Athens from Euboea to say, as we know from history already, that they accepted the terms; it would be equally natural for one of the deputies to be that same Henceleodorus of Oreus (Histiaia)—if he were still alive—who had shown his loyalist tendencies to Athens twenty years before and for these deputies to be feted in the usual way with a banquet at the πρωταρείον, and to be made προβέαρος, and for a stele to be set up on the

15 Paps-Jamodler, Wörterbuch der Griechischen Kinomane, s.v.  
17 See Meissner, op. cit., pp. 45, 46, for instances of the problematic use of μι for μι and εις εις, in fourth century inscriptions.  
18 I.L.G. ii. 1, 84, republished in Ath. Mitt., 1877, pp. 299 foll., and Hicks, 188.
Acropolis to record these events. Such a stele would mention the alliance between Athens and Euboea, without necessarily specifying the names of the separate cities, and would have been erected early in the 106th Olympiad. There can now be little doubt that it is this stele, but unfortunately only a part of it, that we are discussing here. A further argument, if any were needed, to support this attribution is the consideration that there was no other occasion within many years of this date to which the inscription could possibly allude. We can only regret that its upper part which contained the terms of the alliance is not preserved.

Finally we may note in l. 22 that ὰτικάς just fills the required space before ὑπηράκεια, and in l. 23 that we have some unusual formula to deal with. There is no doubt about the reading of the word ὰτικάς, but what it refers to is an insoluble puzzle; it is apparently the genitive plural of ἄσις, meaning a spike or the beak of a ship, and what connexion this has with the terms of an alliance is hard to see: καὶ θάλας ἐπαγγέλοντας, if this restoration is correct, means that some arrangement has been undertaken with regard to the matter, possibly mentioned on the missing part of the stone. It is more than likely, however, that it is an error of the lapidary; if we find such an error as ἱς ἐπαγγείλειν in l. 19, we may well suspect the strange word ὰτικάς to be a mistake; if it is a mistake, it is probably the word ἀδίκως spelt with ζ and ξ transposed: above, in ll. 2 and 4, we have allusions to ἄδικα, and they no doubt contained provisions against mutual injury. If this suggestion is right, the final term of the treaty may well allude to jurisdiction over offenders whether in Euboea or Athens: which probably the more powerful of the two parties in the alliance would claim. It might then be possible to restore Ἀθηναίοις ἔρματα τῶν ἄδικως, but, though this exactly fills the gap, I hesitate to restore it definitely, as it has no parallel.

6. Grey marble, complete from l. 8-11 on left; broken on all other sides. Height 175; breadth 17; thickness 0.6. Letters 0.5 high, στοιχεῖον. In magazine of Acropolis Museum.
The restoration of ll. 8 and 10 which is tolerably certain shows that the lines consisted of 29 letters. But this does not enable us to restore the whole text, nor indeed to see exactly what was the construction, which, particularly in ll. 5–8, is very confused. We can at any rate conclude that it is part of an honorary decree, in favour of someone unknown whose name begins with Δα–, and also that it is part of the preamble of the decree consisting of the speech of its mover: for the string of aorist indicatives can only have been introduced by ἐπεί, and the actual resolution was no doubt contained in the portion missing from below. Further we see from the beginning of 1. 8, which may be safely restored as οἱ ἐπεί ηθος, that one of the previous honours conferred on the recipient of the present decree came from the ἐπεί, and from l. 11 that he was more than once elected to posts of importance.

L. 1. Restoration is hopeless.

L. 2. We seem to have here some form of the words φιλότιμος, φιλοτιμία, or φιλοτιμείν: I have tentatively restored (φ)ιλο(τ)ιμ(ως), which may well allude to ἐπείφη(ά)μονειν in l. 4.

L. 3. We have no doubt to deal with some reference to the ἀθλιππασία, an equestrian event of some sort which figured in the programme of the Olympic and Panathenaic games. We have other epigraphical evidence for it in Dittenberger, Syll. 200 and 687. Its precise nature is unknown, but Dittenberger (note on 687) points out that it was in existence at least before the end of the first quarter of the fourth century, and perhaps considerably earlier. The word before it I would restore as τῇ(τε), perhaps εν τοιτοι τῇ(τε): we may at any rate expect some allusion to the date of the victory in the ἀθλιππασία in this line or the preceding. The suggested restoration ἀθλιππ(α)ία εἰς τῷ εἶπερ ἐπτεφή(ά)μονει is not entirely satisfactory, as it gives us one letter too few, but it is hard to see what else the sense can have
been. The completion of l. 4 is another problem: the letter after ρ at the end of the line is entirely defaced and we have nothing to help us to a restoration except the knowledge that this word contains the object of the verb [ἐστεφ] | ἄρωσεν. Unfortunately our information as to the procedure on such occasions is very limited, but a possible restoration would be τιν Ἔργερχομεν φιλὴν], meaning that the victor rewarded the tribe with a crown. This, however, is far from convincing and leaves us with a gap of five letters before διὰ τοῦτο in l. 5.

L. 5, 6. Further difficulties appear here, for we have apparently the formula ἐπιμεθώτευσα το καὶ ἐστεφάνασα[σω] repeated again in l. 7 and 8. There can be no doubt either that αὐτόν[π],—the π is practically certain,—is the object of the aorist third person plural, of which we have the last two letters at the beginning of l. 6, or that the formula ἐστεφάνω[μ] | ἃν, χρυσῷ στε[φ] | ἄρωσε is contained in the missing space between l. 6 and 7. If, as I have done, we restore of ἅπαξ after αὐτών, we exactly fill the space: but there seems no explanation, except complete mental confusion on the part of the engraver, for the repetition ἐπιμεθώσαν Δα[- - οί ἅπαξ, κ.τ.λ.:—πεῖς can hardly conceivably be any word but ἅπαξ in this context, and we know from I.G. ii. 612 that the ἅπαξ occasionally passed decrees honouring their benefactors. If we omitted the words αὐτών—στεφάνω (in l. 7) inclusive, the inscription would be simple and intelligible, or again, if we omitted the words ἐπιμεθώσαν—στεφάνω (in l. 9); but as it stands, with the adoption of the restorations suggested here, it cannot claim to be one or the other.

But even if these restorations are wrong, I venture to say that no alternative restoration will produce order out of this chaos. The restoration of l. 9 and 10 hardly calls for comment. But in l. 11 restoration is not so easy: we evidently have an allusion to some other office held (a second time?) by the recipient of the decree, and clearly connected with foreigners. The phrase we should expect would be στρατηγός ἐριδι οὐς ξένους, but this involves a line of thirty letters. In I.G. ii. 331 we have the same phrase, though there στρατηγός is understood from στρατηγός χειροτονηθεῖ—ἐπι τὰς παρακεκερωτέων just before: we may here have to supply some other word, of only eight letters,—for the rest of the line seems unassailable,—such as προξενω, though the phrase προξενος ἐπὶ ο栌 ξένους is quite unknown, or we may suppose that an extra letter (ιωτα) was added at the end of the line. We saw in the previous inscription (above, l. 11 and 20) that such a usage is not unknown in σταύρον inscriptions of the fourth century (it is in fact quite common), and if this is granted, στρατηγός would be highly probable. The precise duties attaching to this post are unknown: but it seems to be connected with the administration ξενισκόν ἀργυρίου, as we see from the next line but one.

The whole inscription may be compared with the present fragment with advantage: it likewise contains a long preamble to an honorary decree, consisting of a recital in sixty-six lines of which the beginning is missing, of the honourable career of the recipient, before the name arrives at the actual mention containing the vote of the crown.
L. 12 no doubt gives us the date of his tenure of this office, and Ἀργ., contains the key to it. It is not the beginning of the word Ἀρχ.οντος, but of the Archon's name, for there is apparently no case, prior to the Augustan age, of the word Ἀρχ.οντος preceding the proper name in this formula. We may conclude then that the Archon in question here had a name whose genitive case singular had eight letters: the phrase in question exactly filled this line; for the beginning of the next line cannot be restored as anything else but [τοῦ] τοῦ Ἐρικόν: our requirements are exactly suited by the word Ἀρχ.πτως, which I have restored above. There were two men of this name, but by a coincidence they held office within a very few years of each other, in 321/0 and 318/7 respectively. To settle which of them is the man in question is of course impossible; but we may date our present decree not before 320, and at the latest before 300. This date is roughly what one would expect from the character of the lettering.

The word after Ἐρικόν in l. 13 begins επαεις; the fourth letter is indubitable, and a very natural restoration is επαεις[ἐκ] ἀργυρίου, exactly fills the space before the end of the line, and [κατα] (τ)α the space before συντεταγμένα in the next line. The word Ἐρικόν is puzzling: το Ἐρικόν is found more than once in ancient authors as meaning the mercenary forces, and also, only in Aristotle's Politics, both the foreign population of Athens in general and as equivalent to το Ἐρικόν ἐκαστόριον; of these three usages, certainly the first is the most likely, particularly if we accept the conjecture στρατηγός above, which would naturally mean commander of the mercenaries. But if this is the right sense we must make it an adjective agreeing with ἀργυρίου, and translate 'funds for paying the mercenaries': Ἐρικόν ἀργυρίου might, however, mean 'imported coin,' as we find it in I.Ε. ii. 5. 334, b, l. 89, and the ἐπιμελεία of imported coin is a quite conceivable post, though we have no other knowledge of its existence. However, the whole passage is still doubtful except for the general sense, and it would be rash to claim certainty for a restoration of either l. 11 or l. 13. In l. 14 τοῦ κόμματος is not improbable.

The question, who passed the decree in favour of Δαρ.,—of which we have the introduction here is not solvable on the present evidence: it is just possible that, like the previous honorary decree he had received, which is recorded in II. 7-10, it also was passed by the ἰπτείς. But it is just as likely to have been passed by the ἐκκλησία or any other of the bodies capable of passing such decrees: indeed, judging by the fact that we have only one decree of the ἰπτείς as against the vast number of those of the ἐκκλησία and other bodies, the chance in favour of its being of the former class is practically infinitesimal. This question, like unfortunately so many others in connexion with this inscription, must remain open from lack of evidence.

18 Thuc. III. 25; Deym. 46, I. 20, etc.
19 Il. 5, 3.
20 Dih. 557, I. 321, and note 1532.

[Fragment]

... (ov) ...
... (o) ...

... δοῦναι τὸν ταμιᾶν κ.τ.λ., the usual phrase in Attic decrees for expressing the provision of a sum of money for defraying the cost of erecting the stele to record the decree.

L. 4 may thus be regarded as sufficiently certain to enable us to restore the number of letters in each line, namely 33: in l. 7 the στοιχεῖα arrangement is broken by Eι: taking the place of a single letter, and the last line, according to my restoration, contains only 30 letters, but this is, needless to say, unimportant. There is, however, nothing to guide us as to what exact position on the stone our fragment occupied. I have assumed in the restoration above that about five letters are missing on the left and twelve on the right: this has at any rate the advantage of not dividing up the shorter words such as εἰς, τὴν, κ.τ.λ., which the stone cutter would seem generally to try to avoid, and it may very well be the correct division.

In L. 3, assuming that the formula is restored correctly in detail, εἰκοσι is the most natural sum to fill the space, and thus I restore it.

L. 5, ἐπανειφθῶν: the actual part of the verb represented here is doubtful, but I incline to the view that it was an infinitive, expressing the purpose for which the ταμιᾶς was to pay the 20 (l) drachmae, and that the rest of the line explains what he had to do precisely. The use of the
infinitive in a final clause need not surprise one in an inscription: Meisterhans\(^2\) collects several instances of its use from inscriptions of the last thirty years of the fourth century. About its meaning there can be little doubt: it is used technically of making a correction in an inscription, and this exactly suits the context here. In Attic decrees a very common formula is that in which the ταμιάς is ordered to pay a sum for the erection of a stele to record a decree, and no doubt it was equally his duty to provide the money ἐκ τῶν κατὰ ψηφίσματα ᾿αναποκαμένων τῷ δῆμῳ, if any correction was ordered in an existing inscription. What was the correction ordered in this case it is impossible to say, but the letters missing after ἐπαυρθοῦν and contained the key to the puzzle. In the other instances of the use of this formula we\(^2\) have nothing to guide us here: possibly some such expression as περὶ τῆς στόλου, which contains the required number of letters, was what the stone cutter wrote, or it might have quoted the actual letters that stood in need of correction.

Ll. 6-9 contain the usual formula about putting the question to the vote in the ἐκλογεῖα: the space of sixteen letters between δὴν[ν] and τοὺς contained no doubt the subject of the vote, in fact of the decree. We may be fairly sure that it began with περὶ, but beyond that we are quite in the dark. It is far from improbable that the rest of the phrase was τὴν προφετείαν, but τῆς ἀναγραφῆς, referring to the stele, is just as likely, nor do these exhaust the list of possible alternatives, but the question is not of the first importance. At the end of the line Πα is clear on the stone, and in this place we should expect the name of a tribe, so the restoration Πα[τὸν] καὶ τὴν προφήτην ἐκ[θᾶρ] ἐκ[θὰς] ὑπὸ[ς] calls for no apology.

ARTHUR M. WOODWARD.

\(^2\) Jüttenh. Syll. 49, l. 49: 615, l. 4: 789.
\(^2\) Δευς ἀνάγραφει is used in the same sense, ibid.
\(^5\) L. 28. ἐπαυρθοῦν has other meanings as well in Attic inscriptions, but this particular use is not apparently found elsewhere.
THREE NEW VASES IN THE ASHMOLEAN MUSEUM.

[Plates XXX.-XXXII.]

The Ashmolean Museum has recently acquired three Attic vases with subjects of uncommon interest. The first (Pl. XXX.) is a b.-f. pelike with framed pictures. Each picture is bounded by a band of ordinary lotus-bud-pattern above, at the sides by net-pattern, and below by a clay line. A red band runs right round the vase immediately below the pictures, and a thinner red line, as is usual in panel-amphoras, surrounds the neck at the level of the handles. Red is also used for the beards and wreaths on side A, and on B for the beards, the front hair of 1 and 2, and patch on the goat's neck, the brim of 3's hat and the curved parts of his boots; white for the block and the joints of the folding-stool on A, and on B for the lines on the rock (which has also incised markings), and the chiton of 3 and the crown of his hat. The height of the vase is 40.6 cm., the width at the widest part 29.4 cm., and at the rim 18.4 cm.

The scene on side A is laid in a shoemaker's shop, and the representation has a parallel on the well-known amphora published in Mon. dell' Inst. xi. 29, and now in Boston.1 A third shoemaker-vase is the small r.-f. cup in the British Museum (E. 86).2 The Oxford vase shows a small male figure dressed in a himation standing on a table, one foot on the table itself, the other raised and placed on a piece of leather which is separated from the table by a thin white block, no doubt a piece of hard wood. He seems to steady himself by putting his hand on the head of the worker, a bearded man, who sits on a stool at the table, holding the leather with his left hand and cutting it round the foot with a knife. His himation is rolled round his waist and legs. Beside the table is a shallow vessel to catch the leather shavings; a similar vessel appears on both the other shoemaker-vases. To the right of the table a bearded man leans on the stick, his back turned, and looks on at the work; that he is the master of the shop we may gather from the corresponding figure on the Boston vase, whose hand is stretched out as if in command. His himation is worn in the same way as the customer's, and he seems to have boots on. A folding-stool stands.

---

1 Boston Report, 1902. shoemaker trying a shoe on a customer, is figured
between the master and the table. To right and left of him are the meaningless branches which are commonly found on late b.-f. vases. On the wall is a rack holding two awls, a knife and the cutting implement with semicircular blade (τενάριον) which is used by the shoemakers on the Boston and London vases. The large wreaths worn by the shoemakers are frequently given to workmen. 3

It will readily be seen by comparing the Oxford and Boston vases that both pictures are derived from a common original. The Boston picture is the better work: the accessories are more numerous and more carefully executed, and the composition is superior. Except the neck, all the objects on the wall are wanting in the Oxford vase, and there is only one workman at the table instead of two. The empty space is supplied by the meaningless floral filling and the second workman’s seat, which without the workman has no real justification for being in the picture. Moreover, though in both representations the figure standing on the table, on the principle of isosephaly, is too small for the others, this disparity is less shocking in the Boston vase, where the figure is female, than in the Oxford, where it is male. Indeed, the Oxford painter seems to have realised this fault, for he began to give the customer a beard, but stopped after incising the upper line, so as to allow the figure to look like a boy’s. The Boston amphora perhaps reproduces the original composition more closely.

The picture on side E is by no means so easy to interpret. The central figure is a Silen sitting on a rock, and supporting on his left an oblong object apparently furnished with short legs; his left hand is raised with the fingers joined, his mouth open as if speaking; a goat lies half-hidden behind the rock. In front of the Silen is a bearded man leaning on a knotted stick in an attitude which repeats that of the corresponding figure on side A, except that the legs are reversed, and looking down towards the Silen’s hands; he wears a short white chiton, mantle, patera, and boots with handles to pull them on by; and his long hair is gathered up behind. His features have nothing satyric; he is a traveller, that is all we can say for the present. Behind the rock is a second Silen, dancing gently with his mouth open, his hands over his breast. What is the meaning of this unique representation?

The object which the Silen holds on his knee is probably an abacus; and the gesture of his right hand closely resembles that of the oil-merchant on another b.-f. pelike (Pernice, Ἰστορ. viii, 1883, p. 180) who sits among his pots bargaining with a customer. 4 The Silen then is bargaining with the traveller.

Now the traveller is not necessarily Hermes, but he may be Hermes. But he has no kerykeion, and he has not come to deliver a message. This is some personal adventure of the god’s. Nor would such unofficial activity be without precedent in Hermes; for as we know he began early by

---

3 E.g. Gerhard, A.F. 316, 2 (notes).
4 This gesture is still among the Neapolitans.

significant of the conclusion of a bargain.
removing Apollo’s cattle, and later on in life, to cite a single instance, we find him dressed in a long cloak and leading a dog disguised as a pig, on the well-known r.-f. cup in Vienna. A number of folk-stories must have clustered round the popular figure of the wandering Hermes, and the mysterious Vienna cup shows that some of these stories have left little or no trace in the literary texts. Can we find any hint in the written tradition that will help us to the interpretation of the present scene?

It is possible that such a hint may be found in the Homeric hymn to Pan,* which tells how Pan and the nymphs dance together at evening and sing the story of the birth of the goat-footed god:

*ιδενεσιν δι’ θεοις μάκαρας καὶ μακρὸν Όλυμπων
 οἶνον θ’ Ἑρμείῳ ἐρισόντων ἠξογον ἄλλων
 ἐνετοι, ὡς οὐ’ ἀπασί θεοῖς θοός ἤγγελος εἶτι,
 καὶ δι’ ἐκ Ἄρκαδινος πολυπίδακα, μυτάρα μῆλιν,
 ἐξεῖτε, ἐνθα τε οἱ τέμενος Κυλλήνιον εὐτεῖς,
 οὕθ’ ὦν καὶ θεός ὁν φασάροτριχα μηλ’ εὐμυκεῦσαι,
 καὶ παρα ἄνθητος λαβε ἵππον ἱερός ἐπελθὼν
 νύμφῃ εὐπλοκάμῳ Δρύπος φιλάστης μηνίας
 ἐκ δ’ ἐγέλασεν μάρον θαλερόν, τέκε δ’ ἐν μεγάρωσιν
 Ἑρμείῃ φίλον νιόν, ἀφαρ τερατωπὸν ἱδειθαι, κ.τ.λ.

Now we know that the worship of Pan only spread beyond Arcadia at the beginning of the fifth century, and the story of Pheidippides in Herodotus illustrates its introduction into Athens just after Marathon. The new stories he brought with him would be welcomed by the Athenian dramatists, and we may well suppose that a satyric play was written on the Marriage of Hermes, in which the first scene would show that deity bargaining with his future father-in-law about the price he was to receive for his service. Dryops, the dweller in rude Arcadia, might well appear in the form of a Silenos, a form which moreover would be not unsuitable to the grandfather of so wild a creature as Pan, the τέρατως ἤδειθας, and the favourite of Dionysos (H. H. Pim. 46). The interest of the play would centre round the negotiations between the crafty Hermes and the shrewd Silenos-Dryops; the love-interest would be small or wanting and Hermes’ bride might never even appear; indeed this Rachel seems to have had little personality, for the Homeric Hymn gives her no name. Here then we have our explanation; the seated figure is Dryops as a Silenos, with a goat beside him to suggest his flocks; the standing Hermes bargaining with him; and the dancer one of the friends of Dryops, of whom the chorus in the play would be composed. The vase-picture would not be a direct transcript from the play, but the play would have much to do with putting the legend into shape and making it fit for artistic presentation.

The date of 460 given us by the story of Pheidippides would not be too

---

* Masner, Fig. 24: No. 241.
* Allen and Silen. Homeric Hymns, Intrad.
* H. H. Pim. 27-36.
* Hymn to Pan.
late for our pelike. The pelike form belongs essentially to the red-figure period; the not very numerous b.-f. examples are none of them early, but contemporary with the early r.-f. style. The Homeric hymn is also assigned by authorities to the 5th century. 3

The second vase (Pl. XXXI.) is an early r.-f. krater a solenastile with a single unframed figure on each side. The simplicity of the figure-decoration demands that the ornamentation should be simple also, and accordingly the sole ornament is the usual band of b.-f. lotus-bud-pattern on the neck (and that only on side A), and the usual rays round the base. The height is 38.7 cm., the width at the rim including the handles 37.4 cm. and the diameter of the body 31.7 cm. There is a reserved space between the rays and the black grooved feet; red is used for the wreaths and the string of the sponge, and thinned glaze-paint for the musculature and the whiskers; the contour of the hair is reserved; there is no relief-line for the contour of the feet; the eye on A is closed in front, with the pupil towards the inner edge of the eye, and open at both ends on B.

On side A a naked youth is preparing to throw the diskos, in a position not unlike the position of the Diskobolos of Naukydes, though a closer parallel is to be found in a figure on the Epictetos-cup in the Berlin Museum. 4 The diskos is held up in the left hand on a level with the neck, the body leans a little backwards and is half-turned towards the left side, the weight being on the left leg, and the right arm is raised with the fingers loose. The athlete is feeling his feet. When he has reached the right position, he will swing round to the left, transferring the diskos to his right hand. On side B is another athlete in quick movement to the left, looking back and raising his left hand; we must probably interpret this figure by taking it in connexion with the figure on side A: looking round, the athlete sees that his friend is about to throw, and starts out of the path of the diskos with a gesture meaning 'Wait a moment!' In the left hand the athlete holds a long doubled thong; he is a boxer, and it is the himas which he will presently wind round his hand.

The owl which is painted in silhouette on the diskos is one of a number of charges often placed on diskoi in vases. Jüttner (Antike Vasenrath, p. 29) gives a list of these charges with instances. The owl, though not so common as the various forms of cross or svastika, is not infrequent, and to Jüttner's examples we may add: two r.-f. cup fragments in the Louvre, a r.-f. lekythos in the Cabinet des Médailles (487), and another in Bologna, and a Nolan amphora in Brussels (A 271). The charge on the diskos in B.M. F 58 may well be the short-bodied Athene acetum. This silhouette owl must be taken to represent not, for obvious reasons, an intaglio, but an incised outline owl on the real diskos, in the same technique, that is, as the majority of the engraved votive diskoi preserved in the museums, of which a list has been given by Mr. E. N. Gardner, 5 and of course as the svastikas

---

3 K. B. G. 1903-2; Louvre, F 579; Vatikan, Mon. 2, 446; Vienna, Leberde, 2, 30-1; Corinth, Jakob, vlll. 1893, p. 186.
4 Alien and Sikas, Ith. 8. 1901, p. 372.
5 W. Gerhard, J. F. 272.
6 J.R. S. 1907, p. 9.
and other linear ornaments on the representations of diskoi on vases. These incised designs may have served the practical end of making the diskoi less slippery to the hand; and the owl would of course be lucky in the city of Athena.

An interesting technical detail is to be observed on side B: The dots which bounded the hair at the back of the head were originally placed too low, and had to be painted over; a similar correction occurred in the hydra in the style of Phintias published in Furtwangler-Reichhold, Gr. V, Pl. 71, 23a.

The present scheme of decoration—a single unframed figure on each side—is much less common for kraters a colonnette than the framed compositions of several figures; another early example is Berlin 4027,13 and a later (transition to fine style) Vienna 340,14 on early r.-f. amphorae it is not infrequent and it became the rule in the so-called amphora of Nola. It is to the time of these earlier amphorae that our krater belongs, but the style is not individual, and it cannot be assigned to any particular artist. Indeed the krater a colonnette does not seem to have attracted the painter, for the representations seldom reach a high level of merit, and the usual ornamentation always remains that which we associate with the b.-f. period. The reason for this neglect is probably to be found in the rivalry of the nobler volute-krater; when an artist wished to put forth his powers on a krater, he naturally turned to the more splendid shape. The output therefore divided itself into two distinct classes; the volute-krater, more expensive and more beautifully decorated, and the ordinary and cheaper article, the krater with columnar handles.

The third vase (Pl. XXXII.), a bell-krater of somewhat late r.-f. style, adds another to the representations we already possess of work in a potter’s shop. The ornament consists of a laurel-wreath round the rim; underneath the pictures only, bands of stopped unjoined meander in pairs separated by saltire-cross-squares; and round the bases of the handles egg-pattern. The height is 35.5 cm., and the width at the rim 37.4 cm. The reverse B has three careless mantle-figures.

The space on side A is divided by a pillar. To the left of the pillar is the painter’s room. A young man dressed in an exomis and seated on a stool is painting the background of a large bell-krater of the same shape as our vase. His left arm is inside the krater, the rim resting on his thigh, and he is applying a large brush to the lower part. At his side is a low stand, supporting the skyphos-shaped vase which contains the black paint. In front of the painter a fellow-workman moves to the right carrying a second krater by both handles. He has lifted it from the ground beside the painter and is carrying it out to put it down beside a third krater which stands on the ground at the extreme right of the picture. Presently the hatch will go to the furnace. Beyond the pillar is another workman who moves to the

---

13 Ammès, 1877, W.
14 Manier, Taf. 6.
right in the same attitude as the last. In his raised right hand he holds a skyphos by the foot. Perhaps he is taking it to join a batch of vases of the same shape, but more probably he has been sent by the busy painter to fetch more paint. The skyphos is the usual vessel for holding paint; it appears as a paint pot on the Caputti-hydra (Ann. d. I. 1876, D). A pleasant rhythm is thus imparted to the scene; the first figure is occupied with both vase and paint; the second with vase; and the third with paint.

In the field of the picture are a number of objects which must be conceived as hanging round the walls of the factory. They are not show specimens to impress visitors, but utensils employed by the workmen themselves. They are roughly drawn, and the identification is in some cases uncertain. The first object has a less special function than the others; it is probably a klyix for the workmen to drink from when thirsty. The second is a bowl to pound the solid ingredients of the paint in; the next is probably a brush-case; the fourth a dish for holding the colour after the addition of liquid and before it is passed through the strainer—for this is what the last object appears to be—into the skyphos ready for use.

The hasty execution of this vase does not call for much comment; but the picture is not without life, and the painter has contrived to give it an air of animation and business which places vividly before our eyes the conditions of the potter’s art in the fifth century B.C.

J. D. Beazley,

Postscript.

Of the early R.-L kraters the following are those which most resemble the Oxford vase in style.

2. Ibid. A. athletes: B. kottabos.
3. Once Catania, coll. Ricupero (Benndorf, Gr. a, Sir. Vaseb., 41. 2). 
A: symposion; B. athletes (?).
5. Ibid. 3981. A. Hercules with tripod: B. athlete with akontion.

These kraters all belong to the same period and exhibit the same artistic tendency, a tendency which finds higher expression in the cups and amphorae of the time. The cup with athletes in the Cabinet des Médailles (Hartwig, Meistersch. Taf. 16) is closely akin.

\[14\] Duxenberg-Saglio, s. v. "Pictura."
\[15\] Ibid.
If the famous sites on the mainland of Greece have been largely exhausted—and the only great classical cities now being excavated are Sparta and Corinth—the outlying parts of the Greek world continue to yield a harvest of discoveries, increasingly interesting as they are added to a constantly increasing body of archaeological knowledge. Thus Crete, Delos, Rhodes, and the great cities of Asia such as Miletus and Pergamon continue to give up fresh treasures, and the neolithic and bronze age remains of north Greece and the island of Leukas are adding a new chapter to the book of Greek prehistoric archaeology.

The one great mainland site not yet fully excavated is the most interesting of all, but owing to material difficulties Athens for the present reserves her secrets. The excavation of the Agora, the great task before the Greek Archaeological Society, has now indeed been begun by the clearing of an area east of the Theseum and ancient walls have been found, but they cannot be identified with any known buildings, nor do the inscriptions discovered give any topographical indications. This is, however, only a beginning, and the area ultimately to be excavated is very much larger. It extends on the north to the railway-bridge, on the east at least to the Stoa of the Giants, and on the south to the Areopagus. The land is now all built over, and the expenses of expropriation, as the law now stands, are prohibitive. Some such special decree, as that by which the modern village on the site of Delphi was removed, will be necessary, and when it has been obtained the most important results may be looked for.

Interesting work has been done in piecing together the pre-Persian sculpture in the Acropolis Museum. This has been undertaken by Dr. Schrader and Dr. Heberdey, and their long study of the fragments has led to some very fine reconstructions. Dr. Schrader has worked upon the marbles, with the result that one entirely new Kore figure has been put together, and three others much improved by the addition of their feet. Legs have also been fitted to the statues of horses. Dr. Heberdey has devoted himself to the coloured poros sculpture, and has reconstructed with great skill a group of a bull attacked by a lioness.

A terracotta figure has recently been found in a tomb at Zará near Monemvasia which has directed attention to the problem of the restoration of the missing arms of the Venus of Milo. The terracotta is eighteen inches high, and represents Aphrodite in a similar attitude semi-nude.
right hand holds the drapery at her waist, and her left a mirror. Dr. Stais has published the figure, with the conclusion that, though similar in motive, the resemblance is not sufficient to make it a safe guide for a restoration of the statue.\(^1\)

The most remarkable discovery of the Greek Archaeological Society in the year 1907 was made on the site of Pagasae by Dr. Arvanitopoulos, Ephor of Antiquities for Thessaly. He excavated a small tower of the fifth century, round which a large tower had been hastily built in the Roman period, in order to add to its strength. The material for packing the foundations of this later work, and for filling the space between it and the older building, was taken from a necropolis, and consisted of hundreds of grave stelai. These were decorated not with reliefs but with paintings. Their shape has nothing unusual. They terminate above in a gable, below which are often two rosettes, and below these the inscription, all painted on the flat stone. Below this again is the funereal picture. The subjects are those usual on Greek grave stelai, and Dr. Arvanitopoulos considers that many of the motives are derived from the famous works of Greek painters mentioned by Pliny. The stelai themselves are plainly the excellent works of quite ordinary craftsmen.

In all 1005 pieces have been found, some thirty stelai being complete. On twenty the colours are very well preserved. The outlines of the figures are firmly drawn in black, and a full range of colours is used. The tints are not flat but shaded. From the lettering of the inscriptions they may be dated to the period between the fourth and the second century B.C., and one of them was set up to a soldier killed at the capture of Phthiotic Thebes by Philip V in 217. As specimens of Greek painting their value cannot be overstated, and their study will largely increase our knowledge of its processes, and of the skill of Greek artists in chiaroscuro and perspective. All care has been taken to preserve the paintings, and the seven best were at once copied by M. Gilliéron, and will shortly be published by the Society. The stelai themselves remain in the museum at Volo. Adjacent towers are shortly to be excavated, as it is possible that more of these interesting works may soon be brought to light.\(^2\)

Dr. Stais' discovery of colossal archaic statues at Sunium was noticed in this report a year ago.\(^3\) The excavation has now been continued southeast of the temple, and more fragments have been found, including the shins of the Apollo now in the National Museum. Many important pre-Persian votives are also reported, including scarabs and other small objects of Egyptian art. Remains of houses on each side of the road from the harbour to the temple have been uncovered.

The Society has worked also at Tegea, in Arcadia, at Mycæs, where Dr. Tsountas has cleared and strengthened the Tomb of Clytemnestra, at the Amphiarœion at Oropos, continuing the excavation of the buildings that

\(^{1}\) *Ep. Aeg. 1898, p. 135, Pls. VI., VII.*

\(^{2}\) *Published in* 'Ep. Aeg. 1899, p. 1, Pls. I.-IV.

\(^{3}\) *J.R.S. xvii. p. 234.*
probably were used by the pilgrims to the shrine, and in Euhoia, where 
Mr. Papavasiliou reports a tomb of Mycenaean construction and furniture 
with cremated remains. He has also continued excavating prehistoric 
tombs at Chaícis.

As a tribute to the memory of Furtwaengler, whose death in October 
1907 broke off the excavation of the site of the Throne of the Amphiacian 
Apollo, the Society has paid the expenses of the completion of the work. 
This has involved the removal of the church of Hagia Kyriaki, which 
occupied the top of the hillock. The result will appear in a publication in 
memory of Furtwaengler.

Dr. Kavvadias has again devoted himself chiefly to Epidauros, where 
the study of the fragments of the Tholos of Polykleitos has led to important 
results. I quote Dr. Kavvadias' words: 'The scientific results of this work 
are such that we may say without exaggeration, that we now for the first 
time know this famous building as it really was. The basement, the 
constituents of the wall and the floor, the base of the Corinthian columns, 
and the beautiful and richly adorned marble door have now been recovered 
with certainty.'

In the same careful way the work on the Erechtheion has been con-
tinued, and it has been found possible to replace the greater part of the 
South wall. In these operations the exhaustive study of the Erechtheion, 
stone by stone, by the American architect Mr. Stevens has been of great 
service. His drawings are to be published, but this has been delayed by the 
death of Dr. Heermance, the director of the American School, who was 
to have supplied the text.

The campaign of the British School at Sparta was almost entirely devoted 
to the excavation of the Sanctuary of Artemis Orthia, and a fourth season 
will be needed to finish the site. In 1907 the sixth-century temple was 
cleared, and the arena of the Roman amphitheatre in front of it. In this 
arena a large altar was found which was covered up when the temple was 
built, and is probably as old as the ninth century. The task this year was 
to explore further the deposit of votive offerings that gathered round this 
old altar, and if possible to find the early temple contemporary with it. 
This plan made it necessary to remove a good deal of the foundations of the 
Roman amphitheatre, and as in previous years many inscriptions were found 
used as building material.

Underneath this Roman masonry to the east of the altar the remains of 
houses of the fifth and fourth centuries were found. These were outside the limit 
of the original temenos. The removal of the masonry on the other side of the 
site immediately to the south of the temple was even more profitable. Here we 
first found a rich deposit of objects dating from immediately after the 
construction of the temple, and so to the last half of the sixth and first half 
of the fifth century. They were distinctly later in character than the
votives associated with the archaic altar, and the deposit was very rich in
the curious terracotta masks, of which a number were found in the first
season. These may now be confidently assigned to this period. Earlier than
this they are rare. Below this stratum, and underneath the layer of
building-chips which marked the period of the construction of the sixth
century temple were the remains of a building, which is no doubt the very
early temple associated with the archaic altar. Only part of the west and
south walls remains, as the rest of it was destroyed by the foundation of the
later building. It stands at one edge of a large area roughly paved with
cobble stones, near the opposite edge of which is the altar.

Of the walls of this temple only the foundation course is preserved,
consisting of small unworked stones and vertical slabs. The mass of burned
earth, which overlay these foundations, shows that the upper part of the
wall was made of mud-brick. Down the centre of the temple is a row of
flat stones, and these correspond in position with flat stones built into the
side and end walls. It seems probable that all these supported baumks of
timber, of which those in the wall must have formed a framework, holding
the building together, whilst those in the interior were columns supporting
the roof, which was most likely a gable. This wood and mud temple must
be contemporary with the arcaic altar, and with it go back to the eighth or
ninth century B.C. It is noticeable that at this early period the altar is on a
larger scale than the temple, which only served as a house in which to keep
the cult-statue. There are, in fact, traces at the west end of the temple of a
small cela for this purpose.

For the history of Greek architecture these remains are of great
interest, and to judge from the simplicity of the plan we have here a
building even more primitive than the wooden Heraion at Olympia or the
old temple at Thermos. It is noteworthy that Doerpfeld had already
deduced that the prototype of the Doric style was a brick and timber
building.

The votive offerings found in this archaic stratum were again very
numerous and important. The carved ivories in especial are even better than
before. Two pieces are in a style not hitherto found of very deep and even
undercut relief, recalling the treatment of metopes. Of these one represents
a centaur stabbed by a Lapith, and the other Prometheus torn by the eagle.
A certain development in style is now traceable, and it seems possible to
distinguish between the Ionian style of some of the earlier examples, which
points especially to influence from Ephesos, and the native style which grew
up at Sparta itself.

The pottery in these deposits ranges from Geometric to fifth and fourth
century. It was noticed last year that the Orientalising pottery at Sparta
was of a peculiar kind akin to Cyrenaic, and a full series has now been
obtained of this fabric. It follows the Geometric, develops through a pre-
Cyrenaic phase into true Cyrenaic, and finally ends as a manifest degeneration of the style in the fifth century. One very fine kylix has been recovered practically complete. So little other pottery has been found that this Cyrenaic series is undoubtedly local, and we are led to the important conclusion that the authorities who regarded Cyrenaic ware as Laconian were right, although their view, now so fully supported, has not been generally accepted. Next year it is proposed to remove more of the Roman foundations, and explore thoroughly what remains of the earlier strata. It is possible that the shrine of Eleithyia, which was not far from that of Orthia, may be discovered.\(^6\)

Another British excavation was carried out in September, 1907, and March, 1908, by Professor Burrows and Mr. Ure at Rhitaôna in Boeotia, the probable site of Mycalessos. A row of tombs was dug, mainly of the latter half of the sixth century. There were some very fine individual finds, but the chief interest of the excavation is that it gives some idea of the comparative date of early Boeotian pottery. The cemeteries of Boeotia have yielded enormous quantities of objects, but the excavations have nearly always been illicit. This gives great value to even a small excavation with a proper record of what objects were found together in the same tomb. Professor Burrows has now proved that Boeotian Geometric vases are not confined to the eighth and seventh centuries, but continued in use until the end of the sixth, as nearly every grave with this fabric contained also objects that can scarcely be earlier than 500 B.C.\(^7\)

A row of later tombs parallel to these was opened in March of this year. Outside the tombs, which were built of stone slabs, were masses of black glaze pottery and figurines of the Tanagra style, and inside a few plain vases, a strigil, beads, or a single statuette. These objects resemble those in the National Museum at Athens from the graves of those who fell at Chaeronea.

Mr. Wace and Mr. Droop have again excavated in Thessaly in the name of the British School, with the aid of a grant from the Cambridge University Worts Fund. The site chosen was Zerêlia near Almyró in Phthiotis. All recent topographers have considered this to be the site of Ithnos. This has now been proved impossible by the sanctity of the Greek remains, and the fact that none of them are earlier than the latter part of the fourth century. This, however, hardly touched the real interest of the site, for below these remains the excavators found a rich neolithic deposit from six to eight metres thick. This has been explored, and consists of the débris of eight superposed settlements, the strata being clearly marked off by the layers of burnt mud brick of which the huts of the successive villages were built. The pottery is nearly all hand-made. In the earliest settlements it either has a polished red surface or is painted with
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\(^6\) The results of these excavations are published every year in the *Annals of the British School at Athens.*

\(^7\) These notes are mainly from the report of a paper read by Professor Burrows before the Hellenic Society in November 1907.
decorative patterns in red on a white ground. In the later strata the pottery is either a fine black or a coarse red polished ware. Sunk into the top of the eighth and last neolithic settlement were several cist-graves of the early bronze age. This last village, although neolithic, dates probably from about the twelfth century B.C., as several fragments of late Mycenaean pottery were found amongst its remains. The first settlement therefore must belong to a very remote period, and the excavators, to whom I am indebted for these notes, suggest the first half of the third millennium B.C. The painted ware from the earlier strata closely resembles that found at Chaeronea by Dr. Sotirriadhis. It is also contemporary with the painted pottery found by Professor Tsountas at Sesklo and Dhimini in Thessaly, some fragments of which were found with it, whilst this Zerelia pottery was also found at Sesklo and Dhimini.

Mr. Wace and Mr. Drew have also found this red-on-white ware of the Chaeronea-Zerelia type on prehistoric sites near Lamia and Pharsala, so that it seems to have been used over a large area. The evidence of this excavation points to the Bronze Age in northern Greece having begun very much later than in the southern Aegean region.

The excavation at Chaeronea by Dr. Sotirriadhis just mentioned as having yielded red-on-white pottery like that from Zerelia is of great importance in this connexion. The site is a neolithic tumulus near the Chaeronea railway station, and last summer great progress was made in its excavation. The finest of the pottery is the red-on-white ware mentioned above as having been found at Zerelia. There is also a fabric with dark matt paint resembling Furtwaengler's 'hand-made early Mycenaean' from Aegina, and a black ware with linear ornament in white, in which Dr. Sotirriadhis sees a predecessor of the Cretan Kamares pottery. He also traces a development from the other wares to the Mycenaean, and is led by this to suggest as a date the end of the third millennium B.C.

That there may be some Aegean influence in these fabrics is not unlikely, but the fact that the neolithic age lasted so long in this region (at Zerelia until the late Mycenaean period), seems to me to be strongly against the view that they played any part in the development of Aegean and Mycenaean pottery. Their origin and relations are more likely to be sought for further north in the Balkan Peninsula.

Fresh discoveries continue to be made in Crete. In the earlier years of the work the finds were generally Late or Middle Minoan, and the Early Minoan period, chiefly because it was not well represented at Knossos and Phaistos, remained comparatively obscure. In later years our knowledge of it has been much increased by the Italian and Greek discoveries in the Messara, and still more by the work of the American excavators in the neighbourhood of Gournia. This year Mr. Seager's work on the island of
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* The excavation will be published in the Annual of the British School at Athens, 1905, p. 85. See also Arch. Mitt. 1905, 1906.

* The excavation has been published in the latest number of the Εφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική.
Moklo's has given an entirely new idea of its capabilities, and these discoveries, together with Dr. Xanthoudhidis' increasing evidence for the thickness of the population at this remote time, are the most important achievements of the year. Beside these, work has been carried on at Knossos, and by the Italian Mission at Phaistos and at the archaic Greek site at Prinias.

The most important part of Dr. Evans' work at Knossos this spring has been the excavation of the building which he has called 'the Little Palace.' This lies west of the Great Palace, with which it is connected by a paved way, 'the oldest road in Europe.' Here had already been found the shrine containing the curious fetishes, natural stones bearing a grotesque resemblance to the human form, belonging to the period of Minoan decadence, and a fine hall, which pointed to a building of importance. This has now been excavated, in spite of considerable difficulties. It is a very large building, with a frontage of more than 114 feet, and an area of over 9400 square feet. The remains of stone staircases prove that it possessed at least two storeys. The date assigned is the close of the Middle or the very beginning of the Late Minoan age, that is about the seventeenth century B.C. It contained a shrine of great interest. This consisted of a chamber with two pillars of the kind now familiar in Cretan sanctuaries. This room seems to have formed a kind of crypt, for the ritual objects found came apparently from a room above. One of these is a stepped base of steatite, provided with a socket above—in other words, the typical base for the shaft of one of the sacred double axes of the Cretan sanctuaries. The other object was a black steatite ritual rhyton of remarkable and unique workmanship. The horns were probably of wood, but the only remains are part of the gold foil with which they were overlaid. The nostrils are inlaid with a kind of shell, and the eyes, one of which is perfectly preserved, were made of rock crystal, the pupil and iris being indicated by means of colours applied to the lower face of the crystal, which has been hollowed out, and has a certain magnifying power.

In the Palace area proper work has been done along the southern front, and many interesting objects found, apparently part of the débris from the destruction of the Palace. Dr. Evans mentions cult objects, vases, stucco painted with designs, 'back-work' on crystal, tesserae for mosaic work, and lastly a fragment of a very finely undercut relief in ivory of a griffin seizing a bull.

The south-western quarter of the Palace, reported a year ago, has been explored, and seems chiefly to consist of another large official residence. The excavation of the great rock-cut vault discovered last year has presented great difficulties, and is not yet completed. Its rock floor has, however, been reached at the extraordinary depth of about 52 feet from the original summit of the cupola.

The necessity of preserving the Palace from the ravages of the weather

* These notes are from an account published in the Times by Dr. Evans.
has always been recognised at Knossos, and this year again much has been done towards the restoration and preservation of the Domestic Quarter.

It is very interesting to note that a house-floor has been found with a rich store of Early Minoan pottery. Up to now this period has been but poorly represented at Knossos; most of the material has come from the Messara and the American excavations at Gournia and the neighbouring islets. Our ideas of the capacities of this early stage of Cretan culture have been much enlarged this year by Mr. Seager’s remarkable excavation at Moklos, certainly the most important to be recorded from Crete. The gold jewellery especially has been described by Dr. Evans as being ‘as beautifully wrought as the best Alexandrian fabrics of the beginning of our era.’

Moklos is an islet only half a mile long about two hundred yards off the north coast of Crete, near the port of the modern deme of Tourlou. It is not far from Pseira, another island upon which Mr. Seager excavated a Minoan town in 1906 and 1907. The sea between Moklos and the mainland of Crete is so shallow that there may well have been an isthmus at some time. If so, the harbour so formed would have been the best in the neighbourhood.

The settlement has two main periods. The first and most important is the Early Minoan town, which was destroyed at the beginning of the Middle Minoan period. In Middle Minoan times there seems to have been only a poor village on the island, but at the end of this period the town was rebuilt, and lasted until the catastrophe, which destroyed also Gournia and Pseira. This destruction took place at a time when Late Minoan II. vases had come into use, though possibly as importations: the local Late Minoan I. style lasting on in these towns right into the Palace period of Knossos, and was thus probably contemporary with the destruction of the Palace of Knossos. This later town shows strong Knossian influence in its architecture. The most important finds were some large bronze basins. The destruction was by fire, and every house showed signs of a violent conflagration. In many cases human remains were found amongst the masses of charred wood and ashes. The ruins were much disturbed later by the construction of a port for a Graeco-Roman settlement on the coast a little to the east.

The Early Minoan settlement is much more important. The cemetery lies on a steep slope on the south-west face of the island. Twenty-four graves were opened. Eighteen of these were small, about half Early and half Middle Minoan. These yielded about 300 terracotta vases, 130 stone vases, and about 150 gold ornaments. There were also a good many weapons and seals, the earlier of which are of ivory. These ivory seals are a marked feature of the Early Minoan sites in the Messara plain.

The six remaining tombs were even more important. They all date from Early Minoan II. and III., and are large chamber-tombs like the contemporary rectangular ossuaries at Palaiakastro and the tombs found by Dr. Xanthoudidhis at Drakonmas, which are mentioned below. They are in
two groups of three each, one set facing on a small paved court. The chambers are built of large slabs set on end, with a doorway close by a flat slab of great size. The walls are in places preserved to a height of two metres. The roofs have disappeared. The contents were very rich. There are many stone vases of alabaster, limestone, breccia, many kinds of sienite, and occasionally of marble. They are of very fine workmanship, often as thin as a modern teacup, and very much superior to the pottery of the period. Still more remarkable are the numerous gold ornaments, diadems, chains, pendants, hair-pins and strips for sewing to garments. The work is quite as delicate as anything found later. A few of the diadems, which are thin bands one to two inches wide and twelve long, bear geometrical designs of a simple character incised with a blunt tool. The work in general strikingly resembles that of the gold work from the tombs at Mycenae, except that it is far more primitive, and the patterns all of the simplest character. The technique of the artists was far in advance of their knowledge of design. With these ornaments and stone vases were found dagger blades of the short triangular shape characteristic of the Early Minoan period, ivory seals and the usual pottery, the mottled red-and-black ware first found by Mr. Sanger at Vasiliki, burned black bucheiro, and the Early Minoan III, light-on-dark style. In the eighteen smaller tombs all the finer things came from the earlier burials, the Middle Minoan tombs being notably poorer than the Early Minoan. The daggers in the later tombs lose the early triangular form, and became decidedly longer, and at last (M. M. III.) acquire a pronounced midrib.

Near the surface over these earlier graves was a series of burials in inverted jars. These belong to Middle Minoan III, and Late Minoan I, and all the bones are those of children. The only other Late Minoan I, burial was again near the surface over an earlier tomb. It yielded several bronze bowls, two seal-stones, and a very fine gold signet ring in perfect preservation. The design on this makes it one of the most interesting things that have been found in Crete. A goddess is represented seated with her sacred tree in a curiously shaped boat with a bow shaped like a horse's head. This boat is moving away from the shore, upon which stands a small shrine. Only the door of this is visible on the extreme right. The goddess is beckoning to a flaming figure-of-eight shield, which seems to be flying towards her from the shrine. Higher up in the field is what may be a double axe, and another as yet unknown object. This ring must rank with the famous rings of Mycenae as a document of first-rate importance for Cretan religion. 12

Dr. Xanthoudhidhis' excavations in 1907 and the summer of this year illustrate the condition of the Messara plain in the Early Minoan period. The work, as in previous years, has centred round the settlement at Komos, in the neighbourhood of which a number of tombs have been opened. Thus tholos tombs have been found at Christo, Salami and
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12 This account of these unpublished excavations I owe to notes very kindly sent me by Mr. Sanger.
Kountokéra, all Early Minoan, but unfortunately almost entirely pillaged. A new settlement and two tholos tombs are reported from Drnikonas. One of the tombs had been much altered and almost entirely emptied in the Mycenaean period, but the other was untouched. It contained many bodies, either lying on the ground, or buried in clay chests (kápyra) or pithoi, with stone vases and two steatite seals. In connexion with this tholos were some small rectangular chambers containing similarly buried bodies and many Middle Minoan I. vases. These square tombs are of the same kind as those from Moklós. Dr. Xanthoudhidhisis says nothing of any signs of cremation in these tombs.

On this point the discoveries at Porti throw some light. In 1906 a large tholos tomb was found, dating like the rest of the tholoi in the Koumássi district from the Early Minoan period. The bones in it were burned (kóma katóγμα τα γεκαμμένα). Now a burial-trench (taphos) has been found at the same place full of human bones and Middle Minoan objects. In this later burial, however, there are no signs of cremation. The circular ossuaries or tholoi at Koumássi, in which signs of burning were observed, are at least prevalently Early Minoan, and there is no evidence of any cremation later than this in Minoan Crete. These accumulating signs of an earlier custom of cremation are clearly of great importance.

A Mycenaean settlement was found at Tsougrómin, and one large house (12 × 14 metres), finely built of gypsum blocks, was excavated.

Dr. Xanthoudhidhisis points out that the most important result of the year’s work is to show that the Messara plain was thickly inhabited in the Early Minoan period, no less than seven settlements with their tombs having now been found within a radius of about three miles from Koumássi. Their similarity points to the homogeneity of the population, and no doubt many more such sites remain to be discovered. If future work should prove that this early population regularly burned their dead, it will be necessary to look for the reason why in later times the practice was discontinued.

This summer a tholos tomb was excavated at a site called Triakókulos, near the village of Kalathiana, one hour north-west of Gortyn. It had been pillaged fifty-five years ago by the peasants, and the great store of gold ornaments found melted down to make modern jewellery. In spite of this, a little gold was left, ten ivory seals with geometric designs, five triangular and two elongated bronze daggers. The sherd were Early Minoan II. and III., with one polychrome Kumákos cup. The ivory seals and triangular daggers are characteristically Early Minoan. The elongated daggers are a little later in type, and the much destroyed settlement found close by yielded mainly Middle Minoan I. sherds. The walls of the houses show the peculiar insets which mark the walls of the palaces of Knossos and Phaistos.12

12 Dr. Xanthoudhidhisis has very kindly sent me notes of these excavations. The only published material is a brief account of the work of 1907 in the Athenian periodical Excavations. Nov. 15, 1897.
Dr. Pernier, of the Italian Archaeological Mission in Crete, has kindly sent me his latest publication, which includes a preliminary account of this season’s work. The excavation of the outside walls on the south and southwest sides of the Palace of Phaistos has now been finished. The neolithic deposits below the first Palace have been examined, and remains of a trapezoidal house have been found, exactly like the neolithic house found by the British School at Magasia, near Palaikastro.

The most important discovery, and possibly the most important object found this year in Crete came from an excavation on the north-east angle of the Acropolis of Phaistos. There is no information yet as to its period. It is a terracotta disc about 6½ inches (16 centimetres) in diameter, covered on both sides with characters. These include figures of men, fish, birds, trees, plants, and various implements, all impressed with stamps or types. This amounts to a kind of printing, and is in strong contrast with the Minoan tablets previously known on which the characters are always incised with a stylus. On each face of the disc there are more than 120 characters, arranged in distinct groups. They run between incised lines, forming thus a band disposed in a spiral from the centre to the periphery. Despite its unique character the discoverers consider that the document is of Cretan origin, and that the signs belong to the pictographic script recognised by Dr. Evans on a certain class of engraved seals. The number of signs makes it clear that the text is of some length.

Dr. Pernier has kindly sent me some unpublished notes on his work this year at the archaic Greek site of Patela by Prinias. Last year’s report noticed the archaic sculpture from the temple found here, and this year much progress has been made, especially in examining the towers of the fortress. Some of these are well preserved, and it was a place of much strength. A small funeral stele of the second century B.C. was found, but it is later than the destruction of the fortress. It was set up by Anamatos to his son.

The temple, from which the sculpture mentioned last year came, has now been entirely excavated. It consists of a prostyle and cela, deeper than it is wide. In the middle of the cela is a rectangular pit, lined with partly-calciued stones, and containing burnt clay and animals’ bones. It would appear that victims were burnt here, and that therefore the cela was at least in part open to the sky. Two column-bases in situ suggest such columns as have now been found so often in Minoan sanctuaries. Not much was found inside the temple. A few fragments of sculpture in poros stone and a number of pieces of archaic Greek pithos with ornamentation in relief are the most interesting objects.

Near this temple (called temple A), a second (temple B) has now been discovered. It resembles temple A, excepting that it has an opisthodomus, and only one base in the cela instead of two. This, moreover, seems to be
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16 J.H.S. xvi, p. 290.
rather an altar than the base of a column. Everywhere, but especially in the opisthodomos, fragments of archaic pithoi with the characteristic relief decoration were found. Below the temples were sherds of the Geometric period. The temples Dr. Pernier regards as the true successors of the Mycenaean tsepheia. The position of an archaic tomb below Patela has been discovered, and the excavation is to be continued next year.

The French School continues to concentrate its energies on the great excavation of Delos. Most of the work in 1907 was in the north-west region near the sea, where a very important building was found. A small part of it still remains unexcavated, as it lies underneath the house, in which the expedition lives. Near the surface Byzantine remains were found with Constantinian coins, and below these Graeco-Roman houses, notably a peristyle house with a well-head. Below this was the large building in question, which may be dated from architectural evidence to the second century n.C. It is a great hall 118 by 180 feet (36 by 55 metres), of which one long side is formed by a row of fifteen columns. The interior is divided into six aisles by five rows of nine columns, those along the sides and ends being Doric, and the rest Ionic. The central column is lacking. There is evidence to show that the outer aisles had lean-to roofs, and were lower than the four in the middle, which ran up into a clerestory. The two central aisles were hypaethral. The building thus occupies architecturally a middle place between the stoao and the basilica, and shows the two not yet clearly differentiated. The type may be an adaptation of the pillared walls of Egypt, and in Greece recalls the Thersoleon at Megalopolis and the Telesterion at Eleusis.

The treasuries have now been cleared. The second is the best preserved, and was a building distyle in antis. All are believed to be of the same period, and not to be older than the third century. Fragments of Attic red-figured pottery were found underneath the floor of the second.

The two earlier temples by the side of the fourth century temple of Apollo have now been studied. Of the smaller, a building in antis, only the foundations remain, built of poros resting on a substructure of granite. It is identified with the pro tespheia, and is no doubt much earlier than the fifth century. The other temple is Doric, hexastyle, amphiprostyle, built of Parian marble. The plan of the interior is peculiar. At the entrance to the pronaoe are four unequally spaced rectangular columns, corresponding to four engaged columns in the back wall. The thick wall between the cela and the pronaoe probably had corresponding openings. A semi-circular base in the cela probably supported seven statues. The excellence of the work and analogies to the Parthenon and the temple at Bassae lead to the conclusion that it is the pro tespheia of the Amphictyonic decree. The base for seven statues indicates that it is the pro tespheia of the inscriptions.17

Besides the prosecution of the excavation of Corinth, the American School has turned its attention to the Propylae of the Acropolis. Here

Mr. Wood, an architect, has at last begun a study that should be as valuable as Mr. Stevens' work on the Erechtheion, and for any replacing of fallen blocks his conclusions will form a safe guide. Like Mr. Stevens', Mr. Wood's method consists of the careful study of every block of the building, in situ or fallen, and the results thus obtained have a convincing certainty, which is very far from the conclusions reached by less thorough and more a priori methods. Almost all the details of the roofs have been worked out, and Mr. Wood has shown they were not gables, but hip-roofs. The uncompleted hall by the Pinacotheca is proved to have had eight and not nine columns.

The German Archaeologists have continued the great excavation at Pergamon. The main work of the season has been in the region of the great gymnasium. A temple has been excavated, with a triple statue-base, possibly dedicated to Asklepios, Hermes and Herakles. Some of the inscriptions are of value for the history of the Pergamene royal house, and others give lists of ephebes, natives being distinguished from foreigners by the addition of the name of their tribe. Several fine halls have also been cleared, and in the lower town remains of an amphitheatre, stadium and large bath have been examined.

The great tumulus, suspected of being a royal tomb, has been attacked, but its centre has not yet been reached. A tunnel was begun from the side, but fell in and had to be converted into an open cutting. This is being continued in the direction of the centre of the tumulus by a tunnel supported by stronger vaults of timber. The tumulus (500 metres in circumference) was originally surrounded by a wall, and a flight of steps led up the slope probably to some monument on the top.

The continuation of the German excavations at Olympia has brought fresh evidence as to the age of the Sanctuary. Furtwaengler regarded it as entirely post-Mycenean, saying that none of the bronzes could be dated earlier than the eighth century. This view Doerpfeld does not share, and these latest excavations, he holds, have decided the question definitely against Furtwaengler. Without touching the question of the age of these bronzes, his discovery this year of a hitherto unknown independent house-walls below the Pelopion may be said to have proved that the remains of Olympia go back much earlier than has generally been supposed. Doerpfeld's conclusion is: 'Olympia is of the greatest antiquity (orwall); in the middle of the Altis, the traditional site of the house of King Oinomaos, there was in fact a prehistoric settlement.'

This year's work consisted of a further exploration of the prehistoric stratum, which the excavations of 1907 had revealed below the Geometric layer between the Heraion and the Pelopion. Prehistoric house-walls were thus found between the Pelopion, the Heraion and the Metron. Of six buildings four are sufficiently well preserved to give the ground-plan, which is marked by a semi-circular apsidal ending. Two more buildings of this stratum were found twenty-five years ago, but their true character was not recognised, and they were regarded as the foundations of altars. The masonry resembles that
of the walls in Leukas and at Kakóvates (the Homeric Pylae of Doerpfeld), and the objects found are stone implements, obsidian and flint flakes, and hand-made monochrome pottery, sometimes with simple patterns incised or filled with white, resembling that from Leukas and Kakóvates. No metal was found. The stratification of the three periods of Olympia is particularly plain under the Pelopion, whose north-east corner is directly above the apex of one of these prehistoric houses. Thus on the top is the Classical Greek wall of the Pelopion, below this the Geometric deposit, and below this again these prehistoric remains. Underneath this house there was further a child’s grave with prehistoric vases which shows that this early period lasted a long time. An excavation on the hill of Kronos yielded some prehistoric and many Greek sherds. Prehistoric sherds were found also on the hill to the east of Olympia, and this excavation is to be continued.

The excavation of the three Mycenaean beehive-tombs at Kakóvates near Samikón, the site identified by Doerpfeld with the Homeric Pylae, has been continued. One tomb was dug in 1907, and this spring the two others have been cleared. They had been much destroyed and pillaged, but enough was left to prove them to be, like the first, of the same period as the great beehive-tombs of Mycenae.

In the same neighbourhood a Doric peripteral temple has been excavated. Two inscriptions prove that it was dedicated to Artemis Limnatis. One is an archaic inscription on a mirror (ἵππος Ἀρτεμίδος Αμφίπολος), and the other an inscription of the classical period on a bowl reading Ἀρτέμις Πολεμαρχίας ἀνέθηκε.

Dr. Doerpfeld’s excavations in Leukas made much progress in the summer of 1907, and the following account is derived from his *Vierter Brief über Leukas-Ithaka*, published early in this year. It will be remembered that Doerpfeld identifies the four Homeric islands, Ithaka, Same, Dulichion and Zakynthos, with the four modern islands, Leukas, Ithaka, Kephallenia, and Zakynthos; in this order, thus making the Homeric Ithaka the modern Leukas, and the modern Ithaka the Homeric Same. Acting on this theory he has been excavating for some years on Leukas, with a view to finding the remains of the Homeric town and dwelling of Odysseus, and he is disposed to identify the very ancient remains he has now found with these. The first part of this fourth report gives details of the excavations, and the second deals with recent publications on the Leukas-Ithaka question. Here Doerpfeld gives reasons for holding that Leukas has always been an island, and then criticises Vollgraf’s solution of the Ithaka problem. Vollgraf agrees with Doerpfeld in taking the four modern as the same as the four

---

18 J.H.S. xxvi. p. 296, and below.
19 See Ath. Mitt. xxviii., p. 185.
22 Wilhelm Doerpfeld, *Vierter Brief über Leukas-Ithaka: die Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen von 1907*, Athens, 1908. For the notes on the work of 1908 I am indebted to a letter from Dr. Doerpfeld.
Homer's islands, but leaves Ithaka as Ithaka, and identifies Dulichion with Leukas, and Same with Kephallenia. Against this view Doerpfeld is able to quote several Homeric passages with considerable effect.

The excavations of 1907 were again in the Nidri plain, where previous work had already shown a large prehistoric settlement in a stratum of houses three to six metres below the present surface. This settlement Doerpfeld identified with the Homeric town of Ithaka. In the earth above this stratum remains of Graeco-Roman date were found in several places.

The southern part of the plain has now been carefully explored by a system of trial-pits, and good results obtained in three places.

The first is a point where the water from the hills has apparently always been led into the plain. The remains here Doerpfeld considers to be those of a prehistoric garden.

At a second point a burial-place was found, consisting of eight cist-graves in a rectangular enclosure of slabs, nine by five metres, with a ninth grave added later at one corner. The bodies are contracted. A careful examination is being made of the bones to see if any traces of cremation are to be found; Doerpfeld cannot as yet be positive on this point. The enclosure was originally covered with a mound of earth, and the barrow so formed is identified with the Homeric τύμφος, erected over the graves of the Achaeans. For the single graves—cists containing contracted bodies—he finds parallels in those lately discovered at Tiryns between the oldest settlement and the Mycenaean palace, at Orchomenos and at Zafer Papoura, near Knossos, and traces a resemblance to the shaft-graves at Mycenae. They contained monochrome pottery and a bronze spear-head of peculiar form, which are paralleled from the fourth shaft-grave at Mycenae, and in some bronze-age graves from Sesklo in Thessaly.24 Vases of the same shape have been found by Soziadihas in a bronze-age tomb at Drachmani.25 The discovery of some isolated Mycenaean sherds had already led Doerpfeld to date these remains to the second millennium B.C., a date confirmed by the parallelisms with the fourth shaft-grave. The objects, he holds, belong to the old, native Achaean culture, and the settlement was the Achaean city of Homeric Ithaka, whose inhabitants were afterwards driven out by the Dorians, and founded a new Ithaka, the classical and modern Ithaka, in the neighbouring island to the south, which was called, in Homeric times, Same.

I give these important discoveries as far as I can in Doerpfeld's own words, because of the far-reaching consequence of his view of the Achaeans. Whilst admitting in general his parallelisms, I should hold that the Achaeans do not appear in Greece until much later, and even those archaeologists, who see Achaean remains in the period of the greatness of Mycenae, would, I think, credit them with the Mycenaean objects, regarded by Doerpfeld as Cretan imports, rather than with this Ithakaean series.

The third place is near the narrow entrance to the harbour. Here

24 Αί Περιφοράς Αισιόπλευρα Αντίκα περ. * Επ. Αρχ. 1909, pp. 65 ff. and Fig. 14, Στόικας, Κυνέρυ Κεφαλής, Νε. 4, 20.
25 Περιφοράς Αισιόπλευρα Αντίκα περ. * Επ. Αρχ. 1909, pp. 65 ff. and Fig. 14, Στόικας, Κυνέρυ Κεφαλής, Νε. 4, 20.
prehistoric walls have been found belonging to a building at least thirty metres long, in a style resembling the palace at Old Pylos (Kakóvatos), discovered in 1906. This building Doerpfeld thinks is not only possibly but probably the actual house of Odysseus. The further work necessary to determine this involved some draining, as trenches at this depth fill with water. The work was continued this year, but in spite of drainage-cuttings and pumps not much could be done, and only the foundations are preserved. Near it, however, five stone grave-circles were found (5 to 9 metres in diameter). In the biggest is a shaft-grave, and smaller graves in the others. One is a pithos-grave. The best were pillaged, but one contained three bronze daggers. They present a close parallel to the shaft-graves of Mycenae, which also lay below a round walled tomb. Doerpfeld recognises in these the royal tombs belonging to the palace.

Another grave-enclosure was found, but with a circular wall surrounding the tumulus (τύμβος). The diameter was 12 metres, and it contained some ten burials with contracted bodies. The vases and bronze objects are again like those from the bronze age tombs of Sesklo and Dhimini. Right over these graves, at a higher level, are a good Greek wall and sherds of the classical period.

With these results the excavation is, for the present, to conclude, and the whole to be published.

At Miletus, Dr. Wiegand has been so fortunate as to discover the oldest parts of the town, dating from the late Mycenean period down to the Persian invasion.

The oldest settlement was found in the neighbourhood of the temple of Athena, and may be identified with the πρώτας στήλης Κρητικοῦ of Ephoros. Here late Mycenean houses were found, underlying a deposit marked by Geometric pottery, which itself is older than the oldest temple.

Next in date are the remains on the eminence called Kahalaktpe. This is the site of the town destroyed by the Persians in 494 B.C., and not inhabited. It seems to have been one-third larger than any later town, a fact of great importance for the history of trade and of Greek colonization. It is the place referred to by Ephoros σημεία Στρατηγοῦ as being ἐν τῷ τῆς θαλάσσης τεττυχασμένον, and called ἡ πόλις Μίλητος.

Both of the plateaux, of which Kahalaktpe consists, were inhabited, but the most substantial remains were on the lower, where the foundations of a temple and its peribolos wall have been found. On the south side of the hill is the ancient town wall, of which a piece 250 metres long with a thickness of from three to four metres has been excavated. The plan shows three gates, one of which is protected by towers, a projecting bastion, and steps ascending to the top of the wall. It is judged from these that the wall was not less than about forty feet (twelve metres) high. This town wall is

---

27 The work at Milos and Didymai for 1906 and 1907 has now been published as the Sekretar verlagung Bericht über die von dem K. Archäologischen Museum in Milet und Didymai unternehmen Ausgrabungen, Berlin, 1898, from which these notes are taken.
older than the middle of the seventh century, and dates from the period of late Geometric pottery. Mycenaean pottery was only found very sparingly in this region. The strength of these fortifications accounts for the resistance of the town to Gyges, and for the recognition of its independence by Alyattes and Croesus.

The pottery forms an unbroken series from late Mycenaean (nothing older than the third style of Furtwaengler and Loeschcke) to Attic red- and black-figured, corresponding to the period of the life of the town from its foundation to its taking by the Persians. The Mycenaean pottery is followed by Geometric, and later by Orientalising fabrics. Boehean’s Milesian and Samian, the latter being possibly really a later stage of Milesian. Naukratis and Cyrenaeic pottery were found in small quantities, but hardly any Corinthian.

Progress has been made also with a group of buildings on the Lion Harbour. The fine Hellosamic building, with propylon, court (20 by 30 metres) and side-halls, which was at first supposed to be the Prytaneion, and was referred to in last year’s report under that name, has now been shown to be a gymnasion γυμνασίον τῶν ἀθλητῶν παιδῶν. It was founded in the middle of the second century B.C. by Eudemos the son of Thallion, with a gift of ten talents of silver.

Of the baths of Faustina, the excavation of which was briefly noticed last year, a plan and photographs have now been published, and also inscriptions referring to their construction. Two very interesting inscriptions are published, one giving rules for sacrificing to Dionysos, and the other referring to the worship of the Kabeiri.

A plan is published of the Christian basilica mentioned last year. It was adorned with mosaics, the subjects of which are occasionally symbolical, though the majority are animals and geometric patterns. The course taken by the wall of Justinian proves that this basilica is older than that period, and therefore than Sancta Sophia at Constantinople. The excavator points out that both the architects of Sancta Sophia came from this region.

At Didyma the clearing of the Temple of Apollo and the surrounding ground has revealed a great curved pre-Hellenic wall, which formed the division between two terraces to the east of the temple. Numerous inscriptions have also been found. Work is to be resumed at these excavations in September of the present year.

Dr. Kineh has again kindly given me notes of his work in Rhodes for the Danish Carlsberg Fund. In continuing the exploration of Lindos he has been so fortunate as to find the Mycenaean necropolis. The preparation of the book on the excavations at Lindos itself is now well advanced.

In last year’s report Dr. Kineh’s discovery of a city and necropolis of the Greek Archaic period at the south end of the island was mentioned. The modern name of the site is Youri. He has now dug the tombs and the greater part of the small town. Two sanctuaries have been found, one inside the walls, and one outside near the harbour. The pottery is important.
It dates from about 750 to 500 B.C., and points to close trade-relations with Naukratis. Besides this Naukratite ware, Proto-Corinthian, Corinthian, Rhodian kylikes, so-called "Vogelschalen" and Ionian cups have been found, and also many fragments of Cypriote Geometric and "Aeolian" ware. The properly recorded finding of such a variety of fabrics is bound to yield chronological comparisons of great interest.

It remains for me to record my thanks to the numerous archaeologists who have kindly furnished me with notes of their unpublished excavations.

R. M. DAWKINS.
THE TOPOGRAPHY OF PELION AND MAGNESIA.

Addenda.

I wish to make the following corrections to my paper on this subject that appeared in J.H.S. 1906, pp. 143-168:—

P. 147. Aoio and Aiolo. The conjectured existence of these two Magnesian towns is due to my carelessness. Αίολος in the inscription referred to (Ath. Mitth. 1882, p. 71; Ditt. Syll. 790) means of course a man from Halos in Phthiotis; similarly Αιολες in the same inscription probably means an inhabitant of the Thessalian Aoëlis (v. Pauly-Wissowa, s.n.).

P. 148. The temple site, Thotokou, by Katsi Georgi has recently been excavated by the British School in 1907 (v. B.S.A. xiii, pp. 309 ff.), but no name has yet been found for it.

P. 149. Oliou. A similar votive inscription to Hermes from this site has been found by Dr. Arvanitopoulos at Laffko.

P. 151. Fig. 1. This relief is published by Kern, Hermes, 1902, p. 629, fig. 3; he restores the last line as ᾠδήπες Διί.

P. 152. Koroë. Dr. Arvanitopoulos' successful excavations at Petralona have found there the ruins of the temple of Apollo Koronaus. This confirms the view expressed by me (v. Πρακτικα, 1906, p. 123).

P. 154. The views expressed in note 44 as to the site of Ioleus have been adopted by Kouromiotis (Ep. Arch. 1906, p. 213) and Tsountas (ai Ακροπόλεις Διμηνίου και Σαξαλού, pp. 15, 400).

P. 155. The inscriptions at Episkope have been read and explained by Giannopoulos, ai δημο Αλμυραί, p. 35.

P. 157. Ormion. Lolling also (Ath. Mitth. 1884, p. 97) placed this site at Dhimini (v. Tsountas, op. cit. p. 27). It is still quite uncertain which is the true site of Ormion.

P. 161. Dr. Arvanitopoulos has excavated (1907) part of the eastern wall of Pagasse. Here built into the foundations of a tower he found the painted grave stelai, which have recently been published in the Επιμελεία Αρχαιολογική (1908, pp. 1 ff., Plates I-VI).

P. 165. My attribution of these coins to the Magnetes was anticipated by Leake (Nem. Hitt. p. 88), who also found similar coins in Magnesia. I hope to publish further information on this subject later.

Alan J. B. Wace.
THE ARCHAIC ARTEMISIA.

May I be allowed to correct and hereby to do penance for a blunder which defaces three or four passages in the recent British Museum publication on Ephesus? A mental confusion between Lygdamis, the leader of the Cimmerians or Troes, who probably burned one of the earlier Artemisia, and Pythagoras, a pre-Persian tyrant, who is said to have had to build a temple at Ephesus in expiation for desecrating the Hieron, took possession of me during the lapse of a year between writing Chapters I and XIV, and led me to make the absurd suggestion on p. 245 that Temple B was completed perhaps at the cost of Lygdamis by the middle of the seventh century, and to call the latter a 'tyrant' and a 'traitor.' The last epithet is particularly uncalled for, since the little we know of Lygdamis shows him as a bold tribal leader who died at the head of his horde. If he burned Temple A, neither he nor Pythagoras was the builder of Temple B; and if the latter built any Artemision it can only have been either Temple A (after desecrating a pre-existent hieron) or Temple C. But, as I have stated on p. 7, it is so doubtful whether there is any reference to the Artemision at all in the solitary extant passage regarding Pythagoras, that the suggestion of his responsibility for any of the primitive shrines on the site is hardly worth making. This mental confusion passed away from me in Syria while reflecting on the westward expeditions of Assurbampal, in attacking whose Cilician vassal Lygdamis came by his death; but it was then too late to make amends even in a list of errata, as I had left the book passed for press on quitting England.

I should like to add here that, after considering again the arguments of H. Golzer (Rhein. Mus. xxx. pp. 230 ff.), I must date the Cimmerian attack on Ephesus rather later than 600 B.C. If the catastrophe of Gyges did not take place before 652, the latter date is probably the lower limit of Temple A and of all objects belonging to it.

D. G. Hogarth.
NOTICES OF BOOKS.

The Religious Teachers of Greece: being Gifford lectures delivered at Aberdeen by JAMES ADAM, LL.D. T. & T. Clark, 1908.

The first feeling in the mind of every scholar who opens this book will be regret for the heavy loss sustained by the University of Cambridge and by all Greek students in Dr. Adam's sudden and premature death. And the book gains a special interest as representing his last word on a number of problems which were of vital importance to him. The lectures, as we might expect from so finished a Plato scholar, are permeated with the Platonic point of view. They open with the quarrel between Poetry and Philosophy. Then come two lectures on Homer. Two are also given to Herodotus, two to Euripides, two to Socrates, and the last five all to Plato. The remaining nine cover the rest of the pre-Platonic writers. It is needless to say that the book is throughout the work of a scholar of the first rank. The chapters on Herodotus and Plato are perhaps particularly good, and that on Euripides is at any rate broad-minded and sympathetic. On the other hand, some points in method call for criticism. The motto on Dr. Adam's title page is:

\[ \text{ἀλλά χρώσῳ ἵπποις ὑπὸ ὑπνώοις ἐπιμέλεια,} \\
\text{ἀλλὰ χρώσῃ ἐπεισεῖς ὑπομίσθωσιν ἡμῖν.} \]

Now if the phenomenon of progress were to form the special subject of the book, it is surely a grave error to begin with the Iliad and Odyssey. As far as religion is concerned, these poems cannot be regarded as primitive. They are much less primitive than most of the Homeric tradition, and even than a great deal of the tragö. And this fault is heightened by the writer's habit of treating 'Homer' as one man or at least one book and not distinguishing between the different strata of superstition and reflection which the poems contain. True, Dr. Adam anticipates the first of those objections on p. 21, and sometimes speaks of the authors of the Iliad and Odyssey (p. 54). But the general indictment is, we fear, still true. It is perhaps a part of the same error to treat Homer so emphatically as a creative religious teacher. There is indeed a characteristic religion, or mass of religious theory to be got out of the Iliad; but it is not the religion of the traditional myths which are there used as poetical material, it is a criticism rejection and expurgation of those myths. Of course a defender of Dr. Adam's might answer with perfect justice that he has a right to treat the part of his subject that interests him; that he is not interested in the primitive and anthropological background; and prefers to take the Iliad and Odyssey not in reference to what they grew from, but as a fixed datum for Herodotus and Plato to react against. He might make a similar answer to another criticism which will perhaps occur to many readers; viz., that as this survey of Greek religion is somewhat narrowly limited at the beginning, so it is also at the end. For instance, the repeated parallels drawn between Plato and St. Paul are open possibly to two criticisms. First, one has at times a slight suspicion that Plato is being deliberately drawn—by a most loving hand, it is true—as near as possible to the goal of some Christian orthodoxy. Secondly, a number of doxologies which occur in both St. Paul and Plato are taken as evidence of some special connexion or similarity between these two
NOTICES OF BOOKS.

great minds, whereas in truth they are exceedingly old doctrines of Orphea and other
schools, which were taught to Plato by tradition as they were to St. Paul. For
instance, the ρατόσ δ’οράσ doctrine and that of the παλαιόν ἱερέα. The latter, we now know,
was already traditional in the Κορορομόν, a Hermetic document probably belonging to
the year 510 B.C. and in any case pre-Platonic.


Mr. Agar’s book is, in the main, an attempt to detect and amend the textual errors
which have made their way into the Odyssey in the course of its pre-historic tradition.
"The language of the Homeric poems," he says in his preface, "is Achaeus, and fairly
represents the speech of the Achaeus people;" and in the main it may be taken as
certain that the forms of words in the traditional text are substantially identical with
those used by the poet." Nevertheless it is clear, and is generally admitted, that "our
text has undergone much minor modification of its original form." The detection and
rectification of such modifications is essentially a conservative process, as tending to
remove stumbling-blocks which have caused less temperate critics to obsede whole
passages; and Mr. Agar’s criticism is temperate and reasonable. It rests necessarily, not
on manuscripts, but on considerations of Homeric language and usage, and it is always
instructive on these points, even where his conclusions are most questionable. A book
like this, consisting of detailed examinations of hundreds of detached passages, obviously
does not admit of criticism in a short review; but it may be cordially recommended to
the attention of Homeric scholars.

Herodotus, The Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth Books. With Introduction, Text,
Apparatus, Commentary, Appendices, Indexes, Maps. By Reginald Walter

These volumes are the completion of a task undertaken by Dr. Macan some twenty years
ago. They contain one feature which distinguishes them from the previous volumes on
Books IV., V., VI., viz. the addition of an Apparatus Criticus. This does not, however,
claim to be based on any independent collation of the MSS. The thorough and pains-
taking character of the work is beyond all doubt. The notes to the text are preceded by
an introduction, which is mainly concerned to show that these last three books were really
composed first, since Herodotus intended to make the Persian war the original theme of
his work. An estimate of the merits and defects of Herodotus as an historian is also formed
from an analysis of this portion of the history. Dr. Macan may be said to steer a middle
course between those who would condemn Herodotus as utterly untrustworthy and those
who are prepared to accept most of his statements with implicit confidence. The notes
to the text are very thorough on the historical and topographical side; though here, as
elsewhere, the author is better at throwing out suggestions in the form of numerous queries
than at actually reaching a plausible solution of problems. The notes are supplemented
by a volume of elaborate appendices. The first deals with the value of authorities other
than Herodotus for the Persian war. The succeeding essays discuss the preparations for
the struggle, the Persian and Greek sides, and the various strategic aspects of the
encounters at Artemisium, Thermopylae, Salamis, Plataea, and Mykale. Finally a recon-
struction of the order of events in the first two years of the war is attempted. There is
much that is new in the way of suggestion, such as the view of the successive positions
occupied by the Greek army at Plataea, and the reconstruction of the movements of the
Greek fleets immediately before the battle of Salamis. The Athenians are held responsible
for the failure of the original plan of campaign at Platea, a fact which is observed in the pages of Herodotus, who follows a biased Athenian account of the battle. The work is completed by six full indices of readings, words, names, subjects, and authors. The book is one which will be eminently useful to the student. It is perhaps hardly calculated to arouse the enthusiasm of the reader, the style being somewhat marred by the frequent introduction of needless resumable words varied by expressions which border on alarg. Archaeological knowledge would have been of assistance in elucidating some passages, take, for example, the question as to the form of the *scholetai* in vili. 225. This can scarcely be other than the short-curb cutting sword frequently represented on Greek vessels of the fifth century B.C., a weapon recommended by Xenophon (de re eq. xii. 11) for the use of cælæmms.


Members of the Hellenic Society will welcome this publication, both for its own sake and as a record that England has at last done her duty by the great Ephesian temple. To Mr. Wood belongs the credit not only of discovering the site, but also of bringing to the British Museum the sculptures of the fourth century temple as well as of that contemporary with Ceresus. But he never regarded his work as complete, and though another he nor Mr. A. S. Murray, who initiated the recent excavations, lived to see the earlier strata thoroughly excavated, Mr. Hogarth has now amply made up the deficiency, and has brought to light the remains of no less than three successive temples earlier than the time of Ceresus. Among the foundations of those earlier buildings he has also found a great number of small votive offerings in gold, ivory, and other materials, which throw considerable light on early Ionia art. The excavations were carried out in the season 1904-5, and the present publication, with its excellent plates, brings their results clearly before the public. The site has had to be filled in again, but Mr. Henderson's plans are so full and accurate as to present a complete record of the earlier buildings. Special classes of antiquities are dealt with by various experts in the Museum—the pottery and the ivory statuettes by Mr. Cecil Smith, the coins by Mr. B. V. Head, and the sculpture of the Ceresus temple by Mr. A. H. Smith; the cost being described by Mr. Hogarth himself. His object is evidently to place on record all the facts rather than to discuss rivalry nineteenth-century; we shall doubtless hear more on these matters both from Mr. Hogarth and from others. He has also added a chapter on the Goddess, in which he shows the well-known many-breasted image to be of comparatively late date. The only inscription published is a very interesting one on a silver plate, probably containing accounts for the building of the temple. It will also interest readers of the Journal as containing the earlier example of the symbol T.


Mr. Lethaby issues two further parts (see ante p. 169) of his notes on the remains of historic Greek buildings in the British Museum. In The Tomb of Mausolus, the problem of the restoration is discussed from various points of view. No complete restoration is attempted, but the author is of opinion that the intercolumniation was 9 ft. 3 in. from centre to centre, that the base of the pyraamid was rectangular in the proportion of 34 to 43; that the plan showed a single row of columns, nine on the ends and eleven on the sides (an arrangement which gives a central column on each face); and that the
sculptured frieze was not a part of the order, and probably surrounded the basement at no great height, like that of the Nereid monument.

In The Parthenon Mr. Lethaby discusses points of detail in the architectural remains, and the sculptures, both sections being illustrated by numerous sketches by the author, as well as by illustrations from well-known sources. His discussion of the sculptures from an artist’s standpoint is interesting. Few readers, however, will accept his view that the snake associated with the Cerastes of the West pediment is in fact a prolongation of the spine of Cerastes himself, who is thus given a wholly anomalous serpent form with tail and legs, both being present together.


In view of the scarcity of literature relating to this interesting class of Roman pottery, we welcome Mr. Chase’s work as a most useful contribution. This collection comprises nearly 600 items, both moulds and pieces of Arretine ware, though mostly of a fragmentary nature. Some of the pieces, in particular the complete mould No. 1, are of considerable merit. The illustrations are plentiful though somewhat unequal, and the Introduction, while largely based on Dragendorff’s treatise, should be useful to English readers. Some of the types described are interesting as reminiscences of Hellanistic and “new Attic” art.


A scientific treatise on the money of the Byzantine Empire has long been a desideratum. The books of De Saulcy and Sabatier have been out of date for almost a generation; and in the interval the series has attracted much less attention from numismatists than it deserves. Mr. Wroth’s task was thus one of no ordinary difficulty; he had not merely to classify, but to devise new principles of classification. Fortunately he has been able to avail himself of the pioneer work done in the British Museum by that remarkable numismatist, the late Count de Saulcy. The result is a sound and scholarly contribution to our knowledge of the Byzantine period. It may now fairly be said that the numismatic evidence is marshalled in a form that will enable historians to draw upon it with confidence. And that is a very substantial advance. The arrangement is, of course, by Emperors, beginning with Anastasius I. (491 a.d.) and stretching over nearly a thousand years to John VIII. Palaeologus. But much care has also been devoted to the identification of mints, and the facts so brought out are often very interesting. The summary table on page xiv, for instance, gives a striking bird’s-eye view of the expansion, the vicissitudes, and the final decline of the Byzantine Empire. The introduction is a useful piece of work, continuing as it does a sketch of the long period covered by the coins described, a careful discussion of the denominations and weights of all three metals, and a suggestive section on types, art, and portraiture. In the body of the book the descriptions of the individual specimens are clear and accurate, an indication of provenance being added wherever possible. The abundance of footnotes is a welcome feature, albeit they tend to overcrowd the page a little; and the indexes are, as usual, full and informing. There is a liberal supply of well-executed plates, among which the two that will most please the general student are the frontispieces—the bust of Justinian from the splendid gold medallion once in Paris but now irretrievably lost, and Pisanelli’s fine medal of John VIII. Palaeologus. As befits the opening numbers of a new series, the volumes differ somewhat in appearance from the familiar Catalogues of Greek Coins; the format is slightly larger, and they are bound in a warm, comfortable red.
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This is a useful piece of numismatic spade-work, particularly interesting to students of the Roman period in Britain. A very readable introduction brings together the main known facts regarding the rise and fall of the "carausian" as presented to us in the pages of historians and chroniclers. Then follows a general account of the nature of the numismatic evidence, with discussions upon mints and mint-marks, legends and types. Lastly, and skilfully, we get a carefully compiled and classified catalogue of all coins bearing the name and supervision of Carausius, so far as these have been recorded by other writers or exist in accessible public and private collections. More than 1200 varieties are here described. The task of identification must often have been difficult, for the execution is apt to be barbarous and the lettering is not seldom blundered; but Mr. Webb is a genuine enthusiast, and has taken endless trouble to be accurate. He has his reward. Fresh discoveries will doubtless necessitate a supplement by and by, but the book as it stands is of permanent value.


The aim of the present work is, in the author’s own words, "to present within the compass of a single treatise, which shall be, so far as possible, exhaustive, all that can be gathered, known and inferred about manumission and the condition of freedmen in Greece." On a subject of such interest and importance a comprehensive work was needed, especially as previous writers, as Drachmann, P. Fountas, and G. Fountas, have dealt only with some one Greek state or special group of documents or mode of manumission. Nor is it this greater width alone that gives its value to Sigismund Cardarelli’s work as compared with its predecessors. Recent years have largely increased the epigraphical evidence on this subject, and it is upon inscriptions and papyri that our knowledge of its processes and conditions almost entirely rests. The author has brought to his task an admirable command of his material, epigraphical and literary, a sound judgment, a clear arrangement and a simple and pleasing style, and his treatise will remain for a long time to come the standard work on its subject.

In a series of brief chapters the author discusses the Greek practice and thought regarding manumission from the Homeric Age down to the early centuries of the Christian Era, tracing the influence of the factors which determined its frequency and the position of freedmen. After this "historical introduction" he deals with the process of Greek manumission, discussing the sources of our knowledge, the methods in vogue, those who took part in the ceremony and the conditions attaching to it. The second main section is devoted to the position of freedmen, legal and social, setting forth, so far as our evidence allows, the position of this class in the financial, judicial, military and religious spheres. The book ends with a series of appendices on certain documents or groups of documents; of these the most important are the discussions of the Athenian ἀναδιάδοχος ἀναφορας and of the Delphic manumission records.

It is inevitable that some errors should creep into a work of this kind, full of detail and of references to ancient and modern sources. But these are for the most part mere misprints, which will cause the reader no difficulty, as e.g. the attribution of Sulla’s victory at Chaeronea to the year 186 B.C. Punctuation, accentuation and the spelling of foreign words, however, deserve more attention than they have received in these pages. In the chapter on the professors of freedmen, several mistakes have been made, e.g. the author has not noticed that the ἐστίν αὐτοῦ is a woman, ἐστίν αὐτοῦ and ἐστίν αὐτοῦ should be ἐστίν αὐτοῦ and ἐστίν αὐτοῦ respectively, and the occupations of barbar (R.S.A. viii, p. 321, l. 3), secretary and under-secretary (ibid. p. 210) are omitted.

One more criticism may be added. If the author does not adopt the official renaming of
the Inscriptions Græciae introduced some years ago, he should at least use the abbreviations which were previously in vogue; there may be something to be said for retaining the initials C.L.A. for the corpus of Attic inscriptions, but surely it is only confusing to replace it by In. Att. Nor should the time-honoured initials C.I.G. be discarded for B. in honour of Boeckh. These, however, are but small blemishes, which do not seriously impair the value of a book which may be welcomed without hesitation as a valuable contribution to our knowledge of one of the most interesting points in the social life of ancient Greece.


Many in recent times have subjected Tacitus to vigorous criticism and Mr. Henderson is of their number; in this book his attack is levelled against the "most unbridled of historians." But Mr. Henderson is not a mere critic; he attempts the more difficult task of reconstruction, and in doing so has written a book of great interest and value. His object is to write the history of the famous campaign of 69-70 a.d. by the aid of, and as illustrative of, modern strategical principles. Described as a Companion to the Histories of Tacitus, the book is not unlike Tacitus as any book could be: The brilliant and vivid literary power of the great Roman is but seldom reflected, by translation or paraphrase, in Mr. Henderson's pages; in its place there is given a critical account of strategy and tactics which, coming from the pen of a man versed in the theory of generalship and well-acquainted with the scenes of the campaigns, presents an admirably clear description of the motives of the generals, the importance of the engagements, the causes of success and failure, which the most exact study of Tacitus' tangled narrative would never of itself unfold. From time to time, Dr. Henderson irritates by contemptuous and not altogether just allusions to the capacities of the Roman historian, but his book is certainly an important aid to an intelligent conception of the years of which he writes.


This book constitutes the sixty-fifth volume of the Story of the Nations series. Covering over five hundred years in less than five hundred pages, the book has a compass which leaves little room for detailed history. It contains pleasantly written studies of the earlier Emperors, an interesting and learned account of the obscure and ill-recorded epoch which set in with the Antonines, and a clear, concise description of the settlement of Diocletian and Constantin. The narrative skilfully unfolds the development of the tragedy of the Caesars and the passage from the Diarchy through anarchy to despotism; but the social conditions of the vast territories over which the Emperors actually or nominally ruled are not so fully discussed. Difficult and obscure as the history of the subject peoples remains, one would willingly spare some parts of the printed narrative for a fuller consideration of them. None the less the book gives a very readable account of a period which is little known and whose interest for the general reader will be enhanced by a number of well-chosen illustrations. The value of the work for the student is a good deal discounted by the absence of references to authority either ancient or modern, but references of this nature were no doubt precluded by the object and purpose of the series to which the book belongs.

In an elaborate Introduction the author explains the method of his history, the object of which is, he says, "to do for history what Richat did for Anatomy, Bopp and Potz for Linguistics, or Savigny for Roman Law." In other words his aim is to explain broad historical facts as the result of certain general laws. One of the most potent of these laws he terms "geopolitical," a force resulting from the geographical situation of the country itself and the influence exercised upon it by surrounding peoples. Few will doubt the value of such an attempt to evolve general historic laws, though many may consider the author over-hasty in drawing his conclusions. Of the part of the work dealing with Greek history, the most satisfactory is that which discusses the Spartan state. The author's championship of the historicism of Lycurgus against modern destructive criticism is whole-hearted and successful. His main argument is that so stringent a rule of life as the Spartan s(i)va is only to be enforced, like the discipline of the Orders of the Catholic Church, by a single dominating personality, be his name Lycurgus or some other. The attempt to account for the extraordinary outbreak of genius at Athens in the period between the Persian and Peloponnesian wars cannot be regarded as equally successful. It is not enough to say (as is usually said) that it is accounted for by the splendid victories over Persia, and that the shortness of the golden age is explained by the fact that the life-and-death struggle of Athens with Persia lasted but a short time. Does this explain the unique glory of the city? Why should not Syracuse have sprung into equal glory after the victory at Himera? Dr. Reich finds the answer in the fact that "Carthage was not sensibly stronger than Syracuse." Hardy an adequate answer: it might be suggested that a victory won by the citizens of a free state is far more inspiring than a victory won under a tyrant. But there are many historical facts which defy adequate explanation, and the glory of Periclean Athens is one of them. It may be remarked, incidentally, that Syracuse probably exercised a greater influence in shaping the institutions of Rome than is commonly supposed.

The second volume of the work, which deals with Rome, need not here be discussed. The book as a whole is full of suggestive passages and displays wide reading. The illustrations from mediaeval and modern history will be welcomed by many. The chief fault of the work would seem to lie in the excessive dogmatism with which very doubtful general "laws" are often enunciated, and in a rather ungenerous depreciation of the German historical school. Without the laboured researches of generations of "philological" historians no "General History" would be possible.


This Atlas consists of forty-eight maps, designed to present in graphic fashion the great military movements of classical antiquity. The campaigns depicted range from the first Persian War to the Civil Wars of the time of Caesar. There are also maps of Athens, Rome, and the Roman Empire at the time of its greatest extent. The progress of armies is indicated by lines in different colours, and their direction by arrow-heads, while the names of generals, dates, and the results of battles are shown by abbreviations or signs. The maps are supplemented by a text, which gives the leading events of the different campaigns, without, however, any reference to authorities. Many of the maps present a rather crowded and confused appearance, but the atlas as a whole should prove of indubitable assistance to the student. The danger is that he may try to use it as a short cut to knowledge, and neglect the indispensable study of his authorities.
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A new edition of Baedeker's Grüchenland calls rather for announcement than discussion. The improvements and additions since its first appearance (1874, 3rd ed., 1885) are considerable. The hotel-lists and travelling information are brought up-to-date; accounts of ancient sites renewed—of Sparta entirely re-written in view of the British excavations—while the maps and plans of Laurium district, Aquena, Thuria, Locatas, Eumaeum region, Delphi, and Corinth are for the most part new; in a few cases improved out of recognition. We are surprised, however, to find no mention of the recent Mycenaean tombville at Thebes, and the section on Chalcis strikes us as standing in need of further revision: on the one hand the beautiful walls are now almost non-existent, on the other the archaic Aegaeum-group calls for mention even in the shortest description of the Museum. Precision in detail, as the editor reminds his readers, depends ultimately upon their own co-operation: we hope the hint will not be disregarded.


This is a well arranged book, very thorough and searching in its methods; if the result is largely negative, that is due to the airy irresponsibility of some earlier scholars. The first part, for example, which deals with the ancient authorities, is mostly destructive criticism. Because Alexander of Macedon was a Macedonian, it does not follow that he wrote only in the Macedonian dialect; and Hoffmann's examination discloses the fact that only two of his glosses, ομιλείσθαναι and παράθεσις, can be safely regarded as Macedonian. In the Letters of Alexander there is no trace of local dialect; but there are Macedonian traces in the epos, and a few modern words seem to be survivals of the old dialect. The second section is a subject-index, under which are classified the words that are known. One or two additions or conjectures are worth noting. Ἰμνήλιαν's πρὶς γραμματικόν comes under the second term, of which πρὶς, was Macedonian for ἀρχαίον; āγορά is extended to ἀγορασώ and connected with εὔφρος. Less plausible is the identification of Νεόμενος καπνός as a verb ἀσχημος. The adj. ἀσχημος: καπνις=κασμός is compared with Slav. (O. Bulg.) čid. There is a discussion of divine names and festivals which contains important matter. It is impossible to discuss this section in detail; but it may be added that of thirty-nine glosses regarded by G. Meyer as foreign, ten are validated for Greek with more or less probability. The third section is on personal names, and contains a great deal of incidental discussion that has a bearing on history and social conditions. The fourth section deals with the dialect, sounds, and accent: a meagre record, true, but that is not Hoffmann's fault. Lastly come a few pages on the political question, and excursuses. There is an index of fourteen pages.


The principle underlying this dictionary is the 'evolutionary' or 'historical' theory of language which the author has developed in various works, but which cannot be said to have met with a very favourable reception from philologists in general. It consists in a denial of fixed phonetic laws, Prof. Regnauld admitting only one general law, which, as he has stated in his Éléments de Grammaire Comparée du Grec et du Latin (Paris, A. Colin, 1896), p. 2, 'consiste dans le passage d'un son plus fort à un son plus faible ou
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d'vn son plus ample à un son plus bruy.” The author's method being so much a matter of dispute, it is obvious that many of his etymologies must be regarded as presumptions. After each article he gives a reference to the Dictionnaire Rhetorique Latin of MM. Bréal and Bally (2nd ed. Paris, Hachette, 1886), stating briefly the etymology suggested by those scholars; and at the end is a summary statement, substantially repeated from the Éléments de Grammaire Comparée du Grec et du Latin, of the author's theories as to the phonetic laws of Greek and Latin. The volume concludes with full indices of the words in other languages than Latin which are dealt with in the dictionary; an index of roots in addition would have been useful, but is not given. It is worthy of notice that the Celtic languages, so useful to the Latin etymologists from their close relation to Latin, are represented by only five words, one of which (Welsh quern, which on p. 9, art. omen, appears, presumably by a misprint, as 'quern') is omitted from the index. In the index of modern English words the Anglo-Saxon root is accidentally included.

* * *

For other books received see List of Accessions to the Library.
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I.—INDEX OF SUBJECTS

A.

Acalissus, inscr. monument. Hadrian's visit, 186.

Achaeum settlement, alleged, on Lycian, 333.

Achaimenid, Prince of, suzerain of Boudomutus, 236.

Achilles and Penthesilea on sarcophagus, 29.

Admiral in Persian fleet, 207. 

Aidon, body of, where found by Apothecary, 133.

Aeschylus: on the flat of Xerxes, 207 f.; his use of yosis, 279.

Agora: at Olympia, 207 f.; at Athens, 207 f.; of Artemis Orthia at Sparta, 321 f.

Amazon and Greeks on sarcophagus (Cook Coll.), 29.

Ampelos: Apollo, throne of, 321.

Ampelous, town of, 36.

Araxes of Rhegium and Zande, 50 f.; cooling, 63 f.

Athenian and (Dr. Pop. 842, 284.

Athenaion, 308.

Anton, portrait of, 26.

Aphrodite: and the body of Dionysus, 133; statues of: crouching (Cook Coll.), 14; loom among salvors (ibid.), 15; Mazarian (ibid.), 11; Melian, 319; statuette (Cook Coll.), 12, 15, 18; torso (ibid.), 12.

Aphrodisiaca, 97.

Aphrodisiopolis, 106.

Apollo: fourth cent. statue (Cook Coll.), 8; playing lyre, on b.-f. hydra (Cook Coll.), 44.

Apollonia (Cyrenaica), inscr. from, 198.

Araeida and Sparta in 6th cent., 84.

Archippus, Athenian archon, 319.

Archippus, stele of, 17.

Argive school, 5th century head of, 8.

Argos and Sparta in 6th cent., 84; and Athens, 35.

Argos in Greece, 133 f.

Ariadne and Dionysus on sarcophagus, 30; see also Dionysus.

Ares in Greece, 133 f.

Artémis, Ephesian temple of, 338; remains of group with Iphigenia at Copenhagen, 151; Limmatis, temple of, near Samikon, 322; Orthia, sanctuary of, at Sparta, 321.

Artemisia, her contingent at Salamis, 209.

Artemision, battle of, 218.

Ash-chest, Roman, in Cook Coll., 40.

Asklepios, infant, with goose, 20; statuette (Cook Coll.), 9; temple at Pergamon, 231.

Aspendus, inscr. on, 189.

Atalanta: see Calydonian Buck.

Athens: treasure-list of, 236 f.; head of Pheidias period (Cook Coll.), 6; head of, from Parthenon W. pediment, 46; with Hercules in chariot on b.-f. hydra (Cook Coll.), 44.

Athenian quota lists, now fragment, 291.

Athena: relations with Argos in 6th cent., 85; treaty with Euboeans, c. 238-7 B.C., 205 f.; relations with Sparta in 5th cent., 85 f.; Duke's of, 238.

—Agora excavations, 319; restoration of Erechtheum, 321; study of Propylaea, 331.

—Museums: pre-Persian sculpture, 319; Apollo from Samos, 320; sarcophagus with drunken Eros, 27; Cyrenean kylix, 175; inscriptions, 291 f.

Athlete, head of, in archaic style (Cook Coll.), 33.

Attic inscriptions, now fragments, 291 f.

Augustus, head of (Cook Coll.), 35.
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B

Bacchanate: see Maenad
Bacchus secundus: see Dionysiac
Balsam at Milatos, 325
Bassai, dikeletes of Aphrodite, correspondence of, 98
Bassus, bronze from Moklos, 326
Bebich-tome at Kakovatos, 332
Boat: goddess in, on Cretan seal-ring, 327; lamp in shape of, 274
Boeotian Geometric pottery, 325
Boston Museum: amphora with shoemaker's shop, 313
Boulountis, Marquise of, 234 f.; remains of castle, 246
Boxer on r.-f. krater at Oxford, 316
Boy: with duck or goose, 19; holding ure, 22; votive statuette of, 21
British Museum: Athens from Parthenon, 46; metopes, 47; Tretham statue, 142 f.; Aphrodite paper, 98
Bryaxis, bust of Serapis (copy of), Cook Coll., 10

C

Cæcilius, worship of, at Mileta, 335
Calmes, son of Sycides, 57 f.
Calypsonian Bear-hunt (Cook sarcophagus), 28
Cambridge:
Fitzwilliam Mus.: Cretan kylix, 175
Caravan tribute to Athens in 440 B.C., 294
CARTHAGINIAN: naval organization, 229; see also Alexander the Great
Caryatids, Baroum of, 244 f.
Cedrins (Thessaly), site of, 210
Centaur and Lapith: on Parthenon metopes, 47; on Spartan ivory, 322; two centaurs supporting metallon on sarcophagus, 30
Chersonesus, excavations, 324
Chios, excavations, 321
Chimera (Lydia), inscr. at, 185
Chimaros (Lydia), fragment of, Ephesus, 339
Clast graves at Leukas, 333
Cista mystica, 33; 39
Claudius Bithynicos, Bithynicos, inscr. of, at Side, 190
Cleides, historian, 294
Chisophas Elissineis, secretary to treasurers of Athens, 492 f., 298
Cistocleus, historian, 284
Cnossus, excavations, 325
Cook, Sir Frederick, collection of, 1 ff.

D

Dionysiac: Cretan tombs, 328
Croesus in alliance with Sparta, 88
Crybelis, residence of (Cook Coll.), 36
Cyprus, place-names of, 123; dialect, 134 f.; inscr. from, 197
Cretan pottery at Sparta, 322 f.; kylikes at Cambridge and Athens, 176
Cypriotes, inscr. from, 198 f.

E

Egypt: history of, in Herodotus, 275; outranks from Graeco-Egyptian schools, 121; under the early Khalkides, 98 f.
Elesianan Korai, 254 f.
Eros: Spartan policy toward, 84; coins showing Phidian Zeus, 49 f.
Eudymion type on sarcophagus, 39
Ephesus: the archaic Artemision at, 338; figure of boy with goose from, 29
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Euboea and Os. Pop. 382, 387 f.
Euphrates, excava-tions, 321
Euphrosyne, mother of, 18
Episkope (Themistly), inscri. from, 337
Erechtheum: see Athens
Eros and Eustyle: erecting image of Priasus (tundish), 24; adorning, 30, 32; vining with Pan, 32; with inverted torch, 32; drunken, 27; at play, 28; surrounding deceased person, 39
Esok-Saghra (Thrace), bronze and gold objects from tomb (Cook Coll.), 45
Ethiopian (f.), head of, on Cypro- sic kylix, 177
Ethics, treaty with Athens, c. 356-7 B.C., 356 f.; excavations, 321; possessions of Marquesses of Boscumtes in, 239
Euphrasius, Apollo attributed to, 8
Euphrosyne: use of, 324, 272 f.
Euryalus, battle of, 228
F
Festines from Knossos, 325
Fleets, ancient, 292 f.; of the Khalifate, 112
Fountain-figure (boy with urn), in Cook Coll., 22
Fugitives in the Aphrodite correspondence, 197 f.
Funeral, relief (Cook Coll.), imitation of 8th cent. 35; statues, Greek, 138 f.
G
Geometric and Mycenaean objects, imitation of, 153
Gold jewellery from Mykale (Crete), 326
Gold in Cyprus, 135
Gorgon masks, terracotta (Cook Coll.), 43
Greens, T. Whitecombe, bronze lamp belonging to, 274
Gymnasiuia: scenes from, on r. f. kylix (Cook Coll.), 44; rare Ateidicus column at Mykale, 335
H
Habron in Lyca, 186
Halkarenes, inscri. from, 181
Har on coins of Rhagium and Zacelo, 65
Helots, relation of, to Spartiates, 89 f.
Heracleodrom of Grea pro-Athenian, 366
Heracles: figures of, 4th cent. (Roman copy, Cook Coll.), 9; torso (Cook Coll.), 10; infant, with snakes, on bronze lamp, 274; mask of, on Dionysiac relief (Cook Coll.), 23; slaying Hydra (Campana relief), 42; with Triton, on l. f. kylix (Cook Coll.), 44; temple of, at Pergamum, 331; see also Athens
Heraclameum, Roman copies of tomb-statues from, at Dresden, 140
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Hermes of Andros, 129; some figures identified as, 129 f.; head of (Cook Coll.), 37; temple of, at Pergamum, 331
— and Dionysus, double bust, 12
— and Nymph (Cook Coll.), 36
— and Selenus (Oxford vase), 314
Herod as serpent, on altar at Teuthus, 182
Herodotus, historian, 284
Herodotus: on Egypt, 275 f.; on the land of Norcia, 294 f.; on the Samians at Zancle, 56
Hippocrates and Zancle, 56 f.
Hope Athens: copies of head (Cook Coll.), 6
Hygieia, statue (Cook Coll.), 16
J
Ileipo chilepae, 27
Ialae, site of, 325
Ionian influence at Sparta, 322
Iphigenia group at Copenhagen, 150
Island tribute to Athens in 442-3 B.C., 295
Hips: see Lesbos
Items, excavations at alleged site, 323
Ivory: objects from Sparta, 322; relief with griffins and bull from Mykale, 325; seals from Mykale, 326

K (see also C)

Kakovatos (Homeric Pylos) excavations, 332
Kalasetepe (Miletus), excavations, 324
Karnak, school-extracts from, 191
Komiah, papyri from, 97
Koumias (Crete), excavations, 327
Kratost, marble, with Victories and Dapping Girls, Cook Coll., 24
Kurra b. Shurik, correspondence with, Basilius, 98
Kylikes, Cypro- sic, at Cambridge and Athens, 175

L
Lacedaemon: see Sparta
Lafe, battle of, 228
Lamia under the Marquesses of Boscumtes, 336
Lamp, Greek-Roman bronze, with Heracles and horses, 274
Lapithi: see Centaur
Larissa, inscr. from, 197
Lesbos, excavations, 332
Lindos, excavations, 335
Lorfi, allied with Messana, 68
London: see British Museum

A A
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Lycia, inscriptions in, 181 f.
Lygdamis, leader of Cimmerians, 338
Lycurgus, policy of, 49

M.

Macrinus, stele of, 41.
Macedon : with tympanum (relief, Cook Coll.), 7 : see also Dionysius
Magnesia (Themisian), couris of, 337.
Mantineia, Praxitelean reliefs from, 140.
Marble, use of different, in same statues, 143.
Masks on Dionysiac relief, 23 ; terracotta (Cook Coll.), 43 ; terracotta grotesque, from Sparta, 322 ; tragic and Satyremus (Cook Coll.), 49.
Mathematical school-straika, 131.
Manara, Venus, 11.
Medallion portrait of a Roman (Cook Coll.), 27.
Melos, see Calydonian Bear.
Mendes nitrum, see Bouleotates.
Messaces, see Zancle.
Messene (Crotos), excavations, 324 f., 327.
Messenes, see Zancle.
Messene-Crotos, see Zancle.
Messene, account of Peloponnesian and of Zancle-Messene, 59 f., 73 f. ; at Palos, 148.
Messinia, hoard of coins from, 48.
Miletus, excavations, 334.
Miletus, Venus of, terracotta resembling, 319.
Moklos (Crotos), excavations, 320.
Mule-car on coins of Rhgium and Zancle, 66.
Myacle, battle of, 227.
Myocardium, excavations, 320.
Myce, excavations, 329.
Mygan and Geometric objects, relation of, 153 ; remains in Euboea, 321.
Lekanes, 333 f. ; Lindos, 335 ; Mileta, 334 f. ; Palos (Homeric), 322 ; Tyloneia, 328 ; Zeruld, 324.

N.

Naxos, ancient, 202 f. ; of the early Khalilfate, 119.
Neolithic settlement : at Chasmouha, 324 ; at Zeruld, 323.
Nereus on sea-panthers (sarcophagus in Cook Coll.), 28.
Newton-Robinson (Mr.), last of girl in Coll. of, 27.
NikThemistakes, vase-foot signed by, 43.
Nymph holding shell (statuette in Cook Coll.), 18.

O.

Omphalos on Melos, see sarcophagi, 29.
Olympos, inscr. to Hercules from, 337.
Olympia, excavations, 331 ; earliest remains, 331 f. ; date of Geometric objects from, 133 ; temple and battle of, 30 f. ; throne of Zeus at, 49.
Oreus on sarcophagus of Calydonian Bear, 29.
Ormins, stele of, 337.
Orpheus, excavations, 320.
Ostraka used in schools, 121.
Owl as decoration of diskos, on r.-f. vase, 316.

Oxyrhynchos, school-straika from, 123 ; Ox. Pap., 342, 377 f.

P.

Pausanias, excavations, 329, 337.
Painted stele from Pausanias, 320.
Pallava, marquises of Bouleotiates, 234 f.
Pan and Eros, vintage, 37.
Panathenians, paintings on temple of Zeus, 49.
Paphos, Nova, inscription of, 196.
Papyri, length of rolls used in Heracliteus, Book II., 270 ; papyri from Aphrodisias, 97 f.
Parthenon Sculptures, additions to, 46.
Patera, inscription of, 183.
Patala (Crotos), excavations, 329.
Pausanias, account of temple of Zeus at Olympia 50 f. ; of Zancle-Messene, 50.
Pelasgians and Magnesians, topography, 337.
Peloponnesian School : female head of about 489-480 B.C. (Cook Coll.), 5.
Peloponnesians, policy of Sparta in, 244 f.
Pentekonters in Persian fleet, 260.
Penthesilea, see Achilles.
Pergamene school, draped female statue (Cook Coll.), 16.
Pergamene, excavations, 331.
Perrin, see Spartiates.
Persephonis, see Demeater.
Persian Wars : see Xerxes.
Phaistos, excavations, 329.
Pharsela, inscription of, 185 f.
Philai, stele of, 17.
Phylactetes story on school-straika, 128.
Phoenician fleet in Persian wars, 204 f. ; at Salamis, 224.
Photograph, imprinted on disc from Phaistos, 329.
Plaster, sculptured (Augustan) in Cook Coll., 25.

Pindar, on the Olympics of 476 B.C., 301 f. ; hint of syne, syann, 298 f.
Polydeuchus, Aphrodite by, 15.
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Polyeuctus, tholos of, 321
Polyphemus: see Odysseus
Porphyry: vase in Cook Coll., 42; bust of Sarcins in Cook Coll., 10
Porti (Crete), excavations, 328
Portraits, Roman, in Cook Coll., 25 f.
Poseidon on coin of Zancle, 67
Potter’s shop on Oxford r.d. krater, 317
Pottery: from Chaeronea, 324; from Oenasus, 228; from Miletus, 333; from Rhodos, 325; from Sparta, 322 f.; from Ynnia (Rhodes), 335 f.; from Zerdius, 335; Cyrene, 175; in Cook Coll., 43 f.; at Oxford, 313 f.
Praxiteles, tomb-statue by, 138, 146
Prasus, sarcophagus erecting image of, 28
Priestess, Roman, portrait of, in Cook Coll., 26
Prometheus and eagle, on Spartan ivory, 322
Prytanion, supposed at Miletus, 333
Ptolemaicus of Phaselis, iner, of, 189
Pylos: 148 f.; Homer, size of, 153, 332
Pythagoras, pre-Persian tyrant of Ephesos, 339
Pythian games at Side, 191

Q

Quotation-list, Athenian: new fragment of I. G. I., 228 and 240, 291 f.

R

Rakeneia, Festival of, 237
Rhenia, coins of, 63, see also Amazia
Rhodes, bust of tomb-statue of woman from, 139
Rhodos (Boccotia), excavations, 328
Rhyton, ritual, from Oenasus, 329
Richmond (Surrey), Collection of Sir F. Cook at, 1 f.
Ring (guld) from Mokle with goddess in best, 397
Roman adaptation of Greek funeral statues, 143
Rome: American school: iner from Budrum, 180; from Side, 194

S

Sailors in navy of the early Khalifate, 112 f.
Salamis, battle of, 219 f.
Samaria on coins of Samos, etc., 68 f.
Samians at Zante-Messana, 50
Sandese, his contingent in Persian fleet, 215
Sarapis, bust of, (Cook Coll.), 10
Saropha, Roman, in Cook Coll., 27 f.
Satur: dancing, relief in Cook Coll., 49 f.; in Cook Coll., 10; young, with Slaephon, (Hellenistic relief in Cook Coll.), 25; see also Dionysus
Satrie scene on S. Italian krater, 45
Schools, Graeco-Egyptian, ostraka from, 121
Scythes, king of Zancle, 56 f.
Seilenus: mask of, (Cook Coll.), 39; bargaining with traveller (Hermes), on vase, 314; with satyri (Hellenistic relief), 221; supporting Dionysus (Cook Coll.), 11
Secenio, statue of, 21
Sequin, Cave, identification of, 311
Sophracal urn (Cook Coll.), 40
Shield, 8-shaped, dating, on Crete sealings, 397
Shoemaker’s shop on vase, 313
Shrine in Little Palace at Cnossos, 325
Side, iner. from, 189 f.
Sidonian fleet in Persian war, 297
Siphoncles: use of, 321; 271 f.
Sisylus, on naval tactics, 216
Sparta: excavations at, 321; her population and policy in 6th cent., 17; succession of admirals in early 4th cent., 279; her troops at Pylos and Sphacteria, 148
Spartiates, proportion of to Periessi and Helots, 90
Sphacteria, 138
Stadium at Olympia, 251 f.
Stela, funeral, in Cook Coll., 7, 17 f., 41 painted, from Paphage, 329
Stelae, tomb-portraits by, 146
Straton, sepulchral relief of, 41
Stelum, colossal statue from, 329

T

Tercra, excavations, 326
Temple, iner. at, 131 f.
Terra-cottas: in Cook Coll., 42; disc with impressed Cretonne impressions, 329
Thetis, at Olympia, 250 f.
Themistocles at Salamis, 235
Thesprotium, author of, On. Poes, 842 f., 257 f.
Theokles (Theocles), excavations, 337
Thermopylae, see of, 226
Theseus, Persian fleet off coast of, 311; see also Pelon
Thidias: of Polykleitos at Ephesus, 321; tomb in Crete, 327 f.
Thynchidion at Zante-Messana, 59
Thunor, state of, 7
Toilet, girl at, terra-cotta (Cook Coll.), 63
Tomb-statue, Greek, 126 f.
Tombas, at Olympia and Delphi, 257 f.
Tentamen, tomb-statue of woman from, 142
Tribute-lists, Athenian: see Quota-lists
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Triptolemus, Demeter, and Persephone, on krater (Cook Coll.), 44
Trochilus (Crate), excavations, 328
Tumuli: on Leukas, 323 f.; at Chaeronea, 324; at Pergamum, 351
Turks make Boudonitis tributary, 243; capture it, 244

V

Vases in Cook Coll., 43 f.
Venetians and Boudonitis, 239 f.
Venus: as Aphrodite
Veranion Tlepolemus, Q., inscr. at Xanthus in honour of, 184
Verus, L., bust (Cook Coll.), 26
Victorines on marble krater (Cook Coll.), 24
Vine in group of Eros and Pan (Cook Coll.), 32
Vassilis Sextus, inscr. on, at Phaselis, 187
Volo Museum, statuæ in, 329
Vourdia (Rhodes), excavations, 335

X

Xanthos, Æge, 184
Xanthus, inscr. at, 184
Xenophon on battle of Olympia, 250 f., 296 f.
Xerxes, the fleet of, 292 f.

Z

Zacharo—Homerio Pyles (?), 153
Zanubi-Messana, Samians at, 36; coins of, 63 f.
Zeni, terracotta of Malian Venus type from, 319
Zeralia near Almyro (Thessaly), excavations, 325
Zeus: statuæ of, in Cook Coll., 49; throne of, at Olympia, 49
Zeroli, Niccolò, at Boudonitis, 240 f.
II.—GREEK INDEX.

άγαθος, σύμφωνα όπ. 66
άγαν = κατάνα, 266 f., 268 f.
άδελφος (I.G. II. L. 89), 267
άδων = νεαρός πλανό, 134 f.
άδοματος at Side, 192
άδοματος in συναγωγή, 196
άδριατική, 308
άδρυς = ἀδρύς (Cypr.), 134 f.
αδρής = τοιχόπυρος, 116.

αδικία στη Σίδη, 192
αδικία στη Σίδη, 100
αδικία στη Σίδη, 196

άδικος, 99

αδικία, 311

άδικα στο Θρόνο του Άρη, 53

Ξενοκλής, (Teloança), 183

άδωματος, 70 f.

άδωματος, 260 f.

άδωσίνα, 303

άδωσίνα, 184

αδρυτής : Χαρθού, 184 | Chimaera, 185

αδρυσθής, 192

αδρυσία, 114

αδρυκό = κυκλική, 183

καρνείος of Θρόνος του Άρη στο Όλυμπο, 50

καρπάτις, 265 f.

καρπάτις = Λίλια, 265 f.

κατά στο Θρόνο του Άρη, 52

κατά στο Θρόνο του Άρη, 197

κατά στοιχεία in a συναγωγή, 114

κατά στοιχεία, 116

κατά στοιχεία, 113

κατά στοιχεία, 113

κατά στοιχεία, 101 f.

κατά στοιχεία, 184

κατά στοιχεία, 310

κατά στοιχεία, 109

κατά στοιχεία, κατά στοιχεία, 100 f.

κατά στοιχεία, 183

κατά στοιχεία, 213 f.

κατά στοιχεία, κατά στοιχεία, 134 f.

κατά στοιχεία, 113

κατά στοιχεία, 113

κατά στοιχεία, 196

κατά στοιχεία, 196

κατά στοιχεία, 196

κατά στοιχεία, 101

κατά στοιχεία τού συναγώνα (Σίδη), 196.
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Adam (J.), Religious Teachers of Greece, 339
Agar (T. L.), Homerica, 340
Anderson (W. J.), and Spars (R. P.), Architecture of Greece and Rome, 162
Aristotle, Works, translated (ed. Smith and Rose), 159
Austen (J.), 165
Basecker (K.), Griechenland, 346
Bears (J. I.), Aristotle's Poiae Naturae, 159
Blass (F.), Eumenides v. Aeschylus, 154
Burrage (R. M.), Discoveries in Crete, 159
Calderini (A.), Le Marmomie, 342
Callimachus, Epigrams, ed. Hainvett, 156
Chaplet (V.), Colosse Tarsus, 167
Chass (G. H.), Leoh Collection of Arretines Pottery, 342
Collignon (M.), Archéologie Grecque, 167
---Scopis at Priene, 164
Curtis (C. D.), see Pais.
Dobbs, (A. E.), Philosophy and Popular Morals, 173
Euripides, Bacchae; see Norwood.
Ferguson (W. S.), Points of Aristotle, 166
Fothergill (J.); see Lowey (E.)
Frazier (J. G.), Alcibiades, Alcis, Oisiria, 172
Gemme (G. L.), Index of Archaeological Papers, 167
Grenfell (B. P.), and Hunt (A. S.), Oxyrhynchos Papyri V., 158
Haigh (A. E.), Attic Theatre, ed. Pickard-Cambridge, 164
Hall (H. R.), see Murray
Hauvette (A.), Épigraphies de Collineaux, 156
Heidkamp (W.), Book of Greek Verse, 157
Henderson (B. W.), Civil War and Revolution in Roman Empire, 344
Hesiodus, ed. Masan, 340
Hoffmann (O.), Makeloon, 346
Hogarth (D. G.), Excavations at Ephesus, 341
Holmes (T. R.), Ancient Britain, 171
Hunt (A. S.), see Grenfell (B. P.)
Joachim (H. H.), Aristotle's de Finibus, 342
Jones (H. S.), Roman Empire, 344
Jongkees (P.), and Loeschke (J.), Papyrus Greek, 159
Lagrange (M. J.), Crôce Ancienne, 159
Lefebvre (G.), MS. de Menaure, 157
Lethaby (W. R.), Greek Buildings represented by Fragments in the British Museum, 165; II. III., 341
Lowey (E.), Nature in Early Greek Art, trans. Fothergill, 164
Macan (R. W.), Herodotus VII.--IX., 340
Macmillan's Guide to Greece, etc., 168
Malanby (J. P.), Rambles and Studies, 168
---Slaves of the Greek World, 170
Marden (P. S.), Greece and the Aegean Islands, 168
Marshall (F. H.), Catalogue of Finger Rings, 166
Mendels; see Lefebvre
Mars (A.), Palace of Greece, 159
Murray's Handbook to Egypt and the Sudan, by Hall, 168.
Murray (G.), Rise of the Greek Epics, 154
Nicola (G.), Melians, 163
Norwood (G.), Buildings of the Bacchae, 156
Ny-Carlberg Olympeion, Billhartuvel, 162
Pais (E.), Ancient Italy, transl. G. D. Curtis, 170
Petersen (E.), Eryxtempel der Atheniern, 162
Pickard-Cambridge (A. W.), see Haigh
Ramsey (W. M.), Cities of St. Paul, 172
Regnault (F.), Dictionnaire Rhapsodique, 340
Reich (E.), General History of Western Nations, 345
Reich (E.), *Atlas Antiquus*, 343
Ross (G. R. T.), *Aristotle's Poetics*, 159
Ross (W. D.): see Aristotle, Works
Seymour (T. D.), *Life in the Homeric Age*, 102
Smith (A. S.): see Aristotle, Works
Spiers (R. Phene): see Anderson (W. J.),
and Villiamy (L.)
Tyss (G.), *Olympische Forschungen I.*, 163
Verrall (A. W.), *Romanitas of Asculapius*,
134
Vulliamy (L.), *Classic Ornament*, ed. R. P.
Spills
Webb (P. H.), *Ceraminia*, 343
Weigall (A. K. P.), *Antiquities of Lower
Nubia*, 109
Wroth (W.), *Imperial Byzantine Coins*,
342
"A book that is shut is but a block"
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