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MEETINGS
OF THE SESSION 1941-1942

The Inaugural Meeting of the Session was held on November 4th, 1941, at the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, members of the Oxford Philological Society and the Oxford branch of the Classical Association being invited to attend. Professor Sir John Myres delivered a memorial address on 'The Life and Work of Sir Arthur Evans,' before a crowded audience, with Sir Richard Livingstone in the chair. This lecture has since been published, with some additions, in the Proceedings of the British Academy, vol. xxvii.

A vote of thanks was proposed by the Chairman, who mentioned that this was, appropriately, the first lecture to be given in the Ashmolean since the death of Sir Arthur Evans, and, doubly appropriately, in the very hall which held his books bequeathed to the Museum. It was fitting that this should have been delivered by Prof. Myres, who had been so closely associated with his life and work. The proposal was seconded by Prof. Dawkins, another close friend of Evans, and was enthusiastically applauded.

The Second General Meeting was held on February 23rd, 1942, at the Literary Lecture Rooms in Cambridge, in association with the Cambridge University Classical Society and the Cambridge Antiquarian Society. Prof. E. H. Minns read a paper, illustrated by lantern slides, on Greek Plate from East European Hoards.' He showed photographs of three collections of Byzantine Plate, the first of which was found in Western Siberia and at one time owned by Peter the Great. The second hoard came from Rumania, and is now in Moscow. It contained among other objects of minor interest a dish inscribed with the X-P monogram. The fine design round its rim had been later overlaid with gold medallions. The third hoard also came from Rumania, and is now in Moscow. It consisted of 23 gold pieces, one of them bearing a Turkish inscription in Greek lettering. There was also a Greek inscription, rather badly executed, which Prof. Minns believes to have been originally written in ink upon the gold surface.

The President, who was in the chair, expressed the warm thanks of the society for Prof. Minns' paper, which had given great pleasure.

A Third General Meeting was held on Tuesday, May 3rd, 1942, at Burlington House, where Mr. C. T. Seltman read a paper, illustrated with lantern slides, on Greek Sculpture and some Festival Coins.' This paper is to be published in a later volume of the Journal of Hellenic Studies. The President was in the chair, and Dr. Bell's proposal of the vote of thanks was loudly applauded.

The Annual Meeting of the Society was held on June 23rd, 1942, with the President, Dr. Pickard-Cambridge, in the chair. The adoption of the Annual Report and Accounts was moved by the Chairman and seconded by Sir John Forsdyke. The re-election of the Vice-Presidents and the election of an Honorary Member and ten new members of the Council, as detailed in the Annual Report, were seconded by Mr. Seltman. Mr. L. Wharton proposed, and Miss A. Woodward seconded, the re-election of Mr. C. T. Edge as Auditor.

The President began his address with an explanation of his choice of subject. When he edited, in 1907, the third edition of Haigh's 'Attic Theatre,' he retained much which had already become doubtful, and which he now no longer believed. He hoped to produce a substitute for that book, but in case this became impossible he wished to make a formal recantation now. In particular he no longer maintained the view, formerly upheld by Haigh and most English scholars, that the actors of the fifth century performed in high boots on a raised stage.

Again, there had been no summary of the present state of our knowledge, in English, since 1907. Even Flickinger's useful outline, published in 1936, could not take into account the full publication of Fiechter's excavations later in that year. Before the appearance of Fiechter's volume on Athens, Bulle's book, covering a number of theatres and issued in 1928, had shown what minute investigation and precise drawing could do. Such works have superseded Prof. Turney Allen's little book, which is still useful, however, for its discussions of minor problems. Discussion among German scholars relating to the Greek theatre has left few questions as they were forty years ago, but it has restored to a great extent the credit of Dörpfeld's solutions of 1896, with much added to them.

Only a brief outline could now be given of the history of the Greek theatre to the end of the fifth century. The oldest building of which traces remain within the precinct of Dionysus Eleutherus, is the older temple of Dionysus, whose polygonal masonry goes well back into the sixth century, and may have been built, perhaps by Peisistratos, to receive the θέατρον from Eleutherai. The first provision for lyric and dramatic performances must have consisted of an orchestra levelled in the hillside precinct of this temple. Only six stones now remain—the base of a supporting wall—and Dörpfeld and practically all other investigators of the present century, believed them to form part of a circle of dimensions similar to that of the later orchestra within the lowest tier of seats of the fourth-century theatre, but slightly to the S.S.E. of it. The fragment of a wall farther along the arc of the supposed circle was thought by Dörpfeld to confirm this, but subsequent examination showed this fragment to be of material and masonry different from the six stones, and in fact the section of a straight line. A supposed cutting in the rock, which Dörpfeld believed to form part of the circumference of the orchestra, has no clear direction nor plainly formed sides. Even the six stones do not lie in the position of a regular segment of a circle. Such a wall would in any case have allowed no space outside the circle for actors, if any. Dörpfeld and his American followers later abandoned this hypothetical earliest orchestra.

The six stones probably formed part of a terrace on which, at a little distance inwards, the first circular
orchestra lay, probably of the dimensions, not of the circle bounded by the lowest tier of seats, but of the actual dancing ground lying in a line from north to south which was determined by the conformation of the hillside, and itself probably determined at a later date the position of the centre of the stage buildings. Where the six stones lie, the terrace must have been curved.

Any stage buildings in the first third of the fifth century would have been temporary, and in fact the Suppliant of Aeschylus requires no stage, but only an altar. The next two extant plays of Aeschylus could still have been performed against a plain house front with a door, and even the latest required only what could have been provided for the particular occasion. The spectators apparently first stood on the terrace, or sat or stood on the sloping ground above. Wooden seats supported on stands were presumably in use for some time before the accident in the early century which led to the erection of earthen banks, still early, as Dörpfeld's excavations show. Any supporting walls would have disappeared when a larger and steeper auditorium was built in the middle of the century. This was closely connected with Pericles' Odeum. The new plan entailed the removal of the whole scene of the dramatic performances slightly northwards. It was probably not moved so far as the site of the present day orchestra, but sufficiently for the actors to perform and to allow for scenery. Until recently, archaeologists thought the date of this reconstruction to be post-Périclean, because the foundations were of conglomerate. Dörpfeld, however, had to retract this opinion, because conglomerate foundations had been found, which date to the beginning of the fifth century. The new temple of Dionysus, too, which was part of the complex of buildings, was almost certainly a fifth-century structure, since the last recorded work of Alcmenes, who made its statue, was executed in 403 B.C.

The President then touched upon various details of this Periclean structure: (1) The site of the Odeum, awaiting further excavation. (2) The walls of the auditorium, some of them with extant remains. The auditorium itself was still formed of earthen embankments upon which stood the wooden seats, the noise from which is mentioned in several existing texts. Fifth-century inscribed stones survive, which probably marked reserved seats before being built into the later reconstruction of the theatre. (3) The line of the new terrace wall, the remnants of which are about 204 feet long, was broken by a solid foundation projecting northwards. This, when perfect, probably rose to the ground level, and an opening at the back was carried through the wall of the later hall, to which it must have given access by steps. In the surface of this projecting wall are two depressions, and there are eight vertical grooves in the earth face of the terrace itself. Five were probably cut on either side of the projection, two having disappeared in some later construction. They were evidently intended to receive poles for the support of scenery and the depressions in the projecting wall probably served a similar purpose. Posts set in the grooves probably stood free for use as framework for a painted back scene, while constructions over the cross wall behind may have worked machinery such as the 

Few scholars now believe in a raised stage between the 

The President postponed the second half of his address until the following year. A vote of thanks was proposed by Dr. Bell and heartily applauded.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liabilities</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Debts Payable</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>By Cash in Hand—</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Subscriptions paid in advance</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Assistant Treasurer</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Endowment Fund</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Petty Cash</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(includes legacy of £180 from the late Prof.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deposit Account</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Gardner, £200 from the late Canon Adam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Special Deposit Account (Donation from Arch.</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrar, £200 from the late Rev. H. F. Tozer,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inst. of America)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and £500 from the late Mr. G. A. Macmillan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>764</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Compositions—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Investments, At Cost—</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total at January 1, 1941</td>
<td>2156</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&quot; Present values (not reckoned here)—</td>
<td>2725</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received during year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£453 Calgary &amp; Edmonton Rly. Co. 4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consolidated Debenture Stock.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Less carried to Income and Expenditure Account—Members deceased)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£200 3% Defence Bonds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus at January 1, 1941</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>£174 12s. 4d. 3% War Stock.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Balance from Income and Expenditure Account</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£230 17s. 7d. 2½% Consolidated Stock.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus at December 31, 1941</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>£1395 4½d. 1½% Conversion Loan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£154 7s. 3d. Nottingham 3% Irredeemable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stock.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Library Premises Capital Account—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount spent to date</td>
<td>3584</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(Less Donations received)</td>
<td>4699</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Donations received</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transferred to Income and Expenditure</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account during past years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Now transferred</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>204</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated Valuation of Stocks of Publica-</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot; Valuation of Library</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot; Valuation of Photographic Department</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot; Paper in hand for printing</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot; Journal</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
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</table>

£5984 | 1 | 11

* The Investments as at December 31, 1941, had a value of £3326.
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INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT. FROM JANUARY 1, 1941, TO DECEMBER 31, 1941.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Salaries</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Pensions Insurance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Miscellaneous Expenses</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Stationery</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Postage</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Sundry Printing, Rules, List of Members,</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notices, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Heating, Lighting, Cleaning, Maintenance of</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Premises, etc. (including second floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dilapidations and war damage repairs throughout)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; General</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; War Damage</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Less amounts recovered</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British School at Athens</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Rome</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Balance from 'Journal of Hellenic Studies'</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Balance from Library Account</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Balance from Library Premises Account</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Balance</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Members' Subscriptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrears</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>1083</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Members' Entrance Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Student Associates' Subscriptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrears</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Libraries' Subscriptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrears</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Life Compositions brought into Revenue Account</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Dividends on Investments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Contributed by the Society for Promotion of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Sale of 'Ante Oculis'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Sale of 'Artemis Orthia'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Miscellaneous Receipts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Donations towards current expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Balance from Lantern Slides and Photos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graphs Account</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Donation from Arch. Inst. of America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

£1899 7 9
# JOURNAL OF HELLENIC STUDIES' ACCOUNT

**From January 1, 1941, to December 31, 1941.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£ s. d.</th>
<th>£ s. d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Postage on Vols. LX</td>
<td>74 3 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing and Engraving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing and Reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Sales, including back Vols.—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fer Macmillan &amp; Co., Ltd.</td>
<td>33 4 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenic Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipts from Advertisements</td>
<td>33 4 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance to Income and Expenditure Account</td>
<td>40 19 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£74 3 9</strong></td>
<td><strong>£74 3 9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## LANTERN SLIDES AND PHOTOGRAPHS ACCOUNT

**From January 1, 1941, to December 31, 1941.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£ s. d.</th>
<th>£ s. d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Slides and Photographs for Sale</td>
<td>12 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slides for Hire</td>
<td>16 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance to Income and Expenditure Account</td>
<td>13 4 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£15 13 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## LIBRARY ACCOUNT: PURCHASES AND BINDING

**From January 1, 1941, to December 31, 1941.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£ s. d.</th>
<th>£ s. d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Purchases</td>
<td>6 13 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>3 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of printing Accessions Lists to the Library, and Slides Departments, less contribution from the Roman Society</td>
<td>13 12 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£23 14 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## LIBRARY PREMISES ACCOUNT FOR THE YEAR 1941

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£ s. d.</th>
<th>£ s. d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>402 12 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates</td>
<td>51 8 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred from Balance Sheet—Proportion of Expenditure for Year</td>
<td>23 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£477 1 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have audited the above Balance Sheet and Income and Expenditure Account and in my opinion the same exhibit a true and correct view of the Society's financial position according to the best of my information and the explanations given to me and as shown by the books of the Society.

London, June 2, 1942.

Cyril T. Edge, Chartered Accountant.
WAS THE IONIAN PHILOSOPHY SCIENTIFIC?

[This paper was prepared by the late Professor F. M. Cornford for the Joint Meeting of the Hellenic and Roman Societies held at Oxford in the summer of 1942. It was read there in his absence by Professor Gilbert Murray. To a suggestion that the paper should be published in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Professor Cornford replied: "The paper is a very short (and not very convincing) summary of an argument which I am writing out at length in a book which I hope to publish when times are easier. I hoped to get some criticism and discussion, but not being well enough to attend, I did not gain much that way. Space in the *Journal* is too valuable to justify this sort of advanced patrol work being published as if it were a final statement with all the relevant evidence."

After his lamented death, permission was obtained from Mrs. Cornford and from Mr. W. K. Guthrie, his literary executor, to publish the paper here with an explanation of its origin and intention.]

This paper is concerned with a problem which has puzzled me for many years. The Greek philosophers of the Ionian tradition, from Anaximander to Epicurus, are commonly called specially 'scientific,' in contrast with the Italian tradition started by Pythagoras. Why is it, then, that their systems are cast in the form of dogmatic pronouncements? It is not only that they describe, with complete confidence, matters beyond the reach of observation, such as the origin of the world; but when they come to matters of detail, they make assertions which could have been upset by a little careful observation or by the simplest experiment.

It has been argued—by Burnet, for instance—that this dogmatism may be only apparent. Our evidence is fragmentary, and comes largely from manuals compiled much later by men whose object was to discredit science for reaching contradictory conclusions, and by no means to record the methods employed to reach those conclusions. W. A. Heidel, too, thought that, if we possessed the philosophers' notebooks, we should find that their results were obtained by methods akin to those of modern science, though with less awareness of the need for caution in experimental tests. Behind these arguments lies the assumption that the questions they asked themselves, the motives prompting their inquiries, and the quarter to which they looked for the sources of knowledge, were the same then as now. This assumption is naturally made by most historians of science. Looking back at the past from our own standpoint, they are interested in those features of ancient thought—atomism, for example—which have proved fruitful in modern developments. The archaic features are ignored or dismissed as pardonable errors in the infancy of science. But if our aim is to regain the standpoint of ancient speculation, we cannot afford to discard all elements foreign to our own ways of thinking; any more than the historian of religion can afford to dismiss as 'superstitious fancies' beliefs and practices which the civilised world has outgrown. Rather we should fix attention on these strange features and try to recover the attitude of mind that will account for them.

We are asked to believe that these Ionian systems were based on observation; that hypotheses were then framed by rational inference from observed facts; and that, sometimes at least, these hypotheses were checked by experiment, though with insufficient caution. Let us recall a few of the philosophers' statements and consider whether they could have been founded on such methods.

(1) Anaximander coolly asserted that the distance of the sun from the earth is precisely three times that of the fixed stars, and that the stars' distance is nine times the diameter of the earth. The earth itself is a cylindrical drum, three times as broad as it is high.

(2) A main feature of Anaximenes' system was his reduction of differences of temperature to differences of density: the hotter, the thinner; the colder, the denser. Water is the only substance which can easily be seen passing into vapour when heated and becoming solid when cooled. When water turns to steam, it expands; when chilled into ice, it ought to contract into a smaller volume. But does it contract? If Anaximenes had put a jar of water outside his door on a frosty night, he might have observed that the water did not shrink when it turned into ice, but, on the contrary, split the jar. We may conclude that he never had recourse to this simple experiment. Nor is there any record of anyone testing his dogma in this obvious way.
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Empedocles explained respiration as a process whereby the warm air breathed out through the mouth is automatically replaced inside us by cold air drawn in through pores in the chest. Then the movement is reversed: the air inside, now heated, escapes through the same pores whereby it entered, and is replaced by cold air inhaled through the mouth. Plato adopts this theory. No one ever thought of sitting in a bath with the water up to his neck, to find out whether air bubbles could be observed passing through the water into his chest when he exhaled, and out again when he inhaled; and if not, whether his breathing was impeded.

Such tests would instantly suggest themselves today, not merely to a man of science, but to any sensible person. Why did they not occur to the ancient philosophers, even when they were contradicting one another's theories?

They were, moreover, equally dogmatic on questions beyond the reach of observation, let alone experiment. They announced, with the same assurance, that the ultimate constituents of material things were water, or air, or the four elements, or atoms; and they described the process whereby an ordered world had arisen out of these elements. None of them had witnessed the process, or had the faintest conception of any method for isolating an element.

Yet they narrate the history of the world from such beginnings as if it had happened before their eyes. Plato, whom our modern materialists despise as hopelessly unscientific, was the one philosopher who told the truth about ancient physics, when he said that it could be no more than a 'plausible tale.' That is exactly what all these Ionian systems were—an ἀδίκος μυθος.

I suggest that the key to our problem lies in a difference of attitude towards the question of the sources of knowledge or wisdom. And here some light comes to us from the protest against the methods of philosophy, raised by doctors of the Hippocratic school. In an admirable survey of Hippocratic medicine, Heidel has pointed out that, in the medical art, a procedure was evolved which does go some way towards the methods of modern science. Doctors began to keep careful records of symptoms in individual cases; and from these they advanced to generalisations, and even to the rudiments of experimental procedure. Nearly all the experiments recorded in ancient literature were made by doctors.

Heidel, however, drew no distinction between the methods of medical science and those of philosophy. Hence he assumed, like Burnet, that the philosophers applied to their problems the inchoate scientific procedure of the doctors, and reached many of their conclusions by observation and experiment of which no record remains. Here, I believe, he was mistaken. There was, from the nature of the case, a radical distinction, and even opposition, between medicine and philosophy, in the way they approached such problems as they had in common.

Medicine was, from the outset, a practical art; indeed, it was the only practical art which, in ancient times, was impelled by its own needs to develop a scientific method. The doctor is a healer (λογιστής), a craftsman in the public service (διαμειρυχτής), a hand-worker (χειρουργός) in surgery. He is always dealing with an individual patient, and always with a practical purpose—to cure that patient. Hence (unlike the philosopher, speculating about the origin of the world) he starts by noting the symptoms of a particular case, to find out what is wrong, and needs to be put right. The application of a remedy is based on a generalisation from accumulated experience—'This remedy has proved helpful in cases of this sort'—and it is experimental: 'Will it work in this case?' The doctor will be led on to speculate about the fundamental causes of disease and health. So at last he will arrive at the question of man's nature or bodily constitution—the elements and active or passive properties whose equilibrium needs to be restored by suitable treatment from outside.

Contrast with this procedure the route by which the philosopher approaches the nature of man. He starts with cosmogony. The questions implied (though they are answered rather than explicitly stated) are of this sort: What was the original state of things? What are the simplest constituents of all compound bodies? How can we give a natural explanation
of 'what goes on in the sky and under the earth'? How did life begin? From such speculations about the remotest origins of the world the philosopher arrived at accounts of the origin of plant, animal, and human life—accounts predetermined by doctrines already laid down as to the nature of the world as a whole. So, at the end, he came to the point where his theories impinged on the domain of medicine. The human body could only be composed of the same elements as all other bodies—water, or air, or the four elements, or atoms. The philosopher's 'physiological' theories (as we call them) were thus dictated by their cosmological dogmas; and they were ready to foist on the practical physician a priori accounts of the nature of health and disease.

The characteristic reaction of the scientific doctor is vigorously expressed in the treatise on Ancient Medicine. The author (who may be Hippocrates himself) attacks all writers on medicine who start from a groundless postulate or assumption, such as that all diseases are caused by 'heat or cold or moisture or whatever else they may fancy.' Such postulates, he says, may be inevitable in dealing with 'problems beyond the reach of observation' (τὰ ἀφανή τὲ καὶ ἀπορεώμανα), such as 'what goes on in the sky or under the earth.' There is no means of testing the truth of assertions made in this field. But medicine has long had a different principle and method of its own, securely based on discovered facts, which must be taken as the starting-point for further discovery. Philosophers like Empedocles have written about the nature of things, how man came into being at the first, and of what elements he was constructed. All this has no more to do with medicine than with painting. Man's nature can be ascertained only by discovering his reactions to food and drink and the effect of habits in general on each individual. These effects will differ from one individual to another. We must start with the observation of particular cases.

The contrast could not be more clearly expressed. The philosopher descends from above to deduce the nature of man from unproved postulates; the physician builds up his doctrine from below, generalising from particular observed facts.

My next point is that these two opposite approaches—the a priori approach of the philosopher and the empirical approach of the physician—are reflected in two opposite accounts of the sources of knowledge or wisdom.

The empirical account is set forth by Aristotle, himself the son of a practising physician. It starts with the senses. In the higher animals sensation gives rise to memory. In man repeated memories of the same thing result in a unified experience: 'This remedy benefited Callias in this disease, and also Socrates, and so on in many cases.' We then advance to the generalisation: 'This remedy is good for all phlegmatic temperaments in burning fever.' Such generalisations constitute Art. For practical purposes experience may be sufficient, because the physician is curing not 'man' in general, but some individual who 'happens to be a man.' On the other hand, we associate knowledge or wisdom rather with art than with mere experience, which knows only the fact, not the reason. Knowledge in the full sense comes last, with the understanding of causes.

It is not for nothing that Aristotle's illustrations are all taken from the art of medicine. This empirical theory of knowledge had already been mentioned by Plato as having interested Socrates in his young days. Its author, in fact, was none other than the physician Alcmaeon of the early fifth century, who taught that man is distinguished from the animals by possessing understanding as well as sensation; that our sense-perceptions are centred in the brain; and that from them arise memory, judgment (or belief), and finally knowledge. Alcmaeon even tried, by dissection, to trace the 'pores' leading from the sense organs to the brain.

Here, then, in the practical art of medicine, we find the root of empirical epistemology—the idea that the senses are the ultimate source of knowledge, of that understanding which distinguishes man from the animals. There is no earlier trace of this view of knowledge. It was formulated when the doctors, under the influence of Ionian rationalism, were freeing

their art from its magical phase and reflecting upon the procedure they actually followed in the successful advance of discovery.

If this view is correct, the first steps towards inductive science, as understood since the Renaissance, were taken by the physicians, in opposition to the philosophers. The medical art, moreover, was the only art known in antiquity that was impelled to formulate a method based on observation and rudimentary experiment. It thus became the only 'natural science' (in our sense) that existed before Aristotle. When Aristotle set his three pupils, Theophrastus, Eudemus, and Meno, to write the history of earlier thought, he divided the field into (1) Metaphysics and Natural philosophy, (2) Mathematics, and (3) Medicine. He felt, it would seem, the force of the Hippocratic contention that Medicine stood alone, with a starting-point and procedure of its own, opposed to those of the philosophers.

The alternative theory of the sources of knowledge was formulated by Plato; though I shall argue that it was by much the older of the two, and had all along been unconsciously assumed by the philosophers. It will account for their dogmatism.

It rests upon a very different conception of the nature and contents of memory. The empirical view we have just considered is materialistic. It starts from the tangible bodies outside us, which send off images to invade our senses and stamp impressions on the waxen tablet. At birth the tablet is blank. The impressions accumulate, like a vast unsorted heap of postage-stamps. These are the sole contents of memory. Having got so far, the materialist has reluctantly to admit something suspiciously like a mind, with an entirely inexplicable power of sorting out the stamps and assigning them to their respective countries in an album. The album will symbolise knowledge; and the materialist will then try to forget all about the activity of the stamp-collector.

The memory implied in Plato's theory of Anamnesis is stored in a very different way. The senses have nothing to teach us: they are classed with the lusts of the flesh as a positive hindrance. Perfect knowledge can be enjoyed only by a disembodied spirit with no sense- organs at all. In this life knowledge is recovered from a memory which is not a record, inscribed since the moment of birth, of those personal experiences which are, of course, different for every individual. It is an impersonal memory, the same for all men. Its contents embrace the whole intelligible realm of eternal objects and truths, including all pure mathematics—the whole of knowledge worthy of the name. If this knowledge was ever acquired, it was acquired before the soul first entered a mortal body; but it is more likely that it is eternally possessed by the immortal soul. In this life it is latent; but no limit can be set to the amount that can be recovered by recollection, when the soul withdraws from the body and its senses to think by itself. The process of recovery is illustrated in the Meno, where the solution of a not very simple geometrical problem is elicited by questioning from a slave who has never been taught geometry. The doctrine, supported by fresh arguments in the Phaedo, forms the one substantial proof of pre-existence accepted by all parties in the first part of that dialogue.

It is instructive to attend to the more or less mythical associations and images surrounding Anamnesis in the Phaedrus. There the immortal soul is defined by its essential power of self-motion—the power of Eros. The three main forms of desire—the love of pleasure, the love of honour, and the love of wisdom (φιλοσοφία)—are typified by the winged chariot, drawn by the two horses of appetite and passion, and guided by the Intelligence, which alone is capable of seeing truth. The soul-charets follow the gods in the procession compared to the procession of the already purified initiates to the final revelation at Eleusis. In the divine company, the soul, before incarnation, journeys outside the sphere of the visible heavens to the Plain of Truth, to learn there all the truth it can ever know. After its descent into a mortal body, some part of this knowledge can be regained by recollection, prompted by intimations of beauty shining through the veil of appearances. In this experience of the awakened love of wisdom, the soul is rapt into a condition of enthusiasm or ecstasy, declared to be on a footing with the divine madness of the seer inspired by Apollo, and of the poet inspired by the Muses. Neither seer nor poet has access to the truth of things while he is in his sober senses. And,
like the seer and the poet, the philosopher needs to be rapt beyond this world of sensible experience and to recover a vision denied to the bodily eyes.

The imagery of the *Phaedrus* myth enables us to connect the theory of philosophic knowledge as drawn from memory with prophetic enthusiasm and the inspiration of the poet. To all three—seer, poet, and sage—their peculiar wisdom comes as a revelation—a light breaking in upon what we call the 'inner consciousness.' All three have laid claim to a spiritual faculty with access to an unseen world, beyond those limits of time and space which confine the body and its senses. The mantic inspiration of Apollo endowed the seer Calchas with knowledge of the *past* and the hidden *present*, as well as of the *future*; the whole pageant of events in time was unrolled beneath the prophet's vision. In dreams, moreover, the soul (as Cicero says) is 'called away from the contagion of its bodily associate, and remembers the *past*, discerns the *present*, and foresees the *future*; for the spirit is alive and in full vigour while the sleeper's body lies as if dead.' The knowledge disclosed to the poet by the daughters of Memory is equally extensive. In the second *Iliad* Homer calls on the Muses to 'put him in mind' of all who went to Troy: 'for ye are goddesses, and are present (πρόσεστες) and know all things, while we only hear the report of fame and know nothing.' This means that the poet, when he is inspired, can see the past as an eye-witness present at the events he illustrates, no longer dependent on hearsay. So too the Muses who came to Hesiod on Helicon 'know how to tell many fictions that wear the guise of truth but know also how to declare the truth when they will.' The fictions are what we call creatures of 'imagination'; but what the Muses proceed to reveal to Hesiod is the truth about the remote past, the origin of the world and the birth of the gods. We should take these claims to supernormal knowledge more seriously than we do. For Homer and Hesiod they were already traditional and beginning to fade into a conventional artifice. But earlier they had been made quite literally. I suspect, indeed, that Homer felt as if he were not merely imagining, still less inventing, the scenes he describes, but seeing with the inward eye what had really taken place; just as Ion the rhapsoide assured Socrates that, when he recited the parting of Hector and Andromache or the slaying of the Suitors, he was transported out of his sober senses and 'his soul believed that, in its rapt (ἐνθουσιασμός) condition, it was present at the events in Troy or Ithaca.'

Now the upshot of the *Phaedrus* myth is that knowledge of reality—the unseen nature of things—comes to the philosopher through the analogous exercise of a spiritual faculty called *Nous*, having the same power to rise beyond the bounds of time and space, as the spectator of all time and all existence. The stages of this journey are enumerated in the *Symposium* and the central books of the *Republic*. It carries the soul all the way from the shadows of the Cave to the vision of the Good. The journey is always described in terms of progressive illumination, such as we inevitably use in speaking of intellectual discovery. All the great pioneers of thought have seen the light suddenly irradiate the intelligible pattern in an array of facts that had seemed disorderly and meaningless. This experience Plato equates with poetic and prophetic inspiration. Such moments of illumination come when thought has been extremely concentrated, shutting out the distracting influx of external impressions. A truth which has long been shaping itself breaks through into consciousness, and we seem to recognise something we have always known and had forgotten.

This theory of the sources of philosophic knowledge is no flight of Plato's fancy. It reproduces a serious belief far older than the empirical theory of Alcmaeon—a belief, moreover, which still flourishes in no small part of the world. In that phase of society when writing is unknown or confined to a small lettered class, the wisdom of the community is possessed and orally transmitted by persons of a type in which the attributes of seer, poet, and philosopher are united. Prophecy (in the wide sense) has been defined as the expression of thought, whether subjective or objective, and of knowledge, whether of the present, the future, or the past, acquired by inspiration and uttered in a condition of exaltation or trance. The artistic form of such utterance is poetry. Epic poetry, the literature of entertainment, preserves the history of the race and the great deeds of the men of old. Didactic poetry covers the origin
of the world and of human institutions, the genealogical descent of families, catalogues, proverbial or gnomic wisdom, and information useful to the farmer and the sea-farer—all the elements combined in Hesiod.

Taught by the Muses, the poets are aware of no boundary separating the utterance of spiritual adventures and journeys to the unseen world from information about the right times for sowing crops or about the winds prevalent in certain seasons, which must have come from normal experience and observation. All this lore is vested in a class claiming mantic powers and universally respected as the most intellectual and gifted members of the community. Examples are: the rishi of ancient India, the druids in Gaul, the filid of ancient Ireland. Their successors today are found in the Siberian shamanus, the seers of Polynesia (which is said to possess the richest oral literature in the world), the priests who taught Roscoe the history of Uganda, and so on. Such men are not witch-doctors or vulgar magicians or pathological neurotics. They are rather remarkable for health and sanity, and when not exercising their mantic powers, go about their business like anyone else.

Here I am relying on a great mass of evidence in Mr. and Mrs. Chadwick's survey of oral literature all round the outskirts of Mediterranean civilisation, from Gaul and Ireland, across Scandinavia and Siberia, to Polynesia, India, and North Africa. Their results are summed up in Mrs. Chadwick's Poetry and Prophecy, a book which I earnestly recommend to all students of literature. I will quote one paragraph:

'The fundamental elements of the prophetic function seem to have been everywhere the same. Everywhere the gift of poetry is inseparable from divine inspiration. Everywhere this inspiration carries with it knowledge—whether of the past, in the form of history and genealogy; of the hidden present, in the form commonly of scientific information; or of the future, in the form of prophetic utterance in the narrower sense. Always this knowledge is uttered in poetry which is accompanied by music, whether of song or instrument. Music is everywhere the medium of communication with spirits. Invariably we find that the poet and seer attributes his inspiration to contact with supernatural powers, and his mood during prophetic utterance is exalted, and remote from that of his normal existence. Generally we find that a recognised process is in vogue, by which the prophetic mood can be induced at will. The lofty claims of the poet and seer are universally admitted, and he himself holds a high status wherever he is found.'

To understand the attitude of the early philosopher, we must see him as emerging from this composite figure of the mantic person. By Plato's time seer, poet, and sage had become distinct, but he divined their original affinity. He had before him a complete survival of the type in Empedocles. As philosopher, Empedocles narrated the past and future history of the cosmos; as prophet, he revealed the destiny of the soul and the means of purification; everyone admits his genius as a poet; and he called himself a god who had risen above the trammels of mortality. Earlier still, Heracleitus had denounced the 'learning of many things.' Searching himself, he found within him the Logos which he delivered in the oracular style of 'the Lord of Delphi, who neither explains nor hides the truth, but indicates it by a sign.' Pythagoras was the hierarch of philosophic mysteries, revealed only to the pure. Parmenides, from whom Plato inherited the image of the Soul-chariot, was borne by the horses of the Sun beyond the gates of day and night, to learn the nature of things from a goddess. The truth so revealed already came to him in the form of logical deduction from self-evident premises—the form in which the truths of geometry unfold themselves to Anamnesis. Parmenides is the prophet of Reason; and he sets the senses at defiance.

Yet earlier, in the sixth century, the wise men who shared with the poets the title sophistes were no doubt rationalists; but it is an anachronism to represent them as entirely sceptical and disillusioned men of science, starting afresh to study Nature by observation and experiment. They stood within the old tradition; and it is likely that Anaximander, for example, would look back to the cosmogony of Hesiod, and other cosmogonies of the same fundamental pattern, as the genuine revelations they claimed to be. In Hesiod's short account of the
origin of the world, the mythical element is already reduced to the thinnest veil of allegory or metaphor. Anaximander had only to remove the last vestiges of poetical symbolism and to fill out the scheme with operant factors which seemed indubitably prosaic and natural.

The philosopher thus appears as the rationalising successor of the poet-seer, relying at the outset on the traditional wisdom, confirmed by his own inward conviction. On the other hand, his rationalism was to bring him later into conflict with those two other figures, who had been taking their separate ways. The prosecution of Anaxagoras is believed to have been instigated by the seers, whose occupation as interpreters of omens would be gone, if philosophers were allowed to explain eclipses and earthquakes—"what goes on in the sky and under the earth"—as natural events and not signs of divine wrath. Diopeithes, whose decree forbade such atheistical heresies, was himself a seer. And in the moral sphere, the authority of the poets on matters of religion and conduct was threatened by the Sophists and Socrates. Among Socrates' accusers, Meletus figures on behalf of the poets, and it is with him that Socrates debates the religious count in the indictment. The quarrel between poetry and philosophy was carried further by Plato, to lengths which strike us as extravagant.

These rivalries throw light back upon the time when poet, seer, and sage were the same person. After they had become separate, the poet and the seer still claimed the inspiration of the Muses and Apollo. Plato revived the corresponding claim of the philosopher. But, as I have argued, this was no novelty. The philosopher had all along felt that his spirit was reaching out, beyond every-day experience, to an unseen realm of certain truth.

Against the prestige of this immemorial tradition, the protest of the physicians, with their empirical theory of knowledge, had little weight. Those very Hippocratic writers who object to the philosopher's empty assumptions, indulge in dogmatic pronouncements equally unfounded. "All disease," they will say, "is due to lack of balance in the four humours." Their only excuse is that the four humours can be seen and touched and dealt with, whereas no one has ever seen "the hot" and "the cold."

If Aristotle had followed his father's profession and never joined the Academy, who can say how far he might have carried the empirical impulse of medicine into the whole field of natural philosophy? But he succumbed to the influence of the divine Plato; and no sooner were he and his master dead than they became authorities, whose intuitions rendered the study of brute fact superfluous. Thence onwards and all through the Middle Ages, the philosopher ranked once more beside the prophet, and the premises to which all knowledge must conform were furnished by the combined revelation of faith and reason. The empirical theory of knowledge has only raised its head again effectively in the last few centuries. It is a mistake to assume that it governed the speculations of ancient Ionia.

F. M. CORNFORD
OLYMPICUS OF ALINDA AND THE CARIAN EXPEDITION OF ANTIGONUS DOSON

An inscription found at Demirdjidéré in Caria, and published by A. Laumonier in 1934, deals with the granting of the citizenship of some unnamed city (probably Alinda) to Dionytas and Apollas, officials in the chancery (ἐπιστολαγραφον (sic)) of Olympicus, the στρατηγὸς of a Hellenistic king, whom Laumonier very reasonably identifies with Philip V of Macedon: Olympicus he assumes to be the Carian dynast of that name, whose machinations against the town of Iasus in about 202 B.C. are recorded in three well-known inscriptions, which Holleaux published in 1899. Unfortunately, in dating his inscription to the year 202, Laumonier paved the way for certain unjustifiable conclusions about the relations of Macedonia and Caria during the last quarter of the third century B.C.; and as these conclusions have since been drawn by Lenschau, it is important, I think, to point out their tenuous basis before there is any risk of their becoming widely accepted.

The question at issue is the status of Olympicus at the time when the Rhodians complained to him about the harassing of the friendly town of Iasus by his man Podilus. In the course of their complaints, the Rhodians mention 'King Philip,' and demand that Olympicus respect the rights of Iasus 'in conformity with the intentions which the king has expressed in writing'; hence Holleaux concluded that Olympicus was Philip's subordinate, acting openly in his interests and recognised as such by the Rhodians. Already Hicks had suggested the identification of Olympicus with the Carian dynast mentioned by Polybius (v. 90, 1) as one of the benefactors to Rhodes after the earthquake of 227 B.C.; from this it was only a short step for Beloch to link him up with the Carian expedition of Antigonus Doson, and to assume a continuous period of Macedonian domination in Caria from the time of that expedition up to the date of the Rhodian démarche to Olympicus (which, ignoring Holleaux's strong arguments for 202, he dated early in Philip's reign).

Criticising Beloch's view, Nicolaus correctly pointed out, however, that there was no reason to think that Olympicus was not an independent dynast, acting in his own interests as well as Philip's, in short that his relations with the king were quite loose and not rigidly defined: otherwise he left the question much as it stood. But Ernst Meyer, who was first critical and later incredulous of Doson's expedition to Caria, made one significant comment. Had Macedon possessed Carian territory in 202, it would have been governed by a στρατηγὸς, and it was to this officer that the Rhodians must have presented their complaints about Podilus's attacks on Iasus, not to Olympicus; hence Philip had no such possessions at that time.

Lenschau seized upon this point: if, as Laumonier's dating suggested, Olympicus was himself Philip's στρατηγὸς in 202, then the conclusion to be drawn from Meyer's argument must be completely reversed: and it logically followed that Caria was a Macedonian possession from the time of Doson's expedition in 227. Doson, he argued, opened up friendly relations with a local dynast, Olympicus of Alinda, and gave him the status of a

---

1 BCH viii, 1934, 291-8.
2 BM i iii. 441 = Hicks, 192 = GDI iii. 3720; cf. Holleaux, REG xii, 1899, 20 seq.; REI v, 1903, 223 seq. (giving textual improvements).
3 P-W, s.v. 'Olympicou', cols. 136-5; Busser, cclvi, 1938, 271.
4 Holleaux, REG xii, 1899, 31-2.
5 Commenting on BM i iii. 441; cf. Holleaux, REG xii, 1899, 32.
6 On the date of this see Holleaux, REG xxxvi, 1923, 480-98 (=Études d' épigraphie et d'histoire grecque (Paris, 1938: ed. L. Robert), I, 445-65).
7 Griech. Gesch. iv, 2, 550-1.
11 P-W, s.v. 'Olympicou', cols. 185-6.
12 Lenschau sees (quite rightly) that the assumption of the title of στρατηγὸς is to be connected with the actual presence in Caria of some king of Macedon.
Macedonian στρατηγός. This relationship was maintained into the reign of Philip, and in the years following 205, when the latter was set upon an eastern policy, his στρατηγός embarked upon an aggressive course on his behalf.

Attractive though it may appear, this version of Lenschau's is without adequate foundation. For there is not the slightest reason to date Laounier's inscription to 202. On the contrary, there are good grounds for thinking that it refers to a time subsequent to Philip's invasion of Caria. First, however, excluding Laounier's inscription, we must consider what other evidence there is relevant to Lenschau's theory of a continuous Macedonian στρατηγία in Caria throughout the period 227-201, and in particular what was the position at that time of such dynasts as Olympicus.14

For the period immediately preceding Ptolemy IV's accession there is reason to think that certain of the dynasts of Asia Minor, though virtually independent, came within the general sphere of Ptolemaic interest. This is implied by Polyb. v. 34, 7,16 which contrasts the negligent attitude of Philopator towards the overseas possessions of Egypt with that of his predecessors; enumerating these possessions Polybius writes: παρέκειντο δὲ τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν δυνάταις, ᾲμαίοις δὲ καὶ ταῖς γῆσις, δεσποτότες τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων πόλεων καὶ τόπων καὶ λιμένων κατὰ πάσαν τὴν παραλίαν ὧν ἐπιμελήσθησαν τούτοις κατὰ λυσισκείν τόπων. This seems to imply that Philopator's predecessors, by their control of the coastal cities, harbours, etc., were able to 'exercise their influence over the dynasts of Asia Minor.'10 Doubtless Polybius was thinking of the Attalids; but there is no reason to think there were not others. Can we identify them?

After the earthquake of 227 Rhodes was the recipient of gifts from many quarters; among the benefactors listed by Polybius (v. 90, 1) are included οἱ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν ὄντες δυνάται τότε, λέγω δὲ Λυσισκείν ὁ Ὀλυμπίκηκον Λιμανόν. Olympicus is of course the dynasty of Alinda: the other two are unknown. Attempts have been made to identify one or the other as a predecessor of the Maogates who was dyoast of Cibyra in Greater Phrygia at the time of Cn. Manlius's Galatian expedition in 189;17 and Wilhelm 18 has suggested that 'Lysianas' hides a reference to Lysias of the Phrygian dynasty of the Philomelids. Neither theory has much to support it, though the second is perhaps the less improbable. However, the likelihood is that both Limnaeus and Lysianas were, like Olympicus, minor dynasts in Caria or the immediate vicinity, who had therefore neighbourly reasons for their benefactions to the damaged city.19

The existence of such dynasts in various parts of Asia Minor under the Seleucids is well-attested. Thus a Smyrman decree of about 244 B.C.20 refers to Seleucus II as writing πρὸς...
Admittedly this picture is sketchy and the evidence for it slight. *Olympichus* may have been exceptional among the dynasts. He *may* have been appointed Antigonus Doson's general in Caria in 227, and may even have acted for him in some capacity until 223, when the Lagids and Antigonids patched up their old quarrel at the expense of Cleomenes of Sparta—*for the reference to Olympichus as dynast at the time of his benefactions to Rhodes does not completely rule out the possibility that he was also a Macedonian στρατηγός.*

Indeed, there is nothing in Polybius which definitely excludes a continuous Macedonian στρατηγία in Caria from 227 to 201 or later; for, it should be noted, at the time when Antiochus finished his 'anabasis' and took possession of the sea-coast towns and the dynasts this side Taurus, Olympichus was in any case probably in communication with Philip V. Achaean's recovery of the area was perhaps equally incomplete: in both cases Polybius is writing in general terms. Nevertheless, the complete omission by Polybius of any reference to a Macedonian province in Caria or to its control by Olympichus in a series of passages which are concerned with the sovereignty over that area and its dynasts favours the view that Olympichus stood behind Attalus both in this struggle against Hierax and later in that against the generals of Seleucus III is clear; as Beloch points out (*op. cit.*, iv. 1, 628, n. 2; 666, n. 3), Justinus, xvii. 9, refers to Ptolemy III as the enemy of Hierax; and—a point of greater weight—Andromachus, one of Seleucus III's generals, was lodged, when taken prisoner, at Alexandria (*Polyb. iv. 51, i–5*). It should be noted that the dynasts of S.W. Asia Minor were not from a geographical point of view particularly likely to fall under Egyptian influence.

Polyb. iv. 48, 9–15; cf. Tarn, *CAH vii. 723*: 'by 220 he had recovered the whole of Seleucid Asia Minor.'

See below, n. 45.

27 The Egyptian navarch Philocles appears in inscriptions (*e.g.* Ditt. *Syll.* 391) as *προεροτός* *υπαύχων*, a position granted to him by one or other of the first two Ptolemies; see the next note.
OLYMPICHERUS OF ALINDA

that any such province can have had only a very ephemeral existence. It is a view which obtains support when we turn to the more positive evidence afforded by the Iasus inscription published by Holleaux.

This decree records how certain representations have been made to Olympichus by the Rhodians on behalf of Iasus, which he is threatening; finally the Rhodians make it quite clear that τάμ μέν φιλίαν καὶ τῶν εὔνοιαν τῶν ὑπάρχουσαν αὐτῶι ποτὶ βασιλείᾳ | Φιλίππωι διεκδικεῖ ἡ δόμος, πράξει δὲ ἔπειτει τὰ συμφέροντα | ἐμεῖν ποτὶ τῶν ἱεράν διαφάλειν (insc. C, l. 91–3). This—the last sentence of the decree—is intended as a plain threat to Olympichus. The distinction made between Olympichus and Philip is, however, significant; it raises the question: If Olympichus is Philip's general, how can Rhodes make war on the subordinate and yet maintain peace with the king?

Clearly if Olympichus had now for twenty-five years held his dynastic title merely by courtesy within a domain which was in fact Macedonian, and which he actually governed as a Macedonian στρατηγός, the distinction made by the Rhodians is absurd. Hence, if Lenschau's theory is to survive this difficulty, Olympichus must have exercised a dual function, controlling certain territory—including, presumably, Alinda itself—as dynast, and governing other parts as representative of Pella. In this case his position would be parallel to that of Philocles, who had combined the role of virtually autonomous king of Sidon with that of navarch, or 'viceroy of the sea,' under Ptolemy Philadelphus. Even so the Rhodian distinction would be curious; for by appealing to Philip at all the Rhodians were laying stress on Olympichus's relations with Pella—on his subordinate rather than his independent functions—and one would expect some reference to his actual position as στρατηγός. On finding none, one can scarcely resist the impression that Olympichus was not Philip's στρατηγός in 202.

There is, however, one possible explanation consonant with the theory of the continuous στρατηγία. The object of the Rhodians in insisting on their friendship with Philip (at a time when it was clearly strained) is diplomatic; like the Aetolians in 220, they seek to limit any possible clash, and failing that to put the onus of attack upon Philip. Given this intention it is not impossible that they should play upon Olympichus's dual function, appealing to Philip to curb his subordinate, yet at the same time stressing that in attacking Olympichus they would be attacking only the dynast of Alinda. It might not be logical; but diplomacy frequently jettisons logic.

Once more then we have a probability, but nothing conclusive. For a decisive argument that Olympichus was not Philip's στρατηγός prior to 201 we must turn to Philip's reaction to the Rhodian complaints and the method he adopted to satisfy them. For the curious thing is that he gives his instructions through the agency of Rhodes! Olympichus is called upon by the Rhodian envoys to respect Iasus and make amends to it ἁκολούθως τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως ἑπτασελίᾳ | ἐπιτυχεῖ ἥτι ποὺς ἐπιμεληθήτες διολογούμενα φανεῖται πράσσουσα | τὸν ἔπαρα χρήσει καὶ τοῖς ἐπιτελοῦμεν ὑπὸ αὐτῷ ἅλλαν ῥώτησιν τοῖς τῶν πόλεων (insc. C, l. 79–81). This expression of Philip's wishes is mentioned earlier as contained in τὰ ἐπιτυχεῖ τοῖς ἐπιτελοῦσιν τοῖς βασιλέως ποτὲ τὰν πόλιν (insc. C, l. 74–5). Now it has been argued that in writing to Rhodes in these terms Philip was simply playing a double game, feigning to placate the Rhodians while secretly he egged on Olympichus to new aggressions. This seems to be a likely interpretation of Philip's policy, for it corresponds to what he was doing in Crete and also to the manoeuvre by which his man Heracleides succeeded in burning part of the Rhodian dockyards. But the possibility of such a rôle

28 So Tarn, Antigonus Gonatas, p. 109. For a full discussion of Philocles's position and an account of the inscriptions relating to him see Holleaux, REG viii. 1895, 92 seq. (= Etudes d'Épitropies, 1. 24 seq.); M. Segre, Archivox xiv. 1934, 26 seq.

29 Polyb. iv. 15, 8 seq. εἰ ὁ Ἀταλάντ... συνεδριάζετε ἰθανασιστῇ πρὸς τὰς Ἀδειανώμους καὶ Ἁμησινῆς καὶ τῶν οἷον σατύρων αὐτῷ ἡμῖν... πρὸς αὐτῶι δὲ τὸ τοῖς ἱσχύ τοῖς Κρητήνοις

30 Polyb. xii. 5, 1; cf. Walbank, Philip V of Macedon (Cambridge, 1940), p. 110.

31 Polyb. xii. 5, 1–3; Polyb. v. 17 (2); cf. Walbank, op. cit., p. 111.
depends essentially upon Olympia's status remaining ambiguous. It might be known that he was in close touch with Philip; but if he was in fact a Macedonian officer, then his activities could not be repudiated by Philip, and the only way in which the king could hope to give satisfaction to the Rhodians would be by a statement that he had issued instructions to Olympia's direct; the decrees as preserved have, however, no reference to such a statement and, further, omit to mention Olympia's status, which would be decidedly curious, if he was indeed Philip's general.

We can only conclude that in 202 Olympia was still an independent dynasty, known to be closely connected with Philip V, but not openly and directly under his authority. The change in status must have come, not with Dositheus's, but with Philip's Carian expedition, and Laconier's inscription must consequently be dated subsequent to summer 201. As Philip's power lasted in parts of Caria until 167, this offers no difficulties.

I have deliberately omitted considering whether the Olympia of Holleaux's and Laconier's inscriptions (and I agree with the latter in referring both to the same man) is identical with the Olympia mentioned by Polybius as a benefactor of Rhodes. Laconier thinks it probable that the latter was the father of the former: but he is basing this view on the possibility that one or the other is identical with the Ολυμπίδος Ολυμπίδος mentioned as the recipient of the citizenship of a Carian town, probably Iassus, on an inscription published by Bourcier in 1889. Both Holleaux and Lenschau reject the identification as unlikely; and without categorically denying the possibility that this Olympia may be the same as the one we are considering, it seems safest to refrain from inferences based on such an identification. Whether, therefore, Philip's man Olympia is the Rhodian benefactor or his son is not capable of proof on our present evidence: nor is it very material to the immediate argument, since the same conclusions are valid, whether we are dealing with one man or two successive members of one dynasty.

For the point I wish to stress is this. Laconier's inscription, describing Olympia's status subsequent to 202, can have no direct bearing on the question of Dositheus's obscure Carian expedition of 227. The attitude of extreme scepticism with regard to his expedition is no longer so common as it used to be: but the positive evidence is still very slight, and it is important not to allow it to seem stronger than it actually is. What the facts concerning Olympia (or his dynasty) do seem to suggest is that he was one of a number of dynasts in S.W. Asia Minor, who either obtained their independence or at least abandoned their Syrian allegiance during the War of the Brothers. After some years of confusion, during the clash between Hierax and Attalus, they finally drifted into the sphere of Ptolemaic interest.

28 Thus in Ditt. Žyli 552, a letter to the people of Abae in Phocis, Philip writes: τὸν πολεμαίον χαρακτηρίσα τοῖς Ἱορδανικοῖς μὴ ἔσχημα ἔκρηκε. Heraclides was probably στρατηγὸς in Phocis, a position held earlier by Alexander; cf. Polyb. v. 96, 4: Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ ταχαύς ἐπί τῆς Θεσσαλίας ὑπὸ τοῦ Φιλίππου. This analogy with Heraclides would still be valid, notwithstanding Olympia's postulated dual role as dynasty and royal officer.

29 In a slightly different form, this point was made by Meyer, op. cit., p. 69, when he pointed out that Philip had had a στρατηγὸς in Caria he would have instructed him to tell Olympia to refrain from attacking Iassus.

The phrase διαφημίζεται [驿] τοὺς Ολυμπίας τοῦ στρατηγοῦ ἐν τῷ ἐπισταγμένῳ ἐστὶ the usual formula for officials attached to kings and dynasts (an interesting proof of Olympia's dual status—which 201—as dynasty and royal official); Laconier quotes a number of examples of a phrase. It affords no evidence on the length of time Olympia had been στρατηγὸς, since it is in his capacity as 'independent' ruler that he possesses an ἐπισταγμένῳ.

30 Cf. Meyer, op. cit., p. 70; Walbank, op. cit., p. 109, n. 4, p. 175.

31 Cousin, BCH xiii. 1883, 54. The Olympia's son of Troilos, on an inscription published by Buckler-Caldar, MAMA vi. 3, no. 4, has nothing at all to do with Olympia's Alinda (cf. L. Robert, REG iii. 1930, 320, no. 393, 4, the absence of an ethnic proves he is a citizen of Laodicia), and the somewhat fanciful reconstruction there proposed (viz. an Olympia gave buildings to Laodicia [Buckler's inscription]; in 1917 Laudieni et Asia were fighting against Macedon [Livy (P) xxi. 18, 3]; therefore Olympia probably deserted Philip and opposed him as well) may be dismissed as without foundation. Cf. Rostovtzeff, op. cit., 1935, n. 230.

32 REG xii. 1890, 52, 'extrêmément douteuse'.

33 P. W. v. S. Olympia, col. 185, 'hat... wohl nichts mit ihm zu tun'.

34 The older custom was for a man to take his grandfather's name; but Cousin's inscription is at any rate a useful example of the fact that this was no longer rigidly adhered to, and the two men might well have been father and son.

35 On the date of this see Fine, AJPh xli. 1940, 134 seq.; Walbank, op. cit., p. 41, n. 1.

When Doson invaded Caria in 227, he may well have opened up relations of a loose kind, probably in the form of guest-friendship, with the then ruler of Alinda. Such an action fits in well with the anti-Ptolemaic character of the Carian expedition. However, with the Macedono-Egyptian rapprochement towards the end of Doson’s reign, any political significance will temporarily have lapsed; with the weakening of Ptolemaic power towards the end of Philopator’s reign and the transfer of Macedonian interest to the Aegean and Asia Minor after the Peace of Phoenice Philip evidently revived his relations with Alinda, and obtained the collaboration of Olympichus in a mutually profitable scheme of expansion to the detriment of Rhodes. Following upon Philip’s personal intervention in 201, Olympichus passed directly within his sphere of control and took the status of στρατηγός.

The evidence, therefore, that Olympichus affords for the reality of the Carian expedition is in fact very slight; indeed it cannot be stated categorically that Macedonian relations with Alinda were not first established by Philip during the years 205–202, through the agency of envoys (as he established contacts with the Bastarnae and Danube tribes in the years following 184). But such a compact would, in the circumstances, have tended to be secret, and the open Rhodian assumption that Olympichus is Philip’s man points to a longer and more definite association than this hypothesis makes possible. On this question, however, the inscription published by Laumonier provides no new material; set up after 201, its value lies solely in its indication of the change in Olympichus’s status subsequent to Philip V’s invasion of Caria.

F. W. Walbank

The University, Liverpool.

---

48 That Olympichus may have acted as Doson’s governor until the rapprochement with Egypt cannot, as we saw, be completely ruled out; but it remains a hypothesis unsupported by any evidence.
44 On this see Droysen, Gesch. des Hellen., iii. 2, 145–6; Bettingen, König Antigonos Doson von Makedonien, Diss. Jena, 1912, p. 25; Tarn, CAH vii. 722. Treves, Athen., xiii. 1935, 37 seq., argues that the Carian expedition was directed against Syria (contra Aymard, REA xxxviii. 1936, 266).
46 There is a strong probability that Doson actually surrendered any conquests he had made in exchange for the cessation of Ptolemaic subsidies to Sparta; cf. Tarn, CAH vii. 722; Niccolaus, op. cit., pp. 71 seq.; Walbank, op. cit., p. 13, n. 2.
46 Walbank, op. cit., pp. 105 seq.
47 It is noteworthy that Philip’s policy (and that of Olympichus) is in marked contrast to that of Doson in 227; for Doson was careful to maintain the friendly neutrality of Rhodes by gifts not only from himself, but also from his wife Chryseis (Polyb. vi. 89, 7)—the latter being in line with, and perhaps designed to recall previous benefactions of the Epirete royal house (cf. Timachidas, Lindian Temple Chronica (ed. Blinkenberg, Bonn, 1915), xi, for dedications by Pyrrhus to Athena of Lindus).
48 Walbank, op. cit., pp. 237 seq. Note too that if Nicolaus, op. cit., p. 77, n. 28, is right, and Olympichus is to be included among the dynasts over whom Antiochus reasserted his control (Polyb. xi. 94. 14; see above, p. 10), it is not impossible that his first contacts with Macedon are to be connected with the Syro-Macedonian pact of 203–202. But this hypothesis is open to the same objections as that just mentioned above.
49 Just as Philip’s support of the Cretans and Dieaearchus was secret; cf. Walbank, op. cit., p. 110.
50 I am indebted throughout the whole of this article to the friendly criticism and suggestions of Dr. Pier Treves.
THE GREEK INSCRIPTIONS IN THE FITZWILLIAM MUSEUM.

The collection of Greek inscriptions in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, has been much increased during the last four decades. It will therefore be useful to give a complete list and, where it seems to be advisable, a full description of these sixty-four texts in stone, bronze, and wood, twenty-four of which are unpublished, as far as I am able to ascertain, or have been published without full transcription.¹

I. Athens.


II. Peloponnesus.

b. Megalopolis. Fragment of a bronze decree, given by Dr. M. R. James in 1891. Unpublished. Script of fourth or third century B.C. Length and height about 10 cm. (exact measurements could not be taken owing to war conditions).

διεργάσις τάν ἡμέραν ἦν

ημέρας κυριεύοντος

[τὸ αὐτοῦ

[τῇ Καράγχα ἐς καὶ τῷ

[τῷ

[τῷ τροπᾶς[

III. Islands.


IV. Crete.

a. Eremopoli.


¹ It is my agreeable duty to thank the Fitzwilliam Museum authorities for the kind permission to publish these texts, and especially the Director, the Honorary Keepers and the members of the staff of the Fitzwilliam Museum for giving me all available facilities to begin this article and to complete it under war conditions in 1939. In addition, thanks are due to Dr. W. Morel for the contributions signed with his name, and to Sir Herbert Thompson for translations of Demotic mummy labels.
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V. Pontus, Phanagoria.


VI. Troas.


b. Ilium.


VII. Ionia.

a. Magnesia on the Sipylus. CIG 3411 = Sotheby, Catalogue 30.5.1927 p. 10, No. 59. Acquired in 1927. Length 41.2 cm., height 31.2 cm., thickness 4.3 cm. Third century A.D. The text of this inscription, which had disappeared for a long time, should be revised as follows:

Αὐρήλιος Τρύφων ἄγοράσιος τὸ ηρώου διαπεριστημένον κατε- σκεύασθε ἑαυτῷ καὶ τῇ γυναικὶ ἀντιοιχίδι καὶ τέκνοις αὐτῶν
καὶ ἐκγόνους καὶ θρήμασιν.
Μηδενι θ’ ἐπέρθε ἐσόν εὐνα βληθήναι εἰς τὸ ἡρώου-Εἰ
δὲ μὴ, δώσει Μητρὶ Θε-
δών Σισυφήν* φ.’
Τούτου αὐτίγραφον ἑτέ- θη εἰς τὸ ἄρχειον.


1.5. For the meaning of ἄδεμμα ‘adopted child,’ ‘foster child,’ in free or slave status, cp. A. Cameron, ‘Θηριότος and Related Terms in the Inscriptions of Asia Minor,’ Anatolian Studies Presented to W. H. Buckler, pp. 27 f.

1.6. Read ἔξον.
b. Smyrna.

1. Ph. Le Bas—W. H. Waddington, *Inscriptions Grecques et Latines* III p. 16, No. 26 = Cadoux, *op. cit.* p. 254, note 1 = Sotheby, Cat. 30, V. 1927 p. 10, No. 59. Acquired, together with VII a, from the collection of Archibald G. B. Russell in 1927. Second century A.D. Length 52.8 cm., height 28.5 cm., thickness 3.8 cm. The text of this inscription, which was originally the property of J. F. Lee, should be revised as follows:

Θεόδοτος
Χρυσίω Νικίου τοῦ νεωτέ[ρου τῆς σημείων ού[ς]
καὶ τοῖς ἔγγονοις αὐτῶν, µή ἐξουσιζ.

5 ης ἔξουσιαν Ἄ(π).φιον τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτοῦ ἢ τῶν τέκνων(γ) αὐτῆς ἀντιπαιδους-
θαι τοῦ μνημείου ἢ τῆς ἐπικεφαλί-

10 [οῦ] ἁρχηγοῖον ὑπὶ τῇ διαθήκῃ.

l. 9. For the use of ἀργολίζω cp. Dittenberger, *OGIS* No. 515.25; 613.4.
l. 10. The expression ὑπὶ τῇ διαθήκῃ seems to be without direct parallel. Cp. Laum, *op. cit.* I pp. 116 f.

3. CIG 3269. Transferred from Trinity College in 1924.


VIII. Caria.

Halicarnassus. CIG 106 = Michel, *Receuil* 1 No. 452. Transferred from Trinity College in 1924.

IX. Phrygia.


X. Egypt and Nubia.

b. Dongola.

4. Hawara.


Τιβερίου Ιουλίου Ἀσκληπίου
gυμνασίαρχου καὶ ἄρχιγέρανος
καὶ τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ Ιουλίας
Θεομουσάριον καὶ Δίου τῷ

δ' Ἀμιπωνίου γυμνασίαρχου καὶ τῆς
gυναῖκος Ἡραίδος αἰκία καὶ τάφος
ἀκαταχρηματιστα καὶ ἀεβάλλοντω
ἐπὶ τὸν ἀπάντα χρόνον.


It has not been noticed hitherto that this memorial inscription of two distinguished Alexandrian families of the first century A.D. is of historical importance and can be precisely dated. The only genus of Alexandrian citizens which existed between the times of Augustus and, at the earliest, Septimius Severus was elected in A.D. 37, and was declared illegal by Caligula near the end of the same year, as A. von Premerstein, 'Alexandrinische Geronten vor Kaiser Gaius,' *Mitteilungen aus der Papyrusammlung der Giessener Universitätsbibliothek V* (1939) pp. 57 ff., has recently shown. Tiberius Julius Asclepiades can therefore only have been archigeron of Alexandria during this short period, and must have died before the illegality of the genus was known in Egypt, i.e., before the spring of A.D. 38. The M. Julius Asclepiades of the famous letter of the Emperor Claudius to the Alexandrians (cp. Hunt-Edgar, *Selec Papyri II* (1934) No. 212 l. 17) was perhaps a son or a near relation of this archigeron. The gymnasiarchus Dios of our inscription, who was no Roman citizen, might have been a near relation of Julia Thermuthari, the wife of Asclepiades.


Upper part of a sculptured stele. Sandstone. Length 14.7 cm., height 24.9 cm., thickness 3.6 cm.

Καί (σαρι) συνοδος,

'Υπέρ τῆς Τυχῆς
Nέρωνος Κλαυδίου
Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ

5 Γερμανικοῦ Αὐτοκράτορος
[τε]ρος σύνοδος Λυκο-
[ποιων καὶ ο] νεοι ἑρ-
[τημικότε]ς (?) . . . . .]

There is space left between lines 1 and 2 for a relief showing the Hieroglyphic letter ṣ between two jackals. The Egyptian winged sun is represented above line 1.

ll. 1 and 6. For similar clubs cp. *RE IV A*, 1420 f. art. 'Synodos.'

l. 8. For this restoration cp. Premerstein, op. cit. p. 45.


f. Uncertain of Egypt.

1. Alexandrian (?) memorial stele. Unpublished. Acquired in 1901. Sandstone. Late Ptolemaic period. A relief shows Anubis leading the deceased one to Osiris and Isis. The letters of the inscription are painted in red. Length 27.3 cm., height 33.6 cm., thickness 5.8 cm.

'Ἰσηδύρου Σαρατηνίων
ἀώρου μυελα γένοι-
το εἰς τὸν ἀπάντα
χρόνον

JHS—VOL. LXII.

   'Ἀρωύφρις Κρονίου
   Ζήνωνος

   Below graffito:
   'Ρύμηρος ἑυτυγχάνων
   προσκύνημα (?)

3. Dedication to Sarapis. Unpublished. Acquired in 1901. Limestone. Late Ptolemaic period. Length 17.5 cm, height 18.7 cm, thickness 5 cm.

   Σαραπιδος κλειον

g. Wooden mummy labels. Unpublished.

1. Inv. No. 1. Late second or early third century A.D. 8.5 × 3.5 cm.

   'Ἀρωύτης Πβήκιος
   ἀπὸ Βουταή

2. Inv. No. 2. Second century A.D. 11.3 × 4.4 cm.

   Καλὸς Ἀρης
   μυτρὸς Τεντήγεως
   (ἐτῶν) ν =

l. 2. This female name is not mentioned by F. Preisigke, Namenbuch (1922).

3. Inv. No. 3 = Budge, Cat. Egypt. Coll. in Fitzwilliam Museum, No. 524. Late second or early third century A.D. 8.6 × 4.8 cm. The verso has Demotic script.

   Σευσοντώς
   Ἀρεμίφριος
   μυτρὸς Θεμεσιότος

4. Inv. No. 4. Second century A.D. 9.5 × 6 cm.

   Μίκκαλος
   Πβήκιος υλός
   Θατρήτος

5. Inv. No. 5. Late second or early third century A.D. 9.6 × 6 cm.

   Ταλὼς Ἀπολλωνίου μυτρὸς Θατρήτος
   ἐβίωσεν (ἐτος) α


   Ταλὼς
   Ἀφροδίσιος
   μυτρὸς Τεύριος

7. Inv. No. 7. Third century A.D. 9.5 × 3.4 cm.

   Πατσισοίος ὑεύστεος
   Ἀσιήτος
   μυτρὸς Σεναρτητίδος
   Εἰς αἰὲν μνητόν τὸ δύναμα

l. 1. Πατσισοίος is not mentioned by Preisigke, οπ. οι.
8. Inv. No. 8. Late second or early third century a.d. 9·5 x 4·6 cm. The verso has Demotic script.

(Ἐτῶν) ἐμ (sic)
Πελλίος Πελλίου
μητρὸς Σενχεμ-
συνέως ἀπὸ Βομπατὴ
(Ἐτῶν) με

9. Inv. No. 9. Late second or early third century a.d. 11·2 x 4·6 cm. The verso has Demotic script.

Σενχῆκες Ἀπολλωνίου
μητρὸς Τατρῆφιος
ἀπὸ Βομπατὴ

10. Inv. No. 10. Late second or early third century a.d. 11·9 x 4·8 cm. From Sakkara.

Κολλούθης Κολ-
λοῦθου μὴ τ’(ρός) Σεν-
κολλούθου

11. Inv. No. 11. Late second or early third century a.d. 9·8 x 4·1 cm. The verso has Demotic script and mentions Bompae as home town of Tatriphis.

Τατρῆφις πρεσβυτ(έρα)
’Αρυβότου μητρὸς[ε] Ἱενα-
τειόδος

12. Inv. No. 12. Late second or early third century a.d. 7·6 x 4·6 cm.

Σενυσυνόρις Ἀπολλω-
τος μὴ τ’(ρός) Τικανόπος
ἀπὸ Ψανέως

13. Inv. No. 13. Late second or early third century a.d. 22 x 8·7 cm.

’Αρείος ὁ Κεπτέων Ἐφθού-
μος Ἀθάτος μητρὸς Ἀπολλω-
τος λεγόμενος Ἀππούτος γεγυ-
μασταρχηκτό: Μέμφεως ἐτῶν
ἐξῆκοντα δύο

14. Inv. No. 14. Late second or early third century a.d. 12·1 x 4·6 cm.

Πανάγεως {ὕδω}
Παυσίτους ὕδος Πανίνου Θου-
πομπανί

15. Inv. No. 15. Late second or early third century a.d. 9·6 x 4·6 cm. The verso has Demotic script.

Ἡβίονος
Σενύριος ὑ(ώτερος) Πετεμε-
νος (ἐτῶν) κ

16. Inv. No. 23 = Whyte Bequest 1315. Late second or early third century A.D. 10 × 13.9 cm. On the verso a drawing of Anubis. Acquired in 1932, the original owner being Canon Greenwell.

Ποτεαλώλις
ἐβίσεν
ἔτων
λε

XI. Rome.

CIG 5243 = IG XIV 1683 = Kaibel, op. cit. No. 607. Transferred from Trinity College in 1924.

XII. Britain.

IG XIV 2550. Acquired in 1884.

XIII. Uncertain Provenance.

1. CIG 6852. Transferred from Trinity College in 1924.

Μη με γου(έ)ίς πενήθησαί, άχους δέ
λάθεσθε κρυφόδους* Οὐ γα[ρ ἐν]
μ’ "Αἰδα κατέχει(ε)ι σκότος, ἄλλα νῦν νή-
σους* ἐλλαχοῦ, αἱ μακαρῶν (εἰσι[ν ἔνθ]]
5 ὁμι με* μή μία Μουσάων ἄγαγετε[ε]μυενέως*
Τιβέριος Ἰουλίος Ἰμεναῖος* Ἠφραίη
ἐπι* ιό

2. [ἐν] W. Morel.
II. 3/4. For the νῆς many mentioned by Pindar and numerous later authors, cp. Pauly-Wissowa, R.E.
V 2470 f. art. Elysion.
1. 4. [ἐν], e.g., W. Morel.
II. 5. [μυενέως], e.g., W. Morel.

3. Unpublished. Limestone. This inscription, which is difficult to read, is preserved in the Egyptian Department of the Fitzwilliam Museum, but seems to be non-Egyptian (cp. the system of figures used in lines 6, 7, 9 and 10). The right-hand part and the lower lines of the text are lost. Script of the second or third centuries A.D. Length 21.4 cm. (original length before the loss of the right-hand part: about 39 cm.); height 30.2 cm., thickness 5.1 cm.

'Αρχαι [τ]ό πέντε γῆς ίδρυμένον[u
δὲ], . . . κ(?)]αι θείον[ώ]ς ἐδη κοσμ[ητόν](?)
ον μένονται πάσιν. Ὅ δη[ν]
[ἡ (?) γη] ίδρυμένην πάντες . . .
5 οὔδε πρός ἠλιόν ἡ καὶ γ[ι
[δ[η] γῆς έκάστης ΔΔΔ Δων]
Τῶν δὲ ΠΙΔΔ τῆς έκατο(στής?) πα[ρ]
ες πέταν καὶ εἰκοστῶν) ἐν τ[ι]
ου, χαλκὸς δὲ ε[ὶ (δρ.) ΗΔΔ]
10 [δ[η] [κ]ς[ι] προσέχει (δρ.) ΔΔΔ[Δ]

1. 5. η instead of γ is a possibility.

F. M. HEICHELHEIM

University College, Nottingham.
THE IONIAN AGORA

The agora, the nucleus of all Greek cities, was in the beginning simply a convenient open space, around which buildings were irregularly placed. With the growth of systematic planning in Ionia a new type was evolved, and henceforth the old-fashioned agora and the Ionian existed side by side. Several years ago F. J. Tritsch wrote an account of the old type of agora, taking Elis (Fig. 1) as the best example. Since then Athens has yielded richer and more interesting material. The new evidence clarifies and confirms the picture drawn by Tritsch, which may still be accepted as true in principle. One might, however, attempt a brief general account of the new or Ionian agora, which has not perhaps been given the place it deserves in the history of Hellenic architecture. Finally, since remarkable Hellenistic developments have been revealed in the Athenian agora, one is prompted to ask whether the influence of new ideas and methods produced modifications in the older type.

The difference between the two kinds of agora depends on the treatment of the stoas, as Pausanias realised. The stoa was, in fact, the most characteristic building of the classical Greek town, particularly of its agora. Dependent and interior uses of colonnades are not particularly Hellenic; they were common in Egyptian and Minoan-Mycenean architecture, and were perhaps traditional in Greece. The stoa which was so characteristic of the Hellenic cities was an independent architectural unit. Possibly it was evolved from earlier dependent forms. One is tempted to see in some features of the later Greek town the result of the opening-up or spreading-out of a royal palace, as royal functions were split up between

---

2 *VI. xxiv. 2.*
magistrates. The hearth of the Prytaneion is the royal hearth. The chamber where the king meets his counsellors becomes the Bouleuterion, the shrines become independent temples. In place of the colonnades of the palace courts are stoas built on the public places of the city, providing the citizens with pleasant spots in which to gather and talk and do business. The connexion may be fanciful. The type of architecture which might have been labelled 'stoic', if the word had not been appropriated for higher uses, was natural in Greece in any case; it suited the climate, was adaptable to a variety of uses and had great architectural possibilities. Whatever its origin, the stoa—later a combination of stoas—was developed as an independent factor and became a dominating feature.

In the old-fashioned agora the buildings in general and the stoas in particular were irregularly placed, and did not form a single architectural whole, except perhaps in a vague sense. The words used by Pausanias about Elis probably imply more than that the stoas were 'separated' from each other—the north stoa at Ionian Priene was separated from the rest; 'standing independently of one another' perhaps conveys his meaning better, or even 'scattered here and there.' The picture he tries to give is of an area cut up by streets and with stoas placed as separate units about it.

When he speaks of 'the cities of Ionia and the Greek cities near Ionia,' Pausanias is no doubt thinking of those which, like Miletus and Priene, were laid out and built according to a single scheme. He implies by contrast that in these the agora was distinguished by groups of stoas built contiguous to one another, and forming a single whole. Though by Pausanias' time certain alien tendencies had set in, this is, in fact, precisely what characterises the agoras of the best-planned towns. One need not go further and single out a particular scheme as the regular type. The so-called 'horseshoe'—three stoas at right angles—was favoured, but there were variations and other possibilities. Before good examples were revealed by excavation it was often assumed that the ideal consisted of four stoas completely enclosing a rectangular space. This idea, though thoroughly disproved, dies hard. Vitruvius certainly says that the Greeks made their 'fora' 'in quadrato'; but he is describing a late type, which can hardly be all that the agora in the full sense of the word was to a classical town.

To investigate the real nature of the Ionic agora one must go back to Hippodamus and fifth-century town-planning. The Hippodamian system did not change the vital character of the Greek city—old and new cities alike were all that 'polis' implies, and had the same essential parts. But architecturally the reforms were important enough. The development which had formerly been haphazard and partly unconscious was now carefully controlled and subordinated to a fixed design, though not necessarily much more rapid. The agora was still at first a convenient open space in which the citizens could gather for various purposes; but it had its proper place in the dominating system of sets of parallel streets at right angles to each other. Possible future needs could be calculated better than before in planning the whole city and in assigning a place to the agora. An area of suitable size and situation was reserved.

This is all one can say as far as the fifth century is concerned. The task of evolving appropriate building schemes was left to the fourth and later centuries. Hippodamus came from Miletus to apply the new methods at Peiraeus in the middle of the fifth, and the agora was called 'Hippodameia' after him, but this need not mean more than that he allotted its position and marked it out; there is no reason to believe that he erected stoas or other buildings around; indeed, the fact that a house could stand upon it in the fourth century...

---

3 G. Leroux (Origines de l'Édifice Hyposyle, p. 185) called the stoa (in its common form with interior columns) an elongated megaron with a central row of interior supports, of which one side has been replaced by a colonnade. But the essential openness of the stoa makes it different in principle from any kind of megaron. Possibly its simplest form (as in the stoa of the Athenians at Delphi) was suggested by simple lean-to shelters placed against a wall, and other forms were developed from this.

4 The German writers constantly use the term 'Huf-eisen'; the arrangement could be compared more aptly to goal-posts.

5 A. von Gerkan, Griechische Stadtanlagen, p. 94.

6 V. i.


8 Cf. Demosthenes (? Alx. 22; see W. J. Judeich, Topographia von Athen (1931), p. 452.
indicates that even then a certain openness was preserved. Little is known of this agora; it was probably a large square, a centre of both commerce and political life.

The richest material for the history of the Ionian agora is provided by Miletus, greatest of the Ionian cities (Fig. 2). Here one can see what could be done at a city with growing resources, whose architects were gifted with powers of vision. Miletus was, of course, a very ancient town, and irregular in its archaic form. Its destruction by the Persians was very thorough, and the Milesian survivors, unlike the returning Athenians, planned a new and modern city. The chessboard plan seems to have involved the whole peninsula from the first, though building would proceed slowly as the population grew and prosperity gradually returned. The Milesians apparently had visions of their city regaining much of its former greatness, and planned accordingly. An extensive central area, comparatively low-lying and

![Diagram of Miletus Agora Area in Middle of Second Century B.C.](image)

flat, was reserved for development as agora—there is no sign of houses having to be cleared away for the great architectural schemes carried out later.¹⁹

Early in the fourth century the agora had hardly even begun to assume an impressive architectural form. A structure resembling a large house—possibly the Prytaneion—was one of the first important buildings; later it was incorporated in the north agora complex. The latter began to take shape at the end of the century. A long Dorian stoa, with a row of small rooms behind, was built facing north towards the harbour; a short wing made a return northwards at the west end, and behind the main stoa was a square, colonnaded court with rooms around. This, the first great building scheme of the new agora, gave the town a fine water-front, and provided facilities for the merchants as Miletus recovered its mercantile prosperity.²²

The distinguishing feature of Ionian agora-planning can be seen in the building. The

---


¹¹ Ibid., I. vi, p. 89.
architects who adorned the older cities' agoras designed stoas which as units were both practically and aesthetically satisfying. Ionian architects in the fourth and following centuries fully realised and explored the possibilities of combining stoas at right angles to form appropriate and impressive schemes.

An arrangement which was repeatedly found convenient was the 'horseshoe,' in which three stoas formed three sides of a rectangle, the fourth being occupied by an important street with public buildings or another stoa beyond it. One can hardly regard the 'horseshoe' as the result of the mere extension of the shallow projecting wings sometimes added to single stoas—the Stoa of Zeus at Athens, for instance. The wings of the latter are not much more than ornamental terminations, and face the same way as the central colonnade; the sides of the 'horseshoe' have their façades at right angles to the central part, and are stoas in themselves.

The 'horseshoe' was introduced in a modified form and on a vast scale at Miletus in the south agora-complex, on which building activity was concentrated in the course of the third century, though possibly it was planned earlier. On the east a long single stoa was built with three rows of rooms behind—these were no doubt shops and warehouses. Facing it on the west were two L-shaped stoas with double colonnades; only the southern, which was probably two-storied, had rooms behind. The west side was thus not a continuous stoa, as was the south side at Priene, and additional means of access to the vast place was provided; but the unity and grandeur of the design were hardly impaired by this, or by the fact that the process of building required so long and probably fell into several stages—the south wing may be as late as the middle of the second century B.C. The south agora, says von Gerkan, was conceived as 'Staatsmarkt'; but the east stoa, an important part of the scheme, probably completed at an early stage, was, as he admits, devoted to trade. The huge scale of the stoas, their openness and freedom in large sections from encumbering rooms, may have given the south agora greater civic dignity than the north, which was more of a 'Kaufmarkt'; but the two areas are not to be differentiated clearly or opposed to one another in function.

The political centre of Miletus was perhaps defined as being between them, by the erection of the Bouleuterion, a small covered theatre with a colonnaded court, between 175 and 164 B.C. The north complex had undergone little extension for some time, except that a small 'horseshoe' had been placed behind the west wing; but in the middle of the second century, with the addition of an L-shaped wing on the south-east, displacing part of the Prytaneion, another and much larger 'horseshoe' was formed. What is probably a small temple was unobtrusively inserted in the middle of the long west side; the colonnades incidentally provided it with a fine fore-court. The east side, opposite the temple, was left quite open for the time being, though some distance farther east, and south of the colonnaded court of the Delphi, a gymnasium was built.

At this stage—towards the end of the Hellenistic period and before the period of Roman domination—the Milesian agora area had attained a form which was complete and satisfying, and which the renewed building of the Roman imperial age, following a period of depression in Asia under the Roman republic, could elaborate and complicate according to the fashions of the time without making any real improvement. The architects had been guided throughout by the original rectangular street plan of the city, and had made good use of the opportunities it left them; the result was worthy of a great city. The Bouleuterion marked the political centre, with the maritime agora on one side, and the great south agora, for business not immediately connected with the sea and for recreation and general purposes, on the other. The design was simple and spacious, aesthetically pleasing and practically convenient.

13 Milet, I. vii.
14 Ibid., p. 47.
16 Milet, I. ii.
17 Milet, I. vii. 91-3.
18 Von Gerkan's restoration (Milet, I. vi. Taf. xxvii) gives a good idea of the appearance of a large part; it includes one feature which is a rather later development—the wall across the east side of the north agora.
Priene is well known and is much simpler. One need only emphasise certain points. The agora was planned with the rest of the city in the fourth century, and was built at first on the basis of a simple 'horseshoe'; on east, south and west were continuous stoas with shops. Subsequently there were extensions and modifications. About 300 B.C. the sanctuary of Zeus was placed back to back with the eastern stoa, breaking into the line of shops. The temple had its own little court; neither here nor elsewhere were the agora stoas allowed to degenerate into a mere setting for a temple. They stood in their own right, and were the basis of the agora's architecture; they were the setting for human activity rather than for some architectural masterpiece. Important shrines stood near by; at Priene the temenos of Athena occupied the terrace to the north-west, but though the temple was well placed on a commanding site, the agora still dominated the plan and the inner life of the city.

The westward extension—a small rectangular space for the use of butchers and fishmongers—is architecturally unimportant, but interesting from another point of view; it shows a tendency to segregate the less dignified forms of trade. In early times the same open agora must have sufficed for political and other gatherings and for shopping crowds. Later, even in the old type of agora, something was done towards providing separate places for different functions, though only to a limited extent. One might have expected that on carefully planned sites the process would be fully carried out; but it is doubtful whether this was ever the case in the Ionian towns. The agora was still not clearly divisible according to functions; still less were there political and commercial agoras side by side. Closely related stoas continued to serve a variety of purposes—political and commercial, religious and social. Their numerous rooms are often difficult to identify; many were probably shops, some

---

20 Aristotle (*Politics*, VII. xii. 2, 3, 1331a, b) recommends that, as in Thessaly, there should be an *Oudikes* agora, free or 'pure' of trade, and of a religious (and, it appears, rather snobbish) character; and another and separate agora τὸν ὅμοιον. This is hardly normal or natural in a Greek city—Aristotle goes to Thessaly for his example—and is not, I think, characteristic of the Ionian planned towns. There is something comparable to it in temple courts adjacent to the agora as at Priene and Magnesia, but these are not rival agoras.
government offices, some shrines. The civic buildings of Priene were mostly on the north side, across the main street.²¹

The most important development at Priene was the erection on the north of a magnificent stoa—called Sacred, and containing shrines and probably public offices—which considerably changed the appearance and character of the agora about the middle of the second century. Replacing a much more modest building, the new stoa extended a good deal farther eastwards, along the front of the Ekklesieasterion and the Prytaneion, and since a colonnade was built opposite its eastern end, on the south side of the street, the agora now had a handsome extension in this direction. The city centre of Priene was one of which such a small community might well be proud. It blended perfectly into the plan of the town, and was admirably adapted to the citizens' needs.

At Priene we have the Ionian agora as developed in a small town, at Miletus as in a great commercial city. Magnesia on the Maeander²² falls somewhere between the two.

---

²¹ Contrast the east stoa of the south agora at Miletus, with its shops and stores.

²² C. Humann, etc., Magnesia am Maeander (agora, pp. 3 ff., 22 and 107 ff).
THE IONIAN AGORA

period at Magnesia, though the agora had probably been planned earlier. Double colonnades (outer columns Doric, inner Ionic as usual) were erected on each of the four sides, the northern, eastern and western being continuous. Usually the three connected stoas were one long and two short sides of a rectangle, at Magnesia they were one short and two long; the type was not rigidly fixed and was varied to suit local convenience. A street, at first left quite open,²⁹ separated the south stoa from the rest. A propylon led to the enclosure of Artemis on the east; on the north and west was a series of small rooms, most of which were shops, though one was a fountain-house and two small shrines. The buildings behind the south stoa included what was probably the Prytaneion. Streets approaching from the south broke the line of rooms, but not the colonnade, on this side. As was usual, various monuments stood on the open area. Among them was a temple, but it was small, and hardly changed the character of the square; its position and size made it not the focal point, but merely the

most important of the minor monuments. The variety of function of the buildings associated with the agora is to be noted. Public life in various forms was concentrated in one and the same place; there is little evidence of the tendency to reserve one site as civic centre and another as market-place.

These three—particularly Miletus and Priene, since their monuments are more fully explored—at this stage of their history are examples of what may reasonably be called the true Ionian agora, the type which was evolved to suit Ionian town-planning, and which was still a classical agora in the full sense of the word—this cannot be said of some later specimens. Comparison with the old-fashioned agora reveals not only a well-marked difference in architectural form, but also a vital connexion and similarity in spirit. The true Hellenic agora, whether carefully planned or not, was the innermost zone, the nucleus, and was closely knit into the fabric of the city. Public activities were concentrated and mingled in it; the city's life-blood flowed freely in and out. It was the centre of business and political life, with a

²⁹ Though possibly steps connected the east and south stoas even before the gate (see below) was built (see Magnesia, p. 110).
strong religious element too. It was not merely an ornamental public square or a marketplace, but included both these and more. All this applies to the Ionian agora as much as to the old. It was the heart of the city, and was not exclusive in any way or segregated from the rest, but directly and vitally linked with it. I once argued that in the Hippodamian scheme the agora lost something of the focal position which it had in the old towns, where the streets radiated outwards roughly like the spokes of a wheel; but the loss was superficial; the agora was still directly involved in the street system; the activities of the citizens merged there, and varied streams of energy flowed in. For these reasons one might call the Ionian agora a Hellenic creation, brought to completion in the Hellenistic age. Many of the Asiatic towns enjoyed a good deal of freedom in the time of some Hellenistic rulers, and continued to function as before with little outward change—sometimes actually gaining ground commercially, sometimes helped on by royal munificence without the burdens of royal tyranny. The architectural development which was possible under these conditions, particularly at Miletus, was a continuation of the work of Hippodamus and the early planners; its products show dignity, restraint and orderliness of design, and although the fifth-century exquisiteness of form has gone, deserve to be recognised amongst the notable achievements of Hellenic architecture.

The contrast with a thoroughly Hellenistic town, Pergamon, is illuminating. The kings of Pergamon spared no money to create a beautiful city and a centre of Greek civilisation. They succeeded, but their creation was not a typical Greek city, and did not possess a real agora. The 'lower agora' of Pergamon (Fig. 5) was a slightly irregular peristyle, fully enclosed, with two-storeyed colonnades and numerous shops. It was a handsome market building, but did not play the full part of an agora in the scheme and life of the town. There was also an 'upper agora,' which was only a part, and not one of the most important or conspicuous parts at that, of the series of great monuments adorning the upper city (Fig. 6). The road which ascended to the acropolis passed through without accommodating itself to the agora level. The stoas on the right of the road formed a 'horseshoe.' On the north the terrace of the great altar cut into the area and made its shape irregular. Above the agora on ascending terraces were the altar, the sanctuary of Athena, the library and other monuments. The agora was clearly a mere appendage of this great design.

It has been said that Pergamon, as compared with the unimaginative chessboard towns, is the creation of a real planner. Certainly the Attalids brought into being a fine city. But Miletus, and perhaps even Priene, need not fear comparison. Pergamon was the work of royal architects, with vast resources, giving free play to their masters' fancies and their own, and spreading over the hillside buildings which were very magnificent but not altogether vital to city life, with hands as lavish as those of the sculptors who decorated the great altar. Miletus was the work of real town-builders.

Hellenistic Delos, too, presents a contrast, though in a different way (Fig. 7). Delos in that age was transformed into a great commercial centre; its form was not that of a normal Greek city, but of an international clearing-house. Various monarchs and wealthy merchants and corporations contributed to the growth, and the result naturally showed a certain lack of balance and design. Buildings connected with the commerce of the town sprawled over a wide area, but the agora proper was concentrated south of the sanctuary of Apollo, with its temples and stoas, and east of the harbour, and there in the latter part of the third century and the first half of the second a number of stoas accumulated without close coherence of design. More interesting and possibly more important for Delian trade are the large warehouses which line the quays to the south, the establishments of individual merchants,
with rooms round a square colonnaded court. The central agora was overshadowed also by certain buildings to the north associated with the commerce of Delos. The Hypostyle Hall \(^{31}\) may have been a kind of exchange. Some of the more prominent foreign communities erected establishments of their own; the Italians' 'agora,' \(^{32}\) built towards the end of the second century, was a quadrilateral court completely enclosed by colonnades with rooms and exedrae behind, and was the largest building in Delos. It was not a public market, but a private meeting-place for the Italian colony's general uses. The central area of Delos was not a normal agora, but a cosmopolitan Hellenistic trading centre, irregularly built and hemming in the ancient shrine of Apollo.

The form of the Italian building raises again the question of the part played by the fully enclosed peristyle court in agora planning. The idea that the peristyle was the ideal form of the agora, the culmination of a process in which the Priene type, not fully enclosed, was an intermediate stage, still seems plausible and attractive. It plays an important part

---

\(^{32}\) *BCH* viii. 112 ff.; xxxvi. 117.
in J. C. Wymer’s theory of ancient ‘Marktplatzanlagen’; 33 Wymer goes farther, and sees the influence of the Greek peristyle agora in the Roman imperial fora. Von Gerkan points out 34 the lateness of the peristyles, and shows that the influence worked, in fact, rather in the opposite direction. If the view expressed above of the real nature of the agora in both irregular and planned cities is correct, the peristyle was different in conception from both the classical types. Instead of being an ideal and the culmination of the development, in its complete enclosure and seclusion from the city around it contained an alien element which made it less fully an agora. The ideal was approached, if anywhere, at Miletus and Priene.

In the fourth century and Hellenistic age the peristyle court played an increasingly important part in architecture. It was used in houses, gymnasia and the fore-courts of sacred and civic buildings. It could serve as a market-building, as part of an agora. We have already met examples; and two comparatively early specimens, one from a new and one from an old-fashioned agora, are the square court in the north complex at Miletus, and a peristyle 59 m. square (possibly fourth century) of which the foundations were recently found partly under the Stoa of Attalus at Athens. 35 In Roman times there was a greater tendency to plan the agora as a whole on these lines, and to make it an enclosed building turning in upon itself. City life had lost something of its true quality, and the agora had a less vital part to play, a less intimate relation with all the varied activities of the community. Ephesus, Aphrodisias (probably), Nysa and some towns of southern Asia Minor provide examples of the peristyle agora. 36 In some cases the influence of the forum is clearly at work.

To follow up these later developments is outside our present scope. One may note, however, that these tendencies had some effect at Miletus and Magnesia. At Magnesia in Roman times the street which separated the south stoa from the rest was built over by columnar gateways, and the enclosure of the area made complete. 37 In the second century A.D. the south agora of Miletus was made into a regular peristyle, broken only by the narrow gap on the west; 38 the east stoa was made uniform and continuous with the others. Before this, symptoms had already appeared of the more radical changes to follow. Light gateways had been built across the north-east and probably also the south-east entrances to the south agora; 39 and a little later, towards the middle of the first century B.C., a wall with a handsome propylion in the middle was built shutting in the east side of the north agora. 40

The area east of this, leading from the harbour to the Bouleuterion, developed by several stages into a colonnaded street. The vigorous outburst of building activity in the second century A.D. was marked not only by the more complete enclosure of large open areas, but also by the excessive and functionless architectural elaboration which had become popular by that time. The north gate of the south agora, and the gorgeous façade of the Nymphaeum near by, were built in this ornate style, 41 and with certain minor structures hemmed in more closely the space in front of the Bouleuterion. The agora area of Miletus attained its greatest magnificence in this age, but adaptation to prevailing fashions tended to destroy the openness, spaciousness and simplicity preserved in the Hellenistic stoas, and to impair the character of the site as an agora. 

Ionian methods of town-planning were applied sparingly in European Greece, as far as

---

33 Marktplatzanlagen der Griechen und Römer, Dresdener Diss., 1916. Wymer says (p. 22) that the forum of Caesar, in the middle of which was the temple of Venus, embodied the Ionic ideal regular enclosed place; apart from the question of enclosure, we have seen that a temple was not allowed to dominate the real Ionian agora.


35 Hesperia, VI. iii. (1937), 354-377; Forschungen in Ephesos, iii. 84 ff. (the agora of Ephesus, of which fanciful pictures have been drawn, is only known in a late form; the Hellenistic form cannot be determined). Arch. Anc., 1936, p. 419, and Rev. Arch., 1936 (2), p. 226 (Aphrodisias); W. van Diet, etc., Nysa ad Maandrum, pp. 33 ff.; K. Graf Lanckoronski, Städte Pamphylens und Pisidiens (e.g., Kremm, ii. 161, which shows influence of forum); the small ‘agora’ of Cnidus (Antiquitates of Ionia, III. ch. ii. p. 42), cited by Wymer (p. 16), according to von Gerkan (p. 94) was not large enough for the purpose, and may have been the court of a gymnasion, but in position and form it has some resemblance to the warehouses of Delos.

37 Magnesia, pp. 5, 109 and 110.

38 Milet, I. vii. 51 ff.

39 Ibid., I. vii. 47.

40 Ibid., I. vi. 94.

41 Ibid., I. v.
one can judge. One might expect that even though the inhabitants of an old city were unable or unwilling to give it a complete new plan, the agora could have assumed a regular form; but the process of regularisation does not appear to have gone beyond certain limits. Tritsch has shown how even the agora of Elis, though built in the fifth century, represents the old-fashioned type. Considerably later, the agora of Megalopolis was planned and built on a magnificent scale; one of the excavators described it as laid out in Ionian style; but though the buildings were placed regularly along the four sides of a rectangle, and two stoas were very long, occupying each the greater part of one side, the units had not the close co-ordination of the Ionian scheme; open passages run freely between the buildings; we look in vain for combinations of stoas; the Stoa of Philip (and perhaps the Myropolis too) is a self-contained architectural unity; with its shallow projecting wings, it is a prolongation of the form of the Stoa of Zeus at Athens. This agora, though it has features which distinguish it from Elis, is hardly Ionian.

![Diagram of Delos: Central Area](From P. Roussel, Delos.)

On other sites, too, the rectangular form of the agora was more clearly defined. From the end of the fifth century stoas of great length (in the neighbourhood of 100 m.) were not unusual. At Corinth, where the agora had perhaps originally been concentrated east of the temple hill, though it spread round other sides too, the centre of gravity shifted in the fourth century to the south, where an extensive area was cleared; at a date which has not yet been made clear, a very long stoa was built along the southern edge. The recent excavations at Athens have revealed unsuspected building activity in the Hellenistic age, producing a striking change in the appearance and character of the agora. The Stoa of Attalus extended over 100 m. along the east side; now that the researches of the Americans are well advanced, it

---

42 E. A. Gardner, etc., Excavations at Megalopolis, p. 102; G. C. Richards also found that the excavations confirmed in every point Currie's old restoration, which, while placing the monuments with accuracy, seriously misrepresented the character of the agora by making the colonnades all continuous.

43 AJA xxxvii. 1933, 555 ff.; the stoa was much reconstructed and complicated in Roman times. A shorter stoa on the north side of the area, immediately south of the temple hill, was built possibly at the end of the fourth century (AJA xxx. 1926, 47). At Orchomenos in Arcadia (BCH 1914, pp. 71 ff.) a long stoa, possibly of the fourth century, was placed on the north side of the agora, and at right angles to it on the east, though separate and at a lower level, was another long narrow building. The agora of Mantinea was given its fairly regular enclosed form only by the building schemes of Epigone in the first century A.D. (G. Fougeres, Mantines, pp. 179 ff.).
no longer stands in isolation, but takes its place among a series of buildings which were roughly contemporary and must have been parts of a more or less co-ordinated scheme. At right angles to the Stoa of Attalus, but quite distinct from it, a building 150 m. long and of peculiar form was placed across the whole of the south part of the agora; both sides and both ends were open colonnades, and there was a row of interior supports joined, at least in their lower parts, by curtain walls. This building faced both ways; for the agora extended farther south, and there were important monuments beyond it. The extreme southern limit was marked by a simpler and rather shorter stoa parallel with the other. Not much could be done to bring the old buildings strung out along the west side into line with the new elements; but when the Metroon towards the south end of these assumed a more extensive and complicated form, a continuous colonnade, nearly 39 m. long, was built on the east front, giving a uniform façade to a miscellaneous assemblage of rooms. The Metroon still followed the ancient line of the west buildings, which formed a slightly acute angle with the peripetal stoa. The agora, or at least part of it, was now something approaching a regular colonnaded square, but it was not Ionian in form. Ionian planning may have had some general influence in the direction of regularisation, but in some points Pergamene influence is clear. The kings of Pergamon, of course, contributed freely to the monuments of Athens in this period. In the agora the east stoa was associated with Attalus II (159-138 B.C.), and Pergamene munificence may have contributed in general to the schemes. In architectural form, parallels are found at Pergamon and in the Pergamene sphere of influence. Two-storied colonnades, as in the Stoa of Attalus, are especially characteristic of Pergamon. Stoas with open colonnades at the back as well as the front are found in the Pergamene sphere in some examples of a type of market-building erected on sloping ground—the inner colonnade opened directly on the agora, the outer, facing down the hillside, crowned one or more lower storeys. H. A. Thompson notes in the scheme of the Metroon something similar to the Pergamene library. Not even in the second century, it appears, did the Athenians carry out a scheme attributed by Dr. Dörpfeld to Kimon in the fifth, and reproduce at Athens the agoras of the cities of Ionia.

The University, Manchester.

R. E. Wycherley
THE PHILINNA PAPYRUS


'Too small to have more than a palaeographical interest': thus marked, the Amherst Papyrus II was published by Grenfell and Hunt in 1901; they assigned it to cent. I b.c. For all its smallness, however, Wilamowitz remembered this text when he found a similar one in the Berlin Papyrus 7504, which he edited in 1907, dating the hand 'spätgriechisch.' But in quoting from the Amherst Papyrus he relied too much on his memory, that, and some mistakes which he made in editing the Berlin Papyrus, prevented him from making full use of his discovery.

A considerable step forward was taken by Adam Abt in 1910. He supplemented convincingly II. 8–12 and 17–18 of the Berlin Papyrus from the text of the Amherst Papyrus. He even envisaged, and for excellent reasons, the possibility that the two papyri were parts of the same roll, but eventually decided against it because he thought that II. 13–16 of the Berlin Papyrus could not be made to fit on to the Amherst Papyrus. Here he was wrong, as will be shown presently. But he was more wrong in not settling the whole problem for good and all by simply stating whether the hands of the two papyri are identical or not. He says nothing about the dates.

In 1931, Preisendanz in the main confined himself to a reprint of Wilamowitz's text with Abt's improvements. His silence about the hands and their dates is even more strange than Abt's, because he dates all the other papyrus of his collection. He fell short of Abt in not even mentioning the parts of the Amherst Papyrus which Abt had failed to fit on to the Berlin Papyrus.

In 1942, Mr. D. L. Page reprinted a part of Wilamowitz's text without Abt's improvements, adding 'Ed. pr. compare P. Amherst, II, 11.' When I discussed Page's book with Mr. Löbel, he drew my attention to the Amherst Papyrus. I soon arrived at readings and supplements which show that II. 13–16 of the Berlin Papyrus join on to the Amherst Papyrus quite as well as do the lines joined by Abt. This means that the two papyri are contiguous parts of the same roll and that the hands must be identical. This identity cannot be demonstrated in present conditions [ad oculos]. I hope, however, that the following reconstruction of that whole which was torn into the two pieces—I shall call it the Philinna Papyrus—will be convincing by itself.

2. SOURCES FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE PHILINNA PAPYRUS.

(1) A photograph of the recto of the Amherst fragment, in P. Amth. vol. II, Plate II.
(2) A photograph of the verso of the Amherst fragment, supplied by the J. P. Morgan Library, New York, to the Oxford University Press in January 1943.
(3) Grenfell and Hunt's statements about the Amherst fragment.

---

1. See infra, note 13.
2. Philologus 69 (1910), 150–52. Abt died in 1918 while preparing the new edition of the two large Berlin Magical Papyri which was completed by Preisendanz (P. Mag., vol. I, 1928, nos. 1 and 9).
4. See infra, note 13.
6. "Emmert sei an Pap. Amherst II, 11, der öfter kopflos bietet und irrtäümlicherweise—sich sehnt die Endung—; aber alles ist unverständlich." There are four misstatements in this quotation.
7. I cannot ascertain if he saw the papyrus; see infra, note 9.
8. I have not seen vol. 3 of his collection, which was printing in 1939 (cf. Preisendanz, Neue griechische Zauberpapyri, in Forschungen und Fortschritte 15, 1939, Pp. 151 f.).
10. He had discovered among the unpublished Oxyrhynchus papyri one containing a different version of col. II, ll. 8–12; see infra, p. 37.
12. Grenfell and Hunt saw more letters on col. I of the recto than are visible on the plate. Therefore the edition of this column (infra, p. 36) is based mainly on their state-
(4) Wilamowitz’s statements about the Berlin fragment.\textsuperscript{13}
(5) Perhaps a statement by Preisendanz about the Berlin fragment.\textsuperscript{14}

3. GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE PAPYRUS.

Fragment of a roll, \(10 \times 8.2\) cm., consisting of two contiguous pieces. One of these, \(6 \times 4.2\) cm., was bought between 1897 and 1900 by Grenfell and Hunt for Lord Amherst (\textit{P. Anth.} \textit{II}, since 1913 in the J. P. Morgan Library, New York); the other, \(10 \times 4\) cm., was bought, probably at the same time, by the Berlin Museums (\textit{P. 7504}).\textsuperscript{15}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{recto:} collection of charms (see infra, sections 4–8) written in a literary hand of cent. I B.C.
  \item This date is assigned to the Amherst fragment by Grenfell and Hunt, and Mr. Lobel tells me that he thinks a later date impossible but would not exclude cent. II B.C.
\end{itemize}

On the top of col. II there is a heading \(προς\) \(κεφαλή\) \(πάρο\) written \textit{‘in mehr kurzsier Schrift,’} according to Wilamowitz. It refers to ll. 13 ff. There the beginning of the title is marked by (1) paragraphs under the preceding line; (2) \(\varepsilon\) \(θεά\) σε; \textsuperscript{16} (3) an oblique stroke before the first letter (the \(φ\) of \(φίλαυσ\));\textsuperscript{17} (4) the capitals \(ΚΕΦΑ\) written in the left margin. The beginning of the charm (l. 15) is marked by paragraphs and \(\varepsilon\) \(θεά\) σε only. In ll. 4–6, where the left part of the column is lost, the beginnings of title and charm were presumably arranged in the same way.

\textit{verso}\textsuperscript{18}: fragments of two columns written in a cursive hand of about cent. I A.D. Of the first column only some line ends are preserved, of the second the beginnings and ends of 9 and probably the beginnings of some more lines. On the photograph of the Amherst fragment the last two line ends can be deciphered: 8 \(\varepsilonπο\ λιμω\), 9 \(\varepsilonπο\); about the text of the Berlin fragment nothing is known.

4. TRANSCRIPT OF THE RECTO.

See the drawing below, made by Mr. W. T. Wright of the Clarendon Press, Oxford. It is in the main a copy from Plate II of the \textit{Amherst Papyri}, vol. 2, supplemented from the text of the Berlin Papyrus as I suppose it to run; this text is written by the draughtsman in letters of about the same size as those of the Amherst Papyrus. The contour of the Berlin fragment is...
inferred only from this text and its relation to the Amherst fragment. The letters outside the border-lines are supplied conjecturally. Dots under the letters mark the reading as doubtful; they are not in the papyrus.

5. General Character of Text.

The text is a collection of hexametrical charms, each of which has a title indicating: (1) the name of the author, (2) his or her nationality, (3) the disease for which the charm is intended. No earlier collection of Greek charms and no similar collection are known.

Notes on Some Doubtful Readings.—Col. I: see supra, note 12.—Col. II: for the two unnumbered lines on the top see supra, p. 34.—l. 2, letter before Φ: ‘Rest wie von Α, Λ’ Wil. But only Ε seems to make sense, see section 7.—l. 4, ΓΑΔ: ΤΑΔ Wil. It is more probable that Wil. misread the mutilated line than that the copyist failed to recognise Gadara; G.—H. similarly misread Γ as Τ (see supra, note 12). Therefore I think that ΓΑΔ is in the papyrus.—l. 5, ΥΜ: ΤΑ Wil., who adds ‘die beiden Buchstaben können auch ΥΛ (oder Δ) sein.’ Then YM is equally possible, and this alone makes sense.—l. 6, ΟΚ: thus Wil. without indicating any alternative.—l. 7: ]ποτε[ G.—H. Between AT and ΔΕ there were perhaps two letters.—l. 8 P: `Buchstabe rund, C, Ω, Θ’ Wil.; but no such letter makes sense.—l. 10, ΗΡΑΚΑΝ: thus Wil.: πγαγν Preisendanz (cf. supra, note 14).—l. 13: Ε: C Wil.—l. 15: ‘I in ΦΕΥΓΕI nachgetragen’ Wil.—l. 16, letter before Φ: ‘C oder Ν’ Wil.—l. 18, letter after ΠΟΙ: Ε G.—H.

Col. I

] . . . [ . . . [ . . . 10 σοι 10 θεον
] [ακαι 10 οιστατε
] [αοιδη 15 φυ
] 5 [πωλυ 15 έρ
] [σινε 1
] [κατα]

Col. II


[14 c. 8 ll.] ας Συρας Χαδαραντης [[15] επαιοιδη] προς παν κατακαμα ρα
6 c. 8 ll. ]υποδοκος κατικα[υπη] 7. [ιοτοτ[.] 8' εν δει κατακαμα[ν]η]
8 8' επτά λυκων κρήνας, επτ' αρ[κτων,] 9 επτά λεόντων.
επτά δε παρθε[10] νακιαι κυανώπιδες ηγαγουν 0 11 6ορ
cαλπισι κυανεσαι και 12 έκοιμασιαν ακάματον τυρ.

13 Φιλιννης Θεσσαλις επαιοιδη εις 14 κεφαλης πτων
φευγουσιν δε λυ[17] 1κοι, φευγουσι δε μούνικις τε 18 τοι
[ευ] - πληγασις υπ[ ]

7. Commentary.19

I. 1, συ γαρ ει: this type of invocation has been proved generally to be non-Hellenic by E. Norden, "Ἀγνωστος Θεός" (1913), pp. 83 ff. But II. 2, 185, ως ει γαρ θείοι εστε, and Hymn. Pan. Epidauros, συ γαρ τελειος ιρευμα παντων (immediately before the end, as here),20 come very near; cf. moreover Ἠρως in Orph. H. 84 (85) 8 (αυτοκαταγνητος γαρ Ἠρως), 1 (2) 14, (17,18) 16.

I. 2: εφοδοις is not certain (cf. section 4), nor is προσων. For εφοδοι of visiting by a chthonic power cf. Eur. Ion 1048, Aesch. Eum. 370, Orph. H. 70(71) 9. The deity here invoked may be Hypnos or Oneiros.

II. 2–3: cf. P. Mag. 4. 2939 τελειοι τελαιον ἐπαιοιδην, 4.295 τελεστε μοι την τελειαν ἐπαιοιδην, Aristoph. Fr. 29 (from the 'Αμφιόρεως) τελαιον 8' δ' ἐγαθαντον ἐπαιοιδην, all of these at the end of a charm. There is a good survey of the evidence for ἐπαιοιδη α by Fehrle in R.E., Suppl. 4 (1924) s.v. Epoide.

II. 4–12: of this charm Mr. Lobel has discovered a different version in an unpublished Oxyrhynchus papyrus of c. cent. IV a.d. He has given me a copy of it with his supplements,

20 IG. 3. 1 (1929), no. 130, Maas, Epidauros. Hymn. (1933), pp. 190 ff.; in my opinion the most probable date is III b.c., but others assign it to a.D. II.
and the Committee of the Egypt Exploration Society have granted me permission to publish it. I am greatly obliged to Mr. Lobel and the Committee. Here is the text (‘Ox.’):

5 ω Γη συ δε ταυτα παυντ[

πρ(ος) ερυθραν λογος επτα [επτα] λεοντων επτα [κοιμιαν] αιθεριον πυρ [λεγε] ναε []
10 . . . . . . επικαλουμα[

. ο του Αβρααμ ναε [] επικα-

λουμα δε και το ονιμα

7 more mutilated lines.

II. 4-5: κατάκωμα can mean both fire and inflammation in the medical sense. Ox. specialises by naming ἐρυθρας or ἐρυθρά (which must mean a similar burning disease of the skin, perhaps shingles). Certainly the charm would be more efficacious for a nervous disease of the skin than for an ordinary fire.

II. 6-7: mutilation apparently complicated by corruption does not allow an attempt at restoration (for ἐν ὦραι see note on II. 9-12). A consequence of the corruption seems to be that κρήνης in I. 8 has no verb to govern it. Moreover I see no plausible connexion of wells with wild beasts.

II. 8-9: cf. Apsyrtus in Hippiatr. vol. 2, p. 31 (= Heim no. 65), τρίχ ἐπτα θαλάσσιοι ζῶαι, ἐπτα ἄρκοι, ἐπτα λέοντες, ἐπτα δελφίνοι δελεοκον τὴν ἀγρίαν μάλιν (a disease of horses). Preisendanz refers for this line to R. Wünsch, Zur Geisterhannung im Altertum (Festschr. zur Jahrhundertfeier der Universität Breslau, 1911), p. 13. 1; this publication, which Weinreich, Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 5 (1929), p. 175, calls grundlegend, is inaccessible to me.

II. 9-12: if προσαν is in the pap. (cf. supra, note 14), the copyist may have derived it from ἐρᾶω 'pour out,' though there is no parallel for the α. But Abt's conjecture is good.—ἐκοιμησαν (Ox.) is more poetical than ἐβεβαιω (pap.). The alliteration κάλται κουνέως και ἐκοιμησαν ᾠκάμετων πορ seems deliberate: cf. Heim no. 53 (for colic), 21 θεῶς κελαεί κυ θείαν πτέουν κυλοῦ, where θεος may be a substitute for a name of a daemon beginning with Κ.—αἰθεριον (Ox.) for ᾠκάμετων (pap.) would then be a secondary version intended for an fire caused by lighting.

The tale of the seven maidens quenching a fire with their pitchers is the earliest instance in Greek or Latin charms of what folklorists call a historiola, 22 a short mention of an analogous mythical story. The nearest parallels I have found are the following: (1) Groups of three anonymous virgins or sisters occur in charms transmitted by Marc. Emp. 28. 74 and 21. 3 (= Heim nos. 197, 100) and in Ps.-Pliny ed. Heim l.c., p. 559, 18, but not otherwise connected with that of the Seven Maidens.—(2) As a charm for inflammation Hierocles in Hippiatr. vol. 2, p. 40, 22 (= Heim no. 106), tells this historiola: Κύρη και Μιθέα 23 ἀκαδεψουν προσ ἀντολάς ἥλιου, ἔχτουν το ἀφλεγματον εἶτε ἀπὸ λίθου εἶτε ἀπὸ ξύλου εἶτε ἀπὸ κυνότκου. (3) Because

11 Transmitted by Marc. Emp. 29. 93 and two inscriptions on Roman rings, cf. W. Drexler, Philologus 58 (1899), 688.
20 Cf. Theocr. 2. 15 f., where Perimede (= Agamede in Hom. II. 11. 741) makes the group of three complete.
of ἐν ἔρει in l. 7 of the Philinna Papyrus I quote the beginning of the Charm of the Stupid Man, Marc. Emp. 10, 35 (Heim no. 110): Stupidus in monte ibat, stupidus stultus. 24

If these parallels really are the ones nearest preserved, then there is little hope of finding out who those maidens were. 25

II. 15-18: to the copyist's corrected reading φεύγει δὲ in l. 15 I see no better supplement than λέων or τε λίς. His first reading, φανερέ δὲ, though metrically impossible, has two advantages: (1) the anaphora φεύγει—φεύγε: φεύγουσιν δὲ—φεύγουσι δὲ is more symmetrical than φεύγει: φεύγει δὲ—φεύγουσιν δὲ—φεύγουσι δὲ: (2) the ἀπόπτωσιμεί of the disease into rocks, i.e., into barren land, is just what one would expect. 26 I have considered φεύγε 'ιδαίοις ὑπὸ πέτρας, but the first reading of the copyist can hardly originate from this version.

The φεύγε type is one of the earliest and most frequent in charms for diseases; cf. Heim no. 56-68, Aristotle, Fr. 496 Rose (1886), on Φεύγε ἤς κόρακας; and the lead tablet from Phalasarna (Western Crete), 27 cent. IV B.C., II. 3 f., φεύγε ἄμα φεύγε λύκαια, φεύγε κῶν αμακαπτροκρόστος ἀ τε σύνοικοι μανόμενοι δέ ἀντίων πρὸς δώματα σύντοι ἔκαστος.

6. DATE OF THE CHARMS.

Are Thessalian Philinna and the Syrian woman of Gadara whose name is mutilated real or fictitious persons? Philinna, according to Strepsiades, is one of the most typical female names (Ar. Nub. 684); Thessalian or Syrian origin is just what a forger would be likely to invent for the author of a charm (Ar. Nub. 749, Theocr., 2. 162, etc.). Thus there is no reliance on these data. The style of what is left of the first and the third charm does not point to times earlier than Hellenistic. But the two soft-flowing hexameters about the seven maidens have a true Hellenic ring; εἰπὼν of this kind may have been those which appealed to Aeschylus, Pindar and Plato.

P. MAAS

24 Cf. Cod. Bernensis A 62 (A.D. X) ap. Heim no. 111, Stulta femina super fontem sedebat (where the last line seems to have been originally a versus lemninus: siccant vel venas quae sunt de sanguine flensae) and the end of the Old German "Strassburger Blut-Segen" (a.d. XI) Tumbo set in berks (W. Braune, Altdeutsches Lesebuch, 1928, pp. 89, 202; F. Ohrt in Handwörterbuch des Deutschen Abertalbens s.v. Tumbo, vol. 8, 1936-37).
26 Cf. Heim, nos. 69-74, Weinreich (see supra, p. 37), pp. 170-92. The writings by Wünsch and by Fehrle (Zuβer und Selen, 1926) quoted by Weinreich, pp. 175, 178, are inaccessible to me.
27 Ed. i. by Wünsch, Rhein. Mus. 55 (1900), pp. 73 ff.; cf. Inschrift. c. 2 (1939), p. 223. I shall treat this tablet in one of the next numbers of Hesperia; in its last line I read φιμ καταχρίστωι δεδήλωτοι φιμ επικύκλωι φιμ νυτών.
THE HARPY TOMB AT XANTHUS

[PLATES I-IV.]

I. THE EAST SIDE

One hundred years ago, in 1842, the Lycian Marbles were exhibited for the first time in the British Museum. Sir Charles Fellows had discovered them at Xanthus, the capital of Lycia, and succeeded in procuring them for the Trustees of the British Museum. Since that time, the Lycian Marbles have formed one of the main parts of the collection of Greek sculpture in London. But their London home seems to have had the strange effect of making them more and more reticent: these Lycian sculptures have indeed been extremely successful in withstanding all attempts at explaining them or even understanding them. In spite of the immense sensation caused at the time of their arrival in England and all through the nineteenth century, there is nobody who can even nowadays assign to any of them an accurate date or supply an adequate commentary.

The Harpy Tomb provides us with an excellent example for these (I admit) rather sweeping statements. Its place was in the middle of the Archaic Room of the British Museum. Everybody walked round it, looked at it, tried to explain it, and gave it up. Much has been written about it during these last hundred years, but the only solutions offered were of a vague mythological or symbolic character. However, I believe the time has come to attempt an explanation from a different angle altogether. It seems hopeless to continue on the well-trodden track, and to consider it simply as a piece of architecture or a piece of sculpture, in which we try to puzzle out the religious views expressed in the reliefs. In the interpretation offered in this paper, it is regarded primarily as the tomb or heroön of a certain family and as a monument of a certain historical character.

We know deplorably little of Lycian history. And, although I have come to definite conclusions beyond those that are expressed in this first part of my publication, I still feel that there are a good many riddles to be solved. But with the aid of some new photographs and in the light of a few hitherto unknown details, this paper may perhaps show that we are getting nearer to the solution, or at least that we are on the right track.

To describe this monument, I shall quote the terms used by Sir Charles Fellows (Xanthian Marbles, p. 21): 'The Harpy Tomb consisted of a square shaft in one block, weighing about eighty tons, its height seventeen feet, placed upon a base rising on one side 6 feet from the ground, on the other but a little above the present level of the earth. Around the sides of the top of the shaft were ranged the bas-reliefs in white marble about 3 ft. 3 in. high; upon these rested a capstone, apparently a series of stones, one projecting over the other; but these are cut in one block, probably 15-20 tons in weight. Within the top of the shaft was hollowed out a chamber which, with the bas-relief sides, was 7 ft. 6 in. high and 7 ft. square. This singular chamber ... was a burial chamber, and there was an entrance to it on the west side of the top of the shaft.'

The situation of the Harpy Tomb is an interesting one. It stands on a slope forming the sixth century has recently been expressed by a Turkish archaeologist, Ekrem Akurgal, whose book Griech. Reliefs d. VI. Jhdtis aus Lykien (1942) came into my hands while I was reading the proofs of this paper.

1 A good bibliography is contained in F. N. Pryce’s Catalogue of Sculpture in the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities of the British Museum, vol. i, part I (1828). To this may be added the early accounts given by Sir Charles Fellows in his Journal ... in Asia Minor (1842-9), Xanthian Marbles (1843), Lygia (1847), and Travels (1852); also the more recent references in G. Rodenwaldt, Griechische Reliefs in Lykien (Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie, 1933), and in C. Picard, Manuel d’Archéologie Grecque (1939).

2 A similar view in regard to the Lycian pillar-tombs of the sixth century has recently been expressed by a Turkish archaeologist, Ekrem Akurgal, whose book Griech. Reliefs d. VI. Jhdtis aus Lykien (1942) came into my hands while I was reading the proofs of this paper.

3 Here my thanks go to the Trustees of the British Museum for the extraordinary facilities which they gave me when photographing the reliefs, several years ago, when the present Director, Sir John Forsdyke, was Keeper of the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities. To him I also wish to express my deep gratitude for the interest he has taken in this paper.
edge of a level stretch of ground, and overlooking the deep-cut valley of the Xanthus river. Only about 50 paces to the north-east, there is another pillar tomb, similar in shape and size to the Harpy Tomb; its relief slabs surrounding the burial chamber have been lost, but the sides of the square shaft bear a long inscription, for the most part in Lycian script and language. In the middle of this Lycian inscription, however, are twelve lines in Greek, from which we clearly understand that its situation was on the Agora of Xanthus.

This inscription is of some importance, and its connexion with the Harpy Tomb has not escaped unnoticed. As a matter of fact, the level stretch of ground, on the edge of which the Harpy Tomb stands, has always quite rightly been considered as the ancient Agora of Xanthus. The map given by Sir Charles Fellows is too inaccurate to be reproduced. The map in Fig. 1 was made in 1892 by the architect who accompanied Benndorf, when he followed up Fellows' research. And in the description of his journey to Lycia, Benndorf plainly calls the level piece of ground on which the two pillar tombs stand, the Agora. Why then is this fact never mentioned in more recent publications? For surely it is quite important to know whether a

---

4 Fellows always speaks of 'close by' (Journal, 174) and 'very near' (Travels, 330), but he gives no accurate distance. Benndorf who has measured the distance, gives it in Reisen 1, 85 as '50 Schritte'.

5 T.A.M. i. 44; 6, 21: . . . ἀνίκηταν δάκρυα θεοῦ ἑρωθθαντί καθότι πετάναινα μεμέναι και πολεμοῦντες μάχες τοὺς ὀπισθαντον.'

6 Fellows calls it the burial-place of the kings and says, 'And from finding the district to have been the burial place of the kings, it (i.e. the Harpy Tomb) becomes the more interesting' (Travels, p. 340). Benndorf in his Reisen, vol. i, gives a view from the acropolis on plate 23 and describes this on p. 86 as follows: 'Mann erkennt hier in der linken unteren Ecke des Bildes die Harpagonstenste (i.e. Xanthian Stele) und übersieht rechts davon (i.e. to the south-west) die jetzt durch einige Saatfelder bezeichnete Agora, auf der sich einst das Sarpedonion befand.' For Kalinka, T.A.M., see infra, note 10.

7 The first map was made for Sir Charles Fellows by A. Hoskyn, Master of H.M.S. Biron in 1840, and published in Spratt, Travels (1847), vol. ii, plate 2. Benndorf, Reisen, i, 85, rightly describes it as 'nur dürftige Orientierung.' Another map was given by Fellows in Xanthian Marbles, plate 2, but this is, again according to Benndorf, 'eine Skizze nach verfehlten Schätzungen, daher mit Recht nicht wiederholt in den Travels and Researches.' The map in our Fig. 1 is from Benndorf's article in Oe. Jh. 3 (1900), p. 100, fig. 29, and was made by E. Krickl (Hauptmann im Genieregiment) in 1892. For Benndorf's description see above note 6. As for the Harpy Tomb, the monument still stands at its place, only the marble slabs with the reliefs have been removed to England. The sarcophagus between Harpy Tomb and theatre is of much later date.
monument stood in the civic and religious centre of a town, or not. The omission can only be explained by a confusion due to a second publication of the map. As it is the only accurate map of the remains of Xanthus that has ever been made, it was used and reprinted in a book on inscriptions of the Roman period in Lycia.8 But in order to conform with the period of these inscriptions, a slight modification of figures had to be made, and the term 'agora' was applied to a rectangular building further to the east of the old emplacement, where some inscriptions seem to indicate the civic centre of the Roman period.9 Students knowing only the second map would doubtless think that there was no connection between the Harpy Tomb and the agora. But this would be a mistake. It is merely the Roman civic centre which has no direct connexion with our monument, and even Kalinka who published the second map never tried to infer that this was also the place of the old agora of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.10

The other pillar tomb with the long inscription, the Xanthian Stele, as it is generally called, dates from the end of the fifth or the beginning of the fourth century,11 and there is sufficient evidence to show that it has never been moved from its original place. Its Greek inscription clearly states that it was erected on the agora. The position of the more important part of the Lycian inscription in which the ruler who erected it introduces himself and gives his titles and his genealogy, is on the south side.12 This fact, as well as the nature of the soil around the stele, show that the agora extended from the stele to the south and southwest. Indeed, neither to the north, nor to the east or west are any Lycian monuments or inscriptions to be found, while to the south and southwest the soil is strewn with the remains of buildings and monuments of ancient date and Lycian character. Due south, across the level stretch of ground and not far from the Harpy Tomb, some inscriptions have been found which seem to indicate that the Sarpedonion stood there. From the account of the Bruttus expedition we know that this Sarpedonion stood on the Agora of Xanthus, near the gates to the city.13 Between this spot and the Harpy Tomb extends the theatre. It is built into the slope bordering on this small plain and overlooking it.

The situation vividly recalls the way in which every ancient Greek agora was built, both

---

8 E. Kalinka, Tituli Asiae Minoris (here generally quoted as T.A.M.), vol. i (1901), dealing with the early inscriptions in Lycian, vol. ii (1920), only with the late Greek and Roman inscriptions. The map is in vol. ii, fasc. 1, p. 95. It is marked 'Forma Xanthi urbis.' E. Krickl anno 1892 adnumbravit and this is recorded on the map published by Beulé in 'Xanthus,' in Or. 76, which is marked 'Planissizze von Xanthus, aufgenommen von E. Krickl 1892.' Though it is clearly the same map, yet it is less carefully drawn. While in Beulé's article it is quite obviously made by an architect, with explanation of figures in block letters, the drawing on Kalinka's map is not as accurate, the explanation of figures is in handwriting, and some of the figures (like St. St. Sg. Sg. 8g in Or. 76, corresponding to (S) (S) Sg. Sg. 8g in T.A.M.) have a slightly different explanation, and are sometimes not indicated in the right spot on Kalinka's map. One is led to the conclusion that this second map is not altogether reliable.

The term 'Agora' does not occur on Beulé's map. It is only to be found on Kalinka's map where it applies to the remains of a square building surrounded by a stoa on the east and south. After examining both maps closely (see note 8), this proves to be a late interpolation, inspired by the wish to adjust the map to the inscriptions of the Roman period, and by the interpolator's idea of an agora as surrounded by a stoa on each side of a rectangle. Yet Kalinka's map is fairly well known and because it is in a book dealing with the most important inscriptions from Lycia, it is frequently quoted by scholars, while Beulé's article is almost forgotten and its map hardly known.

9 He says so quite plainly in his commentary, and again refers to the older agora round the spot where the Xanthian Stele now stands to are standing: T.A.M. ii. 1, p. 96 'infra arcem ad meridem situm est forum saxis stratum, ubi praeter cetera accedit et castra sunt dua illae columnae quorum una monumentum Harpyiarum nominatur, altera insignis est longitudine tituli Lycia lingua inscripti et epigrammati Graeco.'


11 This, in Lycia, usually marks the beginning of an inscription and shows the way it was set up. It always faces the direction from which worshippers or visitors are expected to enter.

12 C.I.G. iii, 4296 b, commenting on the Xanthian Stele, says: 'Praetere hanc stelam Xanthi in foro etiam Sarpedonion collocatum fuisset novum ex Appiano bll. cts. iv. 7b.' But Kalinka in T.A.M. ii. 96 'Totae hac regione (sec. prope theatrum) multae parietiae inveniuntur, inter quas illud quoque Sarpedonion fuisset puto cuius Appianus b. c. iv. 7b mentionem facit. Confer M. 313 sq. ubi Sarpedon Glaucus appellavit:

και ταυτίας κατασκευασμένης, μέγα ζώδιον παρ' ὅψιν και τελείως εἰκονής τυρφώνοντος

An inscription (T.A.M. ii. 265) has been found to the south-east of the theatre, erected by Aichmon after a victory, and its last line runs: Sarpedonion καὶ Λίκανος ἔρμην. As this inscription obviously presupposes a heroion of Sarpedon and Glaucus, the C.I.G. iii. 4296 b add. comments: 'Titulus forte postus fuit in Sarpedonion. And Benndorf (Historische Inschriften vom Stadtte zu Xanthus, Bestandtheil fur Otto Hirschfeld, 1909, 99) concludes: 'Das Sarpedonion lag wahrscheinlich auf den Hügel über dem Theater, innerhalb der Ringmauer.' The Sarpedonion was also mentioned in Aristot. pox. 13 sq. and Plin. N.H. 13, 88.
on the Greek mainland and in Asia Minor. It also recalls how the ancient Greek agora gradually developed, and how in course of time it enlarged its extent, more and more buildings being added to it, until finally it was split up into separate groups of squares and buildings, roughly speaking, the civic centre and the market-place. There was no room for an extension of the Xanthian agora to the west, because of the deep river-bed. To the north and south, steep slopes formed a natural boundary. Buildings in later times were added to the east, thus extending the agora to the place where, in Roman times, votive inscriptions were placed which denote a sort of Forum, whereas the old emplacement, with the theatre next to it and the ancient temenos and heroön on it, preserved the more religious character of the old agora.

The Harpy Tomb stands right on this spot, between the Xanthian Stele and the theatre. As the Stele was definitely on the agora, the Harpy Tomb, being the older of the two, was still more connected with the agora. The short distance between the two monuments, and the fact that the agora could only have extended from the Stele southward, i.e. towards the Harpy Tomb and the theatre, make it almost impossible to assume that the agora of a large city like Xanthus did not include the spot where the Harpy Tomb stands. The nature of the

![Fig. 2.—The Harpy Tomb: East Side.](image)

soil and the remains make it plain that the Stele stood on the north border of the agora, connected with the temenos of the Twelve Gods, and so the position of the Harpy Tomb was on the west border but, like the Stele, on the Agora itself. In fact, it was one of its significant features, and it will be shown that it is even mentioned in the long Lycian inscription of the Stele as among the three important heroa (aranazii) on the agora.

There are several not uninteresting conclusions which can be drawn from this fact. But before investigating this matter, it may be useful to consider how the position of the monument is reflected by the subjects of the reliefs surrounding its top. Of the four sides of the Harpy Tomb, the two sides looking north and south are shorter and consist of single scenes with the so-called Harpies on either side, forming a frame to the central scene. The other two sides are the more important ones; they are longer and far more impressive. The west side, overlooking the river, bears the figures of five elaborately dressed women. The east side, facing the agora, shows the stately figure of a bearded man enthroned and surrounded by four younger male figures. I feel inclined to consider the east side as the most important both because of its position and its character, and will begin with it (Fig. 2).

It seems to consist of two very different groups of figures. To the left, the three figures, one enthroned and two standing, are all in very rigid and formal attitudes, well wrapped up in long dresses, and looking towards the right. Even their gestures resemble one another,

---

14 For collected evidence and general literature on this subject see Or. Jh. 1931, xxvii. 82 ff.
the movement of their right arms, forming a circle with head and shoulder, has a crescendo effect, that is, grows larger towards the centre, and a similar crescendo movement applies to the attitude of their left arms and hands. The positions of their feet also show variations of the same sort, starting off with a movement which gradually comes to a standstill in the centre. In contrast to this, the right-hand group of the east side is much freer in its movements and its contours; there are only two figures; their attitude and drapery-folds show a tendency to straight lines and open, straight movements. Their gestures show no variations or gradual increase in movement. Their arms are outstretched and pointing towards the centre. On the central slab this contrast reaches its climax. The slender young boy, throwing back his head and lifting his eyes, stretches out his arms and brings a cock and a fruit as offerings to the bearded old man in front of him. But the latter, seated on his elaborate throne as if he formed together with it one solid block of statuary, seems to take no notice at all. Fully self-satisfied he rests his massive form on the throne, like the archaic image of a god.

The usual interpretation of the figures represented was, up to the end of the nineteenth century, that of a god, frequently called Poseidon because of the figure of a Triton on the throne, his attendants behind him and two worshippers in front of him. The cock does not quite agree with Poseidon, the god of the sea, and quite a number of other anomalies have been noticed; but one usually left it at that, or suggested some unknown Lycian deity. Since the end of the nineteenth century, however, there has been found ample proof of the fact that, in the classical world, no god was ever represented on a tomb, for a tomb was considered as the resting-place and abode of the spirit of the deceased person. And the Harpy Tomb being a sepulchral moniment with a burial chamber, cannot possibly have been ornamented with the figures of gods. So the current opinion now is that this central figure on the east side is meant to be one of the persons buried in the Harpy Tomb.

Before going on to a further investigation of the identity of the figures represented, it is well worth while pointing out one or two of the striking features of this side. What must be considered as rather strange and puzzling in a work of Greek art, is the composition of the central group (Pl. III), which seems to lack the usual principle of symmetry and the Greek sense of equilibrium. A huge figure enthroned with a much smaller worshipper in front of him does occur in Greek art (cf. the reliefs from Chrysapha near Sparta), but on the Harpy Tomb the absolutely empty space above is something quite out of the way on a monument which so clearly bears all the traces of early Greek art and of archaic Greek workmanship. And yet the sculptor who designed this group of figures must have had a strong feeling for symmetry, even distribution, and proportion of figures. The central lines on this side, the axes of symmetry, are a predominant feature of the central group, marking the outlines of the throne, the shoulders of the small figure, and the straight verticals of the legs of the bearded man. The sceptre runs in an accurate diagonal right through the crossing point of these two axes, and this centre is even stressed by the hollow of the enthroned man's massive left hand. But the centre of gravity is quite definitely placed in the left half of the central slab which is completely filled by the figure of the enthroned man. Thus the free space in front of him forms no equilibrium whatever in the Greek sense, but rather tends to stress his importance.

The two draped figures behind this enthroned man on the left angle-slab (Pl. II) have been variously described as male and female. More recently one tend to believe in their male nature, though at the same time their feminine character never passes unmentioned. And it is true, the pose of their hands, the attributes, and the arrangement of the drapery definitely compare with those of the women on the west side of the same monument. As F. N. Pryce in his 1928 edition of the British Museum Catalogue states that their sex is disputable, the following facts may seem worth mentioning. The women on this monument all wear bracelets, fairly large carved diadems, their hair falls over their shoulders, their dress reaches the ground and even trails behind them, and their breasts are outlined quite clearly and are unmistakably feminine. These two figures on the east side are altogether different; like all the men on
this monument they wear no bracelets, instead of carved diadems they had metal circlets round their hair (the rivet holes are still there), their hair does not extend beyond their necks, their dress ends at ankle level, and their breast contours are what are called indefinite. The explanation of the feminine pose of their hands and of the arrangement of the drapery is, I think, quite simple. We have among the Lycian marbles another fairly large fragment of a contemporary frieze from Xanthus (Catalogue, B 314, pl. xxxi.), where a procession is depicted, quite definitely men (and Pryce says so), but with women's clothes and with the feminine attitude of holding up the drapery with one hand. And there are quite a number of reliable witnesses (among them Plutarch) who relate that among the Lycians men had to wear women's clothes on certain religious occasions.15

In this light a few details which struck me when closely examining the monument itself, assume an additional importance. First of all, the attendant standing behind the throne is slightly smaller than the other; he wears sandals whereas the other attendant is barefoot; he is more slender and has no beard whereas the second figure is distinctly corpulent and appears to have a short pointed beard. But what is even more striking, the remains of a tassel are to be seen at the back of the head of the first attendant. Actually, the contours of their heads are entirely different (Pl. IV a, b). The left one is undulating and the rivet hole for the metal circlet lies within this contour, because the hair was compressed by this sort of wrack. The contour of the first attendant's head forms a straight vertical line at the back, the rivet hole is situated on the outside, and there are the distinct traces of a long tassel. They are clearly distinguishable in the photograph, starting near the top of the head and going down almost to the height of the neck. So this figure appears to have worn a cap with a long pendant tassel.

This point leads to a long series of parallels and will ultimately aid in the interpretation of this east side. There are two parallels from Xanthus, both among the Lycian marbles in the British Museum, and both almost contemporaneous with the Harpy Tomb. First the fragment of a frieze with two male figures (Fig. 3), which F. N. Pryce (Cat., B 310) again

---

15 Plat. consol. ad Apoll., 21: Val. Max., ii, 6, 13. Both writers state that, among the Lycians, the male members of a family in mourning had to wear women's clothes. As a reason they give the belief in Lycia that mourning was something unworthy of a man, and so he had to put on a woman's dress to make it less conspicuous. But this is clearly a belated and rationalistic attempt at an explanation of this ancient custom (cf. Hauker in Philologia 54 (N.F.6) 389 ff.). It is proved that, in earlier times, only the female members represented the family in Lycia. The tradition that men had to put on female garments on certain religious occasions where the family as a whole was involved is in itself only one of the many survivals of such ancient customs in Lycia.

Furthermore, the wearing of long dresses by priests and singers or musicians on religious occasions in early archaic Greece as well as in Minoan Crete points to an interesting parallel. And in Persia, Assyria, and Babylonia the king's attendants wore a similar dress for certain other reasons. It will be proved that, as far as the east side of the Harpy Tomb is concerned, the Persian tradition had some importance and coincided with Lycian customs.
describes as male and female, though neither of them has feminine breast contours. The date of the frieze is approximately twenty to thirty years after the Harpy Tomb. The figures are apparently two attendants standing at the end of a couch. The first one is somewhat smaller, more slender, with sandals, in women's clothes, and wears a round cap with a long pendant tassel. This is an almost perfect analogy to our two figures on the Harpy Tomb. Another fragment of a different frieze, slightly older than the previous one but definitely later than the Harpy Tomb (B 309, Cat. Fig. 186) show one figure and the back edge of the cloak of a second figure. Attitude and attire are almost the same as on the previous fragment. The figure is male, but wears a woman's dress, and his attitude is that of an attendant.

But there are more parallels than these two. There is the Satrap Sarcophagus with its reliefs showing the prince who was buried in it, at a banquet or in the midst of his every-day occupations, but always attended by two male servants in longish clothes, holding the implements of their office (Fig. 4). This sarcophagus, found at Sidon and, like the Lycian Sarcophagus found next to it, probably of Lycian workmanship, is almost 100 years later than the Harpy Tomb, and its style is more developed, but the idea seems the same. For the intervening period, three Lycian tombs may serve as examples. On them a ruler is depicted with attendants standing behind him or at his side, performing their habitual duties, holding a sunshade or a napkin, or a jug with wine or water. On two of these three monuments, the Payava Tomb and the Nereid Monument, both among the Lycian marbles in the British Museum, the ruler is a Persian prince or satrap. On the third monument, the Heroön from Gyeulbashí, he is a legendary hero.16

The fact that, on several occasions, it is definitely a Persian prince who is shown with his attendants, but surrounded by Lycians, gives rise to a sudden suspicion. Could it not be that the rulers and the customs have both come to Lycia from Persia? Lycia had formed

---

16 For the Satrap sarcophagus: Mendel, Cat. Mus. Ottom. i. 33 ff. (where Mendel has proved that all these attendants were male); for the Payava Tomb: Smith, B.M. Cat. ii. 47, pl. 11 (the prince represented here is the satrap Autophradales, 375-362 B.C.); for the Nereid Monument: B.M. Cat. ii (fourth frieze), the prince seems to be a Persian satrap but cannot be identified; for the Heroön from Gyeulbashi: Bendord's monograph (the scene has been thought to depict the Ilioupersis with Priam and Hecuba enthroned above the besieged city; it is more probable, however, that it refers to some event in Lycian history or legend).
part of the Persian empire since the middle of the sixth century. Turning therefore to Persia, one soon finds that in Persian art one not only meets a few more parallels but, as it seems, the prototype of these scenes. The so-called audience-reliefs in the Palace of Persepolis,¹⁸ of which quite a number have so far been found, show the Persian King in the midst of a grand function of state, with the royal guards, probably during the ceremony of the New Year festival (Fig. 5). It is known from literary sources that on this occasion the Persian King used to receive all his dignitaries in order of precedence, and after them anybody of standing who wished to be introduced to him and to ask him for some favour. From what we know of the Persian court ceremonial, we can imagine this audience as a very colourful scene. And on the reliefs, as in the literary sources, this very scene is depicted with the king seated on his golden throne under a baldachin, the sceptre and the lotus flower in his hands, resplendent in a diadem of gold, a gold necklace, and gold bracelets. Guards, high court officials and the masters of ceremonies are standing by his side, the latter always being the highest dignitaries of the empire.¹⁹ The king is receiving the Chilarch or the introduced person, who has to keep at a certain distance. Vessels with incense are standing between him and the king. Of the attendants behind the king, the first (either behind his throne or next to the crown prince) wears a long dress and a muffler cap. He is beardless, and above the muffler no trace of a moustache can be seen. The second attendant is slightly taller, has a beard and wears no cap but a diadem, the Median headdress. All this clearly means to the strictly observed court ceremonial which, as we know, had a symbolic meaning in every one of its features.²⁰

The connexion between these Persian reliefs, all of which are to be dated in the fifth century B.C.,²¹ and our group on the Lycian monuments is quite obvious. The empty space in front of the ruler, his attitude, the throne, sceptre and lotus flower, and these two attendants, who on the reliefs were behind the king, according to the literary sources were by his side: all this recurs again and again, on Persian and Lycian monuments. Even the minor details

---

¹⁷ The conquest of Lycia by Harpagos, the general of Cyrus, is to be dated not later than 538 B.C. This campaign consisted mainly in the siege and capture of Xanthus, described in detail by Herodotus i. 176. This Harpagos was a Mede and sometime his son of Deioctes (Hdt. i. 108) and a brother of Antyges (Hdt. i. 109), thus of royal blood himself. As the ruler of Xanthus who erected the Chilarch Stele, a stele dedicated himself son of Harpagos (T.A.M. i. 44; the stele dates from the beginning of the fourth century), it is very probable that members of the house of Harpagos were in some sort of command in Lycia ever since the conquest.

¹⁸ E. Herzfeld, *Iran in the Ancient East*, pl. 67a and b; A. U. Pope, *The Art of Persian Art*, i. pl. 88; E. Schmidt, *The Treasury of Persepolis* (Oriental Institute of Chicago Communications 21), 1939, 21 ff., figs. 14, 16. These are the most recent publications dealing with the subject.

¹⁹ It is to be noted that these two court officials take precedence over the carrier of the royal weapons and over the officers of the king’s bodyguard. They are also the only persons to accompany the king on several other occasions (as shown on other reliefs from Persepolis, e.g. the portals). And every time the sole attribute of their office is a towel or napkin, neatly folded, or a by-whisk, or a scent-bottle. And their attire is always the same. Neither of them can be the famous Hazarapatis, the Major-domo and Grand-Vizier of the empire, who was the commander of the king’s bodyguard (Xenophr. trans. Hutaris, and Cyp. viii. 5). One of them may be the ’Eye of the King’ who was still more prominent than the Hazarapatis, and to whom was entrusted the control of the empire (E. Meyer, *Gesch. d. Alt. iii. 45*). And it seems very likely, as E. F. Schmidt has shown, that the Treasury of Persepolis, 26 ff, that the other was the ’Cupbearer’, who held the rank of a priest in Xerxes’ times and was also responsible for the king’s safety. The office of the Cupbearer was at least in later Achaemenian times, just as that of the Hazarapatis himself, in the hands of eunuchs, as several literary sources indicate. And this information seems born out by the reliefs where the person is depicted without beard or moustache (which would be visible above the muffler). Cf. J. Marquart, *Untersuchungen zur Gesch. von Evan, i. 57 ff., 244 ff., ii. 156 ff.; F. W. König, *Altper. Adelgesch. zu Wies’. Zeitschr. f. d. Kunst des Morgenlandes, 1924, xxxi, 289 ff.; 1926, xxxii, 23 ff., 37 ff.; 1928, xxxvii. 1 ff.; F. W. König, *Die falsche Bardia*, in *Knuth’s Relish*, 1936, 43 ff., passim; E. F. Schmidt, *Treasury of Persepolis*, 20 ff.

²⁰ This court ceremonial was by no means a short-lived institution but a long established religious ritual, as is proved by an Assyrian fresco painting, almost identical in contents with the Persian reliefs (cf. Fig. 5) but of the xiii. Fragment of a similar painting from the palace of Niniveh are in the British Museum. For the king with two attendants accompanying him, many more examples from Assyrian art could be mentioned, chiefly reliefs, e.g. Assurbanipal’s Hunt, the Banquet of Assurbanipal, Sanherib’s Sacrifice (Meissner, *Babylonien und Assyrien*, figs. 46, 48, 117). Etc. For the description of the Assyrian ceremonial in contemporary literature, see F. E. Peters, *Studien zur oriental. Altertumskunde*, in M.V.A.G. 1898, 253, i. 16 ff. On the other hand, this same court ceremonial was continued by the Seleucids, after them by the Arsacids (Phiorastat, *Vita Apolin. Tiran i. 27 ff. describes such an audience at the Arsacid court in the first century A.D.), and after them by the Sassanids (Arabic and Byzantine writers give ample information about this; cf. Nokleke, *Tabari*, 113, 221) and by the Khalifs all through the Middle Ages.

²¹ The date of the Treasury reliefs has recently been stated as between 490 and 486 B.C. (E. F. Schmidt, *Treasury of Persepolis*, 23), and the king and crown prince may be taken to represent Darius and Xerxes, as on the corresponding reliefs of the Tripylon. The Apadana was completed by Xerxes himself. But as the Mandral-Columella Hall, E. Herzfeld discovered in the south-west corner of a stone slab stating in Babylonian that Artaxerxes I erected this structure on the foundations prepared by his father Xerxes (Herzfeld, *Alters. Inschr.* in Arch. Mitt. Iran, 1. Ergänzungsband, 1938, p. 45), and thus the date of these reliefs cannot be before 495 B.C. It was possibly somewhat later in the reign of Artaxerxes I.
are all to be found in Persia and in Lycia. And surely it is not unreasonable to suppose that this court ceremonial was introduced into Lycia during the two centuries when Lycia formed a part of the Persian Empire. I think there is enough evidence to support this view even without further consideration of the fact that Lycia was governed, during a certain time, by the Medo-Persian family of Harpagos, and that, less than a century after the Harpy Tomb was built, the son of Harpagos erected the Xanthian Stele only about 50 paces from the Tomb, on the agora itself, and described himself on it as ruler of Xanthus and of all the Lycians.

![Fig. 6.—Asyrian Fresco Painting.](image)

If it be objected that this Eastern ceremonial might not have been known to the Greeks, and consequently would not have been depicted in such detail in a work of Greek art, I would mention the many Greek authors describing this ceremonial, and show a painting (Fig. 7) from the interior of a shield on a Greek sarcophagus, called the Alexander Sarcophagus. This work of purely Greek art shows again very faithfully the same scene with the same details. If we now return to the Harpy Tomb, I think we cannot fail to be impressed by the striking similarity that is to be noticed here. And almost instinctively we look for the royal tiara of the ruler—the only detail that seems to be omitted. Everything else has been faithfully represented. But there seems to be no tiara or Phrygian cap, as on all the other Lycian monuments of this character. Yet, let me draw attention to the contour of the back of the ruler’s head, a perfectly straight line (Pl. 1). This excludes any possibility of hair forming the contour of the head.

![Fig. 7.—Painting in Shield on the ‘Alexander’ Sarcophagus.](image)

---

22 It is very probable that the detailed account of Harpagos’ campaign by Herodotus, and his stories about the miraculous preservation and the rise of Cyrus (in which Harpagos plays a predominant rôle) were partly derived from some member or members of the house of Harpagos, and later corrected by some Persian friend of Herodotus (Zopyros?). This Harpagid family claimed descent from Deiokes the Mede (cf. note 18), and as they seem to have stood in close connexion with Lycia, Herodotus may well have come across them there. For this ‘Harpagid tradition’ in Herodotus, see R. Schubert, Herodots Darstellung der Kyrosage, 1900, 76; J. V. Prazek in Kle, 1904, iv., 199 ff.; and How and Wells, Commentary on Herodotus, 1936, notes to book i.

23 On the short side (north). Cf. Mendel, Cat., Mu. Ottom., i, 18g (Fig. to the left); Winter, Sarkophoge von Sidon, 14 f., pl. 7, 18. The sarcophagus dates from the end of the fourth century B.C. Yet it is hardly likely that it could have been made by an artist who actually saw the Persepolis reliefs. Persepolis was sacked and burnt down immediately after its capture by Alexander. It is agreed that the sarcophagus is of Attic workmanship, and the many allusions to the Persian court ceremonial and customs in Aeschylus’ Persæ (in language, expressions, ideas, and even in the metre of the dialogues) show that this ceremonial was quite well known in contemporary Athens. Otherwise, how could all these allusions have been understood by the listeners? Writers like Herodotus and Xenophon had also their share in making the people of Athens well acquainted with Persian customs and ritual. Surely the Greeks of the mainland, and even more so the Asiatic Greeks had not to rely on hearsay to describe or depict Eastern ceremonial in a work of art.
Wherever hair is depicted or indicated on this monument, the back line of the head is undulating. Here, the rivet hole for the metal wreath still remains, and its place is outside this contour, which is as straight as if drawn with a ruler. All this definitely recalls the head of the first attendant with his cap and tassel. These are the only examples of a straight line and a rivet hole outside the head contour, and one of them plainly shows a cap. Unfortunately the ruler’s head is too weathered to allow of additional proof, but I almost think this is enough to suggest that he too may have worn some sort of headdress. True, there are no signs of a tassel, but a ruler, whether a satrap or the Persian king himself, never wore a cap with a tassel: it was the royal tiara or diadem that he wore, or the so-called Phrygian cap, with a metal wreath around it. That this was also worn by the Lycian princes is proved by many examples, especially on coins from Xanthus.24

Now, if we only had this evidence of the head contours, we should probably say, it is not unlikely that this enthroned man wore a tiara or diadem, and was a ruler. But we have to consider this detail in connexion with all the rest of the ceremonial, the empty space in front, the two attendants behind, the throne, the sceptre, and the lotus flower. Besides, we must bear in mind that, of the Lycian monuments quoted as parallels, though all but one come from Xanthus, there are only two which date from the fifth century B.C. and they are somewhat later than the Harpy Tomb. This agrees with, and rather confirms the assumption that the court ceremonial was only depicted on sepulchral monuments of rulers, and not indiscriminately on tombs of private persons. The Harpy Tomb was the earliest of these monuments showing the court ceremonial, and this tradition must have started with a ruler. And here it may be useful to remember that the Harpy Tomb stood on the Xanthian agora, close to the Xanthian Stele. If we bear all this in mind, I feel sure that, whether this enthroned man on the Harpy Tomb wore a cap or not, there is room for one conclusion only: this is the ruler of Xanthus, he and his court ceremonial are represented on his tomb, on its east side facing the agora for all his people to see.

Similarly, a later ruler of Xanthus, ‘the son of Harpagos,’ speaks to his people on the south side of the Xanthian Stele, facing the agora, and gives his name and descent. The two frieze fragments dating from the second quarter of the fifth century B.C. (B 309 and B 310 in the British Museum; they come from different friezes: Cat., p. 141) were found built into the wall of the acropolis, and so their original position is not known. But again on the Nereid Monument, the ruler who erected this kind of mausoleum presents himself to his people on its east side, facing the inhabited quarters of the town, though this time not amidst court ceremonial but as a Graeco-Lycian prince with his family, seated opposite to his wife, the children standing behind their parents.

We have yet to discuss the right-hand group of the east side of the Harpy Tomb. I shall do this as briefly as possible. The figures represented are a boy and a young man worshippers the ruler (Plt. II, III, IV e, d). Why a boy? Perhaps it was his own son. But it does occur to us that, on the Persian reliefs too, the person in front of the king was of very much smaller, almost diminutive dimensions compared with the other figures. It was a Persian noble, not a boy, but his size was so reduced in order to show the king as something more than a simple mortal.25 For the same reason the strictly observed distance and the empty space before him were part of these reliefs. Here we have an equivalent in art to what literary sources record as traditional attributive expressions added to the name of the Persian king, describing according to a prescribed formula his greatness, his superiority, and his sacredness. On the Harpy Tomb, the artist, if he was a Greek and not accustomed to this way of

---

24 Babylon, Tristit., III, 8 ff.; Rev. Num., 1908; Six, Num. Chron., 1908, 159 ff.; Hill, B.M. Cat., Coins, Lycia, pl. vi, ff.; cf. also head from Ephesus, Pryce, B.M. Cat. B 215, Fig. 132.

25 This was a sacred law, and had been a rule in Persian art from its very beginning. Xenophon, Cyrop. viii, 3, 14 even goes a little further: when describing the splendid procession of Cyrus, he states that the very tall charioteer of Cyrus was yet much smaller than Cyrus himself. Does this mean that the rule of emphasizing the difference in size between the king, his immediate followers, and the other people, was also applied to simple narratives in an oral tradition? I cannot help feeling that Xenophon was simply describing a picture or relief, though he does not say so in this time. It is to be noted, however, that Xenophon usually does mention reliefs and pictures if he describes them, e.g. Cyrop., 1, 2, 13.
reducing the size of one figure for the glorification of another, would give this smaller figure the appearance of a young boy. Similarly he endowed the figures of the left-hand group with Greek attributes and Greek drapery, adapting a conventional Greek exterior and adjusting the commission given by his employers to his own capacity and style. This was quite in conformity with Lydian tradition in art, which always had a Grecising tendency. However this may be, one thing is certain: for all the details on these reliefs the artist made full use of the Greek models and patterns which he knew. For the right angle-slab especially we may find quite a number of models in Greek art. Both the boy presenting an offering, and the man with his dog were among the favourite subjects for tombstones in Greece. The offering of a cock is connected both with Persian and with Greek ritual. In Lycia, the offering of a cock at a tomb seems to have been a tradition that survived well into Hellenistic and even Roman times. The offering of a rhyton with wine is well known to have a similar bearing and similar connexions, and was quite frequently represented on Lycian tombs.

And so we may come to the explanation of the difference already noticed between the left-hand group and the right-hand one. To the left, the artist had to represent the traditional and very strictly observed features of the Lycian court ceremonial, a task which did not allow him much freedom of movement nor much liberty to choose among the stock of types and models or patterns of his own experience, he could only apply his own imagination and his collected specimens of figures to minor details, such as the drapery, the throne, and the small Triton on it. In contrast to this, the commission to represent on the right-hand side some of the prince’s worshippers, courtiers, or relatives, gave him much more liberty to choose among his own repertory of designs and models. That is probably why the right half of the east side seems more Greek in its character, whereas the left half reflects to a somewhat greater extent the formal Oriental influence in art.

If we accept that view, the east side of the Harpy Tomb may be considered an excellent example of the way in which the Grecising tendency worked in the Near East. We are used to thinking that Grecism is simply a more or less unskilled imitation of Greek design and Greek principles by non-Greek peoples and craftsmen. This is not true. Grecising means adapting foreign principles to a Greek appearance, clothing foreign ideas in a Greek dress. The belief and ritual remain unchanged, but the language and expression become Greek.

In a similar manner an ‘Orientalising’ tendency had spread from the East to the West in archaic times. Ideas and expressions, motives and designs were fluctuating from coast to coast, from island to island. But they were not always simply borrowed or copied, and the Greeks did not feel they belonged to an oriental world because they accepted an orientalising style. Their belief and their faith remained unchanged. ‘Orientalising’ and ‘Grecising’ seem but two unifying tendencies towards one common aim in this ancient world of Eurasia.

And thus we may be able to trace here both the underlying tendencies: we see the dynasty of Xanthus and his Lycian court ceremonial, with all the symbolic and religious ritual of Eastern origin faithfully observed, and over it, the emanation from the radiant light of Greece; the uplifted head and freely raised arms of the boy, the tranquil and unforced bearing of the

---

24 A small boy or girl bringing offerings to their dead parents was frequently depicted on Greek vases and reliefs. The best examples to be compared with this scene on the Harpy Tomb, are the well-known archaic Lacanian reliefs (4th. Mitt. iv. pl. 8, 1–2), where also the offerings are the same as on the Harpy Tomb.

25 Among the earlier tombstones with this group of man and dog, cf. the Anaxandres stele in Sophia (from Apollonia; Jabar. 1902, pl. 1), the Naples stele (Kayet 19; B.-B. 416; it can be traced back to Sardis), the Althenos stele from Orchomenos (Naxian; B.-B. 41), and the Agathocles stele from Athens, Nat. Mus. 724 and Aegina stele (A.D. i, 33).

26 The tradition survives in the fourth century as shown on the Delphi stele (Bulle, pl. 265), the Theespis stele in Athens (Collignon, Stat. junct., Fig. 68), and on the Ilissos stele (Conze ii, pl. 211). But vases prove that this was a favourite subject also in the sixth century, cf. the Timonidas pithon from Corinth, the amphora 2903 in Munich (Richter, Ancient Furniture, Fig. 163), and that it also spread to Italy (South Italian amphora in Rome, Vatican; Collignon, Stat. junct., Fig. 67).

27 See the inscription on a late Lycian rock tomb from Bel near Sidyama (T.A.M. ii, 1, 245; J.H.S. 1914, xxxiv, 5 ff. n. 10):

28 All these minor details could not be dealt with in this paper. Also the question of dating the monument and of analysing its style must be left for a later occasion. The attempt at an interpretation of the other three sides of the Harpy Tomb was briefly outlined in a paper which I read to the Hellenic Society at Cambridge on May 4th, 1943. I trust I shall be forgiven for not compressing it into a few pages for the sake of immediate publication.
youth, the natural and impulsive attitude of the dog. And in this light the whole scene acquires a meaning for the eye even of a Greek; for him it is simply the worshipping of a hero. The offering of a cock and of wine express this in Greek art quite clearly, and the attendants also conform to this Greek custom by holding pomegranates among other attributes. Thus the east side was fully intelligible to Orientals and to Greeks. Both could understand its meaning and, in a border country like Lycia, this was not merely desirable but perhaps essential in that fifth century which marks the beginning both of the collision and of the amalgamation of the Oriental and the Greek worlds.

F. J. TRITSCH
THE PROGRESS OF GREEK EPIGRAPHY, 1939–1940

It need hardly be emphasised that the survey of the past two years’ work in the field of Greek epigraphy which I here offer can make no pretension to completeness. The interruption of communications consequent upon the war has robbed me of access to the majority of the relevant books and periodicals published on the Continent during the last months of 1939 and the whole of 1940. Nevertheless, in view of the amount and importance of the work noted in the following pages, I think it better to write my account, imperfect though it must needs be, in the accustomed form and at the usual time, rather than to hold back my material until the return of peace and the re-establishment of communications enable me to fill the serious gaps which remain. I hope that my next review will be written in conditions which will make it possible to complete this survey of 1939 and 1940 while at the same time summarising the publications of 1941 and 1942. Once again I ask all those scholars who have materially assisted my task by the gift of copies of their works to accept this assurance of my warmest gratitude.

As before, I mark with an asterisk books or articles which I have not personally consulted.

Among the scholars who have died during the two years under review are some who have made contributions of great and lasting value to Greek epigraphical studies, notably E. Bourguet,1 R. Cagnat,2 G. C. Edgar,3 J. B. Frey4 and W. M. Ramsay.5 Some of the veterans continue their work with unflagging vigour and unabated ability, such as J. Kirchner, who attained the age of 80 on September 25, 1939, and F. Hiller von Gaertringen and A. Wilhelm, who respectively completed their seventy-fifth year on August 3 and September 10 of the same year.6 Further impressions of the Amsterdam Epigraphical Congress of 1938 have been recorded by H. Nesselhauf,7 A. Salač,8 A. Calderini,9 and F. Sokolowski.10

I. General.

My summary for 1937–38 appeared in JHS lx. 241 ff., and, so far as Egypt and Nubia are concerned, in JEA xxv. 89 ff. Other bibliographies, among which the masterly ‘Bulletin Épigraphique’11 of R. Placcèriére and J. and L. Robert is in my judgement the most complete and valuable, continue to appear in their usual form, covering either the whole field12 or a selected portion of it,13 and to their number is added a new and elaborate ‘Bollettino di epigrafia greco-romana’14 under the direction of A. Calderini. Attention may also be drawn to the indexes which have been published of AJPh xii.–ix.15 and of MilBeyr i.–xii.16

Of the Inscriptiones Graecae one new instalment, that containing the supplements to vol. xii, edited by F. Hiller von Gaertringen, has appeared, but is still inaccessible to me. Of J. J. E. Hondius’ Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum the first part of vol. ix has been published (see p. 83). L. Montecchielli pursues her researches17 among the codices of the libraries of Milan and Imola, to the enrichment of Latin rather than of Greek epigraphy. L. Robert has published18 an inaugural lecture on ‘L’épigraphie grecque au Collège de France,’ in which he discusses the services rendered to epigraphical study and teaching by Letronne,

1 REA xlii. 105, RA xiiii. 236 ff.
3 Annales du Service, xxxix. 3 ff.
4 Hétes, xx. 958 f.
5 CRA, 1939, 231 f.
6 Gramm., xv. 608 f., 568.
7 kil., xxxii. 445 ff.
8 Hilde, Arch. xi. 408.
9 Epigraphica, t. 5 f., Aegyptus, xvii. 338.
10 Eos, xxix. 375 ff.
11 REG lii. 445 ff.
13 Gioia, xxxvi. 212 ff. (1936), Riv. arch. crist. xii. 182 ff.
15 Epigraphica, i. 36 ff., 207 ff., 337 ff.
16 AJPh ix. 519 ff.
17 MilBeyr xx. 161 ff.
18 Epigraphica, t. 53 f., 172 ff.
P. Foucart and M. Holleaux, adding a bibliography of Foucart's works. His article entitled 'Hellenica,' almost on the scale of a book, attests on every page those qualities of wellnigh superhuman industry, insight and learning which characterise all his work and evoke the amazement of every reader; its main contents will be briefly summarised in their appropriate places in the following pages.

Of A. S. Arvanitopoulos' ambitious work on Greek epigraphy two instalments have now been issued; they contain a general introduction to the subject, followed by a historical survey, somewhat curiously arranged, of the Greek alphabet, divided into nine chapters, which deal respectively with the fixation of the alphabet by Archinus and the changes in letter-forms which occurred in course of time, the pre-Euclidic alphabets, the Inscriptiones Graecae, epigraphical symbols and transcription, directions of writing, changes in the Attic alphabet, the Island, Ionic, Corinthian and Chalcidian alphabets, and the Cyprian syllabic script. To B. D. Meritt we owe a delightful little book, which fills a serious gap in epigraphical literature and imparts some of the thrill and excitement of the epigraphist's work while emphasising also the exacting nature of its demands; it comprises four lectures, entitled 'Readings,' 'Reconstruction,' 'Lettering,' and 'Restoration,' and vividly pictures the tasks confronting the student who from the inscribed stone, perhaps broken and defaced, seeks to win a document of historic value, setting forth the principles of that 'science of architectural epigraphy,' of which the author is an acknowledged master. His illustrative examples are all taken from Attic inscriptions, but the principles and methods enunciated are of a far wider application. Another work of first-class quality is R. P. Austin's thorough examination of that widespread and immensely important phenomenon of Greek inscriptions, the stoichedon arrangement of the letters, of which the same scholar elsewhere gives a briefer and more popular account. A further useful work, marked by extraordinary industry and accuracy, is M. Avi-Yonah's collection and discussion of the epigraphical abbreviations and contractions found in the inscriptions of the Near East from 200 B.C. to A.D. 1100, while another feature of Greek writing, for which our evidence is derived almost wholly from inscriptions, the use of the acrophonic numeral system, has been examined afresh by M. N. Tod, who devotes special attention to the local varieties found at Epidaurus, Thessiae, Delphi, Olynthus, Delos and Cyrene, and adds an index of all the places where this type of numeral signs is represented. L. H. Jeffery comments on a peculiar form of omega which occurs in two archaic texts of Phlius and Perachora, F. S. Crawford suggests that the sporadic appearance in Greek inscriptions of the sign H with the value h, especially in divine names and titles, may be a survival from the syllabic writing used in Greece before the adoption of the Semitic alphabet, and F. R. Blake's article on the development of vowel-signs in alphabets of Phoenician derivation contains a short section on the Greek symbols for the vowels.

In the field of grammar and metric A. Wilhelm has made the chief contributions, displaying once again that astonishing command of the whole epigraphical materials in which he and Robert stand supreme, and incidentally correcting previous readings, restorations and interpretations of numerous texts. He collects from inscriptions of Mistantia, Elaeussa, Termessus, Perinthus and Indjik (Pamphylia) examples of the phrase η σε οὐ. In an article on Greek syntax he discusses, with a wealth of examples, 'prepositionless genitives' (pp. 117 ff.), the present tense combined with an expression referring to the past (pp. 129 ff.), and various dislocations in the order of words (pp. 132 ff.), ending with an invaluable index of inscriptions discussed or amended (p. 149); the article contains an interesting passage (pp. 126 ff.)
relating to fines for tomb-violation and comments upon two metrical phenomena, the absence of caesura in the third foot of a hexameter line (pp. 142 ff.) and the substitution of a trochee for a dactyl in pentameter or hexameter verse (pp. 145 ff.). He is mainly concerned with metrical questions in another article, 31 based upon an epigram quoted by Lucian (Symposium, 41); among the matters discussed are the shortening of οἰ and οὐ (pp. 56 ff.), hiatus (pp. 56 f., 67, 86 f.), the use of a spondee in the second half of a pentameter (pp. 57 ff.), the transposition of hexameter and pentameter in the couplet (pp. 57 f., 81 ff.) and the metrical lengthening of the augment (pp. 87 f.), and contributions are made to the text or exegesis of almost a score of metrical inscriptions. O. J. Todd also collects 32 examples of unusual rhythm or metre in epigrams. Attention may also be drawn to the section 33 of L. Robert's above-mentioned article entitled 'Onomastica,' in which certain personal and local names are examined and Grégoire's derivation of the word ταβάλλος is criticised.

From speech we turn to action, and note some works relative to Greek political, social and economic activity based mainly or wholly on epigraphical foundations; numerous other examples, relating to special localities, will be found in the following pages. A. H. M. Jones' synoptic discussion of The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian 34 utilises all the available evidence, among which inscriptions play a prominent rôle, and the same is true of his essay 35 on the civitates liberae et immunes in the eastern provinces of the Empire. F. Hampf's long article on 'Poleis ohne Territorium' 36 also makes use of a number of inscriptions. E. Groag's monograph 37 on the Roman imperial officials in the province of Achaea from the reign of Caesar to that of Dioecletian is worthy of that master of prosopographical study, and inscriptions, quoted in full but without commentary, play the leading part in M. P. Charlesworth's Documents illustrating the Reigns of Claudius and Nero 38; twenty-four of these are Greek or bilingual, drawn from every quarter of the Greek world. G. Downey's dissertation A Study of the Comites Orientis and the Consulares Syriae 39 also derives some of its materials from inscriptions.

The volumes of T. Frank's Economic Survey of Ancient Rome 40 which deal with Roman Egypt and with Africa, Syria, Greece and Asia Minor draw from the same source some of their most precise and detailed information, L. C. West's notes 41 on the contents and omissions of Dioecletian's famous edict of A.D. 301 seek to show that the needs of the army and the civil service, rather than those of the mass of the population, were uppermost in Dioecletian's mind and that the measure was intended to apply to the whole Empire rather than to its eastern provinces only, and H. Volkmann's article 42 on δοκύς χρηματα has a wider scope than the Eretrian inscription which affords its starting-point. O. Fiebig's 'Inchriftensammlung zur Geschichte der Ostgermanen' 43 contains eighty-six inscriptions, of which fourteen are Greek and one is bilingual. L. Robert deals 44 in characteristic fashion with a group of two decrees and two epigrams, from Cos, Samos, Lambdaesis and Bithynia, relative to doctors; his work 45 on the gladiators of the Greek East, much of the material of which is derived from epigraphical sources, I have not yet seen.

Marked progress has also been made in the utilisation of epigraphical data for the study of various aspects of Greek religious beliefs and practices. Specially noteworthy is M. Guar-ducchi's second and concluding article 46 on the institution of the phratry in the Greek world, which covers the Acolian and Dorian states, Sicily, Naples and the Asiatic phratries of the Imperial period, and republishes in extenso the relevant inscriptions, including a fragmentary name-list hitherto unpublished (No. XXIX bis). An important essay 47 by A. Cameron

31 Wiem. Stud. lvi. 54 ff.
32 ClQ vii. 163 ff.
33 Rev-Phil xii. 174 ff.
35 Anatolian Studies (sec note 434). 103 ff.
36 Klio, xxxii. 1 ff.
37 Die tûmischen Reichsbeamten von Achais (Schriften der Balkankommission: Antiquarische Abteilung, IX), Vienna, 1939.
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discusses documents from Edessa, Susa and Ocnoa Anda recording manumissions which take the form of dedications to a divinity and two interesting confessions from the sanctuary of Apollo Lairosenos, while W. Kamps investigates the origins of the religious endowment in ancient Greece, and A. Parrott examines the curses directed in numerous sepulchral inscriptions against violators of tombs. H. W. Parke's ample volume on the Delphic Oracle makes use of such inscriptions (disappointingly few, it must be admitted) as throw light upon the procedure, policy and influence of Pythian Apollo and his priests. In a third volume, of more than 1300 pages, A. B. Cook brings to a close his monumental work on Zeus, once more attesting a close and fruitful scrutiny of all the epigraphical evidence for the cult of the supreme deity of the Hellenic world. He here deals with the relation of Zeus to earthquakes, clouds, wind, dew, rain and meteorites, and ends with a statement of his general conclusions about Zeus of the dark sky, appendices on floating islands, the prompting Eros and the θεός γένους, addenda and indices. J. D. Beazley's article on Prometheus the fire-lighter starts from the figures and names of gods, heroes, satyrs and men painted on an Attic kalix-krater of about 425-20 B.C. recently acquired by the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, and A. Wilhelm, discussing the Lemnian πυρροποία, proposes to read κόσινον οτός in Philostratus, Heroicus, xx. 24, in place of κόσινον οτός, adcribing numerous epigraphical examples of οτός and of κόσινον of periodic repetition. P. A. Clement examines the Thessalian cult of Enodia, with whom he identifies the 'goddess of Phracæ,' a deity of the type of Hecate. M. Guarducci adds a postscript to her discussion of Euclia, and U. Wilcken publishes an essay on the origin of the Hellenistic ruler-cult, dealing with Alexander the Great, the Diadochi and the royal cults of the Ptolemies and Seleucids; he pays special attention (pp. 318 ff.) to an important edict of the late third century B.C. from Dardurcar (OGi 224 = Welles, Royal Correspondence, No. 36), our sole authority for an official dynastic cult created by a Seleucid monarch, probably Antiochus III, and co-extensive with the whole Empire.

I note briefly in passing some inscriptions on vases and other earthenware articles, excluding those which appear in publications primarily devoted to ceramics; to some of them I allude again under the several localities in which they have come to light. S. Ferri discusses at considerable length the Greek vases with 'acclamatory' inscriptions, J. H. Illishe continues, in a second article, his examination of sigillata-wares in the Near East, M. J. Milne uses some epigraphical evidence to support her contention that the 'pyxis' must be renamed kylichnion. C. Roebuck illustrates three inscribed white-ground plaques by the Cerberus-painter, V. Grace's 'Notes on Stamped Jars' deal with the officials named on Cnidian jars, the results obtained by measuring the capacities of some seventy-five jars, and the bearing of these data on the question why jars were stamped, and H. H. Stow's sumptuous collection of forty plates relating to Greek Athletics and Festivals in the Fifth Century includes six (Nos. 2, 4, 8, 11, 32-3) depicting inscribed vases of various types. A broken tile from Athens bearing a graffito is published by E. Vanderpool, and a plate signed by Sotes and Paeceros by O. Bronner and by C. Roebuck, who also deals with many other inscribed vases and sherds found on the N. slope of the Acropolis (below, p. 57), while M. T. Campbell examines the contents of a well of the b.-f. period at Corinth including some graffiti and dipinti, and G. Mylonas reports the discovery of a stamped amphora-handle near Philippi. Of six similar handles from Egypt, Rhodes and Sicyon, now in the Museum of the American Academy in Rome, C. P. Ludlow gives a description, and A. Minto publishes three frag-
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ments 67 of r.-f. Attic kylikes, two with καλός-inscriptions and one signed by Pamphaeus, from Orvieto. Among inscribed Greek vases in Museums beyond the limits of the Greek world I note one at Oslo with a new καλός-inscription published 68 by S. Marstrander, a b.-f. skyphos 69 inscribed Πιστας and a r.-f. Attic column-krater in the Ny Carlsberg collection at Copenhagen, the well-known r.-f. Duris-krater at Berlin showing verses written on a teacher's book, which H. Lucas revises 70 and tentatively assigns to the beginning of the Aethiopis, a r.-f. lekythos 71 of about 460 acquired by the Museum Antiker Kleinkunst at Munich, a lamp of the second century A.D. in the British Museum discussed 72 by L. Poinsot, a r.-f. pelike 73 by the Meidias-painter in the Metropolitan Museum, New York, and a Saconides in Sydney identified 74 by J. D. Beazley.

S. Eretm devotes an interesting article 75 to magical gems and their dedication, containing a general account of amulets and a discussion of some examples in the Natural Museum at Copenhagen. R. D. Barnett describes 76 a Jewish gold medallion later than the fifth century A.D., now in the Jewish Museum in London, and L. Poinsot comments 77 on an intaglio found at Thysdrus (El-Djem), now preserved in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, which represents the triumph of Augustus in the guise of Neptune. E. Bickel's examination of a Spanish gem is mentioned below (p. 75).

F. Poulsen's catalogue 78 of the sculptures in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek at Copenhagen includes thirty-three inscribed objects collected from various parts of the Greek world, L. Robert discusses 79 four inscriptions in the Louvre recently published 80 by A. Dain, R. Lullies' list of acquisitions of the collections of antiquities at Munich includes 81 a fourth-century Attic loutrophoros from Velanideza and a r.-f. lekythos, both previously published, and G. R. Edwards' description 82 of the classical collection of the Bowdoin College Museum of Fine Arts speaks of a bronze bull, probably from Thesbes, inscribed ΗΙΗΟΠΑ ΚΑΒΕΠΟΙ.

Of work relating to the origin and development of the Greek alphabet and of scripts which have some bearing upon it less has come to my notice than in recent years. A posthumous essay 83 by K. Sethe (who died in November, 1937) deals with the evolution of the alphabet from the ideogram; though the main emphasis is naturally laid on the Egyptian writing, he examines (pp. 56 ff.) the Sinaic inscriptions, dating them between 1800 and 1600 B.C., and the Phoenician alphabet (pp. 48 ff.), whose origin is assigned to 1300-1000 B.C., and briefly surveys the formation and spread of the Greek alphabet (pp. 60 ff.). D. Diringer publishes a short essay 84 on human writing, based upon the full account contained in his recent book (cf. JHS lix. 246), and R. Dussaud comments 85 on some works dealing with the origin and history of the alphabet. J. Leibovitch continues to study 86 the problem of the decipherment of the Sinaic inscriptions, J. L. Myres discusses 87 the Phrygian script, S. Casson adds 88 a dozen bronze-age Cyprian signs to the sixty-one collected in his Ancient Cyprus, 98 ff., and calls for caution in attempts to transiterate them in the light of the Cyprian syllabary of classical times, S. P. Cortsen offers 89 a series of notes on, and a translation of, the Lemmian inscription B, and C. W. Blegen and K. Kourouniotis report 90 the discovery at Pyles of some 618 clay tablets, or fragments of such, inscribed in a form of the Minoan 'Linear B,' almost all of which are clearly lists or inventories. R. S. Young announces 91
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that the excavation on Mount Hymettus in 1939 has brought to light no inscriptions certainly attributable to the eighth century or earlier, but has considerably increased the corpus of seventh-century inscriptions, and examines a series of early graffiti found in the Athenian Agora from the standpoint of the evidence they afford about the introduction into Greece of alphabetic writing; ‘all the inscribed vases and fragments,’ he concludes, ‘can be dated about 700 and later; a vase bearing an alphabetical inscription of the eighth century has yet to be found.’

II. ATTICA.

A. Billheimer examines a large number of Athenian documents cited by R. Laqueur in support of his theory of incorporation and combination of the elements of amended decrees; he concludes that, though unproved, the theory ‘is one of several possible hypotheses which might explain the absence of formal amendments from Athenian decrees passed after the first quarter of the third century B.C.’ T. L. Shear reports on the epigraphical fruits of the excavations carried out in the Athenian Agora in 1938 and 1939; in the former year 549 inscriptions and forty-two ostraka were unearthed, and the sum-total of inscriptions found by the close of 1939 was nearly 6000 and that of stamped amphora-handles nearly 10,000. I have already (p. 52) mentioned Meritt’s Epigraphica Attica, and here only call attention to the ‘Index of Inscriptions cited’ (pp. 155 ff.) which adds greatly to its value.

[IG ii.] Down to 403 B.C.—Among the new finds announced by Shear dating from the fifth or an earlier century are two sixth-century boundary-stones inscribed ἴππος κόλπων and an ostrakon given against Hyperbolus, the final victim of the institution of ostracism. Excellent progress has been made with the publication of the Agora inscriptions by B. D. Meritt, E. Schweigert and W. K. Pritchett, who fully maintain the high standards of promptitude, accuracy, insight and learning which they have taught us to expect. In addition to new fragments, noted below, of inscriptions already known, Meritt edits several wholly new texts, including a boundary of the ‘Aνάσκαν dating about 450 B.C. (No. 14), a choregic dedication of Leagros (No. 15), a boundary-marker of a trittrix (No. 16), an interesting, if tantalising, fragment, engraved about 425, of an archon-list, in which the extant names belong apparently to the years 527–6 to 522–1 B.C. (No. 21), rejecting the almost irresistible temptation to restore in l. 8 the name of Peisistratus’ grandson and namesake, whose archonship he dates in 497–6 B.C. Elsewhere he publishes four trittrix-markers (Nos. 1–4), which add to our knowledge of the component trittrixes of several Attic tribes. To Pritchett we owe a metrical dedication to Demeter and Kore dated about 455 (No. 18) and a fragment of the Erechtheum accounts (No. 19) mentioned below. Schweigert gives us a record of two hitherto unknown golden Nikai from accounts dated about 430–25 (No. 27) and part of a document issued by the Treasurers of Athens in 411–0 or in 407–6 (No. 29). R. S. Young examines the contents of a seventh-century well in the Agora, which include seven early dipinti and graffiti on vases and other clay objects, all datable about 700 B.C. or later, and S. Young discusses a clepsydra of the fifth century bearing the name of the tribe Antiochis and a note of the content, two choes (XX).

The new inscriptions of this period discovered on the N. slope of the Acropolis include the signatures of Socrates and Pachydermon, potter and painter, written boustrophedon on a plate.

---
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discussed by O. Broneer 106 and by C. Roebuck 107 who also deals 108 with a large number of painted and incised texts on vases, most of them signatures, κολλανγεια inscriptions and dedications; among them is an ostrakon 109 given against the elder Alcibiades. R. S. Young’s account of the 1939 excavations on the summit of Mount Hymettus contains 110 a fragment of an archaic inscription on a limestone block and reports the discovery of ninety-eight sherds bearing dedicatory or other inscriptions of the seventh century, of which twelve are here published, affording interesting evidence for the history of the Greek script.

In an important article 111 on archaic Athenian dedications S. Lauffer makes some general remarks on ‘technical epigraphy’ in relation to early Attic votives, which he classifies according to date and material, and proceeds to discuss, correct or restore many marble-inscriptions of 550–480 B.C. published in IG i.2 or in L’olfini’s Νεκταρίων; he separates the two fragments of 688, unites 516, d + 517, 633 + 737, 648, 656 + 737, 675 + 689, 679 + two new fragments, 707 + 737, 737 + 675, 679 + a new fragment, and L.329, corrected or restores 568, 577, 597 and 670, comments on 639, examines the signatures of Euthymus, Gorgias, Polias and Pythis (§§ 12, 14, 17, 18) and offers useful observations on inscriptions written vertically (§10), on small bases supporting bronze statuettes (§11) and on different writing engraved by the same hand on the same stone (§18). We should have welcomed an index of the inscriptions treated in this long and fruitful research. A. E. Raubitschek’s full and instructive article 112 on the technique and form of early Athenian statue-bases contains no discussion of their inscriptions, but many of his illustrations depict inscribed stones; he also devotes a special study 113 to the victorious statues erected at Athens in the fifth century and draws up an annotated list of eight inscriptions (IG i.2 534, 535, 666, 606, 607, 608 + 714, 655, 829, ii 3123) presumably belonging to dedications of victors in the horse-race, chariot-race or gymnastic contests. S. Luria’s article (in Russian, but with German summary) 114 on the earliest Attic inscriptions is inaccessible to me.

M. Giffner deals 115 with the introduction, variously dated by previous scholars, of the ‘conciliar year’ at Athens, and, rejecting two views successively held by Meritt, agrees with Dinsmoor in placing it in 432 and assigning it to the influence of Meton’s work. W. K. Pritchett marshals and examines 116 the evidence, literary and epigraphical, against the theory of H. B. Mayor 117 that Athenian στρατηγοι entered office soon after their election and before the beginning of campaigning operations. Of outstanding interest is the masterly work 118 in which B. D. Meritt, H. T. Wade-Gery and M. F. McGregor provide a definitive edition of the Attic tribute quota-lists. Chapters I–III give a catalogue and bibliography of the 283 fragments of these lists which have so far come to light, V and VI contain restored texts and commentaries, VII and VIII comprise the records supplied by the documents under review for the payments of 343 communities from 454 to 409 B.C., together with supplementary lists, IX contains notes and discussions, historical and topographical, on the local and ethnic names which occur, X lists the known Hellenotamiai with their secretaries and assessors, and XI consists of 161 ‘testimonia’ bearing on the Delian League, eleven of which (T68–78) are epigraphical. Chapters IV–VI also contain catalogues of the surviving fragments of the three extant re-assessment records (IG i.2 63, 64 and a recent find) and of nine decrees (IG i.2 57, 65, 66, 91, 92 and 109) relative to the tribute-question, together with restored texts, bibliographies and some commentary; the decree enforcing uniformity of coinage, weights and measures throughout the Empire is included among the ‘testimonia’ (T69). Elsewhere in this Journal 119 I have expressed my admiration of the wonderful
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achievement of the authors of this volume, and I content myself therefore with repeating a single sentence from my review: 'No group of epigraphical texts has deserved or received a study so meticulous as the Attic quota-lists, and none has yielded results of equal historical importance.' Elsewhere Meritt publishes 126 notes on four Carian members of the Empire—Alinda, Bolbae, Oula, and Thydonos.

In addition to the inscriptions in IG i.2 mentioned above, the following have been restored, corrected, supplemented or discussed.

40. F. Hampfi rejects 121 the interpretations of the Hestiaearean decrees given by F. von Hiller and M. Cary, and, retaining the former's text, essays a new explanation of it.

47. Meritt adds 122 a fresh fragment to this decree of 406 honouring the Carthaginian generals Hannibal and Himilco.

53. E. Schweigert restores 123 by the aid of 87, the treaty concluded in 433–2 B.C. between Athens and Philip of Macedon.

65, 76. In his article on 'Amendments in Attic Decrees,' A. Billheimer examines and criticises 124 the conclusions of R. Laqueur regarding these decrees.

65. A. E. Raubitschek identifies 125 a new fragment of this tribute-decree, giving a revised restoration of l. 59, 60.

66. He dates 126 this tribute-decree, mainly on epigraphical grounds, between 448 and 445 B.C. G. P. Stevens has discovered, 127 but not yet published, a substantial addition to the decree.

76. See 63.

144, 155. B. D. Meritt unites 128 these portions of a proxeny-decree for a Cnidian, adds a new fragment from the Agora and re-edits the whole.

In the work of Meritt, Wade-Gery and McGregor on the quota-lists. This incorporates four new fragments recently brought to light in the Agora and published 129 by Meritt. A. W. Gommé calls in question 130 Wade-Gery's view, accepted in that work, that 449–8 B.C. is the year missing from the lapis primus and that no tribute was then collected; if any year is missing, which he regards as doubtful, it may have been 447–6, and its absence from the lists may be due to the discontinuance of the ἀπαρχαῖ, not of the tribute, in the year in question. He also rejects 131 the interpretation of the rubric πόλεως συναρτήσεως propounded 132 by E. B. Couch and accepted by the authors of The Athenian Tribute Lists (pp. 455 ff.). In a long article 133 on the history of the Athenian συμμαχία, H. Schaefer criticises, mainly with reference to Nesselhauf's Untersuchungen, the current interpretation of the Aristidean φόρος as a fixed 'normal sum,' varied in the case of individual cities for political reasons of reward or punishment, and seeks to prove that the variations are 'an expression of the changes to which the two sources which fed the φόρος, the agricultural land and, in a far higher degree, the προσόδοι, were subject.' He also rejects Nesselhauf's view of the fundamental change in the συμμαχία which accompanied the Peace of Calessa, examining in detail its division into districts (pp. 249 ff.) and rejecting Segre's assignment of the 'coinage-decree' to a date about 448 (pp. 253 ff.).

255. In connexion with his study of the Hellenotamiai, M. Giffier re-edits 134 the last traditio of the Pronoas published by the Treasurers of Athena.

325, 326. Meritt publishes 135 six fragments of a stele bearing sale-lists of property confiscated for impiety in 414–3, adding two fragments from the Agora to the four already
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known. J. Hatzfeld identifies 136 the Phaecrius of this document (I. 63) with the eponymous hero of the Platonic dialogue and so finds an explanation of his poverty (Lysias, xix. 15).


369. Schweigert uses 139 a newly discovered account of a golden Nike to establish the reading and restoration of this earlier record.

372, 374. W. K. Pritchett adds 140 a new fragment to the Erechtheum-account for 408–7 (374. 326 ff.), and P. H. Davis examines 141 the coffering of that temple in the light of 372. M. Giffier maintains 142 that ii. 1655 records work done on the Erechtheum in 406–5 and 1654 its continuation in the first two prytanies of 405–4, after which the defeat at Aegospotami interrupted further work.

394I. To the epigram commemorating the Athenian victories of 506 B.C. Raubitschek assigns 143 a further fragment.

400. He also comments 144 on the Pronapes of this dedication of the Athenian Knights and corrects 145 the restoration of 809.

409. P. de La Coste-Messelière challenges 146 the restoration [Π]οιβος as indicator of the naschophoros, and suggests [Σδεψα; heket]ου βοσ; ονιδασκεν.

609. Raubitschek brilliantly reconstructs 147 the dedication and memorial of Callimachus, erected on the Acropolis soon after the battle of Marathon, showing that the Ionic column was surmounted by a statue not of Hermes but of Nike.

761. The altar of the younger Peisistratus, whose inscription Thucydides quotes (vi. 54–7), is discussed 148 by G. Welter, who thinks that the historian’s description of its letters as άμφίβαθρομ refers to their shallow cutting in the Ionic style, 149 and dates Peisistratus’ archonship, which it commemorates, in 512–11 B.C. 150

763. Raubitschek re-examines 151 the ‘Marathon epigrams,’ of which he accepts Wilmheim’s restoration; he argues that the first commemorates the 192 Athenians who fell at Marathon, the second those who died at Phalerum repelling an attempted Persian landing, and that the names were engraved on two stelae set side by side on the inscribed base.

803. See 400.

864. The ἄρους ἡλικῆς, rediscovered in the Agora, is dated 152 by Meritt ca. 400 B.C.

Raubitschek further claims 153 that Leagros’ dedication to the Twelve Gods (cf. ἸΗΣ ὉΙΩΝ) was probably a victor-statue commemorating a victory he had won at the Panathenaea or one of the Panhellenic Games, and proposes 154 to restore two fragments (Lolling, Κορακάκος, 307) [Ἀθηναίοι; ἄνε][με][σεν] [τό; Μέθικον] and to see herein the dedicatory inscription of Peidias’ Athena Promachos. A. Cameron subjects 155 the ‘Coronea epigram’ (cf. ἸΗΣ λίθου, 170, ll. 251) to a close scrutiny, 1 with a view to elucidating the religious ideas underlying it and to determining, if possible, its relation to the event which it records ; he rejects the hypothesis of ambiguous response and real epiphany, and regards the poem as ‘a post eventum religious interpretation of the defeat,’ ‘a historical document reflecting Periclean policy.’

[IG ii. 1] After 403 B.C.—The excavation of the Agora has brought to light a large number of new inscriptions, as well as new editions, mentioned below, of texts previously known.
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Among them are a boundary-stone of the early fourth century, standing in situ and inscribed ἥρως Ἰεραμίδε, a series of official leaden weights, some of which date from the same century, an altar inscribed Διὸς Φιλατρίου, Ἀθηνᾶς Δομής τρις, unearthen, together with five grave-columellae, by N. Kyparissis and H. A. Thompson in a newly discovered sanctuary, and a group of masons' marks from the temple of Ares, edited by W. B. Dinsmoor. Other epigraphical finds are briefly indicated in T. L. Shear's report, among them a Hellenistic roof-tile bearing the name of Hephaestus and a t.c. plaque sealed by a περιστόλαξιχ. Many important texts are published for the first time by Meritt, Schweigert and Pritchett with their wonted skill and learning, and the addition of indexes to their principal articles greatly enhances their value. To Merritt we owe an inscription of ca. A.D. 100 erected posthumously in honour of a Pergamene, four fourth-century texts, viz. a list of citizens, perhaps prytaneis, of the tribe Hippothontis (No. 5), a list of φίλαρχοι (No. 6), a dedication to Athena Ergane (No. 7) and numerous fragments of an interesting ephelic inscription of 333–2 (No. 8), and five third-century documents, viz. a dedication of επίλεκτοι of the tribe Demetrias, important as assigning to this tribe the deme Daedalidae (No. 10), part of an ephebe-list of the same tribe, which attributes to it the deme Porus (No. 12), and three fragments of decrees (Nos. 11, 14, 15), as well as a mutilated decree of ca. 200 B.C. (No. 16). Pritchett edits a decree honouring the taxarch of 302–1 (No. 20), an early third-century tribal decree for a victor in the ἀνθροπανίστα (No. 21), two second-century prytaneys-decrees honouring Hippothontis (Nos. 24, 25) and three fragments of a similar decree dated 135–4 (No. 26), which fixes the archon's name for that year and enables us to restore ii. 387, 997. 2 and Inscriptions de Dile, 356: Pritchett adds (pp. 130 ff.) a new archon-table for 147–6 to 129–8 B.C. Even richer is Schweigert's contribution. In one article he publishes a dedication made in 373–2 by Thrasybulus of Collytus as general and eight tribal representatives (No. 2), a valuable decree of 367–6 relative to a breach of the mystery-truce of the Eleusinian goddesses, which the Aetolian League had accepted (No. 3), a decree of 356 in praise of the people of Elaeus, which had been loyal to Athens in the Social War (No. 4), five fragments of the navy-list of 357–6, another copy of ii. 1611, supplementing K. Schmidt's list of Attic war-ships (No. 5), a proxeny-decree of 331 for an Abderite (No. 6), twelve fragments of an alliance of 303–2 between Athens and Sicyon (No. 9), part of the prescript of a decree of 287 (No. 10), making possible the restoration of the prescript of ii. 2. 651, passed on the same day, an early third-century decree of the Council honouring Aristomenes of Paenae (No. 11) engraved on the same stele which bore a decree of the δήμος for the same man (ii. 2. 691), and two fragments of a decree of ca. 229 B.C. (No. 12). Elsewhere he edits sixteen new texts, including eleven fragments of a statue-base, probably that on which stood the bronze statue of Chabrias erected in the Agora after the battle of Naxos (No. 31), two fragments of a decree of 336 relative to Lemnos, moved by the orator Demades (No. 35), which demands a new restoration of ii. 2. 239, 6, 7, passed on the same day, a record of the one-per-cent. sales-tax dating ca. 330, which attests the existence in Attica of a guild of Διεύθυνσης (No. 38), a decree of thanks to a Heracleote for aid rendered in the great famine (No. 39), another, important for the restoration of the calendar, granting citizenship in 319 to Anetus of Rhodes (No. 44), yet another, passed in 302, for Adeimantus of Lampacus (No. 45), a leading supporter of Demetrius, which ' throws interesting light on the internal workings and politics of the League of Demetrius,' which is mentioned in ll. 8, 12, and proves that ii. 2. 806, 809 and Hesperia, viii. 44 f. must be dated ca. 300 B.C., a decree of 287–78 B.C. enfranchising Philocrates, King of Sidon and admiral of Ptolemy, to whom he
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157 Hesperia, ix. 2, 15 ff., 29 ff., 38 ff.
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163 Ibid. 129, 132 f.
164 Hesperia, viii. 1 ff.
166 Hesperia, viii. 313 ff.
had handed over the fleet of Demetrius (No. 48). Of the remainder seven are fragments of decrees (Nos. 30, 36, 40 f., 46 f., 49), one is the prescript of a record of the Treasurers of Athena (No. 34) and one a dedication of 191-0 b.C. (No. 50). A fragmentary relief dedicated by a χερνιγος successful in the Great Panathenaeic has been added 168 to the National Museum at Athens.

A. Billheimer examines 169 a large number of decrees to test the conclusions of R. Laquerre 170 regarding the composition and amendment of decrees, first dealing with cases (IG ii. 17, 19, 43, etc.) in which Laquerre appeals to the relative positions of the constituent motions and then with those (ii. 24, 31, 111, etc.) in which arguments are drawn from the context or from external sources to show the incorporation of amendments. E. Weston calls 171 attention to the many Attic inscriptions in Ionic letters which may be confidently assigned, on the ground of contents or formulae, to the fifth century, and herself dates ii. 2 71 (rediscovered in the Agora) + 38 to 426-5 b.C., ii. 2 174 to about 412 b.C., as suggested by Wilhelm, and ii. 2 73 (of II. 2-6 of which a new restoration is offered) to the fifth century. The problem of the composition of the tribes later added to the ten founded by Cleisthenes is again attacked by W. K. Pritchett, who reviews 172 the constitution of Antigonus and Demetrias, created in 307-6, in the light of recent finds from the Agora, and draws up a list of their component demes, while W. B. Dinsmoor dates 173 the institution of the tribe Ptolemais in 226-5, argues that 221 b.C. witnessed a change in the sortition-cycles, and tabulates the tribal affiliations of the boards of archons listed in ii. 2 1706 (229-8 to 213-2 b.C.), based upon the observance of three laws discovered respectively by Sauppe, Beloch and Ferguson; he further claims that ii. 2 1706 confirms the dating of Diomedon in 246-5 b.C. and the arrangement now offered of the secretary-cycles before the close of the Chremonidean War. The same scholar has also returned in an impressive volume 174 to the examination of the chronological problems of Hellenistic Athens, to which he made so notable a contribution eight years previously in his Archons of Athens in the Hellenistic Age. 175 ‘The new material,’ he writes (p. vii), ‘accumulated through eight seasons of the Agora excavations is so vast, and the welter of conflicting opinion is so provocative, that I am once more induced to undertake a synthesis of the whole situation.’ After an introduction (pp. 3 ff.) dealing with the Athenian theory of tribal rotation and sortition-cycles, he examines with characteristic thoroughness the evidence for the archons of the third and second centuries b.C. and for the priests of Asclepius (pp. 92 ff.), and appends a long series of notes on the Attic calendar (pp. 265 ff.); he also reviews anew the much discussed problem of the archonship of Polyceuctus (which he dates in 248-7) and the Delphian Soteria (pp. 109 ff.), gives a valuable dated table of important chronometrical, political and cultural events from 566 to 109 B.C., summarises his conclusions about the archons, secretaries and priests of Asclepius from 307 to 101 B.C. (pp. 20 ff.), and adds an index of inscriptions cited, occupying six pages and indicating the use of many still unpublished texts from the Agora, as well as indexes of persons and of subjects (pp. 255 ff.). No less important is the work by W. K. Pritchett and B. D. Meritt on The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens, 176 which traverses the same ground; it is ‘essentially a book for specialists, who will want to control the arguments here advanced by reference to the original source material’ (p. vi), though the perfection of its typography and illustration makes it a pleasure even for the layman to handle. It too presents its conclusions in tabular form (pp. xiv ff.), with the addition of full bibliographical references to ancient sources, almost entirely epigraphical, and to modern discussions. In successive chapters it deals with (i) the tribal cycles introduced in 307-6 B.C., after the fall of Demetrius of Phalerum, (ii) the controlling cycles, which for the priests of Asclepius are claimed to be.
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in every instance those of the secretaries of the Council, (iii) the inventories and (iv) priests of Asclepius, (v) the third-century archons, secretaries and priests, who constitute the main subject of inquiry, and (vi) those of the second century, for whom a considerable amount of new evidence is here first presented. The volume closes with indexes of personal names and of inscriptions cited; the fresh readings or restorations offered are indicated by asterisks in the final index, showing that in IG ii. 2 alone no fewer than forty texts are thus improved, while fourteen new inscriptions from the Agora receive here their edito princeps. A comparison of the chronological tables of Dinsmoor and of Pritchett and Meritt shows that, though numerous minor divergencies still subsist, immense progress has been made, thanks to the accession of fresh epigraphical evidence, in unravelling the knotty problems of Attic chronology of the third and second centuries B.C.

In a posthumously published paper, 177 P. Graindor inquired into the name borne by the University of Athens in the Imperial period, challenging Oliver’s view 178 that it was called Μουσεον and suggesting the title Αθηναίων S. Dow in an article 179 on ‘Aristotle, the Kleroteria and the Courts’ continues his study of the nature and operation of the Greek allotment-machine on the basis of literature, inscriptions, and the surviving κληρωτήρια.

In addition to the inscriptions in IG ii. 2 already mentioned, the following attracted special attention in the period under review; incomplete though it is, the list bears eloquent testimony to the advances made in the study of Attic epigraphical records.

1. To the Boeotian–Athenian alliance of 395 B.C. E. Schweigert adds 180 a new fragment.

43. He also shows 181 that ll. 93–6 of the foundation-decree of the second Athenian Empire are separately published as ii. 883.

44. He points out 182 that ii. 155, of which he gives a new reading and restoration, is a duplicate of this treaty of 378–7 between Athens and Chalcis.

98. He further adds 183 a fresh fragment to this pact between Athens and Cephallenia, of which he gives a new restoration, dating it to 373–2.

105. He shows 184 that ii. 523 belongs to the close of this treaty between Athens and Dionysius of Syracuse.

155. See 44.

159. Meritt gives 185 a revised text of this decree-heading.

219. Schweigert re-edits 186 this decree of 344 B.C., perhaps honouring Elacus.

276. He restores 187 the prescript of this grant of ισοτρεπής, which he dates in 336 B.C.

285. See 369.

289. Schweigert shows 188 that this fragment and 372 belong to the same decree of 321 B.C., which he restores.

335. He also completes 189 the text of this decree, moved in 333 by Demades, and adds to it a fragment 190 found by Broncer: see also 369.

343. He re-reads and restores 191 the earlier part of the decree of 323–2 B.C. in honour of Apollonides of Sidon.

350. He dates 192 this honorary decree in 317 B.C. and restores ll. 1–16.

369. Schweigert unites 193 this fragment with 414 b, c and eight others found in the Agora to form a decree of 322 B.C. honouring those who by gifts of grain or in other ways had alleviated the needs of the Athenians in the crisis of the Lamian War. He maintains that 414d is part of 285 and that 414a is wholly independent; this last text he restores 194 by the

177 Rev. Belg., xvii. 207 ff.
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183 Hesperia, ix. 321 ff.
184 Hesperia, viii. 527.
185 Hesperia, ix. 65.
186 Hesperia, viii. 172 f.
187 Hesperia, ix. 342.
188 Hesperia, viii. 173 ff.
189 Hesperia, ix. 339 ff.
190 Hesperia, iv. 109 ff.
191 Hesperia, ix. 342 f.
192 Hesperia, viii. 92 ff.
193 Hesperia, viii. 27 ff., ix. 335 ff.
194 Hesperia, ix. 339 ff.
aid of 335 and 405, which belong to the same year and were apparently engraved by the same hand.

372. See 280.
379. W. K. Pritchett alters 195 the restoration of l. 3 of this honorary decree.
404. Schweigert restores 196 ll. 6–7 of this decree concerning the cities of Ceos.
405. He revises and restores 197 the prescript of this decree moved by Demades in 333.
414. See 369.
456, 470. These decrees in honour of Colophon, passed in 307 and 305, are examined 198 by A. Wilhelm, who proposes new restorations in both.
463. An important addition to this decree of 307–6, regarding the repair of the walls of Athens and Peiraeus, and to the subjoined specification is made 199 by Meritt, who re-edits ll. 100 ff.
482. Schweigert restores 200 ll. 9–12 of this decree of 304 B.C. relative to a committee chosen to supervise the repair of the Athena Parthenos.
523. See 105.
535. With this fragment Schweigert associates 201 two more from the Agora, belonging to an honorary decree of 317 B.C.
562. He restores 202 this decree of 301 B.C. for a friend of Antigonus and Demetrius.
643. He has identified and Meritt publishes 203 the prescript of a decree of 297 B.C. granting citizenship to Aristolas and Sostratus.
883. See 43.
887. Pritchett restores 204 the prescript of a decree of 135–4 B.C. by the aid of a new discovery from the Agora.
917. He also adds 205 two fragments to this decree of 222 B.C. for the prytanies of the Acamantid tribe, recently republished by Dow, 206 and gives a revised text of ll. 18 ff.
966. A. Wilhelm discusses and restores 207 this decree, dating it 241–197 B.C.
977. Pritchett restores 208 l. 2 of this ptyany-decree.
1090 (= SEG iii. 108). Meritt adds 210 the prescript, unearthed in the Agora, of this correspondence between the γέφυρας of the Gephyrae and the Delphians relative to a consultation of the oracle, dates it about 37–6 B.C., and discusses several other texts (SEG iii. 667, 745, Inscriptions de Délos, 1624 bis, 2516–8) referring to the Gephyraean envoy.
1097. J. H. Oliver unites and re-edits 211 an inscription relating to the Directorship of the Epicurean School at Athens, of which 1097 and SEG iii. 226 are parts.
1194, 1274. J. C. Threpsiades unites 212 these two texts with a newly discovered fragment of a decree of the Eleusinians passed ca. 300 B.C. in honour of an ex-demarch for services and gifts.
1370 + 1371 + 1384 (cf. 'Εφης 1937, 164). Schweigert restores 213 l. 13 of this traditio.
1381 + 1386 (cf. JHS lviii. 73). He adds 214 a new fragment, relating to a golden Nike, to this traditio of the Hekatompedon for 401–0 B.C.
1421. He also assigns 215 a new, non-contiguous fragment to col. i of this inventory.
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1496. With this record of the Treasurers of Athena for 331–0 he unites an opisthographic fragment.

1600, 1952. He claims 1952 as part of a list of Athenian cleruchs sent to Samos in 365–4 and 1609 as being of the same date and relating to the same cleruchy.

1611. He regards five fragments from the Agora as belonging to a second copy of the navy-list for 357–6.

1628. He ascribes to the navy-list for 326–5 a considerable new fragment, which adds forty-four lines at the foot of col. b.

1633–49. J. Coupry annotates corrects and restores the series of administrative documents published by the Athenian Amphictyones of Delos, showing that 1640 and 1643 belong to the same stele, as do also 1648 and 1649.

1654, 1655. See above (p. 59) under IG i.2 372.

1705. Schweigert adds a new fragment to this list of officials.

1706. W. B. Dinsmoor tabulates anew the tribal affiliations of the boards of archons (229–8 to 213–2 b.c.) here listed, in order to clarify the Athenian system of rotation.

1942, 1943. See 1034.

1952. See 1609.

2413, 2437. W. K. Pritchett’s study of the tribes Antigonis and Demetrias pays special attention to these two lists of demesmen.

2434. He assigns a new fragment of a Prytany-list of Leontis to the same stele as republished, with an addition from the Agora, by S. Dow (Prytaneis, 57 ff.).

2437. See 2413.

2581a. Meritt announces the rediscovery of this grave-boundary.

2798, 2949. G. Welter re-examines these sculptured and inscribed altars.

2953. Dinsmoor comments on this Acharian dedication to Ares and Augustus.

3090–3, 3096–7, 3101, 3104, 3106, 3108. G. V. Vitucci’s study of the dramatic performances at the country Dionysia discusses these records; 3091 forms the starting-point of A. Szantyr’s attempt to determine the character and composition of the Sophoclean Telephoea.

3123. A. E. Raubitschek deals with the dedication of this votive.

3177, 3055. Meritt studies this dedication and this inscription on a theatre-seat in connexion with his inquiry into the relation between Buzygae and Gephyraei.

3631, 3796, etc. P. L. Maas and J. H. Oliver re-edit, with the aid of a new fragment, an interesting philosophical poem, couched in the Dorian dialect but with a few epic forms, dealing with a physician’s duties; it was engraved on the front of the votive monument of Sarapion, erected about A.D. 220 in the Athenian Asclepieum and reconstructed from numerous fragments by Oliver.

4329. Meritt restores this dedication to Athena Ergane on the basis of a new votive.

4589. A. Greifenhagen’s article on the Bona Dea discusses this dedication ’Ayodhi θεῶι.

4817. A. Salac’s comments on Artemis Kolainis and the Κολανιστάι deal especially with this dedication, recently re-edited by J. Kirchner and S. Dow.

4997. A. Wilhelm discusses and restores this oracle.

5055. See 3177.
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The following texts not found in IG ii. also call for remark. IG iii. 1550, a tomb-epigram, is metrically examined by A. Wilhelm, as is also another Attic epigram (Memories, iv. 13). D. W. Prakken writes Π ι ι instead of Π ι ι in ll. 40, 41, 42 of the alleged oath of the Athenians at Platoae, published by L. Robert. E. Schweigerst restores Χολαιδής in l. 3 of the earliest extant prytany-decree (AM ii. 157 f.) from Hesperia, vii. 291 f. (a decree of 338 B.C.), and Φιδίρης in the latter document from the former. M. A. Shangin’s discussion of an Attic lead tablet I do not know.

III. The Peloponnesse.

[IG iv.] G. Welser publishes three archaic brick-stamps from Aegina, together with two stone anchors inscribed Αφροδίτα η ποτήρια and one (IG iv. 176) bearing the legend μι κιντι τοδε, two inscribed ophaloi (one of them iv. 61) and some names and dates painted or engraved on chamber-tombs (including iv. 70, 92, 186). C. H. Morgan’s report on the excavations at Corinthis in 1938 refers to epigraphical discoveries, one of which supplements Corinth, viii (1). 23. O. Borneer ed. an official rescript from the same site, which throws valuable light on the municipal affairs of Roman Corinth; by it a governor of Achaea in the second century B.C. permits the sale of a site for the erection of a building with fifty rooms and regulates its use for the athletes who visit the games. The inscriptions found at Perachora are provisionally published in the impressive volume devoted to that site, with the exception of three archaic votive inscriptions of a retrograde or boestizophon script, of which H. T. Wade-Gery gives a definitive edition, assigning them to the century from ca. 750 to ca. 650 B.C.

Ernst Meyer refers to the famous Asclepius-inscription from Titane, a little way south of Sicyon. C. W. Blegen discusses A spherical marble sun-dial bearing zodiacal names and the epigram

and two archaic inscribed sherds, one of which dates from the mid-seventh century, from the Argive Heraeum, about a mile from which has also been found the abacus of a column, now in the Argos Museum, bearing an archaic epigraph of two couples commemorating a man who fell in battle, possibly at Sepea in 494 B.C., edited by L. W. Daly. At Ligurio, near the Asclepium of Epidaurus, R. L. Scranton found a Cnidian amphora-handle, graffiti on fragments of a pithos, two roof-tiles and a late fourth-century epigraph. J. F. Crome bases an article dealing with the temple-sculptures upon the extant fourth-century building-accounts (iv. 102), and A. Wilhelm restores and re-interprets one of the miracles from the same sanctuary (iv. 123: 21 ff.).

[IG v.] A. Wilhelm also discusses a metrical epigraph from Boeae in Laconia (v. 1. 960). N. Valmin’s report on the Swedish Archaeological Mission to Messenia deals with the curious script from Malthi and with two dedications from the temple of Phoebus at Hagios Phleors; he further announces the discovery of a number of inscribed potsherds of the sixth and fifth centuries B.C. near the village of Vasiliko. For the mystery-inscription of Andania (v. 1. 1390) the remarks of R. Placeliere and J. and L. Robert should be noted.
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G. M. A. Richter describes a bronze spear-butt of the first quarter of the fifth century B.C. recently acquired by the Metropolitan Museum in New York, inscribed ἵππος Τυνδαρίδας ὀμὴ Ἐρέσον, and suggests Cletor in Arcadia as its provenance, while at Glanitsa in North Arcadia an archaic inscribed base has come to light. In the course of a journey through this part of Greece, Ernst Meyer found twelve unpublished inscriptions at Thelphusa, including an archaic text on a triglyph, a record of the repair of the Agora in honour of Trajan, and ten simple epitaphs. W. Vollgraff discusses the characteristics of the Arcadian dialect and a number of words and forms found in the 'judgement of Mantinea' (v. 2. 262), which he dates between 480 and 460 B.C.

[IV vi.] At Cerynea in Achaea E. Meyer found an inscribed tombstone, a bronze shield unearthed at Olympia bears a legend indicating that it was part of the spoils taken by the Tanagraeans, and other finds from the same site are announced.

IV. CENTRAL AND NORTHERN GREECE.

[IG vii.] P. Friedländer comments on the language and the spirit of the epigram from Megara commemorating the Megarians who fell in the Persian War of 480 and 479 B.C. (vii. 53 = Tod, GHI 20), and L. Robert brilliantly demonstrates that vii. 188 and 189, found at Pegae, are parts of the same Megarian decree, of which he offers a revised reading and restoration, and discusses the arbitration between Pegae and Aegosthena to which it relates.

P. Teissier discusses some points of Boeotian dialect, especially the forms λέις, ὅναγγα, ἢλλοιος, τάπτωμας and Ἑλκός, and Robert suggests Tanagra as the provenance of an interesting ephebic inscription (AM lix. 77 ff.), now in the Chalcis Museum, and shows that a dedication to Isis included by A. Dain among the unpublished inscriptions in the Louvre, and assigned by him to the district of Byzantium, comes in reality from Thebes and has long been known (vii. 2483). D’Arcy W. Thompson annotates the alphabetic list of fish-names recently found at Thespiae (BCH lx. 28 f.), and A. von Blumenthal proposes to read ἔκτοκοντα[5] in l. 101 of the famous building-inscription of Lebadea (vii. 3073 = SIG 972).

[IG viii.] The sixth fascicule of the epigraphical volume of the Foulies de Delphes, edited by N. Valmin, comprises the inscriptions of the Theatre, those that are engraved on stones of the Theatre still in situ as well as those on blocks discovered in the Theatre but transported to the Epigraphical Museum or elsewhere. They number 144 in all, of which 71 are here first fully published; a section on the chronological conclusions to be drawn from them, an index and a table of concordance are added. No fewer than 133 are manumission-records; the remainder include inscriptions on the theatre-seats (No. 1–3), a Delphian decree in honour of an Athenian (No. 4), the signature of a Thespian sculptor (No. 59), a Cnidian votive (No. 60), two honorary inscriptions (Nos. 96, 143), and the text, copied by Cyriae of Ancena but now lost, of a famous oracle recorded by Herodotus as given to Croesus (i. 47). J. Bousquet publishes a long and important article, in which he edits a number of proxeny-decrees ranging between 301 B.C. and the early third century (pp. 332 ff.), an epitaph of Κρήστανας καὶ Παλέον (p. 334), a new name on a tufa block from the 'Treasury of the Bocotians' (pp. 347 f.), a new list of offerings made in 340 B.C. for the...
rebuilding of the great Temple, and four new fragments of the same series of accounts (pp. 348 ff.), two fragments revealing a new third-century archon, Praecoxus I, whom Bousquet tentatively assigns to 270-6 B.C. (pp. 358 ff.), and a new inscription (pp. 362 ff.) from the southern face of the Athenian Treasury containing part of a list of members of the Athenian Dionysiac πεντάτευχος, falling between Foulis de Delphes, iii (2). 48. 23 and 53. 1.

H. W. Parke has fully discussed 275 the origin and procedure of the Delphic oracle and the part played by it in the public, religious, ethical and private life of the Greek world, drawing freely on the rich epigraphical discoveries made at Delphi (see Index, p. 446), and has also re-examined 276 the agreement between Delphi and Phaselis regarding payments for the πελακός, which he seeks to date between 421 and 404 B.C.; in this payment he sees the fixed tariff for consultation of the oracle. F. Sokolowski, in an article 277 written in Polish but summarised in French, investigates the sums recorded in Delphian fourth-century contribution-lists as paid τοῦ ὀδελου τοῦ δευτέρου, which he regards as voluntary offerings paid from 368 B.C. onwards; the first offering of each state was officially styled ἔπαρχη, the following one ὁ ὀδελος ὁ δευτέρος. A. Passerini’s article 278 on the epigraphical sources for the history of Marius includes a discussion of the famous ‘Pirate Law’ of Delphi (SEG iii. 378), A. Wilhelm examines 279 the form Φοικω used in the regulations of the phratry of the Labydaca (Schwyzer, DGE 323 C 23), L. Robert points out 280 that the Chian who figures in the list of Delphian ἑκτερίδοι (BCH xlv. 4) as acting in that capacity at Carpae in N.E. Cyprus is known from an unpublished Cyprian inscription as the governor of that city under Ptolemy V Epiphanes, J. A. O. Larsen’s account of the economic life of Greece under Roman sway contains 281 the text and a translation of the Amphiicon decree enforcing the currency of the Attic tetradrachm in the last quarter of the second century B.C. (Foulis, iii (2). 139). W. Kolbe argues 282 chiefly on the basis of SIG 402 and 598 and OGIS 36, that the Aetolian festival of the Soteria was penteteric and occurred in the same years as the Olympia; hence he rejects the view that it was founded in 242 B.C.

[IG ix.] S. von Bolla comments 283 on the text and the content of a second-century arbitrator from Thesitia in Aetolia, recently published by G. Klaffenbach (SBBerl 1936, 380 ff.), paying special attention to the cause of the dispute and the meaning of the πολιτικός νόμος and seeking to determine who were the lessers of τὰ διάλειψα and who the judges (κατοι). T. D. Xenides publishes 284 a fragment, found at Larisa in Thessaly, of the record of a frontier-dispute which occurred, perhaps in 186-5 B.C., between Πολυνάσσατι and Θεορνεῖτι, A. Wilhelm comments 285 on an epigram of the same provenance (Πολυνάσσαν, ι. 71 ff.), A. von Blumenthal interprets 286 as ‘oil-press’ the word κελτερα found in another Larisaean text (IG ix. 2. 521. 33), and P. A. Clement examines 287 the cult of the Thessalian Ἐυδοκια, a deity of the type of Hecate also called the ‘goddess of Pherec,’ and gives a corrected reading of a votive inscription from Demetriac (SEG iii. 485).

V. MACEDONIA, THRAKE AND SCYTHIA.

[IG x.] Interesting finds continue to be made in western Macedonia. N. Vulić publishes 288 or republishes, two long and valuable inscriptions from Derriopos (Cepigovo, near Prilep) containing five lists of ῥηγαῖοι, dating between A.D. 74 and 107, issued by a gymnasiarch, who is described as δαιμόνιος ἀπὸ ὀρος θ’ ἐως ὄρος ι’ ἐξ ὀλίκου δρακτ[φ] καὶ παραπολήσας τὸν τῆς γυμνασιαρχίας ἐνιαυτὸν ἐπὶ ἀσσαρίῳ τὸν ξέπην πολυμένου

---

276 Hermathena, liii. 59 ff.
277 Es., xxxix. 239 ff.; cf. REG liii. 470.
278 Athenaeum, xvi. 62 ff.
282 Hermes, lxv. 54 ff.
284 Elymiae, xi. 263 ff.
286 Hermes, lixiv. 93 ff.
287 Hepteria, viii. 200.
288 CRAdescrib 1939, 219 ff.; cf. REG liii. 473.
A. Wilhelm restores an epigram from Thessalonica (AM iv. 20 f., vii. 257), now in the Istanbul Museum (Mendel, Catalogue, iii. 934), and L. Robert corrects and dates the epitaph of a Thessalian υφόσκοτος. The report of D. M. Robinson and G. E. Mylonas on the fourth campaign of excavation at OLYNTHUS deals with a pithos-fragment bearing numeral signs and an engraved leaden sling-bullet, and gives a general survey of the archaeological finds of 1938. These are fully published by Robinson elsewhere, from Olynthus a short archaic text in the Corinthian script (No. 1), a treaty between the Ilyrian King Grabus and the Chalcidians, concluded in 357 B.C. (No. 2), seven fourth-century records of leases or sales of houses (Nos. 3–9), a palimpsest Athenian diacast’s ticket (No. 10), a fifth-century tombstone of an Athenian (No. 11); from Αγίος Μάκας two fourth-century epitaphs and an honorary decree (Nos. 12–14); from Ptolemaea-Cassandrea a victor-list of the Ολύμπια τά ἐν Δίον (No. 16) and two epitaphs (Nos. 17, 18) and perhaps two texts already mentioned (Nos. 8, 11); from Valta two epitaphs (Nos. 21, 23); from Mende, Polycyros, Galatista and Amphipolis eight inscriptions, mostly funerary, of minor importance; Robinson also re-edits several texts (Nos. 20, 29, 30, 33) imperfectly published by previous scholars. J. Roger gives a photograph of a third-century grave-stele from Amphipolis, L. Robert restores a tomb-inscription found near Acanthus and recording a college of δρησκευόντων τοις ἱεροῖς (Demetrias, 789) and discusses the inscribed stones which have found their way from various sites to the monasteries of Athos, M. Guarducci examines an endowment-record from Serrhae (Ἑρμή 1936, παρ. 17 ff.) containing the first mention of the festival of the Μενέδες; G. Mylonas reports the discovery of a stamped amphora-handle near the village of Akrotamato, and G. Bakalakis publishes the results of his excavations in and near
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Neapolis (Kavala), which include part of a potter’s signature, almost certainly that of Tleson, on a b.-f. kylix, a group of inscribed vase-fragments, a base from the grotto of the Nymphs at Herakleia bearing a fourth-century dedication to the Nymphs, a mutilated stele of the same century with the curious text "Ἀπωλ[ός] συντόται ὑξίως[ες] τοις πελαι[ῶι] μημέοι ἐθηκαν, and six amphora-handles from Vivlia, one of them inscribed ΟΙΣΥΜΑΛΩΝ. L. Robert examines 307 a group of inscriptions published in 1885 and 1897 by Dr. S. Mertzides as coming from Philippi and concludes that, with one exception, these are forgeries or at least seriously contaminated; he also shows (p. 147) that a mutilated metrical epitaph seen by F. Cumont at Drama was already known from a perfect copy made by Papadopoulos Kera- meus, and corrects 308 the accepted restoration of an inscription (IGRom i. 829) in honour of the Thracian king Rhoemetalces, which he assigns to Abdera. He also attributes 309 to Chalcedon a grave-stele, now in the Istanbul Museum, which Mendel (Catalogue, iii. 977) claimed for Byzantium. The work 310 of T. S. Theophanidis on the island of Proconnesus (Marmara) I know only by name.

THRACE continues to supply a steady stream of new inscriptions, the great majority of them dedicatory, which are collected in the various Bulgarian Museums, notably at Sofia, Plovdiv and Varna. G. I. Kazarow describes and illustrates 311 no fewer than 1128 monuments, many of which are inscribed, relative to the cult of the Thracian horseman-god, with an introductory survey of the cult, a list of provenances (pp. 17 ff.), and useful indices compiled by C. M. Danov; he also publishes 315 five votives, three of them previously edited by G. Seure, to Heracles, Soter Asclepius, the Nymphs, θός ἐρως, and an unnamed deity, found in the district of Ivailograd, at Philippopolis (Plovdiv) and at Gorna Orlovo. Danov publishes 316 an altar dedicated κυριός Κρήνη by a πραγματευτής, son of a Θρακάρχης, two dedications to the Νύμφαι θάνατοι or σώτεραι, a thank-offering κυρία 'Ασκληπιον and another Δίτ Ζελαζώροδι from the districts of Čirpan and Pazardjik, and from various sites a group 314 of five dedications, an epitaph and a potter’s signature. To D. Detschew we owe 315 two epitaphs from the district of Sveti Vrač in E. Macedonia, a dedication Δαμελ ἐπηκόο[ς] Συροτήρη [θ]εός, now in the Burgas Museum, from the Malko Tarnovo neighbourhood, a thankoffering to Ares imperfectly edited in Bull. Inst. Arch. Bulg. vii. 317, and one to Pluto and Demeter from the district of Sofia. V. Ivanova’s report on the excavation of three Christian basilicas at Hissar, N. of Plovdiv, contains 316 several late epitaphs and other inscriptions. H. U. Instinsky discusses 317 two fragments of a milestone recently discovered at Guljanovtsi, N. of Kostinbrod, bearing an inscription of Ἡ Παυσαλωτών πόλις engraved about A.D. 230 in the reign of Severus Alexander and the governorship of Rutilius Crispinus, and examines the problem of the frontier between the territories of Pautalia and Serdica. A. Salač deals 318 with the votive inscription on an altar from Kara Orman, in S. Bulgaria, published 319 by G. I. Kazarow, and J. Zingerle corrects 320 Δυσερηνός into Δυσερηνός in a thankoffering of a Roman soldier found at Dinikly, between Philippopolis and Hadrianopolis (IGRom i. 764).

Especially noteworthy is the contribution made by the Greek colonies founded on the western coast of the Pontus. I regret that M. Apostolidis’ ‘Collection of ancient Greek inscriptions discovered in and near the Greek colonies on the Euxine’ 321 is inaccessible to me. C. M. Danov uses 322 published inscriptions and one apparently unpublished (p. 246), as well as amphora-handles, among the sources for his essay on ‘The ancient economic
history of the western shore of the Pontus down to the Roman settlement.' Apostolidis discusses 323 an unknown Thracian poet or philosopher ' on the basis of Apollonia (Sozopol), now at Plovdiv (RA xvii 1911, 435 ff.), and A. Šalač examines 324 a dedication erected at Mesembria by six generals and their secretary (ibid. 423 ff.), probably to Athena Soteira, dating it after the war with Burebistas, edits 325 with a full commentary a new text of Odessus (Varna), which sheds an interesting light on the barbarian menace threatening that city early in the second century B.C. and the measures taken to avert it, and discusses 326 a dedication from Pavlikeni (Tirnovo) in the Varuna Museum, first published by B. Filow (Bull. Soc. Arch. Bulg. iii. 25 ff.). G. I. Kazarov publishes 327 votives from Orta Keui and Akalan now preserved at Varna, and C. M. Danov examines 328 the history of the West Pontic κοινον in the light of an honorary inscription of Odessus, which indicates that in the second century a.d. the Pontic hexapolis comprised Odessus, Tomi, Callatis, Istria and Dionysopolis, and edits 329 a banquet-relief from the same site bearing an interesting epigram commemorating a man who died soon after marriage. L. Robert restores 330 a fragment of a grave-cippus and two mutilated decrees of Callatis, and opens his discussion 331 of the origin of the word caballo by examining the use of καβαλλαθην in a third-century subscription list for the building of a temple of Dionysus in that city. I call special attention to his valuable summaries of other epigraphical discoveries from Callatis, 332 Tomi 333 and other sites in the Dobrudja 334 which have appeared in works out of my reach, and to R. Vulpe's remarks 335 on the fifth- and sixth-century inscriptions of that district.

N. Dzikowski re-edits 336 the Olbian dedication (CIG 2080) to Achilles Πονταρνης rediscovered in the Museum of Wilno, E. Bikerian studies 337 ' the Orphic blessing' of a metrical epitaph from Panticapaeum, and J. and L. Robert summarise and correct 338 M. A. Shangin's publication 339 of a group of texts from Chersonesus Taurica.

VI. ISLANDS OF THE AEGEAN.

[IG xi.] In a new volume 340 of the series entitled Exploration archéologique de Délos, E. Lapalus deals with the 'Agora of the Italians' and treats incidentally the inscriptions engraved on the portico, exedrae, thermae and other portions of that complex of buildings. J. Coubry's 'Studies in Delian Epigraphy' are concerned mainly with administrative documents found at Athens (see p. 64), but contain 341 also the first edition of a fragment from Delos, ll. 7-11 of which correspond to ll. 9-13 of IG ii.2 1634, and W. Deonna describes 342 a fragmentary Delian bronze lamp bearing two month-names. S. Ronzevalle proposes 343 to see in the enigmatic NEMAFA of Inscriptions de Délos, 2249 ff., the tiara of Atargatis, A. Pasci- rini's examination of the inscriptions relating to Marius deals 344 with the dedication of the Delian Agora (BCH lvi. 491 ff.), in which Marius' name must be restored, and J. A. O. Larsen's account of the economic condition of Greece under the Roman Empire makes full use 345 of the specially abundant materials afforded by the Delian temple-records. B. D. Meritt discusses, 346 in connexion with an Athenian document of ca. 37-6 B.C. (see p. 63), four Delian dedications (Inscr. de Délos, 1624 bis, 2516-3) relative to Zenon son of Pammenes and Pammenes son of Zenon of the Marathonian deme.
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331 Ibid. 175.
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333 Ibid. 401 f.
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336 7HS lix. 64 ff.
338 REG iii. 404 ff.
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I have not yet seen the eagerly awaited supplementary volume of the *Inscriptions Graecae* dealing with the Aegean islands (with the exception of Delos), on which F. Hiller von Gaertringen has long been engaged, but can safely assume that it will be essential for any future study of the epigraphy of this district.

C. Blinkenberg examines eleven sacrificial regulations found in the island of Rhodes, at Lindus (Nos. 1–4) and in the territories of Lindus (5–7), Ialysus (8) and Camirus (9–11); four of these are here first published, while the remainder will be found in *IG* xii. 1, 892, *SIG* 1930–1, *ARW* xxxii. 87, *Annuario* i. 397 and *Clara Rhodos*, vi/vii. 385. One of these (No. 7 = xii. 1, 892), which presents especial difficulties, is independently discussed and boldly restored by J. Zingerle. A fragment of a bilingual Phoenician-Greek votive text, found near the temple of Apollo Pythius at Rhodes, is discussed by G. Levi Della Vida.

M. Guarducci reviews the various interpretations which have been proposed of the term *γυγελος* used in a number of epitaphs from Thera (*IG* xii. 3, 933 ff.) of the second and third centuries A.D., and concludes that the *γυγελοι* are pagan rather than Christian and so inferi piuttosto che celesti, perhaps similar to the *Di Menes* of the Romans.

L. Robert shows that an honorary inscription for Geta copied in Nisyros (*IGRom* iv. 1733) originates from Cos, where it had previously been seen by Rayet (*ibid*. 1107); he also claims a Coan origin for a leaden weight in the Froehner Collection at Paris inscribed *Νικόμαχος Ἰδρυόμενος* and proves the same provenance for an inscription, now in England, assigned to Crete in *IGRom* i. 1023. He further restores a fragmentary text from Cos (Maturi, *Sillog. 438*) as a copy of a Halicarnassian decree in honour of Hermias, a Coan doctor, the latter part of which survives in Paton-Hicks, *Inscriptions of Cos*, 13. M. Segre discusses two *leges sacae* from the Coan Asclepieum, (a) editing for the first time a fourth-century regulation (which he regards as 'perhaps the most beautiful inscription of Cos') of the cult of the Nymphs, also mentioned in a third-century fragment of a sacred calendar here published, providing against contamination of the *κρατεν*, and (b) giving a new edition, with full commentary, of the regulation regarding the preservation of the cypresses in Apollo's precinct, and adding a newly discovered fragment of a second copy of the same law exhibited in the temple of Aphrodite. M. Giffler revises, in the light of recent excavations to our knowledge, the Coan calendar as drawn up by R. Herzog. Segre also throws fresh light on the well-known record (*SIG* 953 = *IBM* 299) of the Cnidian arbitration between Calymna and certain citizens of Cos, discovered in the former island and preserved in the British Museum. The names of several of the persons involved in the case recur in Calymnian inscriptions newly unearthed, which prove that the arbitration belongs to the late fourth or early third century B.C., and attention is drawn to the significance of the document for the relation of Cos and Calymna, which at this time were still independent, though in the third century Calymna appears as a Coan deme. Of outstanding value and interest is the preliminary report by Segre on the first campaign of excavation carried out in Calymna in 1937. Among the numerous inscriptions brought to light there and awaiting fuller publication, Segre signals a Christian invocation of the fifth century (p. 35), dedications to Dionysus and Poseidon, Demeter and Kore (p. 37), a decree granting citizenship and other privileges to Moschion of Thera (pp. 37 ff.), a long decree of ca. 229 B.C. in honour of Iasian judges, a fragment of which (*IBM* 262) has long been in the British Museum (pp. 39 ff.), a new fragment of the third-century dedication of the *σκευα* and *προσκαλευον* of the Theatre (pp. 41 ff.), and the inscription recording the dedication of the Theatre itself by a woman
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(p. 42), three statue-bases from the monument of a distinguished Roman family (pp. 43 ff.), five blocks from the monument of M. Laterensis, including three epigrams (pp. 45 ff.), a first-century honorary inscription of Apollodorus son of Python (pp. 48 f.), a text commemorative of Μονοχρωμάτων καὶ Ιστιμωτόν (pp. 49 f.), part of an architrave dedicated to Caligula and Ἀπόλλωνι Δαίολοι Κρησίων (p. 50), and several manumission-records, of which forty-two have been discovered, with a double dating by Coan μόνορχος and Calymnian στεφανημάτως (pp. 53 ff.)

A dedication discovered at Paros (IG xii. 5. 271), but originating from Delos (Inscr. de Délos, 1624 bis), is discussed by B. D. Meritt, and an epigram of Syros (Ἐφιμ 1931, 114 f.) is corrected by A. Wilhelm. M. Guarducci retains in a Tanian honorary decree (xii. 5. 840, 13) the name ‘Ἀμφέρων, which, she points out, is elsewhere attested for Hierapytna.

A. Salac examines and restores the preamble of an interesting name-list from Chios, suggesting [οῖκος] τοῦ γράμματος [οὶ κοντά] τῆς Ἡλεορείων. P. P. Argenti’s Bibliography of Chios from Classical Times to 1936 (Oxford, 1940) contains a section on ancient and medieval epigraphy. L. Politis has brought to light an inscribed sarcophagus on the island of Icarus, and a passage in a Samian decree in honour of a doctor is explained and restored by L. Robert.

K. Lehmann-Hartleben has issued provisional reports on the first and second campaigns of excavation at Samothrace. The earlier of these includes a bilingual cult-regulation from the Anaktoron, Deorum sacra qui non accepturit, non intransit. ‘Ἀμφέτων μη στροφαίνει, on which C. Picard comments, together with an honorary decree for a citizen of Maronea, a fragment of a list of initiates in Latin prefixed by the heading ‘Ἀγαθα [τό] ἤτοι, an early Christian leaden amulet, and some early Hellenistic stamped tiles and Rhodian amphorae-headers. G. Bakalakis and R. L. Scantton edit a third-century Samothracian decree honouring an officer of the Ptolemy in charge of the Maronea district for saving the region, including Samothrace itself, from barbarian, perhaps Gaulish, attacks. Comments and corrections are made by P. Roussel, by J. and L. Robert, and by M. Rostovtzeff and C. B. Welles. The second report announces the rescue of a number of already known inscriptions and the discovery of eighteen new texts, of which twelve are catalogues of μόρσος, including one of special importance dated A.D. 19, and provisionally edits three such lists, one of them in Latin, of which that for A.D. 113 is perfectly preserved. Wilhelm opens his discussion of ‘prepositionless genitives’ by rejecting the proposed insertion of ἐκ before Χερσονήσου in a Samothracian decree (xii. 8. 156 B 16 = SIG 502. 37). An interesting inscription of a triple ἱππός has come to light at Thasos, and C. Picard restores a passage in another Thasian document on the basis of a poem of Ras Shamra.

H. Volkmann’s article entitled Δόκιμα χρήματα starts by examining the meaning of this phrase as used in a sixth-century legal document of Eretria (xii. 9. 1273), and L. Robert shows that an ephetic inscription in the Museum at Chalke, recently published by W. Peak (AM lxix. 77 ff.), is of Boeotian, probably of Tanagraean, origin.

[IG xiii.] M. Guarducci has issued a second volume of the epigraphical corpus of Crete, but this is still inaccessible to me, and I must defer to a later occasion some indication of its
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contents. The same scholar has, with her accustomed energy and skill, (a) published a relief from Melambes, S. of Retimo, dedicated to Αθάνας (Hθανας), (b) given a revised text, with ample commentary, of the well-known hymn to Dictaeon Zeus from Palaikastro; (c) discussed the oath of the Derrians (SIG 527 = Inscr. Cret. I. ix. 1), now at Istanbul, showing in the light of a new discovery that it belongs to the Hellenistic age, and explaining the curious phrases added in ll. 137 ff. as a list of memoranda for the future; (d) rejected the interpretation given by Demargne and van Effenterre of the mysterious θεσσαλονικης of an archaic decree from Derrus; re-examined the decree of Praesus (SIG 524) relative to the Stalite, proposing a new reading of l. 10; suggested a fresh restoration of a passage in a Parian decree engraved at Allaria and now preserved in Berlin (GDI 490); (e) offered a commentary, based on a revision of the stone, on an inscription of Palaikastro (DGE 200) relative to the maintenance and repair of the statues in the Dictaeon sanctuary; and (f) corrected and interpreted the text of a long and interesting epigram from Itanos, now at Candia, dealing with the heroic cult of three dead children (SEG iii. 774). C. N. Petrou-Mesogeites publishes a batch of ten new texts, mostly epitaphs, from Lato τρος Καραξος, Olus, Chersonesus and an unknown origin, of which the most interesting is an archaic epitaph in retrograde script from Chersonesus; to him we also owe a series of Observations on Cretan Inscriptions, containing comments on or corrections of a considerable number of inscriptions appearing in the first two volumes of the Inscriptiones Creticae, some of them based on a re-examination of the actual stones. J. Bousquet’s report on the Hellenistic temple of Aphrodite and Ares at sta Lenika includes a publication of a perfectly preserved building-record dating from the second half of the second century b.c., an unfinished metrical votive, a fragment which enables us to restore Inscriptiones Creticae, I. xxii. 2, and a dedication to Aphrodite commemorating a victory won, probably by Lato, over Olus. I. Robert restores a fragment from Lebanon (Inscr. Cret. I. xvii. 33) in honour of Seleucus, Ptolemaic commandant in Cyprus, which may have been brought from that island to Crete, and also proves the Coan origin of an inscription assigned to an unknown locality in Crete (IGRom i. 1923). A lamp discovered in the course of the British excavations in the plain of Lasithi bears the maker’s name. A. Wilhelm discusses fully an epitaph from Rhacus (Inscr. Cret. I. xxvii. 2), and S. Marinatos’ excavation at Amnisus has brought to light a dedication made by a board of κοίμωνi to Zeus Thenatas, whose name must be restored in a votive inscription found in 1934.

VII. Western Europe.

[IG xiv.] From Sicily there is less than usual to record. In her work on the ancient Greek phratry of M. Guarducci revises and discusses eight sling-bullets found at Catania and elsewhere (IG xiv. 2407. 10–15, 18, 11a) and edits one, in the Palermo Museum, for the first time. M. Gütschow quotes a Syracusan epitaph (xiv. 150) for the use of ληνος meaning ‘sarcophagus’; A. Ferrua’s notes on the Christian epigraphy of Syracuse I have not yet seen.

We pass to Italy. A. Rocco discusses the archaic ex-voto of Nicomachus (xiv. 652) from S. Mauro Forte, near Metapontum, and M. Guarducci re-edits and examines a
group of documents 409 which throw light upon the position and activities of the Neapolitan phratries, which appear to have played an important rôle in the life of their city. M. Della Corte publishes 410 a series of inscriptions and graffiti, of which twelve are Greek, from the cryptoporicus of the theatre of Suessa Aurunca (Sessa); A. Adriani 402 and U. Zanotti-Bianco 403 publish the signatures of two Athenian sculptors of the second century B.C., Callimachus and Gorgias, engraved on a base at Minturnae, and G. Carettoni 404 has brought to light a fragment of a Greek inscription in excavating the theatre of Casinum (Cassino). G. Calza describes 405 the Tavern of the Seven Sages at Ostia, in which the identity of the Sages—Σιλαρον Ἀθηναίοις, Θεός Μελέθησις, Χείλους Λακεδαιμόνιος and [Βίος] Προπαγευτικός—is indicated by Greek legends placed beside their several portraits.

The discoveries made in Rome are fairly numerous but not of outstanding interest. A. Ferrua publishes 416 five new epitaphs found to the North of the church of S. Agone on the Via Nomentana, one of which is an epigram commemorating a native of Tyana in Cappadocia, and provides 417 a full edition of a tomb-inscription already published 408 ending with the formula Ἡ ὁ θεός ἀναφέρει τὴν ψυχήν, which is also edited 409 by E. Josi, together with another short epitaph from the Christian cemetery on the Via Latina. From the Via di S. Basilio, A. L. Pietrogrande reports 410 the discovery of an amphora inscription and a graffiti, fully discussed 411 by V. De Marco, reproducing, though not without some mistakes, Homer, Iliad, xxiv. 171–5. R. Paribeni publishes 412 a fragment of a metrical epitaph found on the Via Casilina, and G. Jacopi 413 a similar fragment and the extant portion of the epitaph of an ἐπιτροπος λαόκων, ἐπιτροπος Νομικοῦ, εὐθυμίαρχης of Alexandria. C. P. Ludlum has catalogued 414 the Museum of the American Academy at Rome, among the contents of which are six stamped amphora-handles, four of which are from Egypt and one each from Rhodes and Loryma. F. Cumont discusses 415 a tombstone from the Campagna commemorating in verse and picture the erotic passion of a native of Germe in Mysia buried near Rome. D. Magie assigns 416 the dedication erected on the Capitol by the people of Tabae to a date soon after 169 B.C., and examines the chronology of the other dedications grouped with it (xiv. 986–7 and pp. 695 f.); A. Pascari's survey of the epigraphical evidence for the career of C. Marius includes 417 a hitherto neglected entry in a Roman chronological table of historical events (xiv. 1297, i. 10); A. Wilhelm proposes 418 to read ἅβι in place of ἄβ (Wilamowitz 50) in the poem of Marcellus of Side (xiv. 1389, 42); A. Puech examines 419 the interesting metrical epitaph of the physician Asclepiades (xiv. 1424), with special reference to Boyancé's recent treatment 420 of it; Wilhelm interprets 421 and restores a metrical epitaph from Rome (xiv. 1497) and examines its metrical structure, and F. Cumont offers 422 a new reading of the epigram (xiv. 1560 = Kaibel, Epigr. Graecae, 723) engraved on a child's sarcophagus, now in the Lateran. L. Robert shows 423 that the man commemorated in yet another Roman grave-epigram (SEG iv. 105) was a native of Nicomedia in Bithynia. J. Quasten discusses 424 in detail the sculptured stone, now in the Lateran Museum, set up by Βηθαματοσ Νικοτωρος over the grave of three women κοιν φιλίας βευμερέντες ὑπὸ βίος τοῦτου (E. Dicht, Inschr. Lat. Christ. Vet. 4463 and Add.), and conjectures for Beratius a Pontic origin, G. Stuhlmann describes 425 a relief of the second century A.D. in the Vatican bearing the representation of the lighthouse at Ostia and the legend [Ε]δώλος accompanied by the
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Wilhelm investigates the problems presented by a grave-epigram from Bononia (IG xiv. 1550) and M. M. Roberti re-edits a bilingual epitaph from Pola, now in the Istria Museum (CIL v. 168). A. Ferrua’s article on a Montanist community in the Aurelia at the close of the fourth century I have not seen.

Ferrua gives a short account of the inscription of Augusta Treverorum (Trier) recently published by R. Herzog (cf. JHS lix. 272), whose chronology and interpretation of the document he challenges, believing that it relates to a girdle dedicated to Apollo in one of his temples. E. Bickel discusses the legend Φηλις Φωτιστις on a Spanish gem of A.D. 161–76 (CIL ii, p. 1025); R. P. Wright edits a graffito on two fragments of a shale vessel found in 1937 at Dorchester (Dorset), and M. V. Taylor’s survey of the Romano-British remains of Oxfordshire includes a fragment of copper with a Greek inscription found at Welcote.

VIII. Asia Minor.

Among the contents of the Buckler-Festschrift are a bibliography of Buckler’s published works and a number of essays relative to the inscriptions of Asia Minor. W. M. Calder examines (pp. 15 ff.) the pagan epitaphs of Eumenea and Apamea, showing that probably none which contain the ‘Eumenean formula,’ ἐστιν αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν (ζωντα) Θέον, are pagan, though a few may be Jewish; A. Cameron discusses (pp. 27 ff.) the status of the priest and cognate classes as revealed by epigraphic evidence from Asia Minor; C. W. M. Cox publishes (pp. 63 ff.) the epitaph of the Fortasius, bishop of Appia between A.D. 350 and 400, τιμων εὐνοῦχος δα Θεόν Αγα(ν)ίνον; F. Cumont adds (pp. 67 ff.) two recent finds, both of the first century A.D., to the scanty supply of documents relating to the cult of Mithra in Anatolia; J. J. E. Hondius comments (pp. 99 ff.) on a Bithynian inscription in the Brussa Museum honouring Cornutus, ἢρετηρια Μουσών κεὶ λέγουν κατήγορος; A. H. M. Jones deals (pp. 103 ff.) with the civitates liberae et immunes in the East; J. Keil marshals and examines (pp. 119 ff.) the epigraphical evidence, some hitherto unpublished, for the cults of Hestia Boulai, Artemis Ephesia, Παρ ἅθετον and other deities in the Prytaneum at Ephesus; D. Magie traces (pp. 161 ff.), partly with the aid of inscriptions, the relations of Rome to the city-states of Asia Minor from 200 to 133 B.C.; B. D. Meritt discusses (pp. 187 ff.) four Carian members of the Athenian Empire; T. B. Mitford publishes (pp. 197 ff.) a dedication of Nicocles, King of Paphos, in the Cyprian syllabic script; W. M. Ramsay tackles (pp. 201 ff.) various problems connected with the early history of Asia Minor; L. Robert throws new light on the letter of Julius Caesar found in the Agora of Smyrna, assigns to the temple of Apollo Smimtheus, near Kulakli in the Troad, a fragment attributed to Assos by Sterrett, and edits with a full and valuable commentary on style and content an interesting honorary decree of Ephesus discovered at Aphrodiasia in 1913 (pp. 227 ff.); R. Syme’s ‘Observations on the Province of Cilicia’ include a study of IG Rom iv. 1604 in connexion with Antipater, dynast of Derbe and Laranda (pp. 301 ff.); M. N. Tod traces the career of Pliney’s friend, the corrector Maximus, and denies Viale’s contention that an inscription of Attalea (SEG vi. 650) relates to him (pp. 333 ff.); and A. Wilhelm discusses the relations of Athens and Colophon with special reference to a group of documents recently unearthed at Colophon (pp. 345 ff.). The concluding index (pp. 381 ff.) of inscriptions quoted in full will be found especially valuable to the epigraphist, and shows that eleven inscriptions have found in this volume their first
publication. T. R. S. Broughton’s exhaustive account of the economic life of Asia Minor under the Roman Empire also draws largely upon inscriptive materials, and M. P. Charlesworth derives from the same region eleven of his Documents illustrating the Reigns of Claudius and Nero. Asia Minor also figures prominently in L. Robert’s long and varied article already repeatedly cited; the principal items will be noted below in their appropriate places. W. H. Buckler and W. M. Calder have edited with their characteristic skill and thoroughness a new volume of the invaluable Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua devoted to Laodicea, Colossae, Attouda, Hieraclea, Tabae, Apamea, Dioleia, the Upper Tembris Valley, Synnada and Afyon Karahissar, as well as other sites in Phrygia and Caria; 422 monuments, of which all save 47 are inscribed, are here described and, for the most part, illustrated, and an annotated list is added of 242 inscriptions previously found on the sites in question. H. Grégoire points out that one of the inscriptions in this collection (No. 385) almost certainly comes from a baptistery.

We start our geographical survey with the Greek cities of Caria. J. Zingerle offers a new restoration of a lex sacra (Ἑργα 191, 54) from Loryma, in the Rhodian Peraea. O. Gottwald publishes an enigmatic text from Mylasa, which he seeks to interpret in the light of an inscription from Patara in Lycia (TAM i, 491). T. R. S. Broughton translates and comments on the Mylasian decree of trapezitis (OGI 515), and L. Robert establishes the Mylasian provenance of a dedication to Zeus Labraundos now in Alexandria. In an article on the organisation of the Carian κωνόν, H. Volkmann discusses a lease from Olympos (BSA xxii. 197) containing a mention of a ἱερέως καὶ βασιλείου τοῦ κωνοῦ τοῦ Καρα[νυ]. Zingerle examines and restores a cult-regulation from Panamara (SEG iv. 267), H. Rolland re-edits a dedication from the same sanctuary (BCH xii. 490, No. 105) now in his possession at Brussels, and A. Laumonier studies the documents, chiefly of the second century A.D., relative to the priests of Hecate at Laguna, corrects or restores many of the texts and seeks to establish the chronology of the priests. I have already spoken of U. Wilcken’s study of the important document of 204 B.C. found at Dardurkar, near Eriza (OGI 224). G. Jacopi reports on some of the epigraphical discoveries, among them the dedication of a portico in Tiberius’ reign, made by the Italian excavators of Aphrodisias. H. Grégoire criticises N. H. Baynes’ treatment of the Great Persecution and of Constantine in the Cambridge Ancient History, xii. 646 ff., and examines the inscription of Didyma (Philol. xxiii. 74 ff.) referring to Didodian’s consultation of the oracle in A.D. 302-3, in l. 8 he restores ο[κ]οι in place of Rehm’s ο[κ]οι. L. Robert discusses an epitaph from the same site, rejecting Zingerle’s proposal to read Ερως Κανέ for the Ερωσκας of its editors, and gives an improved reading of a fragmentary honorary decree of Miletus, now in the Louvre. A. Wilhelm examines the phraseology of a Prieonian decree (Ib Priene, 113, 68), W. Kolbe restores καὶ Πυθιος καὶ Λευκοφυινοι [ς] καὶ τρια της ταυτισμου] in an important Amphictyonic decree engraved at Magnesia (Ib Magn. 91. 9 ff. = SIG 598), K. Latte enquires into the meaning of παλακας, παλακεος in inscriptions of Tralles, and L. Robert restores a Trallian text (AM xxvi. 237 f.).

In his notes on the Ephesian deer-law of 85 B.C. (SIG 742) J. H. Oliver gives an explanation and translation of ll. 21-34 with some textual emendations, A. Wilhelm dis-
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cusses an involved passage in ll. 395 ff. of the decree of Ephesus for Vibius Salutaris (IBM 481 * = Ephesos, ii, p. 137), and F. Eichler investigates the monument of Eutropius, who, probably about A.D. 400-25, paved the streets of Ephesus in marble. Of Wilhelm’s treatment of a group of Colophonian texts I have already spoken (p. 75). L. Robert traces an interesting fragment discovered at Selles-sur-Cher in France, and Wilhelm corrects an epigram from Philadelphia.

F. Hiller von Gaertringen describes seven archaic sherds bearing painted or inscribed texts, most of them dedicatory in character, from Larissa in Aeolis. A. Schober’s article on Epigonus of Pergamum and early Pergamene art examines the extant signatures of that sculptor and confirms the restoration of his name in Io Perg. 22 and 29; elsewhere he discusses a fragmentary Pergamene base on which is engraved part of the name Attalus. T. R. S. Broughton translates and explains the rescript de collybo sent by Hadrian to Pergamum (OGI 494). L. Robert adds a twelfth dedication, now in Berlin (AA 1919, 110 f.), to the series which he has traced to the sanctuary of Zeus Olbios at Kavak in Mysia, and comments on several inscriptions of Cyzicus, notably IGRom iv. 174, while A. Wilhelm suggests a new restoration of a Cyzicene epigram (ibid. 140) and gives parallels for its shortening of α.

Passing to Bithynia, we note Robert’s vindication of the Chalcedonian origin of an inscribed relief now in Istanbul (Mendel, Catalogue, 977), his identification of a fragment from Apollonia ad Rhynacum (AM xvin. 311) as a cursus honorum, his discussion of an epigram engraved on the cenotaph of a doctor found near Hadrian, and his assignment of two grave-stelae of soldiers, now preserved at Istanbul (ibid. 891-2), to Heraclea-Perinthus rather than to Heraclea Pontica. A. M. Schneider and W. Karnapp append to their examination of the city wall of Nicaea a chapter devoted to the forty-two inscriptions on or connected with that wall; four of these are Latin and thirty-eight Greek, of which twenty are published here, in some cases inadequately, for the first time and eighteen are new editions of texts previously known. Of the new documents the most interesting are Nos. 10, 13, 16 and 34.

The principal contribution of Phrygia lies in the new volume of the Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua mentioned above, but some additions call for notice. A. Cameron’s essay on confession-inscriptions contains a detailed analysis of one text of this class (MAMA iv. 279) from Ortakeu and suggests στήκο in place of ἄτηκο in another from the same neighbourhood (SEG vi. 252). L. Robert shows that an epitaph in the Trau collection at Vienna (ÖJh xxix. 52 f.), recently published as new and of uncertain provenance, was found at Kula and appears in CIG 3445 and LeBas-Waddington, 703; he uses an epitaph discovered at the village of Manai to provide an argument for reading Cabalitin, instead of Caralitin, paludem in Livy, xxxviii. 15, and discusses a dedicatory relief from Dorylaeum now in the Louvre, correcting and amplifying Dain’s edition, and an epitaph from the same site (IGRom iv. 530), in which he substitutes οὐκ [καὶ ἐν πώ [πις for his predecessors’ οὐ [καὶ πις [πις ; he also corrects and explains the building-record of a νῦν at Acmonia (LeBas-Wadd. 751). W. M. Calder returns to the vexed question of the reading and restoration of ll. 7-11 of the famous epitaph of Avicius Marcellus, bishop of
Hieropolis, and advocates the reading συνωμησις in l. 11. A. Wilhelm draws attention to the 'prepositionless' genitive του ταπου in an epitaph of Hierapolis and collects examples of the use of the word βομεος to indicate 'grave,' and he also restores an epigram of Laodicea ad Lycum (AM xxii. 358).

From Galatia there is little to report save the second edition of E. Malcovati's useful edition of the 'Monumentum Ancyranum,' which does not contain the Greek text, A. Solari's essay on 'Il monumento politico di Augusto,' and D. B. King's paper, published in Résumé, maintaining that the Latin text of the Res gestae emphasises the republican nature of Augustus' government, while the Greek translation stresses rather the general imperial aspects of his work and the personal character of his rule. A. Wilhelm proposes a restoration of a metrical epitaph brought to light at Ancyra (AM livi. 133, No. 20) and corrects an epitaph from Amastis. L. Robert points out that an inscribed relief representing a funeral-banquet now preserved at Istanbul was first copied by G. Mendel on the site of Ticeum (BCH xxv. 39, No. 187).

J. and L. Robert have some valuable notes on the inscriptions of Paphlagonia and Cappadocia edited in G. Jacopi's Esplorazioni e studi in Patagonia e Cappadocia, and L. Robert devotes particular attention to four Cappadocian epitaphs in that collection, discovered at Tyana (No. 2), Colonia Faustiniana (Nos. 31–2) and Archelais (No. 36), and shows that another epitaph from Tyana (No. 4) had been twice previously published.

He also corrects and explains a text of Pinaria in Lycia (TAM ii. 509), shows that an honorary inscription from Antiphellus (BCH xviii. 325) attests the influence exercised by Rhodes over Lycia between 158 and 167 a.c., when Lycia was under Rhodian domination, and traces the history of an inscription in honour of the Emperor Tiberius seen complete at Andriace (IGRom iii. 721) and subsequently transported to Megiste (Castelorizo) in two fragments, imperfectly published as independent inscriptions in IGRom iii. 689 and 718.

A. Wilhelm examines the diction of a decree of Termessus (TAM iii. 1. 4) and restores an epigram from the same site (ibid. 584). A. Cameron explains a document of Oenoanda (Heberdey-Kalinka, No. 79), reading πανδικος in place of πανδις and interpreting Ἱορθόδοκος as a person manumitted by the sacral process. E. Bignone defends his own view of the polemic directed against Aristotle in fragments 3 and 4 of the great inscription of Diogenes of Oenoanda against the criticism of R. Philippson (RivPhil lxvi. 235 ff.), which he dismisses as wholly untenable, and G. Capone-Braga supports his arguments with fresh citations from Aristotle. P. Jacobsthal and A. H. M. Jones publish two silver plaques, one bearing the figure of Zeus and the other that of Ares, said to have been found some four miles N. of Oenoanda; the Ares-plaque, with five inscriptions, was probably dedicated in A.D. 25 and repaired in 95, the Zeus-plaque, inscribed ἐπόσθοι ἱεραλέόν ο ὁ δημος κα των ἱερῶν ἀτο δηναρίων τρικάστιον τριῶν συν χεροπτονίοις κα πάνοις δεσπότατοι ἐπότεσθε Γάϊος, was apparently made in A.D. 70; but possibly all these dates should be put 110 years later.

E. Honigmann takes several inscriptions of Corycus in Cilicia (MAMA iii. 445, 507, 563, 642) as the starting-point of his essay on ἔκπρεξτον κομι, the modern Kafarlatha, and O. Ottwald edits a puzzling Corycian epitaph, to which is apparently prefixed the word Ἑσυμωξις, indicating the invocation of earthquakes against tomb-violators: J. and L.
Robert points out 507 the difficulties raised by Gottwald's reading and interpretation and themselves made proposals for their solution.

Of Cyprus there is more to report, 508 though T. B. Mitford's fruitful researches have been temporarily interrupted by military duties. He has, however, published 509 a group of seven newly discovered milestones from the western part of the island, dating between A.D. 198 and 355 or even later; of the new inscriptions one is Greek (No. 5), two are Latin (Nos. 4, 7) and the remainder are bilingual. Mitford also discusses the milestones previously known and shows the topographical value of these monuments. He has also published 510 a new text in Cyprian syllabic script found near Palaipaphos (Koukla), a dedication of Nicocles, King of Paphos and priest of Vanassa. The largest collection of new material is that contained in three appendices, edited by A. W. Persson, E. Ekman and E. Gjerstad respectively, in volume III of the monumental report of The Swedish Cyprus Expedition. 511 Appendix I is devoted to recent discoveries of Cypro-Minoan inscriptions, Appendix IV to seven texts from Vouni and two from Mersinaki written in the Cyprian syllabary, Appendix III to Greek inscriptions from Vouni (an Attic lekythos), Mersinaki (six texts, mostly votive, on marble or limestone) and Soli (eight on marble or stone and a Rhodian amphora-handle; among them are the foundation-record of a temple of Priapus erected by heath of Sarapis, the dedication of a statue of Κύπρος to Aphrodite Oreia ἐπήκοος, and numerous fragments of an iambic hymn to Aphrodite). J. F. Daniel sees 512 in the two syllabic signs on three pithoi from Curium the word κυτή and concludes that Greek was spoken in Cyprus before the Trojan War, H. Pedersen discusses 513 the Greek names in the bilingual inscription 514 discovered at Amathus, L. Robert shows 515 how an unpublished honorary inscription from Carpea, mentioned by Mitford (APF xiii. 22), can be restored by the aid of, and itself aids in restoring, a passage relative to Cyprus in the list of Delphian θεοφοροδοκαί (BCH xiv. 4), G. Klaßenbach restores 516 a fragment of an honorary decree in Nicosia Museum published by Mitford (APF xiii. 18, No. 6), and W. Otto's chapter on the state-cult of the Ptolemies contains 517 an examination of an honorary inscription 518 for Helenus Αρχιερεύς τῆς νήσου καὶ ἱερᾶ διὰ βίου βασιλεύσις Κλεοπάτρας θεὸς Αφροδίτης Εὐαγγελίου, erected at Salamis.

IX. SYRIA AND PALESTINE.

The second instalment 519 of J. H. Iliffe's 'Sigillata Wares in the Near East' contains a large number of potters' signatures and other stamps, both Greek and Latin. W. W. Tarn examines 520 a dedication, dated 166 B.C. from Babylon (Ogi 253), showing its interest for Seleucid history. M. Engers deals 521 with the letter addressed by the Parthian king Artabanus III to Susa (SEG vii. 1, Welles, Royal Correspondence, 75) and discusses the restoration of ll. 8–10, 14. F. Cumont publishes 522 a portrait head of a Parthian queen of ca. 1 B.C., probably Musa, found at Susa, on whose diadem is inscribed Αντίσεως Δράγαντος ἐπιτίθει, and a sherd bearing a text written in ink, dated 43–2 B.C. and relating to the πρωτεία Ελευθερίας. A. Cameron agrees 523 with L. Robert (Rev. Phil. x. 137 ff.) and E. Schönbaumer (APF xii. 214 ff.) in regarding the munimization-documents found at Susa (SEG vii. 15–26) as being of the Greek type.

L. Jalabert and R. Mouterde have issued a second volume of their valuable corpus of inscriptions in Syria, 524 covering the regions of Chalcidice and Antiochene with the exception
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of Antioch, Daphne and Seleucia, where excavations are still proceeding. The items comprised in this installment number 446, among which are 84. inedita: epitaphs, building-inscriptions and Christian invocations form a large majority; all are in Greek only, with the exception of three Latin texts, eight Greco-Latin or Greco-Syriac bilinguals and one trilingual (No. 310). F. M. Heichelheim’s account of the economics of Roman Syria notices and translates the chief epigraphical sources of our knowledge, such as the documents relating to the sales-monopoly at Baetocaece (OGI 262. 12–25) on p. 229, the billeting-regulations of Phaeacae (OGI 609) on p. 242, the fiscal law of Palmyra (OGI 629) on pp. 250 ff., the Augustan inscription from Rhosus (see below) on pp. 243 ff., and a large number of graffiti from Dura-Europos (SEG vii. 381 ff.), reflecting the commercial activities of that city, on pp. 186 ff., 205 ff. H. Seyrig’s note on the Seleucid kings and the grant of οίκος give frequent references to inscriptions, but quotes in text suffic., R. Mouterde’s essay on the Syrian deity Op examines a relief from Mashtala in Upper Syria inscribed μεγάστων ωπ θεον κτλ. and publishes a cippus recently found at Yammouné, some eight miles N.W. of Ba‘albek, dedicated by its sculptor τω θεοι Ηρακλης ὑπερ της ἡμερας τῆς πνευματικῆς ζωής and published at Krencker and Zschietzschmann’s Römische Tempel in Syrien (cf. JHS lix. 277), and A. Al‘i investigates the chronological system followed in the temple-inscriptions of the Hermon district comprised in this work. Of special importance is a further instalment of H. Seyrig’s ‘Antiquités Syriennes,’ in which he discusses (pp. 296 ff.) the worship of Zeus at Seleucia, adding (p. 301) three inscriptions from Kaboussié and Seleucia attesting the cult of Ζέας Κεραυνός Νικηφόρος, and publishes (pp. 302 ff.) thirty Greek inscriptions from various sites—Tell Arr (N. of Aleppo), Hierapolis-Bambuye, Sakisler, Azaz, Seleucia Pieria, Antioch, and Palmyra—among which are a dedication ΔΙ Βελεά θεοι Αδανδέλα (No. 1), a base from Hierapolis erected κατὰ κέλευσις Απολλόνου τοῦ κυρίου in honour of Hadrian by a λαμπάδασι θεος (No. 2), a bas-relief of A.D. 233–4 dedicated to Hadad (No. 3), an altar of A.D. 114 dedicated ΔΙΑ ΕΠΙΧΟΣ (No. 5), a group of interesting sepulchral inscriptions from Seleucia (No. 6), a building-record of A.D. 524 commemorating the repair of ΔΙ θεοί Μελάντων καὶ ΤΟΥ ΠΕΙΡΗΣ (No. 7), a marble base inscribed ΔΙΑΚΟΧΟΣ ΔΙΑ ΡΕΙΟΥ ΔΙΑΚΟΧΟΣ (No. 15), a cippus from Palmyra set up as a thanksgiving to Zeus ἐπίκοις in A.D. 235–6 (No. 20), an ex-voto ΔΙΑ ΥΠΕΡ ΕΠΙΧΟΣ (No. 21), the record of an endowment for providing λαμπάδια καὶ θεόνομα καὶ θείαμα της θεού ανθρώπου (No. 23), dedications from the temple of Bel at Palmyra (Nos. 24, 27, 28) and honorary inscriptions for Hadrian and for Antonius Pius (Nos. 25, 26).

The famous dossier from Rhosus (cf. JHS lix. 277) is discussed by F. M. Heichelheim (see above), by M. Guarducci with special emphasis on the decree annexed to the first letter (ll. 9 ff.) and the Lex Munatia-Aemilia of 42 B.C., on the basis of which the triumvirs granted to Seleucus and other veterans Roman civitas and immunitas, and by E. Schönbauer, who claims that the inscription brings positive proof of the nature of the legal status of newly enfranchised Hellenes; the Romans allowed to the citizens of Greek πόλεις on becoming Roman cives the option between the two statuses, under the influence of the Greek conception of ἱστοποιατίκη. ‘This measure,’ he concludes, ‘throws afresh the most favourable light on Roman statecraft and explains for us the subsequent evolution by which the Hellenes became the Ρωμαίοι.’

No further inscriptions from Antioch have been published, but attention may be drawn to G. Downey’s papers on the personification of abstract ideas, especially μεγάλοφων, and their representation in the Antioch mosaics of the second to the fifth century A.D. C. L. Woolley’s excavation at Al Mina, Sutidia, near the mouth of the Orontes, has brought to
light. a fragmentary Greek text. L. Robert explains a fragment (RevBibl xxv. 579), found at Aradus (Rouad), of the dedication in late Imperial times of a garden-precinct by τὸ ἡμών Θεόν Κρόνου. F. Mayence reports on the sixth campaign of excavation at Apamea, which laid bare several inscribed mosaics, including those of a synagogue, and P. J. Riis's note on the early Christian basilica at Epaphania (Hama) includes two Christian texts of the late sixth century A.D.

In an article on boundary-stones marking the frontiers of Palmyrene, D. Schlumberger publishes three such stones with Latin inscriptions and also a Greek inscription, sadly defaced, in honour of Trajan, engraved in a tabula ansata on a column at Kheurbet el-Bilaas, on the road from Epaphania to Palmyra; his preliminary report on the excavations of Qasr el-Heir el-Gharbi, on the Damascus—Palmyra road, describes a broken lintel, now at Damascus, bearing three inscriptions in red paint, of which the first records the dedication of a monastery-gate.

Of the Palmyrene fiscal law I have spoken above. J. Sauvaget's article on the Ghassanids and Sergiopolis discusses the acclamatio Νικάς ἡ τοχή Ἀλαμουνδάρου inscribed in the so-called 'church'. M. Dunand's definitive report on the excavations at Byblos includes a large number of amphora-handles and inscribed pithos-fragments, together with seven inscriptions on stone (pp. 18, 27, 39, 53, 57, 58, 98), of which the longest and most interesting is that on a base honouring θείος Ἀπαμέας τῶν θεόν τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ τῆς πόλεως. H. Seyrig publishes a bronze hand in the Beyrouth Museum, bearing a votive inscription, M. Meurdrac describes a Christian grave at Sidon without giving the text of its inscription, and E. Bikerman discusses the oldest Greek inscription hitherto found in Phoenicia, a Sidonian epigram (Kaihel, Epigr. graeca, 932) commemorating Diotimus δικαστήν ἱερεῖα καὶ ἃμερί, which gives us an insight into the progress of Hellenism in a Phoenician metropolis about 200 B.C.

M. I. Rostovtzeff, F. E. Brown and C. B. Welles edit a preliminary report on the excavations at Dura-Europus in 1933-4 and 1934-5, themselves publishing the epigraphical discoveries with the aid of C. C. Torrey and C. Hopkins. Of the 82 inscriptions here published seven are Latin, seven are Palmyrene and three (Nos. 843, 913, 915) Greco-Palmyrene bilinguals; the remainder are Greek, derived from many sources—the Mithraeum (Nos. 845-69), the temple of Adonis (Nos. 870-85), Zeus θεός (No. 886–900), the Gaddé (Nos. 901-13) and Zeus κυρίος (Nos. 914-5), the Necropolis Temple (Nos. 916-8), the painted shields (Nos. 919-26), and a miscellaneous group of graffiti (Nos. 927-33); of the chapters on coins, pendants and papyri (X, XI) I must not here speak, but attention may be called to a few of the most interesting inscriptions—the bilingual dedication of the Mithraeum in A.D. 168 (No. 845), the record of the 'making' of Mithras by a στρατηγὸς τησσοτόν in A.D. 170-1 (No. 846), the dedication for the victory of an Emperor, probably Caracalla, with its curios blend of Greek, Roman and Syrian elements (No. 848), the benedictions of the artist who painted the Late Mithraeum (No. 853), of an ἐρυθρόγραφος (No. 854) and of other members of the Mithraic church (Nos. 855-8), the record of the foundation of a chapel by Epinicus, κήρυκς καὶ Ιερέων τοῦ θεοῦ, and of its restoration and extension in A.D. 116-7, after the departure of the Romans, who had carried off the ancient doors, by his son Alexander, who also erected an οἴκος in 118-9 (Nos. 867-9), the dedication of the temple of Adonis by a group of eight in A.D. 153 (No. 871) and of his altar in 175 (No. 872), the building-inscription of a πέρσαλς καὶ ισλοχύσθεν αὐτῷ Ἄδωνισιν in 181-2 by two Semites, one of whom is δεσμοφύλαξ (No. 875), the dedication of a temple-gateway in A.D. 114 (No. 886) by a
Seleucus, who in 120–1 ἀνήγειρεν Διὸ θεοὶ τοῦ ναόν καὶ τὰ δυρώματα καὶ τὴν τῶν ἐκόνων γι[ρ]αφὴν πάσον (No. 888), a painted dedication θεοὶ ἱεράλεγον on an altar (No. 901), inscriptions of A.D. 28–9 and 31 in the temple of Zeus κύριος (Nos. 914–5), and a long but seriously mutilated thanksgiving and dedication of A.D. 173 (No. 918). Du Mesnil du Buisson, editing a Jewish liturgical parchment from Dura, discusses 547 a group of graffiti on a lintel, perhaps of a cook-shop, found near the synagogue, one of which is dated A.D. 240–1. To P. Roussel we owe the first edition 548 of a remarkable monument of Hierapolis-Bambye (Membidj), now in the Damascus Museum, bearing the upper parts of four inscriptions, two of them metrical, commemorating Justinian’s perpetual peace, concluded in A.D. 532, μεταξύ Ἑρωδίου καὶ Περσῶν.

Of the inscriptions of Gerasa, collected and edited by C. B. Welles (cf. JHS lxx. 279), J. and L. Robert give a useful résumé, 549 and L. Robert corrects and interprets 550 the dedication of a statue of Justice (SEG viii. 847), two fragments relative to athletic contests at Gerasa (ibid. 899, 900) and the decree of the Dionysiaca πρεσβύτης T. Flavius Gerrhemenius (ibid. 825), giving to the much discussed term θεσπρέπει in l. 18 the sense 'jouer au théâtre.' W. F. Stinespring uses 551 the inscription of the Triumphal Arch at Gerasa (Welles, No. 58) to settle the chronology of Hadrian’s visit to Palestine and to show that he visited Jerash between December 10, 129 and autumn, 130. L. H. Vincent devotes an article 552 to the θεοὶ ἄγιοι Παρενήχων of two Gerasene texts (Welles, Nos. 17, 18), examining the philology of the name and the religious concept it expresses in the Arabian pantheon, emphasising the Nabatean character of the god and concluding that Paqeidas and Hera are the equivalents of Zeus Helios and Hera Ourania.

C. C. McCown has found 553 at Marwa, near Irbid, in Transjordania a painted tomb bearing an epigram, now largely defaced, R. de Vaux edits 554 four short epitaphs and a fragment of inscribed mosaic from Má’in, and F. M. Abel 555 an epitaph of the sixth or seventh century from Dat Ras.

A. Alt comments 556 on inscriptions in the Palestinian section of SEG viii. M. Schwabe edits, 557 in Hebrew, a Greco-Jewish epigram found at Beth She’arim, J. and L. Robert discuss 558 the leaden desflesions from Scythopolis (Beisan) published by Youtie and Bonner (cf. JHS lxx. 280), and E. Loukianoff’s monograph on the basilica of Eleon on the Mount of Olives in Constantine’s time describes 559 three mosaic texts of the fifth and sixth centuries A.D., one the epitaph of a πρεσβύτερος καὶ ἡγούμενος at Jericho and two commemorative texts from the Mount of Olives. N. Glueck’s explorations in Moab and Edom led to the discovery 560 of a Greek inscription of the sixth or seventh century from Kh. Khäldeh, N.E. of the head of the Gulf of Aqaba, and G. E. Kirk’s analysis 561 of the formulae appearing on early Christian graves in S. Palestine calls attention to the striking divergence in the usage of neighbouring towns, due to the varying elements in their population or to different cultural influences affecting them.

X. Africa.

The section of my survey which relates to Egypt and Nubia appears in the Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, xxvii. 153 ff.

Vol. IX of the Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum is devoted to the inscriptions of North Africa, with the exception of those from Egypt and Nubia already collected in Vol. VIII, and to those of uncertain provenance. Unfortunately, the war has retarded the issue of the
second fascicule, but the first was published in May, 1939, and contained 712 items, all of them from Cyrenaica: of these, Cyrene claims 342, Ptolemais (Tolmeta) 58, and Teuchirara-Arsinoe (Toeca) 303. In this collection the inscriptions of greatest general interest are a group of important political (Nos. 1-9) and religious (No. 72) documents from Cyrene and the constittutio of Anastasius from Ptolemais (No. 356). No further inscriptions from this district have appeared, but marked progress has been made with the restoration and interpretation of some well-known texts. L. Robert has improved in a number of points the text of the decree honouring Barcaeus, priest of Augustus (No. 4); a Cyrenian decree, to which are appended a letter and a rescript of 'King Ptolemy and Queen Cleopatra' (No. 5), has been re-examined by W. Otto, who regards Oliverio's assignment of the dossier to 108 B.C., in the reign of Ptolemy X Soter II, as assured, and by P. Roussel, who, in view of the relations existing between Egypt and Cyrene towards the close of the second century B.C., challenges Oliverio's view and maintains that column II certainly, and column I in all probability, date from the reign of Ptolemy VI Philometer; he further discusses an inscription (No. 62) erected at Cyrene in honour of Ptolemy X Soter II by Stolus ὀ ἄρχεστρος καὶ ἐπι τῶν ἡμῶν. E. Volterra has dealt with the Testament of Ptolemy the Younger (No. 7) in connexion with his historical and juristic study of the will of Ptolemy Alexander II of Egypt. F. de Visscher examines the system of liturgies applied to newly enfranchised Roman citizens under the terms of the third of the Augustan edicts found at Cyrene (No. 8, II. 55-62), which throws light on the relations of provincials in the Greek provinces of the Empire to the cities of their origin after having been admitted to the Roman civitas; A. Wilhelm interprets the Cyrenian epigram (No. 63) of A.D. 2 praising the priest Pausanias for his services in the Marmaric War, and proposes to read Καίρους instead of καιρόθε in its last line, and M. P. Charlesworth includes among his documentary sources for Nero's reign the bilingual record of Nero's restoration to the Roman people of lands occupied by private citizens (No. 352).

A metrical epitaph from Lambaesis commemorating a military doctor from Nicomedia is interpreted by L. Robert, and F. Icard edits a further series of seals and leaden bullae from Carthage, nineteen of which bear Greek legends.

Oriel College, Oxford.

---

562 Leyden, 1938 (sic).
563 RevPhil xii. 196 ff.
564 SBMünchen, 1939, 3. 16 ff.; cf. CIW. xxxii. 279 ff.
565 REA xlii. 5 ff.; cf. AJA xliii. 436 f., REG lii. 535.
566 Ibid. 15 f.
567 Bull. Inst. Ég. xxi. 105 ff.
568 CRInsr 1939, 111 ff.
570 Op. cit. (see note 36), 34.
571 RevPhil xiii. 166 ff.
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The Alleged Fortifications of Cnosus.—The belief that Minoan Crete relied on ships for defence is supported by the obvious absence of fortifications at almost all known sites. There are, however, a few works of early date (Middle Minoan) which have been classed as defensive. One of them is a 'Cyclopean' wall round the top of Mt. Juktas,1 which seems to have formed a religious enclosure around the tomb of Zeus; it cannot be a fortification because it runs for a third of its course beside a 2000-foot precipice, where it is built just as strongly as elsewhere, and it never actually meets the cliff. The other remains are at Cnosus, and it is the contention of this paper that their military aspect has been overstated.

Stretches of wall at various points around the palace give the impression that it was in MM I times enclosed by a boundary wall. Its thickness—slightly over one metre—proves that it cannot have been a normal entrance with wall-walk and parapet. In places, however, it forms the edge of a terrace, where it might be considered defensive but for the fact that the ramp, which gave access to it from without, approaches it just left of a corner, so that fire from the terrace would be restricted to one side of an attacking force, and that the side on which shields were worn.

It remains to consider a succession of buildings by the North Entrance, which faced the sea and the greatest potential dangers. The oldest was apparently an isolated block, stretching between the North and Central Courts, and dates soon after the beginning of the MM I period, perhaps to the 20th century B.C. (Fig. 1).2 It was demoli

---

1 Evans, Palace of Minos, i, p. 156, fig. 113 a, b. A fuller publication would be useful.

2 Ibid. iv, p. 49, figs. 30, 34.

3 Ibid. i, p. 196, figs. 106, 101; cf. p. 450, and iii, p. 6. An early plan (BSA, ix, 1902-3, fig. 11) gives the dimensions of Pits I-IV but not of V and VI, which are shown in different positions and of different shapes from the final plan. The dimensions given for the first pits discovered are discrepant from the original reports (previous vol.

Fig. 1.—Plan of 'Keep', Cnosus.

A schematic plan of the M.M.I palace (Pendlebury, Archaeology of Crete, fig. 19) is useful, though conjectural.

Their prototype at Langeais—begun in 994, the oldest known defensive tower of the Middle Ages—has a thickness, however, of only 35 ft. It is the only survivor of at least 22 forts built by the same Count of Anjou for the King of England in constant struggle, and may be dismissed as a garrison post rather than a castle (E. S. Armitage, Early Norman Castles, p. 353).

The foundations (ignoring a slight batter, omitted in the accompanying plan) measure about 13 x 12.5 m. Evans says 15 x 20, by some slip (op. cit. i, p. 138).
of that view may be deduced from the fact that they are deep enough—just deep enough, to judge by imperfect data—to penetrate the older deposits through which they are sunk. For the foundations, in which the pits form gaps, go through a slope consisting of Neolithic and (in a lesser extent) Early Bronze Age strata, mostly resulting from the decay of mud-brick houses, and rest upon a bed of red potter's clay. If the pits were really cisterns, the exceptional depth is no longer a mystery, because its object would be to prevent seepage in the loose Neolithic deposit and get an imperious wall of black blocks; in the usual oriental manner, most have few, if any, windows, and those often set high above ground, but some had light-wells, to judge by the latticework of the type which has always been used in Egypt to cover the air-shafts which there correspond to light-wells. In passing, it may be said that Evans took these models to represent a fortified town and distinguished some of them as towers of the city wall. These include one with a large window on the ground-floor, another with a large window level with the top of the door, another with a row of four doors occupying the entire facade—none of which can represent truly defensive buildings. Certain models without doors, which he interpreted as house-backs facing the city wall, might equally depict portions of a rambling building like the palaces of Crete.

He has also claimed that the North Entrance at Cnossus always showed a tendency towards fortifications. The sketch (Fig. 2) shows the most defensive-looking scheme, a late extension before the old Entrance Passage. It is clear that a slightly older 'tower', formed by the pylon-like gateway, lies too far back to help in defending the approach, while its counterpart beyond the gateway is blanketed on the north by a salient too short and narrow to have been designed as a serious flanking work. The whole entrance seems to be meant only to impress, like the monumental gateways of modern buildings that fulfil the same functions of palace or government offices. I believe that the previous forms of this entrance, when it comprised a passage between terraces bearing porticoes, likewise had only an incidental military value. To sum up, there may have been Minoan fortifications but no one has yet recorded any.

A. W. LAWRENCE
NOTICES OF BOOKS


This handsome volume is the first of a three-volume history of Cyprus, and it contains the story from the earliest times to the English conquest by Richard Coeur-de-lion. It contains some excellent illustrations, three good maps, an index and copious and elaborate footnotes. The special difficulties attending such a work have been clearly seen by the author himself: Cyprus has really had no continuous history of its own, but has lain always on the fringes of greater Powers; a certain discontinuity in treating of its history can therefore hardly be avoided. Each chapter must for this reason be regarded separately, and the author has made each of them extremely interesting. Many details, evidence of the writer's care and learning, have been consigned to the notes: the text is in this way readable as well as authoritative.

The book begins with a chapter on the land, and then goes on to the Bronze Age. The author's eminence as an archaeologist is a sure guarantee for the excellence of all this part of the work. In spite of the great amount that has been written about Cyprus, this is the first attempt at its complete history on any considerable scale, and is therefore to be very warmly welcomed. It should certainly be put into modern Greek, and made accessible to the Cypriots, who have always a strong interest in the history of their island. The next volume, which will begin with the Lusignan period, when Cyprus had a history really of its own, will be eagerly looked for.

The appearance of the book is worthy of the press which has issued it and of the scholarship which has gone into its writing.

R. M. D.


These are the first two annual volumes of the Journal of a young society—the Society of Cyprian Studies—to which we wish to give a hearty welcome. There is an editorial board of four scholars, well known for their interest in the various periods of Cypriot culture—A. Amiandies, P. Dikaios, A. Indoulos and K. Spiridakis. We can say no more here than indicate some of the articles, without derogation from the value of others which lack of space compels us to omit. (Readers of the JHB will probably be most interested in the contributions of Dikaios on Neolithic civilisation in Cyprus, of Spiridakis on the ancient constitution of Idalion and on the Kourio Kelliai, and of Sotiriou on that very puzzling Byzantine church of St. Barnabas and the Tomb of the Apostle near Salamis. Amiandies has a useful account of the privileges and capitulations accorded to foreigners from Byzantine to modern times, and what we judge to be a more important study of the laws affecting mixed marriages. Korallia Louzisidou defends—not very successfully, we think—the traditional association of Saint Hilarion I with the mountain sanctuary of that name in the Kerynia range. Lastly we may mention two articles by Indoulos, of which the first gives the text of two pages of a MS, in the Marchioness of Lodore's collection, and the second, the Chronicle of George Bustron down to 1580. In his conclusion the editor gives chronological lists of the various visitations of nature—locusts, drought, plague and earthquake—from which the island has suffered. Incidentally he criticises the translation previously published by Loizos Philippou of a passage from the diary of the secretary who accompanied Lala Mustafa on his expedition against Cyprus in 1570. But, as a 'Byzantine scholar' who has examined the text of the original makes clear to us, Philippou's translation is correct, only he has

tually corrected a misprint of 16 for 26 Mukhram. The translation given by Indoulos, when confronted with the facts, makes nonsense. The second article is a useful account of the Dragomans of Cyprus under Turkish rule. Those who are interested in icons will be glad to find here something like a correct account of one of the latest specimens of that art, with the portraits of Hadji Joseph and his wife Anna, which has been the victim of much misinterpretation by the writers, Peristianes, Jefery and Talbot Rice, who have hitherto dealt with it. Its date Indoulos reads as 1776. We have mentioned enough to show the varied and interesting nature of the contents of these two volumes, which justify the hope that the Society may resume its activities before long. It may not be improper to say here that the annual subscription was fixed at 10/6.

G. H.


In the compass of little more than two hundred pages Professor Roussel traces the course of Spartan history from its dawn to its decline, adding a glimpse of the afterglow in the city's revived prosperity under the Roman Empire. Not altogether an easy task, even for a so well qualified as is the author, but it has been performed with striking success. In fact it would be difficult to imagine a better brief survey of the Spartan achievement; and readers, however much, or little, they knew of the subject beforehand, will appreciate in particular the vigour and brevity of the narrative, the avoidance of controversial minutiae and the refusal to draw parallels for or from modern systems of government.

Familiar difficulties such as the Lycurgus question, the origins of the Ephorai and the reasons for the decline of Sparta in the early fourth century, are treated with commendable clarity and restraint. The geographical background and the artistic achievement are given due emphasis, and the well-chosen illustrations include many delightful views of Laconian and Messenian landscape, and some typical products of archaic Laconian art. The reviewer will not, perhaps, be the only reader to wonder why the scene on the Ancestral vase is described as the weighing and shipment of wool. When circumstances permit this little volume to be readily available in this country, its merits will, we feel sure, be rapidly and widely appreciated.

A. M. W.


It is strange that during the thirty years that have now elapsed since the late Dr. E. M. Walker published his lectures on the Oxyrhynchus Historian, and Professor F. E. Adcock contributed to Klio his article on the Solonian chapters of the Attic, Pad., practically nothing has appeared in English from either side of the Atlantic concerning the Fragments of the Greek Historians. Mr. G. L. Barber's study of Ephorus (1935) was a welcome exception. Rather than seek reasons for this phenomenon, let us note with approval that a young Yale graduate, Professor L. Pearson, has stepped boldly and successfully into the breach, and has followed up his recent monograph on the Ionian Historians with a comprehensive study of the local Historians of Attica. This undertaking is to be welcomed for two reasons in particular: the author collects and draws attention to the many new fragments of Attic Historians brought to light or identified, since the publication of the F.H.G. by the brothers Muller in 1841-70 (Didot), but not yet included in Jacoby's F.H.G.; and he re-examines the validity of the view that the development and continuity of the 'Athid ' tradition is to be regarded as an established fact of literary history.
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These two objectives are successfully attained: the historical Attica is rescued from Hellenicus down to Philochorus and Ister, in six chapters, to each of which is appended a bibliography which will be of real service to the studious; and a final chapter deals with the Athid-tradition in the light of the sources. The work is a timely reminder of the uneven, and often slender, nature of the evidence for the historical methods of many of these writers, and points cut that whereas there is no real evidence to support the view (put forward by Whitley) that there was a lost Attica, later than that of Hellenicus, which established a fixed and semi-authoritative version of Athenian political history for the later ‘Athidographers,’ there was, on the whole, a continuous literary tradition that historians kept alive to some degree of progress and development. Their characteristic interest in religious matters he traces back to Hellenicus.

Among many other topics profitably discussed, which can only be briefly noticed here, are the importance of Thucydides in keeping alive the traditions of local Attic history, and the presumable identity of Androtion the historian with the opponent of Demosthenes; and the author’s reconstruction of the personality of Philochorus and of his contribution to Attic history is a particularly convincing and helpful piece of work. Here is, in fact, a well-planned and pleasantly written work of solid learning, which gives a significant contribution to this field of research and interpretation. Three misprints which I have noticed will not seriously mislead his many readers (p. 26, note 90, ‘G. F. Hicks 41’ should be ‘Hicks-Hill 53’; p. 86, med., goes for dictionary reference to an article by De Sanctis on the Ath Pali.; p. 125, l. 1, 424-5 should of course be 424-3).

A. M. W.


Confronted by the statement in the ‘Foreword’ that ‘this is essentially a book for specialists,’ a reviewer who can make no claim to that title is at a grave disadvantage. He can, however, assert with some confidence that any student at all interested in the intricate problems of the chronology of Hellenistic Athens will be well on the way to qualifying as a ‘specialist’ when he has mastered the contents of this volume. Such a student will probably be aware that in the twelve years that have now elapsed since the publication of the monumental work on the Athenian Archons, the American excavations of the Agora at Athens have yielded an astonishingly rich harvest of inscriptions of the Hellenistic period; and that these texts, as interpreted by such men as Dow, Ferguson, Meritt, Pritchett, Soldier, and others, have enabled many gaps to be filled in our knowledge of the lists of Archons and Secretaries, as well as of the actual details of the Athenian calendar. He may even have been able to consult Damien’s recent work The Athenian Archon List in the Light of Recent Discoveries (1939; cf. the review in JHS lxi. 41).

The present work deals with many aspects of the problems, paying special attention to the evidence to be obtained for the working of the tribal cycles by a re-examination of the inventories of the sanctuary of Asklepios (IG II° 1532–39), and establishes beyond doubt that for the priests of Asklepios ‘the controlling cycles were not those of the priests themselves, but rather in every instance those of the Secretaries of the Council’ (p. 37); this control is also established for the inventory of the Chalkothike (IG II° 120) now known to belong to 533-2 B.C., a year which is shown to have nothing to do with the beginning or end of a tribal cycle of the Secretaries of the Treasurers of Athena. The tribal cycles of the last-named officials in the fourth century are again discussed (pp. 37-42), with conclusions that for the most part support Ferguson’s arrangement, ranging from 401-0 B.C., a reversed broken midway through the second cycle in 386-7, to three cycles in ‘allotted’ order (for which the evidence is still, admittedly, very scanty), followed by a return to forward rotation, decided on in 356-5, the first year of the fifth Metonic cycle, and instituted in the following year with the tribes next in official order to those that happened to be in office in 356-5. It is certainly significant that this change proves to be equally valid for the Secretaries of the Council and the Priests of Asklepios. The other contributions of outstanding value for fourth-century chronology is the discussion (ch. I) of the cycles of 307-6 B.C., when the ‘democratic’ form for the preamble to decrees was restored. After a careful reconsideration of all the existing documents this conclusion is reached that whilst the year began as ‘ordinary’ with a twelve-fold Ptolemaic division, it was decided, during Gannaelon, to add an extra month, making the year intercalary, and the extra thirty days were divided among the last six Ptolemies. The new tribes Antigonis and Demetrias were ready to function by the middle of the year, and were inserted as Ptolemaic VII and VIII.

A brief glance at the discussion of the many disputed dates for third-century Archons in the light of new documents or improved readings shows that Polybenos (6 μηδι παλαι παγχρι) is not after all allowed to rest in the haven of 243-2 (cf. Hep. VII. 186 f.), but returns to 249-8, as fixed by Dimnien (in 1931), Kydmenor moving in to the vacated year; that the long-debated demotic of the Secretary of Dimelos’s year (now 247/6) is now authorized (M. Encyrisis [111]; (the author believes in the Δ propounded by other authorities, but believes that a tendency to crowding of the letters justifies the restoration of a ten-letter demotic in the ten spaces). Another interesting break is in 267-5 (which will no doubt win Dr. Tarm’s approval). For the still mysterious break in the cycles in 247, which the author (p. v) consider ‘an established fact,’ having no good reason to offer, they have refrained from giving any... being confident that further study will find the answer.’

These, and many other newly established dates both in the third and second centuries, are all set out in Table (pp. 60-xxxv), which gives the lists of Archons, Secretaries, and (as far as possible) Priests of Asklepios from 307-6 to 101-0 B.C., accompanied by the essential literary and epigraphic references.

It is needless to illustrate further the far-reaching importance of this book, which displays all the lucidity of exposition and precise documentation that we expect from Professor Meritt and his collaborators. Above all, it commends itself by its integrity of method, for the reader never feels that evidence is being used to fit in with a preconceived conclusion, and difficulties are frankly faced and allowed their full weight. It is admirably indexed and printed (one misprint occurs on p. 19, [ιμαονεβς]), and is a pleasure to handle.

A. M. W.


Professor Meritt has here reprinted, with the addition of notes and illustrations, four lectures delivered at Oberlin College, Ohio, in 1939. His main purpose, which is achieved with his customary lucidity of presentation and an apt choice of examples, all taken (as his title implies) from Attic documents, is to demonstrate how the well-recognized ‘architectural’ epigraphy, i.e., the treatment of inscriptions as three-dimensional monuments, whether or not they are engraved on more than one face of the stone; in the third he provides a well-balanced discussion of the question of recognising the hand of the same stone-cutter in different inscriptions; and in his final chapter he handles the more con-
traversial topic of the extent to which conjectural restoration is justified by filling lacunae with fragmentary texts. Here he stands forward boldly in favour of the general principle that the subject to the necessary limitations imposed by the nature of the contents and the architectural requirements of the stone. He effectively reminds us that epigraphy is an essentially conjectural and, on occasions, a little Zincone. For Zincone the conjecture [Keroprós] w[ Equivalent in Amasis] (ibid., col. II) is vigorous (to say the least) and unanswerable. No less forceful are his criticisms of 'corrections' of ethnics lately proposed by others. And his reminder that in such studies 'la critique paléographique ne peut ici réussir que si elle est maniée par qui s'intéresse à l'histoire et à la géographie, with which few would be found to disagree.

In the same chapter is a full exposition of the evidence for locating the site of Col, Julia Paralai at Barla, on the w. bank of Lake Egerdir (cf. his Villas d'Asie Mineure, p. 98.), as was originally suggested by Arundell in 1834, but always rejected by Ramsay. This may be commended as a model of constructive reasoning; the final proof being supplied by the discovery at Barla (in 1914, cf. Annuario Scuola Arch. Atene, iii. 1921) of an inscription including the phrase έν τοις ἐνδιοτά (p. 209), for this mention of domniz proves that here was in fact a Roman colony, which, by a process of exclusion, can only have been Paralai.

Ch. VI (pp. 247–50). Tod, p. 260) discusses the fragmentation of a title relating to Coronea, which is not only contemporaneous with the well-known l.c. of 170 B.C. for Thermus (Atis), but must presumably be the actual decree referred to by Livy (xlvi. 3), which wrongly dates it to 171 B.C.

To Ch. VII (pp. 260–316; Tod, p. 223 f.) demands rather fuller treatment, for it comprises the most noteworthy of all the new documents in the volume, namely, the two steles from Acharnai, of which the first, adorned above with a relief, but incomplete below, is a decree of the local deme which relates to the erection of altars to Ares and Athena Areia. The second, engraved by order of a priest of those deities, contains the full text of the ephibic oath, for which lithero we have had to rely on versions, which, though sometimes, preserved by Stobaeus and Pollux. The new copy, agreeing on the whole more closely with the former, supports the reading παύλα δι καὶ διὸς as against the corrupt phrase in Pollux. παύλα δι καὶ λύμος, which has led to some reckless and improbable conjectures. This oath is followed by the text of the apocryphal oath taken by the Athenians before the battle of Platea: it proves to include certain phrases not given in either of the two known versions quoted by Lycurgus (e. locutrum) and Diodorus, which are apparently derived from a common original. Both steai belong to the fourth century B.C., and, to judge by the script, are rather later than 350 B.C., though the editor does not suggest an exact date. He suggests, however, that the engraving of these oaths was inspired, directly or indirectly, by Lycurgus, which would be fully in accord with what is known of that statesman's patriotic sentiments and antiquarian piety.

It is hardly necessary to add that this rich harvest of learning is presented with the author's customary lucidity, and reveals on every page his profound and perhaps unrivalled acquaintance with epigraphical material and cognate literature. The book is admirably produced, and serves a special word of gratitude for the indices and the photographs.

It is hardly surprising that a careful reading reveals occasional traces of haste, notably in the inaccurate spelling of English words quoted in the footnotes. On pp. 155–68 I have noted four instances; on pp. 242–67 eight more. Nor has the author's extremely high standard of accuracy been quite consistently maintained in his transcription of the fragments of the Mytrophous inscriptions from Chios (Ch. II), for a study of the photographs necessitates a few minor corrections: p. 129, A. L. 19 opaque for opaque; p. 130, B. L. 1, 2; τάξι̣ς for τὰς στάδια; p. 131, C. 3, δαγγύλος for δαγγύλλος; L. 1, 2, δαγγύλοι for δαγγύλων; L. 1, 2, δαγγύλοι for δαγγύλων; L. 1, 2, surely σταὶ [1865]; p. 132, A. L. 2, the sixth letter is clearly M not N, enabling us to restore [Κατάστασις Μησοβού πατρίδι τοις ευγέλεις . . . ].

1 Some of the readings here corrected represent readings of the original publications, which, however, L. R. has not commented on.
Finally, it may be noted, with genuine surprise and regret, that the author is less fully acquainted than might have been expected with Spartan inscriptions of the Imperial period, whether published in *IG V* i. or in the *Annual* of the British School. Thus, in an invaluable collection of the evidence for eponymous offices held by Kings and Emperors in antiquity to the tenure of the Spartan at Sparta by Hadrian (p. 145) include only the three examples contained in *IG V* i.; but subsequent discoveries reported in *BSA* xxvi. and xxix. have shown that the second of his references is based on a spurious reading and must be discarded, whereas a fresh example (xxvi. p. 170, 1, D 3) is to be added. Again, *IG V* i. 37 might well have been cited as another example of an embassy being sent to Aelius Caesar in Pamphonia; in an interesting discussion of the name Στρόφας (p. 181f.), a Spartan example might have been quoted (restored, with great probability for Μοροπες, *BSA* xxvi. p. 64.; A 4, by Wilhelm); and the list of instances of the word *προφανή* should certainly have included the small altar to Zeus Hypsistos, in which this word occurs in the plural (*BSA* xxvi. 223 ff.). The willing nature of these criticisms and omissions only emphasises the more clearly the profound erudition of Robert’s book.

A M. W.

**Abbreviations in Greek Inscriptions: The Near East, 200 B.C.—A.D. 600**


Mr. Avi-Yonah has long been familiar to all who are interested in Palestinian archaeology, chiefly, though by no means solely, for his *Mosaic Pavements in Palestine*, and he has now increased our indebtedness to him by giving us what is inestimably the best available account of the use of abbreviations in Greek inscriptions, superseding the very imperfect lists drawn up by Franz, Reinach and Larfeld. Geographically the field of his inquiry comprises North Africa, Western Asia, the Near East, Russia and the Balkan Peninsula (except Macedonia, Greece and the Greek islands), chronologically it extends from 500 B.C. to A.D. 1100; but both in space and in time it by no means rigidly observes these boundaries.

After a brief preface (pp. 1-4) explaining the purpose, arrangement and limitations of the present study and a list (pp. 5-6) of abbreviations used to indicate the books and periodicals examined, the author gives a long and elaborate introduction (pp. 9-44), in which he discusses (1) the definition and characteristics of Greek epigraphical abbreviations, their subject-matter and their historical development, (2) the methods of abbreviation, (3) the suspension of abbreviation (the omission of one or more letters from the interior of a word, as in ‘Bart.’ or ‘Mr.’) and the vexed question of the relation of contraction in general to that of the *nomina sacra*, (4) abbreviation marks and their chronological sequence, the doubling of the last letter to denote a plural and the use of alphabetic numerals to denote words or phrases. The main section of the work (pp. 45-125) consists of (a) an alphabetical catalogue of 4,699 abbreviations of both types, with references and, where possible, dates, (b) a list of sigla, (c) addenda, derived mainly from periodicals published between 1871 and 1946, and (d) a table of abbreviations arranged in the chronological order of their first appearances.

Mr. Avi-Yonah has fulfilled his exacting task with an industry and thoroughness deserving of the highest praise and has spared himself the trouble in pursuance of his twofold aim: ‘to help the student and the epigraphist.’ Every page of the book attests his unflagging diligence, his attention to detail and his keen interest in every aspect of the subject. True, it would not be difficult to question points of interpretation (though the author’s frank statement that ‘the abbreviations and their solutions are given as indicated by the sources, even where

*Sales on the Installment Plan,* 12

*Railway Regulations in a Letter to myself.*
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France to the consummate scholar who began his epigraphical career so auspiciously in 1912 with "Greek Inscriptions of Sardis," helped to found the American Society for Archaeological Research in Asia Minor, laboured valiantly to preserve Anatolian monuments, crowning his achievements as joint editor of S.A.R.A.M.I.VI. This hand-somely printed volume, even those who are not partial to nêlanges will agree, is an offering worthy of the great scholar, humanist and friend it honours.

J. M. R. CORMACK


On the whole, the Delphic Oracle has had rather a bad press in this country. Most British historians have favoured the democratic side, and Delphus has, rightly or wrongly, been taken for an opponent of freedom; it supported Socrates, it was wholeheartedly on the Spartan side in 431, and it was an ally of Philip of Macedon. The ambiguity of its replies was a stock joke in antiquity; they seem to have been taken more seriously in modern times, and the occasional comparison of Delphi with the Vatican was not meant to be a compliment to either institution. The anti-Delphic view has been upheld most recently by Professor Thayer, Professor Farrington; occasionally it has been said on the other side that Delphi took up a humane attitude on questions of slavery and the treatment of subject races, but there have been few lengthy studies of the oracle for its own sake; in Dr. Parke's bibliography, the number of articles on Delphi are very much in a minority, and of them many are articles.

In the four hundred pages of the present work, Dr. Parke deals with the history of the oracle in a novel and interesting way. His is a new book, a new approach, and it is a work which will give an interest and endure. The editor has made a thorough study of the oracle, its history, its development, its place in the history of Greece. He has given us a history of the oracle, a history of the times in which it lived, and a history of the people who used it.


This book is the first of a new series. The American Committee for Lectures on the History of Religions having handed over its functions to the American Council of Learned Societies, the latter is carrying on the good work begun in 1896 by the Revs. Davies' lectures on Buddhism. A better choice for the first volume of the new series could hardly have been made. Works on Greek mythology, philosophy, state cults and higher religious developments are numerous and, many of them, good; it has not been so easy to get information, access to a non-specialist, and a non-specialist had no mandate problem of what the average decent Greek, who was neither priest, poet, philosopher nor prophet, thought and did about his gods. One reason is that surviving literature does not tell us very much about the subject and reluctance to return, including that of modern Greece. An anthropologist, therefore, who is also well seen in philology, in sympathy with the "philological anthropology" of recent years, but not with its more hazardous theories, and, not the least important point, possessed of a hereditary understanding of the countryside and its ways, was the obvious person to supply and interpret the facts in a book which, without being full of minute details, is never for a moment unscholarly.

Briefly, its seven chapters start with the preasymtly of early Greece and their practices and half-articulate beliefs; go on to tell the highest development of the ancient cult of rustic deities, the Eleusinian Mysteries; explain the importance of family worship and the mystery cults by the transference of gods and their adorers to cities and great assemblies such as the Games; give a fair account, significant over- or under-emphasising, of the part played by superstition, some of it coarse, enough; and end the book, being the phenomena of a religion becoming more and more individualistic, such as belief in Hellen, the emphasis on signs and oracles and the tendency to choose one's own
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gods instead of accepting those to which, as the author puts it (p. 19), one was born.

Many very good points are made; good especially, because they stress things not at once obvious to a learner, or indeed to some who are well past the elementary stages of the country of those 23 years ago. They make one wonder how all the words on the calendar which put it in its proper place in the history of religion. On p. 90, the increasing remoteness of the great city-gods is rightly given as a reason for the importance of getting a calendar. On p. 116 and elsewhere, survivals are dealt with moderately and with good critical sense. The last chapter explains in a most satisfactory way the position of seers and diviners as champions of orthodoxy, if so it may be called, against social attacks. The learned apparatus of the book is light and its length very moderate. Hence several things which are doubtfully have to be left without full discussion, as pre-deistic rites (p. 28 sq.), the author's as against Deubner's views of the Choses (p. 34), the importance of Orphism, in several passages, and the question (p. 119) whether Hell is really a Greek invention. The reviewer thinks he has found one or two minute errors, not worth listing, and the generally well-produced book suffers slightly from some of the illustrations being on too small a scale to be clear. These are trifles.

H. J. R.


Dr. Person's account of prehistoric Greek religion is based upon precise observation of his archaeological material and general inference from cults in the nearer "Median" countries. There is also a chapter on its survivals in classical Greek religion and another on comparisons with that of the Nordic Bronze Age. His archaeological evidence consists mainly of twenty-eight engraved signet-rings from Crete and the Greek Mainland, rather more than have hitherto been counted among religious documents; their subjects are excellently reproduced in enlarged photographs and are very fully, ingeniously and plausibly described. A twenty-ninth illustration shows the elaborate design of the "Ring of Nestor" and those of the "Thise Treasures" are more discreetly passed over. Dr. Person's conclusion is that Minoan-Myce-

E. J. F.


This is a book that is much needed even for the Egyptologist. Although most of the details are well known individually, their cumulative effect is a surprising and altogether welcome revelation, and will probably be a still greater surprise to the classical scholar, in spite of the commonplace that the Greeks were indebted to the wisdom of the Egyptians for much of their own knowledge, and that such men as Thales, Pythagoras, and Herodotus had been to Egypt. Plato had sat at the feet of the Egyptian priests.

One cannot but regret that the opening chapter of so valuable a book should be one so crammed with conjecture and assumption, instead of dealing only with matters on which we have definite evidence. This is not the place in which to enter on controversy, but suffice it to point out that the Samian festival of ancient Britain is here supposed to have originated in Egypt, and to have been brought by mariners from Knossos! Yet is it well known that no material evidence has ever been found of the presence in Britain of any craft which used to be called "Phoenixian," and are here supposed to be Knossians.

But let us leave the realms of phantasy for those of ascertained fact, which are so well represented in the book under review.

Egypt's outstanding legacy to the world is of course the calendar, originally of 365 days and finally corrected to 365 1/4 days. It was its later form that was brought to Rome in the time of Julius Caesar on the advice of an Alexandrian scientist. It is still in use to-day in the Church as the calendar of saints' days, having survived for this purpose the slight correction which Augustus made in it, and the greater correction of Pope Gregory IX in 1300. The calendar and the continuous history of Egypt have left to the modern student is that he has been provided with the framework into which to fit the history and sequences of the More Ancient East. This is something not to be found elsewhere.

Egypt exported not only much knowledge, but its vehicle as well—in other words, the papyrus on which to write it. Actually it provided the whole of the classical world with its written material right up to the Dark Ages, and the modern world with its words "paper," "Bible." Besides the papyrus on which to write Egypt ultimately provided the world with the alphabet with which to write, for the Phoenician alphabet is derived from the Syro-Cypriot script, which in its turn is a selection of Egyptian hieroglyphs.

In science and medicine the Greeks could never have made the advances they did, if they had not been able to build on the vast groundwork of experience they found in Egypt. Mr. Sloley aptly sums up the situation when he says that we have in that country 'science in the making.' The Egyptians were the first to use, and it was left to the Greek to attempt to systematise it and to discover the underlying laws. Fig. 2 on p. 172 will probably come as a surprise, being as it is a page of problems out of a mathematical papyrus complete with diagrams, in the Euclidean manner. Even if the methods seem cumbrousome to us, they could produce results of astonishing accuracy. Of this the Great Pyramid, dating to about 2500 B.C., is the outstanding example. Mr. Sloley points out with justice that we ourselves are able to work accurately and without undue inconvenience in tons, hundredweights, quarters, and pounds, and in other complicated media. Water-clocks, the cleophrades of the Greeks, had been in use in Egypt at least 2500 B.C., and some of the names of the dekans survive in Greece.

Not only did the Greeks go to Egypt to study medicine, but the Persian kings sent there for their physicians, and with reason. In Egypt we have by far the earliest medical books, observations on anatomy, experiments in surgery, pharmacy, the use of splints, bandages, compresses, and a very full anatomical and medical vocabulary. Alexandria provided the Greeks with the possibility of systematic dissection of the human body. The form of prescription that had been in use in Egypt for centuries was copied by the Greeks down to the smallest details, and Egyptian influence can be recognised in Greek, Latin, Arabic, Syriac, Persian, and medieval European medical books. Moreover, the popular medicine of Egypt and the Near East largely owes its origin to Egypt. Dioscorides, Galen, Hippocrates, and Pliny ascribe the same virtues and traditions to many drugs as had the Egyptians long before them. Alchemists take it from that of the land of Egypt, and the Egyptian mummies themselves provided Europe with its medicament "mumia." In building we have what are called "proto-Doric" columns of Saqqarah and the temple of Hassan, and the sun-dried bricks. These latter have spread to Spain and thence to

1 Two unfortunate "printers' errors occur in some of the copies, and should be corrected. On p. 169, 6th line from the bottom, 69 should read 89. On p. 168, 1st line, the fraction 4 should read 1/3.
Spanish America, taking the name with them—djehe:e in Pyramid times, tôbhe in Coptic, tihbe in Arabic, adobe in Spanish.

Glass-making originated in Egypt, and Alexandria exported blown glass all over Roman Europe, just as she did papyrus. In the sphere of religion Egypt’s influence on the Hebrews has been surprisingly small. This is the more astonishing in view of the nearness of the two peoples, the Sojourner in Egypt at the beginning of Israel’s history, the close political connections until the end of the Jewish monarchy, and the long-continued practice of Egyptian religion in the Palestinian and Syrian provinces of the Empire. The Egyptian influence is practically only to be found in the forms of Hebrew poetry and in the Wisdom literature, but in both of these it is profound. It was at Alexandria, however, that the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament was made.

The case of the Christian Church is totally different, for here Egypt has left a lasting legacy. Manetho’s chronology seems to have provided the Alexandrian Church with its date for the creation, i.e. 5488. The survival of the old Egyptian calendar as that of the saints’ days of the Church has already been mentioned. Ascription, hence monotheism, spread throughout Christendom from Egypt. The very word ‘cremne, hermit’ comes to us direct from the desert. Alexandria was the home of such great figures of the early Church as Origen, Clement, Hippocrates, Athanasius, and Athanasius. It was also the home of Gnosticism.

The legacy left in the Greek papyri, that to the Byzantine Empire, and that again to our knowledge of Roman architecture, can be too well left to classical scholars to need emphasis here, and Egypt’s immense contributions to Islam and also to daily life in modern Egypt are outside the purview of this review.

G. A. WERNWRIGHT


This volume consists of eight essays by different writers dealing with various aspects of the Greek Tradition from the Hellenistic age to the present day; and it includes, besides more familiar matters, essays on the influence of the classic tradition on American architecture and on the Italian opera. The writers are well versed in their respective subjects and their essays repay study, but the diversity of subject and treatment makes criticism difficult in a short review, and only one or two things can be noted. The first is that all the writers are concerned about architecture and the other arts, and have little to say on the influence of Greece on ideas and institutions. The second point is that though chapters are devoted to France and Germany respectively, there is an unobtrusive neglect of the influence of the Italian Renaissance, and England is seldom mentioned, except for an allusion to the ‘Platonists of England’ in the Preface by the editor. That preface is interesting, and so are the short introductions to the separate essays.


This is one of the rare books which have interest at once for the expert and for the general reader, for Dr. Glover’s ideas are almost as wide and various as his reading. In this volume he deals, besides subjects more strictly classical, with subjects so diverse as Forestry, Farming, Economics, and Athletics; and though he is concerned with them in ancient Greece, he tells us here and there things which may be new and the whole to a modern student of the subject; for Dr. Glover’s learning is always related to life. Similarly the professional school will find here and there either new facts or unexpected aspects of the old, and he will certainly be prompted more than once to say to himself, ‘I must really read so-and-so again’: a very salutary result. He may even be led into fresh fields of reading. And if he is sometimes tempted to disagree, that is equally good for him. The variety of the subjects treated, and the pleasant discomfort of the treatment make it impossible to give a general idea of the ground covered, but it may be added that most of the essays, and especially that entitled ‘Is Ajax a Man or Hero?’ have a bearing on the problems of the present. The Greeks, rightly studied, have always a topical interest.


A review in a classical journal can hardly do justice to this book, because the reviewer has not the opportunity to be a centre of his interest the second partner in the title rather than the first. The book itself, on the other hand, is naturally centred round the modern poet. I hope, however, that I am not unfair in saying that the reaction of a great man to the Greeks is almost as important for the promotion of Hellenic studies as scholarly investigation into Greek originals. The humblest scholar will sometimes feel that he is right, where the great modern poet, perhaps relying on insufficient knowledge, and certainly under the sway of his own genius, is wrong. But even then scholarly accuracy may be less important than creative insight. The genius, though not concerned with the recovery of historical Greece, may nevertheless open doors which lead to the, doors which otherwise would probably be closed for ever.

Few great men of modern times have struggled as hard as Goethe in their attempts to get hold of the Greek spirit. It has been a past matter of controversy among scholars whether, on the whole, the Greek influence on Goethe was salutary or not, i.e. whether his creative power and poetical imagination were richer and greater when he followed only his ‘northern’ soul, or when he tried to shape his poetry, those ‘fragments of one great confession,’ under the deep experience and formative power of his attempt to ‘be a Greek.’ It is a special merit of Mr. Trevelyan’s scholarly and sound book that he does not, with more or less subjective enthusiasm, enter the arena of this fight, though he apparently opposes his hero’s real ‘northerness’ as it appears, e.g., in Professor Butler’s challenging book which bears the significant title The Tyranny of Greece over Germany. Trevelyan gives a detailed and chronological account of the stages through which Goethe went in his relations to the Greeks. The outstanding impression throughout all the many changes is of a peculiar combination of intellectual assimilation of knowledge with deeper perception and inspiration; in fact, poet and scholar were one in Goethe, and not only with regard to the Greeks. He tried again and again, by hard and humble work, to understand; but he was equally, a priori as it were, pete his ideal in the Greek, and had an exceptional longing for the ‘higher reality’ of those Greeks whose spirit he desired to face him in poor casts of Hellenistic sculpture. This latter attitude, of course, he owed to Winckelmann, who had created a new generation from the rococo Greeks, but imposed on them the almost religious ‘form of noble simplicity and quiet greatness.’ The fact that Goethe did not see Rome and Greece truly separated, that he used to speak of the ‘Ancients,’ that he found his Greece in Sicily and declined to go to Athens—all this shows the predominant power of Winckelmann’s ideas.

But Goethe soon outgrew his master, and through a long and amazing process of triumph and defeat, of hope and despair, of humble surrender and proud conquest, of clear insight and strange error, he reached heights and depths far beyond the reach of other human beings. It is impossible even to outline here this process which Mr. Trevelyan describes from the early days when the child eagerly writes his first Greek sentences, through the years when Nature reveals itself to Goethe in the Greeks, up to the stage when in the wedding of Faust and Helen a final synthesis is achieved, and the thought-presentation of Trevelyan’s story of Goethe’s unending spiritual development is sound and seeks to go to the roots. It is also full of interesting detail, of new aspects and of stimulating observations. In stressing his points, Trevelyan is inclined, naturally enough, to simplify. He almost excludes all the other original creative forces in Goethe’s life and nature. To read that in the days of Strassburg and Wetzlar Homer (and not Shakespeare) revealed to Goethe most of man’s nature, is certainly surprising, in spite of Werther’s love for the
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Odyssey. And the nine Greek mythological symbols during the period of Stumm und Drang (even if they include Prometheus and Ganymede) weigh little against the three German figures among whom are Götz and Faust. However, this one-sidedness in Trelvyan’s book, though it sometimes pictures Goethe in a thoroughly un-Greek manner, is, it must be admitted, is controlled by subtle and sober judgement, which in turn is based on a good knowledge of Greek art and poetry.

Who indeed were the Greeks who emerge from Goethe’s unceasing struggles? There is no simple answer to this question. Again and again we are startled by Goethe’s remarks on subjects of Greek art and poetry, revealing his deep insight and true reverence. But his interest never remains concentrated on the object alone. Homer and Sophocles and Phidias—they all become immediately powers in his own life. Starting from the belief that Greek beauty is the highest possible approach to nature itself, Goethe nevertheless was shocked by the reluctance and amoral in Greek tragedy, which to his mind seemed incompatible with the serenity of Greek sculpture. In the Iphigenie he tried to overcome the natural and cruel ‘inhumanity’ of the Greeks by modern (in fact, Christian) morality. But what he found out (Paestum cerasus Paladino!) that great things were not simply beautiful. With his pagan mind he went beyond the limits of mere classicism and entered the land of true tragedy. He touched on and cut into the most typical, but he only touched on it. He kept aloof from those tragic powers which became alive later in Shelley’s poems no less than in Nietzsche’s Dionysian world. The static greatness of the Greeks, even if no longer seen in the serene brightness of Schiller’s Goethe of Greece, was contrasted with the unrest of the northern soul. The Helen scene reveals this even more clearly than the strange features of the Klassische Walpurgismaacht. In the horrible menace of Helen, embalmed beauty, being sacrificed by Helen to her beauty, Goethe pictures full-blooded Greek ‘inhumanity,’ a truly tragic subject. But Helen meets Faust, and her beauty becomes the complement to his desire for creative activity. Faust, in marrying Helen, understands what Goethe had undergone when he came home from Italy. The tragic beauty of Greece as the true perfection of nature gives to modern man what no other revelation of the human spirit can give.

Goethe’s Hellenism is naturally of the German kind, and therefore different from what Greece means to England. But he was so great, and so much of an European, that his struggle for Greece no less than his poetry itself has its meaning and importance beyond national frontiers. It is certain that Stumm and Drang, the son of Faust, has brought out of the empire of tragedy, as a true master of the art of the European classicism, and has given us in his Helen the union of the most typical Greek and the most modern Greek. He has given us in his Helen the union of the most typical Greek and the most modern Greek spirit, and the book is a pleasantly written account which quotes and interprets all the most important passages.

T.B.L.W.


A short review cannot do justice to this book, which needs careful reading and concurrence with the Greek text. It falls into two parts—an exposition of Greek views on ambiguity and a discussion of the poets’ practice from Homer to Euripides. The central thesis is that the seer, after scientific precision of thought and language ambiguity seems a dangerous virus, the security of a mind dissolved; but to the poet and imaginative writer it is a must of the rigid formalism of prose into Protagorean creatures of ever-changing and immoral power. But the chief value of the book lies not in the adequately proven central thesis but in the detailed examples, particularly in the admirable chapter on the Schénaus and figures of Euripides noticed elsewhere in this journal. All those who study Greek poetry and its technique will need this book on their shelves.

I.B.L.W.


This book consists of four lectures on the ancient novel which the author delivered in the University of Sydney, and which he was urged—not surprisingly—to publish. Their aim was to give a general account of the ancient novel, with what reasonably certain there is of its possible origins, of its salient features, of its influence on later prose fiction.

Professor Todd chooses for particular treatment Leucippe and Clitophon, Daphnis and Chloe, the Satyricon, and the Golden Ass; these, he thinks, possibly not the best, of the Greek romances, the second because it is the only ancient pastoral romance, and because of its great influence on the English pastoral, the other two as works of original genius and intrinsic importance.

The treatment is clear, sensitive and unpretentious, and holds the balance nicely between summaries of plots, discussion and criticism. The criticism is sensible and fresh; Professor Todd can point out the defects of the Greek romances temperately, without losing sight of what merits they have, and he is clear and definite about the superiority of Petronius and Apuleius—real novelists as distinct from rhetoricians. It is a short but informative and trustworthy survey for the general reader, all the better that the author keeps an appreciative eye on the Tudor translators.

H.D.F.K.


Aeschylus, Prometheus Bound. Translated by R. C. TRELVYAN. Pp. 48. Cambridge: University Press, 1939. 7s. 6d.

Euripides, Medea. Translated by R. C. TRELVYAN. Pp. 38. Cambridge: University Press, 1939. 7s. 6d.


The first three of these books deal with the Greek Anthology. The late Dr. Way’s volume contains his version of Books V to VII. Dr. Way was probably the most prolific of all translators of the Classics into English, but one cannot help feeling that he lacks the lightness of touch which is required for rendering occasional verse of this kind. Moreover, his long and often rather stuffy phrases are ill adapted to the epigrams. For example, the well-known epigram of Simonides (AP VI, 216) is rendered thus:

This thank-offering Sosos and Soso dedicate,
To deliverance Sosos, that Sosos escaped black fate.
He shows skill in toning down some of the more outspoken of the poems of BK. V, but there are seven omitted in that Book and one each in Books VI and VII.

It is sad that they do not correspond with the Greek text. There is no indication what text has been used.

This thank-offering Sosos and Soso dedicate,
To deliverance Sosos, that Sosos escaped black fate.
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Asklepiades of Samos by William and Mary Wallace contains the text of the poems of this author, who was probably an earlier contemporary of Theocritus, extracted from the Anthology, with versions by the editors and selected renderings by another translators. It is remarkable how many British scholars and literary men have tried their hand at translating the Anthology; they include A. C. Benson, Lord Cromer, Richard Garnett, G. B. Grundy, Andrew Lang, Walter Leaf, J. H. Merivale, J. S. Phillimore, J. F. R. Höfer, and Humber-Vincent. The general impression which these versions give is that it is extraordinarily difficult to render a Greek epigram into English which contains all the ideas of the original without becoming too lengthy and avoiding all 'padding.' Not a few of the versions given here are highly successful; for example, Walter Leaf's version of VII, 284 and the editor's version of V. 150. This little book is admirably printed and produced.

The Budé volume is the fourth volume to appear of the Greek Anthology and contains the first half of Book VII (the Sepulchral Epigrams). It consists of an Introduction, text with full apparatus criticus, translation and notes. The Introduction discusses the manuscript tradition, the composition of the book, the literary form of the Sepulchral Epigram and the conditions of its composition. The apparatus criticus is admirably clear and contains a number of new emendations, many of them due to M. Descrousseaux, who acted as supervisor of the edition. The notes give just the sort of information which is required for the explanation of the epigrams. The Budé Greek Anthology is a valuable work of serious scholarship, and it is much to be hoped that it will be completed in due course, and will not be treated like Schmidt's edition, which ended in the middle of Book IX in 1906.

The translations of the Promethes and Medea by R. C. Trevelyan and that of the Antigone by D. Fitts and R. Fitzgerald offer an interesting contrast. Mr. Trevelyan states that his object is 'to reproduce as faithfully as possible for those who cannot read Greek, not only the meaning, but the form, phrasing and movement of the original.' He considers, no doubt rightly, that English blank verse is similar in movement and general effect to the Greek iambic line; in the lyrical and anaepatic passages he has tried to imitate as closely as possible the metrical pattern and phrasing, in such a way that one musical setting would fit both the Greek and the English words. The version is remarkably faithful, and one seldom feels that one is reading a translation. The rendering of the echoes is an interesting and, on the whole, a successful experiment, since Greek poetry varies greatly in quantity and English verse on stress, it has been necessary to substitute the latter for the former. In the famous ode, however, written in praise of Athens (Medea, 826 ff.), the translator does not attempt to reproduce the Greek rhythms and uses freer verse forms. There is no doubt that a Greekless reader would derive a good idea from these two versions of what a Greek play is like.

Messrs. Fitts and Fitzgerald have set before themselves quite a different ideal. As they justly remark, they have not made a translation of the Antigone 'in the class-room sense of the word.' Passages are omitted, expanded and altered. Their version is printed partly as verse and partly as prose, and some lines can certainly be scanned as blank verse. The general effect is to bring the play down to the level of everyday life; Antigone and Ismene talk like two modern young women, and Creon is a claptor orator. The effect thus transformed may well be effective when put upon the stage, but to the ordinary reader it would give a very false idea of Sophoclean tragedy.

EDWARD S. FORSTER


This is the journal, which welcomed the first part of the new Liddell and Scott, should not let its last part pass unnoted, and since the editor invites me to raise this much-belated thank you I gladly do so, for I have been using the complete book for some three years, know it to be a great improvement on its predecessor, and can offer to those who are printers, and publishers hearty thanks and congratulations. It is not in order to find fault with them, but to aid their successors, that I offer the following criticisms; for no dictionary is ever perfect and the comparison of one revision is an invitation to look forward to the next.

Since a scholar must chiefly notice the obstacles which his own hobby-horse has stumbled, I had better say that I have been using the book mainly on Theocritus, and, viewing it from that angle, I have two general complaints to make. The first is that the representation of later epic vocabulary is desultory and misleading. One cannot infer from silence that a Homeric word is not used by the Alexandrians or by Quintus. Oppian, and scholion-not, where post-Homeric citations are given that they present a true picture. For instance, the author of Theocrit. Id. xxv uses the forms δεδοκινης and προφέρος, and the first occurs also in Apollonius. Οὐδεμισθαί is cited only from Timo, προφέροθεν only from Quintus and an inscription of Roman date. A lexicon has many uses, but one of them is to enable an inquirer to trace the history of a word through the extent literature; and here this lexicon is defective.

My second complaint is that too many mistakes of earlier editions have been perpetuated, and in Theocritus many rate some of these are gross indeed—see, for instance, εἰσιν ἐφεσύν, ἤρμηνος. I have gone from bad to worse over ἐφεσύν and has introduced some original blunders elsewhere (e.g., ἡκούν ἐνεργοῦν, παρειαίατο). It is much easier to get blunders into a lexic on than to get them out again; therefore I hope that all who notice such things will communicate them to Dr. G. C. Greene, who sees them at the Clarendon Press to receive them—indeed, I think it their bounden duty to do so, for the more cooks who lend a hand in slimming this broth the better it will be.

The new edition contains many valuable, but its predecessor, largely owing to the accent on the newness of some passages, in spite of rigorous compression (which occasionally delays one in finding the required entry) is nearly three hundred pages longer. Those of the latter part respectively more cumbrous than ed. 8.

A S. F. G.


In his preface the editor sets out fully the various sources of the scholia on Plato and the story of their collection, leading up to those most recent labours of F. D. Allen, J. Burnet and C. P. Parker upon which the present publication is based. He treats in detail the work and collection of Arethas, and discusses later contributions to the corpus and the bearing of variants in the scholia upon the relations between manuscripts. In the text, the scholia inter are followed by those of Arethas set out in a separate section. The footnotes give not only variant readings but copious parallels and illustrative matter from the lexic and other sources. There are full indexes of proper names and variations.

This bare inventory of contents is the best indication that can be given of the importance and value of this monumental work, which will be indispensable to students of Plato. It may be added that the printing and arrangement are clear and spacious, making the book in this respect a model for works of this kind. Dr. Greene has made an outstanding contribution to Hellenic studies.

D. T.


This is an interesting treatise, embodying full research in a field hitherto unexplored. Plato's treatment of slavery
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in the *Laus* is analysed under various heads, and at every point all possible comparison is made with known Greek law, or, in the frequent lack of such knowledge, with Greek practice as it may be inferred from literature. The dual aspect of the slave in Plato's possession (and a rudimentary legal person) is clearly brought out; so is the inescapable fact that Plato (in the *Laus* explicitly and constantly, in the *Republic* also by implication) not only accepts but approves slavery as an institution corresponding to a natural grading in human capacity and worth. His law of slavery is found to be 'an adaptation of positive Greek law,' showing certain innovations, some of which may (it is suggested) be traced to his desire to revive the practice in Athens. The author's judicious use of evidence, and his objective attitude throughout, contribute to make the book a valuable enrichment of Greek studies.

D. T.

**The Theory of Motion in Plato's Later Dialogues.**
By J. B. SKEMP. Pp. xv + 129. Cambridge: University Press, 1942. 6s. 6d.

This treatise, the latest volume in 'Cambridge Classical Studies,' examines the pre-Socratic origins, and the emergence in the later dialogues, of Plato's theory of a Moving Cause. The study culminates of course in the *Timaeus,* and Mr. Skepp has thoroughly illuminated both sides of that dialogue and on its metaphysical meaning. In the latter connection, he postulates as Plato's θνησκός the Forms and the Δυσμανίς, which creates the world-soul and the ψυχή, and the cosmic process is in motion. Aristotle's statement that Plato neglected the θνής νεφελήly is partly explained, he thinks, by the 'gap' which remains at the point of the causer of particular ψυχή. The least satisfying part of Mr. Skepp's exposition is his treatment of the θνής, which he says in his introduction (p. xl) 'we shall find is a power of the psychic order.' In Chapter VI its function in physical motion is thoroughly examined, but its metaphysical status remains obscure, though we are told on p. 111 that 'the pre-cosmic παρακολύτη θνής and the θνή of the four bodies are as ultimate as the Δυσμανίς.' The book has a short bibliography and an index of passages cited: a general index would have increased its usefulness for reference.

D. T.

**Plato's Method of Dialectic.**

This volume presents, in a most readable version and with a helpful introduction, a collection of Stenzel's papers on Platonist problems; the chief of these is an essay entitled 'The Literary and Philosophic Context of the Platonic Dialogue.' Some of the shorter papers are of considerable interest, particularly a note on Plato's relation to Democritus. Even with such assistance from the translator and editor, the English reader will probably find Stenzel's argument at many points obscure; but his work is full of suggestive points. He holds to the view of an earlier (Socratic) and a later (revised) theory, and insists on the substantial being of the Ideas: he finds the method of *Sophist* all-important in the development of Plato's theory of knowledge. The book is one for students of Plato to possess and ponder.

D. T.

**Plato's Earlier Dialectic.**

In this study of the logical basis of Plato's earlier thought, the author insists on the historical and evolutionary approach, and makes a close examination of the actual language of the dialogues and its precise implications. After chapters on ὄνομα, διάλεκτη and the Socratic definitions, we pass to a particularly useful treatment of the method of hypothesis, with special reference to the *Meno, Phaedo* and *Republic.* In a long discussion of the 'upward path' in *Republic* VI and VII, the process is explained as 'a thoroughgoing elenchus' which culminates in illumination. The distinction between the two possessions, the Line and the Cave is usefully worked out, and the Line is examined in detail with special reference to the mathematical method. In a final chapter on Plato's theory and practice of analogy and imagery, his inconsistencies and his flights of fancy are given due weight as producing certain 'incoherences' in the work of the middle period. This is a valuable book, especially perhaps in its bearing on the study of *Republic* VI and VII.

D. T.

**Plutarchus: on Methods of Inference.**

The Herculaneum papyrus containing Plutarchus' treatise known as Πίαν Στυάσιας has been edited on the basis of photostats of the Oxford copy, and is here furnished with a parallel text and commentary, from the two other passages. Introductory chapters deal with the life and work of Plutarchus and with the contents and criticism of this particular work. In further sections the Epicurean empiricism is studied—its sources, its development and its exercise in controversy with Stoics and Skeptics. A bibliography of the Herculanean papyri is appended. The editors have built well upon the foundations laid by Gomperz and Philippson; the translation is faithful and readable, and both the explanatory notes and the supplementary chapters contain much that is valuable for the study of Epicureanism in the Roman period.

D. T.

**Philo and the Oral Law: the Philonic Interpretation of Biblical Law in Relation to the Palestinian Halakah.**

This book may be described as an attempt to assess part of the Jewish element in Philo as distinct from his debt to Hellenism. Three main illegacies have been examined: 1. for much of the legal tradition in his works, namely, Greek and Roman jurisprudence, Palestinian Halakah and the decisions of Jewish courts in Egypt. While Professor Belkin is far from denying any contribution from the other two sources, he argues that in the main Philo's legal statements are based on the Palestinian Halakah. Chapter I states the problem, Chapter II investigates the terminology of the Oral Law in Philo and his knowledge of Hebrew, and Chapters III-X examine the legal evidence in detail. Apart from its virtue of clarity and arrangement, the study is particularly valuable as being made from a careful knowledge of the Palestinian evidence, a knowledge frequently lacking in expositions of Philo. In one or two places Professor Belkin's arguments might be questioned. He maintains that, beside using the LXX, Philo shows a knowledge of the Hebrew original of the Law. But this apparent knowledge of the Hebrew manuscript has been explained elsewhere. It is probable that on occasion the text of Philo's quotations from the Law in Cohn and Wendland represent a corrected text, and the text that Philo quoted is to be found in the readings of the apparatus criticus which diverge from later LXX standards. It may be that the real text of these passages sometimes accounts for Philo's agreement in his exposition with the Hebrew. Further, though as early as the Greek version of the Pentateuch there was a traditional exegesis of the Law, Professor Belkin does not allow for the existence of this exegesis in Philo's time and for its influence on his explanations, even when they are contrary to his text of the Law. It might be wished that its predecessor Professor Belkin had given more weight to Dr. Goodenough's words quoted in a note on pp. 35-36. However, this does not detract from the general value of the book, which can be highly commended for its treatment of its theme.

G. D. KILPATRICK

**Aeschylus in his Style: a Study in Language and Wurnsonality.**

Professor Stanford has followed his earlier books on *Metaphor and Ambiguity* with this admirable little book,
which he calls 'A Study in Language and Personality.' Perhaps war-time restrictions made an index locorum impossible, though this would have been most valuable for reference when reading Aeschylus. 'Drastic abridgements' are mentioned, and perhaps precluded a fuller treatment of the influence of other tragedians. The comparison of Aeschylus to El Greco and Sophocles to Leonardo is just, but in this journal at any rate the reviewer may be allowed to suggest that to equate the series Prynchus-Aeschylus-Sophocles with either Aegina-Olympia-Parnassus or Euphriones-Gle- phrdates prr.-Achilles prr. would have been even more pertinent and instructive. But this is the best book on Aeschylus' style that has so far appeared in English, and gives a much more accurate statement of his borrowings from other authors, his choice of words, and his imagery. Although the details are all given, as the title says, the book is not only a study in language, but a study in personality as revealed in language, and therefore tells us not only more about Aeschylus' style, but also more about Aeschylus himself.

T. B. L. W.

Aeschylus and Athens: a Study in the Social Origins of Greek Tragedy, GEORGE THOMSON, Pp. xii + 476; pl. 1 + 2 maps and 9 text figs. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1941. 21s.

Professor George Thomson introduces this most controversial of the literature, writing: 'The attempt to interpret the plays of Aeschylus, on which I have been working for many years, in the light of the general evolution of Greek society and in particular the transition from tribal society to the city-state, raises the problem of the range of his borrowings. I believe that we should have been glad to spend more time on it, but in the immediate future research is likely to be difficult, and therefore I have decided to publish it without delay' (Preface, p. viii, dated September, 1940). Many of its conclusions are admittedly provisional, but it is hoped 'that it will help to convince classical scholars of the need for a new approach to their problems' (the advertisement on the dust-cover).

It is only fair to remember these statements, and to assume that the book is not quite a definitive publication. It is very much better to have it as it is than not to have it at all, or not for several years; and allowances should be made, if much is asserted with only hasty proof. Apart from many excellent treatments in it of parts of its large subject, the reference of Greek Tragedy to its wider context, and some acute intuitions which originated the book, ought to be of high ultimate value. The danger is that in the much harm has already been done.

The book is based on Marxist assumptions and on certain theories of anthropology and psychology which cohere with the economic and materialistic philosophy of his own time. The Marxian bias of the best of the school of Marxist authority is sometimes seriously challenged. The Greeks and their ancestors are conceived to have developed from a 'primitive horde,' through phases of 'primitive communism,' 'group marriage,' and matrilinear institutions, to a system of sharply antagonistic economic classes, and to a cultural order in which totalism, the central cult of initiation at the Men's House, and connected practices and beliefs, had left not only traces, but structural lines. Straight and simple directions for this development are sought: and there is a strong tendency to treat as purely economic whatever has an economic aspect.

There are thus two main risks of error, one in the major premises—that is, the materialistic scheme of human history in which Athens and Aeschylus are set—and the other in minor premises, in which individual facts are identified as having a certain place and certain relationships in the universal scheme. Many will think that the former risk is the more serious, on the ground that a denial of God, of the soul, and of a large part of the psychological knowledge now available, restrict any discussion of Greek poetry. The other risk will also be captivating, the cultural stages among the Greeks, at any historically fixed time, with stages identified as generally encountered in the anthropological material. The Greeks of history may have left similar stages behind, but very remotely, and the interfering complications, with much interaction between groups at different levels of progress, reduce the probability of inferences, even if the universality of cultural sequences, with details generally recurrent, were better established than it is. Thus totalism, still a very obscure subject, is not yet proved to have existed in Greece, though it is possible that Professor Thomson has made it seem much more probable. Again, it is not certain that purely matrilinear institutions occur anywhere; and though in parts of Greece strong matrilinear influences undoubtedly existed, there are serious doubts about times and places. Initiations in many parts of the world have strong similarities. But there are also diversities, and a universal pattern is hard to establish with any but the simplest of his data, even in a narrow text, such as on the Malekun island described by Mr. John Layard, the complications are hard to thread; and it is dangerous to classify details of Greek rite within a wider pattern which itself is varyingly certain in different parts of the world. Greece had economic forces; but the theory of their total and exclusive control, in Greece or anywhere else, is not the kind of theory likely to be permanent, even if it were much more generally accepted than it is. Human choice retains its mystery, and many suspect with Bergson that 'la vie c'est l'indeterminasion'; and, even if it would be unfair to add that the Arunta never had an Aeschylus, though they had economic laws, it is scarcely unfair to see grave risk in thus fixing, or even preaching, a universal pattern of economic life. The relation of poetry, especially tragic poetry, to current fact, political, economic, or other, is an important problem, and Professor Thomson deserves gratefulness for approaching it from a new angle. He has advanced a new formula. Aeschylus, like the Moirai, Prometheus, the Orphics, Anaximander, Pythagoras, and other personalities who are economically interpreted in the book, may have taken shapes and tenures from economic, among other, phenomena; but that is only a little of it. Patterns and symbols go deeper than that.

Yet Professor Thomson has probably seen with acute intuition, and boldly said, much that others have suspected but for lack of proof foreborne to say; and of this much may turn out to be true. To some extent this might be said of his identification in Greece of the initiation pattern of the Men's House, with its emphasis at every stage of life on the ritual intention of rebirth. Here I think that he is much more right than wrong, though the pattern is fragmentary in Greece and the place of details often obscure. The traces of the pattern in the Dorian education of Crete and Darta are effectively demonstrated. The parallels are not so close as to offer considerable probability. Here help might have been derived from Speiser; a reference to Ziegler would have corrected the interpretation of 'nact', which means the consecration, a form of the best of the best. Aeschylus is not able to initiations, as being a completion of the personality or of anything else; and Körte's recent arguments, that at the Eleusinia the preservation both of the community and of the individual soul were intended, might have been considered. For the Olympic Festival the parallels again have some force, and here the late Professor Cornford's line reconstruction is well developed. On Dionysiac cult the indentifications are more speculative. The account of the dithyramb is not very satisfactory, and forces the evidence. Here and elsewhere some Greek words are overlaidly explained, and perhaps a more scientific and comprehensive critique of myth might be desired. Thaesian orgies, dithyramb, symposium, and cult might have been, and the Attic Dionysia cannot yet be clearly related in a single unity; here Ziegler's article on tragodia in RE might usefully have been cited, especially for his account of the distinction between the Aristotelian tradition of tragic origins, and the Hellenistic tradition represented by Horace. Professor Thomson writes very well on Aristotle, but he is less successful in vindicating Aristotle's version of tragic origins serious. It is a very progressive explanation of kathisis, on which, however, he might have consulted Tate. The later part of the book is mainly an exposition of individual tragedies. It is of great value and merit, and the treatment of the Eletra of Sophocles deserves special praise.
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On the whole, in spite of what look like distortions and hasty arguments in the service of the materialist theory of history, the book either achieves, or seems to suggest, considerable advances in knowledge. Among them is a new chance to rescue the sound, if obscure, parts of some of Ridge’s thesis. Perhaps it failed in argumentation when he succeeded in intuition. Such results are offered by some new and illuminating parallels from tribal institutions, relevant to the rise of tragedy but hitherto not applied to it. We may yet come to understand how both Dionysus and the revered dead made their contribution.

A book can survive the faults present in Aeschylus and Athens. Beneath much that is unsound there is an immense power to see, to secure results which in better times one has felt a better, if smaller, book. May we feel glad in the hope that, fully according to the rules of Engels, it will work dialectically, challenging in anathema and existence, and infusing much that will help the culminating synthesis that is to be.

W. F. J. Knight


It is surprising that there has been no more interaction between the study of social history and that of drama, particularly the value of comedy as a source to the social historian can be direct; since it concentrates upon a side of man’s nature which is not normally stressed, but which is none the less important. Indirectly also the value is great: the fact that an audience at a certain time laughed at a certain thing provides a guide to the limits within which they thought. Similarly, for the literary critic, the recreation of the background of a comedy is a necessary part (though only a part) of his task, since a great deal of the superficial side of comedy is essentially topical. The lack of co-operation between these two branches of scholarship is all the more surprising in the sphere of Old Attic Comedy. As an art form, this comedy is at once monde de situation and a comode de moeurs; consequently for the social historian it provides a great deal of evidence about a period for which otherwise evidence is none too great, whilst for the critic it raises a host of problems which can only be answered by reference to history.

Thus, the appearance of Dr. Ehrenberg’s new book “The People of Aristophanes” is very timely. It would be imperative to criticise it as a work of scholarship. Stearing a sure course between the dangerous shoal of denunciation and exaggeration, it is an admirable collection of all the evidence in Aristophanes and Eupolis regarding the social life of the people with whom they were dealing. The arrangement of the evidence is also on the whole, good; though in this connection it is unfortunate that the majority of the book is impaired by the incorporation of the references into the text.

Nevertheless, in spite of the very competent way in which Dr. Ehrenberg has handled his material, it is difficult to see exactly what he intended to achieve by confining his study within the limits which he has chosen. He gives it the rather ambiguous sub-title of “A Sociology of Old Attic Comedy.” Whichever way this is interpreted, one feels that he has fallen between two stools; if it is intended as a background to the Old Attic Comedy, then it suffers very much from the absence of co-ordination with other evidence, ceramic, numismatic and that of inscriptions. It is only possible to create the background to X wholly from X. Similarly, the absence of co-ordination with other evidence seriously affects the validity of the judgements in the book from the point of view of the social historian. The feeling remains that the value of Dr. Ehrenberg’s book is rather as a source-book for some future study either of Aristophanes, or of the social life of fifth-century Athens; as a water-colour study for a broad canvas still to be painted.

H. R. L.

Politics, Finance and Consequences. A Study of the Relations between Politics and Finance in Fifth-century Athens with Special Reference to the Consequences of Sound and Unsound JHS—Vol. LXII.


It has become, during the last decades, almost a fashion among economists to write from time to time books on the problems of ancient economics. These books have been successful in one way—through the one exception of Max Weber’s great work. Even the fullest command of the facts and laws of modern economics usually proved to be a poor guide, especially when it is supported by only a slight knowledge of modern finance on ancient history, and an even slighter acquaintance with the ancient sources. This exactly is the case with the book which the Emeritus Professor of Economics at Harvard has written as the first contribution on antiquity among the Harvard Economic Studies. As the title indicates, it is a mixture of political history and the history of finance. The former is treated in a very superficial and entirely derivative manner, without any really new line of approach; the latter produces a number of generalisations, most of which are based upon utterly insufficient evidence and a generous neglect of chronology.

The first two chapters deal with Egypt, Assyria, Babylonia, and Israel. In all these countries, and first under the 18th Egyptian dynasty (what about the 19th?), Professor Bullock discovers a “law” of development according to which the height of power (Thutmose III) is followed by the height of submission (Amenhotep III), which in turn brings about financial distress and thus general decline. Even if true, this rather trivial theory is far from covering the essential facts; to prove this, we need only point out that the representation of the last stage is the famous Akhmenaton, the highly refined founder of a new religion. Bullock, however, even attributes the alleged development of the other Eastern kingdoms to direct Egyptian influence and to some sort of international money-culture.

In Persia and Lydia (Ch. III) the author finds a different kind of financial policy, that of accumulation of treasure and of sound expenditure. His characterisation of the “shopkeeper” Darius (Herod. III. 86) is interesting, but the general picture of the fundamental antithesis between the two types is unconvincing.

Greek finance is dealt with in three chapters, which are characterised by light-hearted generalisations embracing every age from Homer to the third century B.C., but containing at the same time a few more detailed paragraphs of more or less sound reasoning, e.g. on the finances of the tyrants, on isopo and liturgies, on Demeosthenes (depending on W. Jaeger’s book). The desire to mention every detail of Athenian democracy on the whole is in substance familiar lines, even in some of its errors and misjudgments. The author seems to realise that in overstressing the general importance of finance he is one-sided and mistaken. However, more about democratic Athens ought to be attributed primarily, still less exclusively, to unsound finance. On the other hand, the strength of the city and its great recuperative power were not due to sound finance . . . . But this excellent statement is not reflected in the general trend of the book.

The last chapter deals with “Two Commercial Oligarchies.” Both in the depreciation of Carthage and the praise of Rhodes one-sided generalisations are even more predominant than elsewhere.

V. E.


This is a pleasant essay on an interesting subject. Starting from the isolated and uncertain example of Chrysippus’s law on public teaching, Mr. Forbes deals carefully with evidence throughout the centuries. The sophists, the orators, the philosophers, the elementary teachers and grammatici, the teachers of special subjects, and the university dons—all have their say. In short, this readable handbook provides a good survey of our knowledge, but there it stops. No attempt is made to compare educational fees with the earnings of other people and the cost of living. Next to nothing therefore is said about the most interesting.
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though most difficult, question, that of the economic and social standing of the different groups of teachers during the various periods of Greek civilisation.

V. E.


Mr. Jones' monumental work deserves something better than the short and belated review which by force of circumstances is all that the present writer can give. It will not be possible to discuss the book in detail, but only to stress a few important features.

The most obvious is what may be called the architecture of the book. Mr. Jones rightly groups his enormous mass of material under systematic headings, but his guiding principle is the historical development of the cities of the Near East as parts of the Hellenistic kingdoms, the Roman and the Byzantine empires. On the solid foundations, laid by his previous work (The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces, 1937) and represented here by the first section (The Diffusion of the City), three large pillars arise (Part II-IV) which carry the covering roof (Part V). The pillars are foreign policy, necessarily restricted to the Relations with the Successors, the constitutional aspect, called Introduction, and the activities of the cities, united under the heading Civil Services. The roof is perhaps a little light for the heavy substructure. Under the title The Achievements of the City the economic, political and cultural importance of the cities is discussed, which results hardly in accordance with the true statement that "the history of Greek Roman civilisation is the history of the cities". The architect, while erecting his large and imposing building, was bound to realise that his materials were partly not of the best; thus, it must have had grown slightly dented when he came to apply his finishing touches, with the result that he fails in some degree to give due credit to the achievements of the cities.

Next, the economic nor the cultural importance of many cities is sufficiently emphasised: the remarks on literature are inadequate; and architecture as a source of social evidence is hardly exploited. An interesting point is the survival of the native languages. The difference in language between the urban aristocracy and the peasantry implies a deep cultural cleavage, but both in pre-Christian and Christian times the separation of town and country was at least partly counteracted by mutual religious influence. We need think only of the great 'Eastern' city of the West, Carthage, to realise how strong even after the completion of the destruction of a hellenised city the spiritual and probably also the biological influence of the native element remained.

The material is quite solid, that is to say, stated by stating that an aristocracy of parasitic landowners and a luxurious town life, which served this class were alone responsible for the wealth and civilisation of the cities, and that the lower urban classes and especially the country-side had hardly any share in this.

It is an enjoyable feature of the book that time and again the author, though clad in the full armour of his stupendous and austere scholarship, interrupts his sober and matter-of-fact story by short illuminating remarks of a more pointed character which sometimes, though not always, strikingly emphasise decisive facts. I give a few examples. Alexander as the 'champion or even 'apostle' of Hellenism has been neglected for some time past to be a much too simple formula. But the policy of most of his successors is well characterised, the financial background of Antiochus Epiphanes' policy disclosed, and the suggestion made that dynamic city-names 'mark the grant of a charter of autonomy'. The work of the kings, however, was less important than is generally assumed; the motive force which produced the vast majority of cities in the Near East was the ambition of the native upper class to adopt the Greek way of life — undoubtably a more remarkable statement. The changing part played by democracy is well pointed out, and it is useful to learn that the Latin adverb esti 'the' is used in the sense of sunt 'the' never meant real autonomy, but 'the right of self-government under a constant of which might be imposed by Rome'. As early as by the beginning of the second century B.C. 'the term democracy came to be watered down so that it meant little more than constitutional republican government'. What a decline in the political energy of the Greek cities is witnessed by the fact that the Byzantine emperors' 'chief anxiety was to galvanise them into activity'. Another interesting aspect of this development was the rise of the Class during the later empire. The ephebate, originally an Athenian invention, spread almost everywhere, 'as a kind of university training for the sons of the well-to-do'. This is certainly a more appropriate interpretation than that of the Dionysian technitai as an 'international trade union'. Most important for the understanding of the development of the later Roman Empire is that neither in the bureaucracy nor in the army did any true imperial loyalty emerge... The sentiment of civic loyalty was won on the other hand, deep and strong... Civic patriotism died from inanition, and as it died the machinery of local government began to run down

As these quotations indicate the book is written in a clear and vigorous style. It is in fact interesting throughout, and this in itself is a remarkable achievement, if one considers the tremendous amount of detailed facts that had to be used, and the dreary nature of much of the evidence, particularly the innumerable monotonous inscriptions. The reader is led by a smooth path, smoother indeed than is justified by the character of the sources and problems. There is certainly danger in this—a danger which is increased by the fact that in the extensive notes published in the Cambridge Ancient History are cited, but very little of the modern literature; only rarely is a disputable question discussed. Since there are, and always will be, very few people whose knowledge of the subject is comparable to that of the author, the book will be used less as a basis for discussion than a source of reference. In most cases, however, Mr. Jones' sound judgment will serve this purpose admirably.

V. E.


This book is one of the most remarkable feats of scholarship ever performed: that is obvious to those who know Professor Beazley's work and have traced its development from Attic Red-Figure Vases in America through Attische Vasenmaler and Vases in Poland to this majestic volume; there may, however, be readers of the Journal who do not understand quite how great the accomplishment is; if they will imagine someone who was faced with the whole of Greek literature but only had authors' names for half a century, and had to create the grounds of style to create authors for all the surviving works, they will have some idea of what has been achieved.

In this book over 15,000 Athenian vases have been assigned to the draughts as many again as in Attische Vasenmaler published 18 years ago. This work includes, besides the vast mass of late sixth-century and fifth-century red-figure vases, the black-figure work of the early red-figure painters, the white-ground vases of the fifth century, and early fourth-century vases. In this way Beazley's work on white lekythoi, Miss Haspel's work on lekythoi, and Hahl's work on late Attic red-figure have been absorbed into the whole—absorbed but also reconstructed and where necessary re-modelled.

The general grouping of the painters in chapters and the brief notes that precede the list of each painter's works make it possible to trace the history of Greek drawing from the late sixth to the early fourth century. Such remarks as these give the main lines: 'The earliest work is connected with Myson and so with the Pan painter'; 'the Berlin painter issues from the group of Euthymides and Phintias'; 'the Phintias evidence painter, Hermoxas, and the Achilles painter were his pupils'; 'The Villanovan painter belongs to the following of Duris'; 'Polygnotus issues from the school of the Niobid painter'; 'The Cleobis painter belongs to the late group of Polygnotus'; 'The Dinys painter was a pupil of the latest. These guiding hints show the way for anyone who will take Beazley's book and look up his references to accessible pictures of the vases.

Those who prefer a different method of art study will find an admirable guide in Dr. Paul Jacobsthal's index of
mythological subjects; this makes it possible to discover how different painters painted the same subject and the material is rich enough to allow reliable conclusions as to what subjects were popular in what years.

A few notes of detail: the Menon painter is now known by his fresh, and his brushwork, which he has greatly increased. Some vases previously assigned to Euthymides have now been given to the Clocophrades painter in his earliest period. A group of cups previously assigned to the Panaion painter has been placed off as a prototype of a Panaion group, but the possibility of the Panaion painter being Onesimos is still entertained. Diepold’s identification of the Pistoxenus painter with the Penthesilea painter is rejected. A list is given of vases in the ‘Círëus Painter’ and of the Penthesilea painter on which both hands can be traced.

Now that this definitive work on red-figure is complete, it is perhaps greedy to ask for more, but it is to be hoped that Professor Beazley’s already published studies on Black-Figure vases are the nucleus round which ‘Attic Black-Figure Vas-Painters’ is rapidly forming.

T. B. L. W.

Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum: U.S.A. fasc. 8, Fogg Museum and Gallatin Collections. By G. H. Chase and M. Z. Pease. Pp. 116; pl. 64. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Humphrey Milford, 1942). These Gallatin collections have already been published in the Corpus (Hoppin and Gallatin). The new facsimile contains the rest. The text is careful and scholarly, and of the pictures clear and good: the background of the painter’s workshop on which two hands can be traced;

Harvard. Etruscan. Pl. 6, 2; in the same style, Vatican 136 (Albizzati, pl. 13) and Philadelphia (Dotham Italian Tomb-groups, pl. 32, 17). Pl. 6, 5 and 6, see Raccolita (Giangiuliani), 73, no. 89. Pl. 6, 8 and 9, see ibid, 73, no. 82. Attic bb. Pl. 9, 4: imitation of the Griffin-shield group, to which Tübingen D.35, quoted by Chase, belongs, while Tübingen D.34, also quoted, is related. Pl. 11, 3: cf. Toronto X96 (Robinson, pl. 11, 392, top); pl. 12, 13, 14; pl. 12, 5: all manner of following of the Hangon painter. Pl. 12, 6, Beldam painter. Pl. 19, 10: workshop of the Athena and Bowdon painters? Attic rr. Pl. 15: ARV 264, no. 16; the third devotee of Douris, somewhat recalling the Villa Giulia painter. Pl. 15, Splanchnoet painter (ARV 562, foot); much repaired. Pl. 16, 1; ARV 335, no. 5. Pl. 16, 5, ARV 136, no. 51. Pl. 17, 1: ARV 568, top. Pl. 17, 2: ARV 136, no. 51. Pl. 17, 4: ARV 141.4, no. 48. Pl. 17, 5: extraordinary subject: wretched drawing, but nothing modern, as far as I can see, except a little repainting of the fractures. The old woman is not standing on a pedestal decorated with vases: the block is this side of her: on it, a snake; this side of it, a pair of snakes. The man holds a snake, and what looks like a bunch of grapes. The woman holds a purse or little bag in her left hand, and in it, or right something small, not visible in the photograph, according to Chase a flower. The man has the look of a customer, the woman of a vendor; or the other way round: but what on earth is happening? Pl. 17, 6: ARV 569, below; perhaps the Colchicous skylphos CV, pl. 43, 3. Pl. 18, 3: I originally attributed this to the Eusan painter, but in ARV 553, no. 25, I thought it more prudent to speak of ‘an unidentified painter’ (Panaion). I now think I have seen a reproduction. I find that my original attribution was correct (ARV 569, below): one of the painter’s later works. Pl. 19, 2: ARV 568, top. Attic bb. on white ground. Pl. 21, 3: there are two subjects: (A) a youth and a boy, and (B) a youth and a plaited figure. The upper parts are lost, but the

boy was no doubt singing, the youth playing the flute; B. a citharode. Pl. 21, 7: Athena painter or his manner. Pl. 21, 8: the same. Pl. 21, 9: the drawing looks modern. Attic white. Pl. 22, 1: imitation of the Achilles painter. Pl. 22, 2: Woman painter. Pl. 22, 3: B.M. 63.7-9, 105, which is not, I thought, Attic. Pl. 24, 4: as Ryberg fig. 115 and fig. 119 b, from Rome: Italian. Pl. 24, 10: as Caesar 66.145 (Edgar, pl. 12). Pl. 24, 12, as B.M. old black number 1093; Pl. 24, 15 is certainly from Ceiba. Pl. 26, 6: a good example of Bleech’s ‘Acropolis cups’. Pl. 26, 7: cf. RG 75, no. 122, and the parallels: I took those to be Etruscan. Pl. 26, 10: Etruscans of the ‘Malacena’ fabric, see R, 75, no. 16. Attic. Pl. 35, 6 is a ‘Círëus Painter’ and the Penthesilea painter on which both hands can be traced.

Gallatin (the whole collection now belongs to the Metropolitan Museum). Pl. 33, 14: I had suggested that this, and a cup of somewhat similar style in Heidelburg, might be Etruscan imitations of Attic; but Miss Pease doubts this, and so does Prof. Ure; so the suggestion had better be withdrawn. Attic bb. Pl. 35, 2: Leto rather than Hera. Pl. 37, 1: related to the Leagros group; group of Villa Giulia 3536 (Villa Giulia 1536, pl. 12, 3). Pl. 39, 4: Cab. Med. inv. 2239, C V, pl. 42, 7: Orivetto, Apollo with gods and goddesses; Berkeley 83376, CV, pl. 26, 2. Pl. 37, 2: related to the Leagros group; cf. the much-repaired Compigna 936. Pl. 38, 2: Leagros group; in it: group of Würzburg 936. Pl. 40, 1: Munich 1596, J. 61, Triton. Pl. 46, 2: group of the midgut Panathenaea (Shoe in Hep. 1, 86); two round aryballoi from the same fabric, one in Oxford (CV pl. 43, 9), the other in the Vlasto collection, and many of the small vases, decorated with scales or network, collected by Bulas (BCH, 1932, 368-88) and Miss Halspells (ABL, 167-8); all those, for example, figured by Bulas. Pl. 45, 4; Philadelphia, pl. 45, 1: ARV 268, middle. Pl. 43, 3, the warrior seems to be leading the horse. Pl. 44, 2, the forerunner should be Iris rather than a Nereid. Pl. 45, 4: Pidias” shape (Ar in. 1935, 479); manner of the Hangon painter. Attic rr. Pl. 59, 21: maenads rather than Demeata and Persephone. Pl. 58, 3: the relation to the Berlin painter is remotter than I thought at first, and I should no longer describe the vase in as his manner. Pl. 59, 7: in front of the head, not, I think, a quiver, but a left hand holding a phiale: Apollo, all the same (Apollo with phiale, London Eg 16, C. Smith BM Cat, iii pl. 18, 2). Pl. 62, 1: nearest the shape, Lau pl. 9, 6. Pl. 62, 14: Attic.


It will be seen by perusing this volume that it is now possible, thanks to the researches of archaeologists, to identify some of the finest works of Greek art by attributing this or that fresco of Herculaneum or Pompeii to this or that famous artist. So the author in his preface: but he does not mean what he says. He means, of course, no more than that some of the Campanian wall-paintings are copies of pictures by famous Greek artists of the past; but he has not been able to prove that yet, and the lack of precision is typical of the book. Fig. 8 is described as ‘The Marriage of Alexander, after Sodoma’; and it is indeed from a photograph of Sodoma’s fresco. But fig. 9 is described as ‘Achilles in Scyros, after Athienom’. Fig. 10 is also ‘Achilles in Scyros, after Athenion’. Now the paintings reproduced in figs. 9 and 10 go back to a single original; but they differ widely. The painting fig. 10 is better than the painting fig. 9, and more so. But how faithful is it? And even if the design should have been copied with moderate accuracy, what of the colour? Similarly, fig. 4 is ‘The Calympus of Apelles, after Botticelli’; fig. 5 is ‘Io and Argo, after Nikias’. Fig. 6 is also ‘Io and Argos, after Nikias’; but what has it in common with fig. 5 beyond the main lines of Argo and Io? And which ‘copy’ is the less faithful?
The fact is that if the researches of archaeologists have ground only; it is that the question of copy and original in the wall-painting of the Roman period is exceedingly complicated and the greatest caution always essential. Prof. M. de M. is well aware of this, but sometimes he seems to be tenacious of an opinion not. The public should not be allowed to fancy that the researches of archaeologists have made it possible to appreciate the styles of 'Nabatéen,' 'Attic,' or 'Timonoschacch,' or even to say with certainty of a period, a century, a century, a column, a century, a century, a century. It is known that the researches of archaeologists have made it possible to appreciate the styles of 'Nabatéen,' 'Attic,' or 'Timonoschacch,' or even to say with certainty of a period, a century, a century, a century, a century, a century.
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coins are available for purposes of reference, it may be possible to solve a number of numismatic problems. For example, the classification of coins may sometimes differ, according to their small size and lack of symbols and mint marks may be fitted into their place in the series by their chemical analysis, and definite information may be gained of the varied questions of restrikes. Counterfeits and imitations may be recognised as such. Evidence from chemical analysis may have the effect of narrowing the period of issue previously assigned to coins, or, in the case of Constantinian coins, may help to determine the period of issue. It may provide support for the suggestion made on archaeological grounds that the period of use extended in fact beyond the date normally assigned.

The evaluation of the less important minor constituents and impurities of the alloys would seem to be of less significance than might have been anticipated: there is a sameness in this respect in the analyses of Greek bronze coins from different places and widely different periods of time. Zinc tends to be present with greater regularity in the late coins, and arsenic is a common impurity where there is much lead. No coin was found to be entirely free from iron, and next to iron nickel occurred most frequently, gold and silver not at all.

Oxidised copper ores were no doubt used at the earliest period for the production of the copper required for minting. As to the method of minting, evidence is forthcoming from the results of the analysis of a coin in conjunction with a metallographic examination: circumstances of size, alloy, etc., determine whether coins were to be cast or struck and whether struck on cast blanks or on metal obtained otherwise than by casting.

It is clear, as the author points out, that the numismatic evidence must still remain the primary basis for the solution of problems of provenance, dating, etc., but he has succeeded in demonstrating how 'the conjuncture of chemical and numismatic evidence often leads to conclusions or suggestions that could not be reached from either sort of evidence used alone.' The monograph goes a long way towards satisfying the lack of accurate analytical data for properly documented bronze alloys of antiquity, and the value of systematic chemical recording will be more apparent as data continue to accumulate and the many gaps in time-sequence and mining sites are gradually filled.

H. J. P.


The value of this book would have been increased if it had been more generally accepted practical definitions of masonry throughout. Thus, by all means invent 'trapezoidal'—it is not a bad term—but do not stretch it so far as to include the wall in Fig. 12, which, to the practical mason, would represent a rubble wall, built for the most part, of irregularly-worked blocks. The present reviewer can claim the review mentioned on p. 20, footnote, and is still unconvinced about the use of the term 'ashlar,' nor are some of the author's meanings of it borne out in the Encyclopaedia Britannica (14th edn.) article which he quotes. In such a genuine and useful attempt to straighten out various kinds of Greek masonry in a particular field, it is of some comfort that terms like 'isodomic' are used; they mean nothing to the practical mason, who, again, would not accept 'irregular ashlar,' any work in this category being 'squared rubble.' The book shows evidence of much research and is a useful reference one of a limited kind (in general, only fortification walls are included), so much so particularly on account of the excellent lists in Appendix III, with their full documentation, but it is unfortunate that it is so sparsely illustrated. Thus, the very fine wall at Larisa (Ancient Corinth) is not particularly interesting not only for its ordinary walking, but for its slightly-projecting stringcourses. The geographical restrictions of the book rule out Sicily and Magna Grecia, so that the works at Paestum, Hipponion and Sparti are not included: some of the material can be got from these sites. There is hardly sufficient examination of the whole question of drafted joints and corners (extremely interesting where, as at Priene temple bastion, they are combined with rock-faced treatment), which is the outstanding contribution of Greek masonry; though the writer considers that the author is correct in insisting on deliberate conscious method in these treatments. The clear division of the two kinds of so-called 'polygonal' masonry is useful, as is the use of 'Lemnian' and 'Polygonal.' It is unfortunate that such a neatly-bound and well-produced volume has no title page.

T. F.

The Lion Monument at Amphipolis. By Oscar Bronzer. Pp. ix + 76; pl. 11 + 37 text figs. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1941. This sumptuous volume seems to have been primarily intended as a gift for the citizen who commissioned the restoration of the lion. The sculptor of the restoration, a Greek, was to have supplied an account of his work, but this projected section and certain detailed notes and measurements could not be obtained because of the Greek invasion of Greece. Other relevant matter was omitted since a French collaborator had already published it in the BCH for 1939; unfortunately for English readers, since few, if any, copies can have reached this country. In its absence, a review of the American text is likely to slip into error or injustice.

The lion, a marble figure 5·30 metres high, carved in several dozen blocks, was restored with extreme care and precision. The missing parts of which there is no trace were supplied in concrete tinted to match, which cannot be distinguished in the photographs; their precise limits had presumably been made clear in the French edition. In the photographs in the book, the photographs can certainly be accepted as an absolutely faithful reconstruction. It has been replaced in situ on a concrete pedestal faced with ancient blocks, in such a position that the passer-by sees it at roughly the same eye-level as in antiquity, though the original support was taller. It was also far more complex and ornate.

The lower part of the monument was square and measured nearly ten metres a side at the foundation. Above ground it was faced with Doric half-columns engaged in the wall and standing on steps; its entablature has not been found. On top came a stepped pyramid, from the crown of which rose a pedestal of unknown height to carry the lion. The height of some individual steps is known but not their total number. The height of the Doric facade is not measurable. But, from contemporary analogies, the monument is ascribed to the last quarter of the fourth century, and the structure of the building, in conjunction with ingenious calculations involving the dimensions of each course.

This restoration has however certain features aesthetically objectionable but inevitable from the height given to the columns. The drawing allows four half-columns a side and is obliged to place no less than three triglyphs over each intercolumniation, which seems scarcely plausible for the end of the fourth century; yet to increase the height of the frieze and reduce the number of its elements would wreck the design, as experiment will show. Apart however from scarcely tenable arguments that the use of Doric and good masonry's work indicate fourth century rather than later date, the shape of the capital is the only evidence produced for that conclusion and it is unconvincing, while every other criterion merely establishes that the monument is not older than Hellenistic.

Strangely enough, little use is made of the lion in this connection. There is no comparison with the lions carved on the Alexander Sarcophagus, although a theory is advanced that both monuments commemorate the same man; yet there is some stylistic discussion with reference to other (notably) lion from the Louvre. In the British Museum! While it is rash to date a sculptured lion by its style, it should be easy in this instance to show a fair measure of probability that it is considerably later than has been assumed—perhaps a century later, and even a
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century and a half. The Greeks had a tendency to humanise the faces of lions, so that the features and expression changed with time just as did those of their human figures, and pari passu. In the Mausoleum, for instance, the human and lion faces alike are smooth and calm, in the Alexanderion they frown under beetling brows, in the Pergamon gigantomachy the figures are monstrously heavy and register all requisite emotions. The Amphipolis figure must come late in this series, and it appears from the photographs (which are perhaps more striking than instructive) to wear tosh. Duce looked first popularised by the Hellenistic monarchs.

Taking this new basis of conjecture, the Doric order can be restored from analogies of advanced Hellenistic date at Pergamon and Alexandria (the Mustafa Pasha tombs). A multiplicity of triglyphs becomes plausible, though the height of the frieze can be increased till rather fewer are needed, because the half-columns can themselves be restored much taller, in accordance with the Hellenistic preference for slim columns. Accordingly there is no longer any need for such a high pedastal under the lion to bring him to the required elevation, and he will therefore cease to sit in ridiculous isolation as though perched on a box. Sketching it out, this alternative “period piece” is seen also to be better balanced than the fourth-century scheme, for the relative size of the lion is reduced and he is therefore brought into proportion with the Doric facade. There appear therefore to be several grounds for dating the monument somewhere about 200 b.c.; a closer examination might be possible on a detailed comparison of the friezes of the Belevi tomb and of water-spouts.

A. W. LAWRENCE

The Tholos of Athens and its Predecessors. By HOMER A. THOMPSON. Pp. 160; pl. 4 + 105 text figs. Baltimore, American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1940. $5.

Observations on the Heraeum. By W. B. DINSMOOR. Pp. 177; pl. 1 + 76 text figs. Baltimore, American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1941. $5.

(American Excavations in the Athenian Agora. Hesperia: Supplimente IV and V.)

Both these publications illustrate in different ways the great importance for the history of Greek architecture of the American excavations in the Athenian Agora. While Thompson’s account of the Tholos reveals in masterly detail a monument hitherto known only from literary and epigraphical sources, Dinsmoor’s penetrating analysis of the new evidence for the ‘Theseeum’ throws much light on one of the most famous of ancient buildings.

The Tholos, first built, as the style of the original roof-tile and the datable pottery finds combine to prove, about 470 B.C., has undergone many catastrophes and changes, till the fifth century A.D., and its long history is here traced with admirable care and insight. The opening sections (pp. 1—44) discuss exhaustively the earlier structures on or near the same site, mostly dating from the third quarter of the sixth century B.C. These do not resemble the Tholos in form, but include a group (F to K) with the same function of providing the Prytaneis with living-room, kitchen and chapel: this group was often modified, and was much damaged by the Persians, but it was quickly reconditioned, and remained in use till the erection of the Tholos. An older group (C to E) bears a similar relation to the archaic and classical Bouleuteria: these old buildings are here carefully described, but the Bouleuteria themselves are not treated in detail, though their identity is firmly established.

The Tholos, as its name implies, was a circular structure, and obviously unpretentious in plan and execution, for its walls were seemingly, above a few poros courses, of unburnt brick, and till Roman times its main door, opening to the east, had no porch. The gap roof-tiles, many of which survive, show that they covered a wooden roof resting on six unfluted Doric columns, which were arranged with pleasing unconventionality in a compromise between a ring concentric with the wall and an east—west scheme of nave and aisles. The kitchen, at first detached, was reached through a north door, and there was an elaborate drainage system. The columns were removed in the second century A.D., when a marble pavement replaced a mosaic laid down a hundred years earlier, and the floor had been plain clay. Minor finds included fragments of the standard weights and measures officially kept in the Tholos, and of simple terracotta table ware, very different from the plain epigraphical ware found in the temple bodily as that is needed. His main purpose is to present and weigh the new evidence provided by the American excavations.

The first thirty pages are chiefly concerned with the temple’s fortunes as the Church of St. George, and with the many graves sunk in its floor between the middle ages and the opening of the nineteenth century, when, for a short time, the Greek clergy let it be used as a Protestant burial-place. The first Protestant so buried was a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, the ingenious but unfortunate John Tweedde, who died at Athens in 1759 at the age of thirty, and the choice of the Theseum was a brilliant device of Fauvel’s for finding the body of a classical scholar looking to be examined. It will not escape the classical scholar that the last line of the Rev. Robert Walpole’s Greek poem, as printed by Dinsmoor on p. 21, does not scan, but this is not the fault of the author, a competent versifier, but a misprint in the Rev. Robert Twedde’s Remains of his brother, published in 1815, which also trapped Laurent in 1821. The true reading (KESEAI, not ΚΕΣΕΑ) was printed in 1814 in Clarke’s transcript, which Robert Tweedde copied, and the misprint is not corrected in a manuscript list of Errata added by the author to the Trinity Library copy of the Remains. A Fellow of John Tweedde’s College may perhaps be forgiven for wasting space on so trivial a point.

Far more important than these preliminary matters, are the contents of the next hundred pages, which deal elaborately with the new evidence, especially that provided by the careful examination of the foundations, now first fully exposed. The results are of the highest interest. The details of the foundation jointing prove that the ground plan was twice modified in the course of the work, and that in its final form the Hseaaum, unlike the other temples which Dinsmoor convincingly attributes to the same unknown architect (those at Samia on the Acropolis, and the Temple of Ares in the Athenian Agora) had an inner colonnade. This colonnade was Doric, in two tiers, such as an ambulatory scheme, like that of the Parthenon. It seems to have consisted of eleven columns, five on each side and three at the west end behind the cult statues, and its restoration is confirmed by the evidence of a block from the upper epistyle, found by Orlandos in 1937 in the modern east wall of the church.

Other modifications successively reduced the length of the cela, chiefly to the advantage of the pronaos, which in the final scheme (C) was to the opisthodomus as 4:5. The dimensions of the temple are based on the familiar ‘Attic foot’ of c. 0.326 m., while Dinsmoor, but not Norden, in Hesperi IX, p. 26, n. 40, substitutes the term ‘Doric foot,’ a change which the ambiguity of the old names makes desirable and welcome.

The excavations have most fortunately yielded also external evidence for the temple’s date, in the form of fragments of pottery and ostracon, and it now seems certain that building was begun about 450 b.c.: there are other grounds, partly astronomical, for dating the definite date 449 B.C. Dinsmoor allows about five years for the building, and suggests that the inner columns, with their ambulatory scheme, were an afterthought, between stages A and B, imitated from the similar schemes already adopted by Ictinus (on Dinsmoor’s view) at Bassae, to the organization of the temple planned by him for the Parthenon. The Hseaaum is to be regarded as the earliest of its architect’s four known
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temples, the other three following in the order Sunium, Ares, Rhamnus. It is likely that an earlier Hephaesteum, on a less artificial site farther inland, was reconstructed in temporary form after the Persian retreat.

Another matter elaborately discussed is the old and bitter controversy about the treatment of the marble wall surfaces. Dinsmoor concludes that both the stippling of the marble surface and the lead waterproofing of the joints prove that it was intended to apply stucco and to add mural painting, but that neither stucco nor paint was in fact applied, perhaps because of the intrusion of later colonnades, though it seems that some of this preparation must have gone on after the change of plan.

The new finds include parts of the bases of the cult-statues, in dark Eleusinian limestone, pieces of the aima, indistinguishable from those of the Temple of Ares, and some doubtful bits of metope and pediment sculpture. Dinsmoor concludes with an interesting discussion of the Hephaesteum's historical setting, now placed on a firm chronological basis, and a short appendix discusses in detail problems raised by the ostraka.

D. S. ROBERTSON


The occasion for this book was the discovery, during the American excavations of the ancient Agora at Athens, of three inscriptions (numbered here 24, 31 and 32). They were intrusted to Mr. Oliver for publication, and he has made an extremely workmanlike job of it, and in effect made a study of the various Gerusia of the time of the Roman Empire, drawing material from Ephesus, Stratonicea, Tralles, Apamea, Thessalonica, Philippiopolis and other cities. Once or twice he has used unpublished material; always the text of the inscriptions has been carefully worked over, and is never a mere reproduction. Here, then, is a volume which is of great importance for any student of Greek institutions under the Roman Empire, and generally for Greek social and economic history.

These Gerusia are not all of one form, and the Ephesian one goes back to before the days of Lysimachus. But by the time of the Empire, from being a purely social institution they have become sometimes municipal, sometimes a sort of Financial Board for the management of temple estates and funds, and concerned with expenditure on public religious festivals. It looks as though the Roman emperors of the second century A.D. were a benovolent idea and perhaps the rivalry of these Gerusia, supporting them, and even favouring their institution, and Mr. Oliver has some very good general pages (48-50) in which he discusses the reasons for this. He shows how it is that the Romans attempt to breathe fresh life into the official and city religion of the ancient world, and to counteract 'spiritual forces of a new and perhaps subversive character'. This is how the situation may well have appeared to Hadrian and his successors: if temples were being deserted as Pliny relates (Ep. X., 96), if Epicureans and Christians were subverting belief in the traditional gods, these able rulers realised that a policy of repression alone against these movements would be of little avail, unless it was supported by a revival of religious festivals, with their accompaniments of processions, ceremonies, splendour and junketings, in which all the population might join. Into these festivals, too, even though the god or goddess of the city was the ostensible object of the celebrations, the imperial cult and the figures of the ruling house were being steadily and skillfully insinuated. Moreover, the Gerusia—these managing-boards—would be composed of elderly, cautious, happily pious elements in the population, pillars of stability and 'sound finance', and Rome would be ready enough to back them. Such is the general picture: Mr. Oliver is most careful to warn readers that it is as yet incomplete and not a certainty, one, simply, 'a promising one'. This policy of the Antonines, sincere and subtle, finds its culmination in the efforts of Maximin to rehabilitate and exalt the pagan priesthoods and ceremonies, and in the moral and religious reforms of the earnest Julian.

Some other points of interest. In the newly-published letter of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus (no. 24) there is a fresh example of the emperors refusing gold statues offered them, for fear of incurring envy. They indicate that they prefer to hold on to their small and inexpensive bronze pontikes, which can easily be moved to various places. They are prepared, however, to allow their names to be placed on the bases, readily accepting such an expression of loyalty, on the condition that they accept όλα τὰ θέτα καὶ τὰ δικαιάνα ἐπίθημα δικαίως ἔθυμεν ἐν ἀπόστασιν: διό καὶ νόμος εὐγένειος ἐν ἑρμήνευσιν ποιήηται πολυτιθάντων μόνον χαλκᾶς ὁ τοῦ δὲ ἐχθέλων μετὰ κεραμάριον.

Here we have the emperors employing a very old formula, discovered (as I believe) by Augustus, and traceable in various pronouncements of Tiberius, Germanicus and Claudius (for the literature see Papers of the British School at Rome, XV, 1939, 1): it is interesting to find it in use two centuries after Augustus, and it must be one of the latest uses, for Commodus and his successors were not likely to adopt such an attitude. These inscriptions, too, reveal not only the generosity and public spirit of the richer citizens, but also the comparative poverty of many of the Greek cities and the hand-to-mouth existence that they often led.

A city is short of funds, there is a sudden emergency, a famine—and the only hope lies in the generous donations of a small body of wealthy citizens: Time and person come forward and undertake the burdens. There was too little initiative and resource in the cities themselves.

This seems to me a model of what such studies should be, and I shall look forward to reading more from Mr. Oliver.

M. P. C.


In their subtitles these volumes claim to be more than mere publications of Olynthian finds; and such a claim is justified, though less strikingly than in Vol. IX. They are presented with a thoroughness which makes it fully and conveniently available. The author constantly makes wide comparisons and draws general conclusions; often he traces the history of the class of objects illustrated or shows diverse cultural influences at work on Olynthus.

Vol. X presents over 2600 metal objects. In some categories the material though impressive in quantity inevitably becomes a little monotonous, and the excellent illustrations are extravagantly numerous. Most of the material is of the late fifth and early fourth centuries, though some is archaic. Professor Robinson finds corroborative of his Olynthian chronology: but those who doubt his contention that Olynthus virtually ceased to exist in 348 will not have their doubts finally removed by Vol. X (or XI); believers on the other hand are not likely to have their belief shaken. Most of the objects are naturally small and useful, and made of bronze, iron or lead ('the majority of lead is unusual'); there is little more valuable stuff. Vol. X gives the impression, as does XI too, that the Olynthians were mostly people of moderate wealth. However, a number of the items have considerable artistic interest.

Ch. I deals with statuettes and reliefs. Most remarkable are two bronze reliefs (with a young nude male figure and an Asiatic king; perhaps Apollo and Croesus) which Professor Robinson explains as parts of a horse's bridle. There is a statuette of a comic actor, probably a cook; some twin lead hens; and fragments of a relief of winged deities whose legs end in griffins.

Ch. II. Jewellery and Personal Ornaments. These include
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heads; bracelets, mostly of the type with two snakes' heads; earrings and fibulae of many varieties; and finger-rings, the bezels of which have a great variety of designs, some very delicate, some with rather mysterious subjects (the silver pin 474 is inscribed ΔΙΟΠΟΝ in gilt letters. A wreath of bronze leaves and clay berries was found in place on a skull.

Ch. III. Toilet Articles. A silver lid shows Cybele in a lion-car. There are several mirrors; the finest has a head of Athena, apparently a simplified Parthenos. Strigils are very numerous.

Ch. IV. Furnishings. Most impressive is the well-preserved bronze brazier (the 'bowl' 573 certainly looks like a brazier). There are two fine bronze moschaphic phialae with ring handles, a lidded tripod, and steins or graters, lamps, lades and many handles of various kinds.

Ch. V. Structural Material. Among door-fittings is a fine fifth-century lion-head knocker (or rather handle, if one considers the position of the ring: contrast Wiegand, Priene, Fig. 325). Perhaps the curious holes in the sides of the pivot-sockets 1:88 ft. are merely for econony in bronze. There is a great assortment of nails; and clamps, some of strange design. The iron dowel set in lead (541) might have been included here.

Ch. VI (Tools) deals with knives and swords (hard to distinguish) and varied instruments of carpentry, agriculture, surgery. Among the still is a fine specimen with crocodiles' (?) heads. Fish hooks and netting needles are remarkably numerous.

Ch. VII. Arms and Armour. Most types of arrowhead, usually in bronze, are well represented. Spear-heads, nearly all of bronze, are numerous too; three spear ends are given as arrowheads in Pl. CXXIV. Of the 500 sling-bullets over 100 are inscribed, with ΧΑ, ΟΙΑ, ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΣ, the names of Philip's generals and others, and more obscure inscriptions. (May not ΑΣΟΡΙΟΔΕΙ be a humorously coined name?) By means of the bullets Professor Robinson throws interesting light on the attack of 546. A well-preserved shield rim has been found.

Ch. VIII. Weights. These the author recommends for further study on account of their curious divergences. One has the inscription ΠΕΛΈΕΣΥ, 'which is probably a survival from the time when bronze axes were used as barter or currency.'

Ch. IX. Miscellaneous. This includes horse-bits, on which Professor Robinson gives extensive notes; a revolving rattle (from a child's grave), which he thinks a mere playingthing, not magical; an Athenian diacst's bronze 'tablet,' and seven sets of spears.

Some earlier Olynthus volumes have been criticised for not giving 'archaeological contexts' in full. In X the place of discovery at least is given with most items, usually a particular room of a house, or a grave; and Professor Robinson's captions are far from lacking in concise information in some cases. A 'Concurrence of Proveniences' at the end, and the author suggests that further study of this would be profitable.

Vol. XI deals with the crematoria, in which about 600 graves have been excavated, mostly of the fifth and fourth centuries; 'the graves seem to end quite abruptly' at 348. Part I gives a careful description of all the burials; Part II analyzes and discusses them. The Appendix publishes nine skulls which, T. J. Angel has reconstructed (a difficult task, since remains at Olynthus are badly warped and disintegrated in the damp earth). Illustrations are very full, and in most cases good, considering the difficult nature of the subject.

The 'riverside' cemetery on the west was most populous. None of the groups of graves shows any orderly arrangement. Often a later burial encroaches upon or is superimposed upon an earlier. There are very few possible fragments of funeral monuments. The corpses almost always lay supine; with the head usually to the east, though there were many variations.

Olynthus (556, a child's) was found within the city. There were three closely buried corpses (nineteen and twenty-six bodies) of possibilities in fighting. The handsome chamber tomb was built under a mound about 1040 m. west of the town. The walls were stuccoed and painted in horizontal bands of blue, white and red; the ceiling was probably of wood. The tomb was probably built early in the fourth century (a coin and pottery confirm this). Professor Robinson states that the burial was probably a secondary cremation, and the tomb never contained a coffin. In a preliminary report he suggested that the occupant was a distinguished statesman or general; and much evidence is forthcoming. It is said to hear that every stone has been stolen since excavation.

The proportion of cremations was as usual low—not more than 10 per cent.; though a few may have been secondary. Among the inhumations were several stone sarcophagi, and a number of wooden coffins, of which usually only the nails were left. Most Olynthian burials were simple and cheap. Commonest of all is the gabled-tile type; but many had tiles laid flat either directly on the body or resting on the sides of a narrow trench. 'There is no difference in the types of graves from the earliest to the latest or in their construction or arrangement.' Thirty per cent. of the burials found were of infants or small children, and even this probably does not indicate fully the rate of infant mortality. Most infants were buried in amphorae, usually broken off at the shoulder to allow the insertion of the corpse. Professor Robinson says (n. 50, p. 172), 'In view of our excavations I believe that exposure of infants was rare'; but it is difficult to see what the evidence is.

Valuable furniture was found in about 60 per cent. of the burials, though usually very meagre. It was frequent in cremations and coffins, and surprisingly above the average in simple 'unprotected' burials which are very numerous; for this reason in particular the assertion that none of these ever had coffins is not entirely convincing. The 'furniture' is of a miscellaneous and casual nature; some objects are inappropriate to the age or sex of the deceased. Much of this material has been published in earlier volumes. It includes, besides many vases of various kinds, and jewellery, feeding-bottles, eggs (two), a very few lamps, many terra-cotta figurines (mostly in children's graves); about 1000 astragali. About 10 per cent. of the burials contained coins (mostly of the fourth century and none necessarily later than 546); these were usually placed in the mouth.

The author very reasonably concludes that 'funeral customs were free and open to variations, and were loosely interpreted. This is to be expected of a people who, though profoundly religious, had no precise creed.' Constant comparison with material from other sources leads to the further conclusion that in spite of variations due to local conditions there was an essential uniformity in Helenic customs.

In the Appendix Mr. J. Angel, after his careful description of the specimens and analysis of their characteristics, showing the influence of various types at Olynthus, concludes, 'The study of these Olynthians and other Greeks shows at least that the first civilization is achieved by a highly mengrel, much mixed and subtly blended people.' Tables of comparative measurements are appended.

R. E. W.


Conçu dans un esprit pédagogique plus que proprement scientifique, l’ouvrage se propose de faire connaître les pays sous Mandat français et ses voisins immédiats du point de vue géographique et géologique et aussi du point de vue de la géographie humaine. L’auteur affirme aussi que les problèmes historiques, politiques ou confessionnels ont été abordés dans l’esprit de la plus scrupuleuse impartialité.

L’ouvrage a visiblement été écrit pour un ouvrage plus vaste tel qu’il a été préliminairement conçu, c’est-à-dire en deux volumes dont l’un devait replacer la Syrie et le Liban dans leur cadre géographique naturel, le second devait traiter en détail les diverses régions des pays sous Mandat.

La Guerre ayant empêché la réalisation du projet, les auteurs ont décidé de publier la première partie seule. Il.

It is not often that books dealing exclusively with the ancient Near East and general interest and yet prove valuable to the student of classical antiquity. This volume succeeds in both respects. It is another of those fascinating and sumptuously illustrated publications which the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago has been producing in the last decade. Its organizer, the late James H. Breasted, had extended the scope of its enterprises in 1931 to the Achaemenian remains of Persepolis and the results of the campaigns 1931-1933 are published in the present volume. Even a hasty glance at the many excellent illustrations will show the wealth and variety of the material brought to light, while the methods of aerial mapping and aerial survey introduced here for the first time will make the book extremely valuable and interesting to everyone interested in the ancient Near East.

The Aeronautical Department of the Expedition, founded by Mary Helen Warden Schmidt in 1933, has contributed a great deal to the volume. The splendid air views of Persepolis, of Naqshi-Rustam, and of the Persepolis plain show very clearly the importance of these new methods of exploration and survey. As Schmidt puts it: 'It would be impossible for any surveyor to produce a drafted topographical map of the area here shown and to indicate all the innumerable details appearing on the air view.' It may be added, however, that such spectacular success can only be achieved in an area not densely populated, where every single fragment of ancient brick-work becomes visibly visible from the air.

Part of this volume deals with the discoveries made during tests, clearings, and restorations on the Persepolis Terrace, as well as during the excavations near Persepolis (e.g., Naqshi-Rustam, Istahlab, and Tall-i-Bakun). Especially interesting are seals with a great variety of designs, metal objects, and vases of alabaster or lapis lazuli which the author shows to have been brought to Persepolis as spoils from Egypt. E. F. Schmidt has an excellent way of dealing with the results of his exploration. He is modest in his claims and not dogmatic about his own theories, yet he displays an enthusiasm and an archeologist which recall the eighteenth-century generation of classical archeologists. The author's descriptions are adequate and clear, and the wealth of information enables the reader to criticize the author's views.

It is to be regretted, however, that the author, when commenting on the objects found, or when dealing with the chronology or development of types, has paid so little attention to the almost inexhaustible reservoir of Greek art in Asia Minor and in the Aegean generally. More light could have been thrown on a good many of the discoveries made at Persepolis. For instance, the pedestal composed of three lions attached to a bronze socket might have become less problematical and more interesting by comparison with the parionion in Greece and Asia Minor.

The striking resemblance to an early archaic group from the Heraean at Olympia should have been stated. The bronze group of two galloping horses, cast in one piece, should not only have been compared with Assyrian models, and indeed this comparison does not help to explain any of the peculiarities of this group. Assyria was never the centre of bronze technique. Surely the time has come to drop the old method of trying to find foreign influence on one nation through its borrowings from its neighbour, and to turn to a new way of looking at things, i.e. to start with a full view embracing the whole of the Near East and the Mediterranean Basin as one single world of homogeneous culture, with two or more distinct, but all somewhat related to each other. Thus, when a piece of bronze sculpture is to be examined and no parallels are forthcoming, should not the thought occur at once, either to look for a parallel of bronze technique at that time in one of the other similar products found in this ancient world of Eurasia? Much more could have been said about that astonishing piece of metal work on the sword of the carrier of the royal battle-axe found on the southern Mesopotamian relief. The fact might have been mentioned that, on a relief of this kind, all the minor details have their importance and their meaning, and we cannot understand them properly unless we trace them back to their origins and to the ways in which they had been employed on other occasions.

The main feat of the campaigns described, however, is the discovery of the Treasury. In the south-eastern part of the Persepolis Terrace a block of building material which was identified with their contents as royal storehouses and armories. The character and value of many find the term 'Treasury.' Its large courtyard, called Court of Reception, is surrounded by two of which are ornamented with animal reliefs onhuge reliefs. These reliefs show all the persons who appear on the well-known portraits of the Hundred Column Hall, but one figure is added: that of the crown prince standing behind the throne of his father. Schmidt was probably right in assuming that this fact helps to date the reliefs. He says the king must be Darius, and the crown prince can only be Xerxes, who so emphatically states in some of his inscriptions that his father chose him in preference to his brothers. As this relates to the year 490, and as Darius died before 485, it seems to give a comparatively accurate date to the two reliefs. But it will be remembered how emphatically Esdras Hefeld once stated that the corresponding reliefs in the Hundred Column Hall must represent Darius. Later, a foundation document was found showing that it was Artaxerxes I who completed the Hundred Column Hall on the foundations prepared by his father Xerxes. Thus even Hefeld, unqualified as an authority on ancient Iran, had to correct his identification.

As for the Treasury reliefs, Schmidt states that the decisive factor is the presence of the second person of royal rank, the crown prince. On this he bases his identification of Darius and Xerxes, with Aspandine to the left and Gobryas to the right. But was not also Darius II in 439 chosen as crown prince by his father Artaxerxes I in preference to his brothers, and was not Artaxerxes II in 424 chosen crown prince by his father Darius II? It must be remembered that there are only two great reliefs definitely dating back to Darius the Great, the Baghistan relief and the tomb of Darius. If the Treasury relief goes back to this date, the carrier of the royal battle-axe (the second dignitary behind the king) may well be Aspandine, as on the tomb of Darius. But the lance-bearer on the right cannot be Gobryas, for on the Darius reliefs Gobryas is the first dignitary of the state, standing behind the king. And Gobryas patishahar probably does not mean the 'Patashian, for he was a Persian noble and of the family of the Mardamunian; it can only mean a title which we are not able to translate, corresponding to the title of Aspandine wusaba ( = carrier of the royal battle-axe).

In contrast to the two existing Darius reliefs, the first dignitary of state on the Treasury reliefs is far from being a warrior-prince like Gobryas or father of Mardamios and their heir in law to Darius himself with whom he had helped to defend the throne: he is a man with a long dress (no Persian trousers) and a muffer cap, without a beard or mustache (which would be visible behind it, as out), and with a neatly folded napkin in his right hand. Schmidt thinks he may be a eunuch, and that is quite possible, for literary
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sources of the time of Artaxerxes indicate that the first dignitaries of the state were enuchi. But this precisely points to a later date for the reliefs. With Darius, the first dignitaries are the men who helped him to win the throne. No such figure as "enuchi" occurs on the two existing Darius reliefs. It does, however, occur on some of the corresponding audience reliefs of the Hundred Column Hall in the palace set up by Artaxerxes I. And it is well to remember that with Artaxerxes I we are in the heyday of Mazdazism which was instituted as the state religion by Xerxes and Artaxerxes I. It may well be that this so-called enuchi was a high priest of the empire, characterised as such by his dress, and thus performing the functions of the first dignitary of the state in the court of Artaxerxes I.

This is just to show that it is not much use stating anything very emphatically before the Treasury has been completely cleared and foundation documents discovered. Schmidt may be right with his early date, but the absence of Gobryas and the presence of the muffled first dignitary as on the Artaxerxes reliefs are rather unsatisfactory.

Another fact has been stated with accuracy by Schmidt: All those who on this audience relief are shown in close presence of majesty are persons of high rank. He had at first believed that the two figures on the left and one of those at the right were lance-carrying guards. Some details have changed since, and he shows with very good evidence that none of them in his simple guards and all persons on these audience reliefs are some sort of dignitaries of the king. The number of persons figuring on the Treasury relief and the audience reliefs of the Hundred Column Hall are seven, one from king and crown prince. Darius, however, in the Baghistant inscription mentions his generals by name and gives them prominent rank which he meant their families to hold in all the future. On the tomb of Darius there same six men appear, with the same names, standing on either side of the king. Xenophon records that it was Artaxerxes I who instituted the seven dignitaries of the state and that this institution continued down to his time; Herodotus confirms this by mentioning the seven princes, and the Book of Esther does the same.

These were no longer members of the six old families whom Darius and Xerxes had promoted to high rank, for most of those families had been exterminated by that time. Nor were they all generals by any means. These seven high dignitaries had become part of the court ceremonial. The rank remained, but the person and family could be changed, and thus they figure on the reliefs of Artaxerxes I in the Hundred Column Hall, without any inscriptions.

The whole group of audience reliefs really deserves a separate study, and it is a great pity that this has not been done.

The present volume forms an important contribution to the study of art. The points on which one may differ from the author, as in the instances just shown, are of a nature that does not impair the value of the book as a whole. This value is determined chiefly by the quality of the illustrations, by the clarity and accuracy of the descriptions, and by the adequacy of the illustrations. In these respects it leaves little to be desired. It is an extremely useful to those concerned with Greek art in the fifth century, and of permanent value to those interested in the Near East.

F. J. Turrsch


In this work are published the récits céramiques rapportées par Dr. Emil Forrer de plusieurs sondages exécutés par lui en 1934, pour le compte du Bryn Mawr College, au Qalatu-er-Rus et sur le Tell Souksa situé à la côte syrienne au N et au S de Djeblé (ou Jebelb), le Qalatu-er-Rus, en comparant le court rapport du fouilleur est publié à la fin (Appendix II, p. 125). Il aurait, logiquement, dû être place en tête du petit volume.

Sur le Qalatu-er-Rus, tell à peu près carré d'environ 300 m d'après la mémorial, à l'embouchure du Nahr Russo et à 45 km au S de Ras Shamra, Dr. Forrer a reconnu au-dessous d'une couche superficielle non stratifiée de 2 m 30 d'épais-

seur, quatorze niveaux archéologiques atteignant ensemble une épaisseur de 10 m. Après A. M. Ehrich, les plus anciens de ces niveaux remontent au 3e millénaire d. J. C. environ 4000 envir. Les données stratigraphiques et céramiques sont, à mon avis, insuffisantes pour permettre des conclusions, même provisoires. Je renonce à leur discussion.

Dans le niveau V qui est le plus profond, Dr. Forrer observe les murs en briques d'une habitation sous le sol de laquelle gisait un squelette accompagné d'un grand nombre d'objets, d'outils en bronze et de pièces d'or en bronze, d'autres s erhires en corail et quartz (fig. 2). Lors d'une visite à Ras Shamra, Dr. Forrer me montra ses trouvailles. Leur identité avec les parures rituelles des sépultures à la base du niveau II de l'édifice de Ras Shamra ne fait pas de doute. La tombe de Qalatu-er-Rus est par conséquent contemporaine de l'Ugarit Moyen I (2100-1900). Cette date est plus élevée que celles proposées par Dr. Forrer (XVIIIe s.), et par A. M. Ehrich (XIXe s.). A propos de ces trouvailles, le second auteur fait allusion aux terres et épingles identiques de Byblos trouvées par Mr. Montet et considérées comme importées du Cappadoce depuis un article publié par H. Hubert dans Syria. Cette hypothèse n'est pas soutenable, mais me semble que les Qalaat-er-Rus et Ras Shamra ont démontré que ces terres et épingles ont été apportées comme parure par une population installée à demeure sur la côte syrienne au début du IIe millénaire. D'un autre côté, comme l'a souligné H. Hubert, le Cappadoce, contrairement à ce que l'on a parfois dit, demeurera longtemps un lieu livré des terres et épingles de ce type (cf. nos Élémens de Chronologie de Ras Shamra, in préparation).

Sous le niveau V qui a restitué la tombe au tour du temps, Dr. Forrer a reconnu une couche d'incendie épaisse de 60 cm qui, d'après lui, marque une interruption dans l'habitation ancienne de cette partie du Qalatu (I. p. 118). Plus tard, les ruines d'un important bâtiment antérieur à l'incendie furent mises au jour. Soit basé sur l'examen de la céramique, A. M. Ehrich, à son tour, était amené à supposer l'existence d'un hiatus chronologique au Qalatu qui d'après elle, s'intercalerait entre 2300 et 1800 (I. p. 50).

L'analyse de la structure stratigraphique du Qalatu par Dr. Forrer et A. M. Ehrich correspond à mes observations de Ras Shamra. Là aussi, les tombeaux et autres terres et épingles perçues de l'Ugarit Moyen I se trouvent à la base d'une couche qui succède à un niveau d'incendie lequel marque une interruption dans l'habitation du tell. Il est à supposer que les événements qui avaient cause cette rupture dans la séquence stratigraphique des deux sites si longtemps après l'un de l'autre, étaient les mêmes à Ras Shamra qu'au Qalatu. Cette hypothèse permet d'apporter au Qalatu la chronologie élaborée à Ras Shamra, qui s'applique possiblement de préférence à la période d'incendie qui a précédé l'arrivée de l'Ugarit Ancien III de Ras Shamra, attribuée à la période entre 2400 et 2200 envir. La même date a été proposée pour la céramique analogique du Qalatu.
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C. F. A. Schafer


Situé sur la vieille route qui relie le Nord de la Perse au Golfe Persique, le tell ou têpé Sialk est proche de la ville actuelle de Khashan et constitue le centre d’une ferme oisie qui recueille l’eau des sources de la montagne voisine. Entre 1933 et 1937, trois campagnes de fouilles furent entreprises par le Musée du Louvre sous la direction de M. Girshman sur les deux collines dont se compose le site ancien. Les résultats obtenus dans les strates inférieures et prétériques appelées Sialk I à IV sont exposés dans le I vol publ en 1938. Le volume II, dont un certain nombre d’articles inédits figurent, débute par la mémoire de J. M. Frey sur la colline méridionale dans les couches V à VII et dans les deux nécropoles à 250 m au S de l’étage appelées nécropole A et B, lesquelles sont contemporaines de Sialk V et VI respectivement. Pour simplifier l’on peut désigner par nécropole A et B les nécropoles correspondantes par les sigles A et VI, B et VI. Sialk V, A est caractérisé par une céramique faite au tournant d’un terre fini monochrome, généralement gris-noir et par la rareté des vases peints et de la poterie commune. Les armes et outils sont en bronze à l’exception d’un petit poignard à soie et d’un poinçon qui sont en fer. Les bijoux sont exceptionnellement en or et décorés de rangées de tiges en grénat, les perles sont faites d’agate, coquillage, lapiaz, turquoise, pierre. Béton, bronze, coquille marine et pâte de verre. Deux tombes contenaient chacune un cylindre dont l’urine, en hématite assez grossièrement gravé, figure une scène reminiscence de la glyptique du Bronze récent en Syrie. L’extrême rareté des objets de fer et le fait que les rapprochements que l’on peut établir à propos des types céramiques et des cylindres ne concerne que des sites où le fer existait important, prouvant, comme la première fois, l’inscription. Sialk I, A est attribué à la fin du Bronze. Cela permet de placer la date finale vers 1200 avant notre ère, le l’âge du Fer débutant Perse septentrionale et au Tadjik en Syrie vers le fin du XIIe s. D’autre part, parallèle, le cylindre en métaux semblables babyloniens et syriens du Bronze récent permet de fixer le terminus ante quem vers 1400. M. Girshman, ayant avoir d’abord attribué Sialk V, A au Bronze final, entre 1400 et 1200 (voir son rapport préliminaire dans Syra, 1935, p. 289), prétend dans la publication définitive une date beaucoup plus basse : le commencement du Fer, entre 1200 et 1000 (Sialk II, p. 20). Pourtant cette date n’est pas seulement confirmée avec les indices chronologiques fournis par les trouvailles de Sialk, mais aussi avec ceux qui l’on peut tirer des nombreux comparaisons avec les sites correspondants en Perse et ailleurs soigneusement établies par M. Girshman lui-même. En résumé, les rapprochements qui s’imposent entre les vases tripodes et les jarres ornées de têtes de bélier d’une part, les vases analogues des couches III et I de Gyan-Djashnameh, de l’autre, témoignent de la même date. Il en est de même des rapprochements, en vérié assises vagues, entre la céramique de Sialk V, A, celle du Talychche et celle de Gandha-Karabagh dans la Transcaucasie orientale (cf. F. Hancar, Eur. Sept. Ant. IX, p. 50 et nos Éléments de chronologie de Ras Shamra, en préparation). Les liens que le fouilleur est tenté d’établir entre certaines rares spécimens de poterie peinte de Sialk V, A, et la céramique de Cappadoce (Alishar III) et de Boghaz Keui ne sont pas non plus pour encourager la réduction proposée par lui. La meilleure comparaison qui puissent actuellement être établies à propos de la céramique gris-noire dominante à Sialk V, A est celle avec la poterie correspondante de Rayy ou de Tépé Piramidal de la région de la Caspienne du Sud. Ici les constataisions des fouilleurs suédois et américains sont unanimes : la céramique gris-noire est caractéristique du Bronze récent, et feuille de nécropole V, B, était en usage à l’époque où des travaux de fortification considérables avaient été entrepris à Sialk en vue d’assurer la sécurité de la ville pendant la dernière période de son existence. D’après les empreintes de lits, les crânes par M. V. Vallois (l.c. p. 3 et suiv.), les auteurs notent que ces travaux appartenaient au groupe dit arménien, le stock matériel est différent de celui qui prévaut à Sialk. Certaines correspondances que l’on peut relever entre la céramique de VI, B et V, A de Sialk sont considérées par M. Girshman comme de nature accidentelle ; elle ne semble néanmoins indiquer un certain degré de continuité entre les deux périodes du site. Sur plus de 200 examens par la mission de Sialk, 70 seulement étaient intactes. Les autres avaient été ouvertes par les indigènes à la recherche de belles céramique peinte appréciée par les antiquaires depuis la aucque des bronzes du Louvre. C’est cette céramique peinte, faite au tour, d’une pâte fine, dans laquelle les potiers ont réussi à modérer les formes métalliques les plus extravagantes jusqu’à imiter le décor en camaïeurs et les rivets, qui caractérise le mobilier funéraire de la nécropole V, B. Dans les tombes riches de Sialk, l’utilisation du bronze se trouvent à l’abandon de leurs imitations en terre cuite. Ceux-ci, après avoir leur long bec tubulaire rappelant parfois un phallos se détachant à angle droit de la panse, ne pouvaient être utilisés que difficilement pour les besoins de la vie quotidienne, puisque la plupart des vases peints de Sialk VI, B figurent des étalons. En ce qui concerne le mobilier métallique, l’armement et l’outillage sont principalement en bronze ; le fer utilise aussi pour les bracelets, torches et épingles à habits a être considéré comme relativement précieux. La fibule était inconnue. Parmi la parure corporelle, il y a de nombreux cylindres en pâte vitreuse ou en pierre tendre. L’arrangement synchrone des sujets, l’attitude des caprins accroupis sont reminiscences de la glyptique dite de Kirkouk, du Talychche et de Ras Shamra des XVe-XIVe s. Quand aux statues, l’un d’eux (l.c. p. 67, pl. XXXI) porte des hétérophylles qui entrent dans la composition du cartouche de Séri I (1319-1300). D’après M. Boreux, il serait de fabrication syrienne. On a quelquefois constaté que des scarabées de ce type ont été utilisés comme l’instrument le plus efficace de propulsion. En admettant que le scarabée du Sialk V, B avait été en usage encore un siècle après l’époque de Séri I, la tombe d’où il prouvant devrait être placée autour de 1200. En allant jusqu’à admettre, de deux siècles, la tombe serait de Séri IIIE s. C’est cette date que M. Girshman, dans son premier rapport de fouilles, avait considéré comme le terminus post quem de Sialk VI, B. Dans la publication définitive il a cru devoir
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dela descendance au Xe s. portant ainsi à 300 ans l'écart minimum entre la date supposée des nécropole et celle qu’indique le scarabée qu’elle a restitué. Quant à la fin de Sialk VI B, l'auteur, en dernier lieu, propose le IXe s., ou le début du VIIIe.

Cette proposition est inavouable; elle va à l'opposé de tous les indices fournis par les mobiliers funéraires de Sialk VI B et aussi de ceux suggérés par les rapports extérieurs. Ainsi, les tombes du "guerreur Luristan" de Ghirshman considère comme étant contemporaines de Sialk VI B avaient été attribuées par Mr. Contenau et lui-même entre 1400 et 1500. D'après le "Tepé Hisar III C", en dépit de certains traits communs seraient antérieurs à celles de Sialk VI B. Cette observation est en accord avec la date proposée par Hissar par Mr. E. F. Schmidt: 2000-1500, date que MM. Contenau et Ghirshman估imaient devoir descendre jusqu'à 1300-1250. Dans le présent travail, Mr. Ghirshman ne cite plus que l'opinion de Heine-Geldern d'après laquelle la fin de Hissar III C serait à placer vers 1000. Fondé sur un argument qui, au contraire, témoigne en faveur de la date plus haute: l'abondance totale du fer à Hissar, la proposition de Heine-Geldern est inacceptable. Ainsi, le rapprochement avec Hissar III C n'appuie pas la réduction de la date de Sialk VI B.

Mr. Ghirshman a noté dans l'Exécution de certains traits communs d'aspect céramique de Sialk VI B avec ceux de la Talych de Bronze final, notamment les poignards à manche incurvées. Les poignards de ce type de Véry peuvent être maintenant attribués au XIIIe s. Mais où il faut faire fausse route, de notre point de vue, c'est quand l'auteur déclare Sialk VI B contemporain de l'âge du fer de l'Asie Centrale. Ni les poignards, ni les épées, ni les haches, ni la céramique des nécropoles talychienées du Fer ne montrent la moindre ressemblance typologique avec les objets équivalents de Sialk VI B. Il faut rappeler aussi que la civilisation du fer de la Talyche n'a plus connu le cylindre ce qui contribue à accuser sa différence avec celle de Sialk VI B.

Les rapprochements avec les trouvailles de la région de Gandhara-Karabagh signalés par l'auteur ne sont pas non plus en faveur de la date basée proposée par lui, les trouvailles de la Transcaucasie en question étant attribuables entre 1530 et 1900 (voir F. Hancar, t.c., et nos Elements de Chronologie). Il est difficile de comprendre d'autre part, comment la comparaison avec les trouvailles du Bronze et du Fer du Kouban puisse justifier la thèse d'une parenté entre la civilisation de Sialk VI B et celle du Caucase septentrionale. Mr. Ghirshman ne peut citer que des rapprochements assez vagués, mais insiste lui-même sur la différence des types de l'Élément, de la parure corporelle, du harnachement ou sur leur absence respective dans l'une ou l'autre des deux civilisations comparées (p. 93, 94). Même si le rapprochement était justifié, il ne se confirme pas. Je crois qu'à partir de la date de Sialk VI B, car, l'on sait maintenant, que les civilisations illustrées par les nombreuses trouvailles koubianiennes du Bronze et du Fer ne peuvent pas au-dessous de 1000 avant notre ère être en chiffres rouges.

Mr. Ghirshman note que la position respectée des nécropoles de Sialk VA et VI B, ne permet pas d'admettre qu'il y eut une interruption entre leurs périodes d'utilisation. Comparé avec ce qui a été dit ici des indices chronologiques tirés de l'étude du mobilier et des rapprochements avec des sites voisins, cette observation permet de fixer le commencement de Sialk VI B au cours du XIIIe s. This date s'accorde avec le fait rapporté par Mr. Ghirshman le commencement de cette époque concerne les formes courantes à la fin du Bronze et que le fer était encore le privilège des classes fortunées. Dans la civilisation aussi développée que celle de Sialk et dont le territoire s'étendait aux pays producteurs très riches en fer, un pareil état de chose ne paraît pas s'accompagner du XIXe s. En définitif, l'écart entre les dates soutenues ici et celles proposées par Mr. Ghirshman dans la publication définitive du Xe s. est net comme suit:

pour Sialk VI A: 1400-1200 au lieu de 1200-1000

pour Sialk VI B: 1250-1100 au lieu de 1000-900

Si je me suis évidemment ici sur la question de la date des niveaux VA et VI B de Sialk, c'est que ce site est le seul, à partir Tépé Guyan, où l'on ait rencontré et exploré de nombreuses sépultures contemporaines de certaines des nécropoles du Luristan voisin desquelles les indigènes avaient retiré les fameux bronze. Le classement chronologique est donc très controversé des antiques époques tardives, mais les trouvailles correspondantes de Sialk offrent un appui précieux. Elles permettent de confirmer, ce que nous avons établi avec précision, que Sialk est en réalité à l'âge du Bronze et à une date antérieure au XIXe s.

Pour l'étude des épées protohistoriques de la Perse et de l'Asie Centrale en général, le volume de Sialk avec son abondante illustration se présente ainsi comme un instrument de travail de premier ordre.

C. F. A. SCHAEPFER


The memoir is an account of the work carried out by a British expedition which spent the summer of 1938 in excavating a number of sites in the extreme north of the Gandhara country, and in making an archaeological reconnaissance in the Oxus territories of Afghanistan. The material results ensuing from this work have not perhaps been completely published, though the information obtained seems to have been calculated or of the obscure history of Greco-Buddhist art appear in a new and unexpected light.

The first chapter gives a résumé of our present knowledge of the archaeology of Gandhara and Central Asia, and clearly defines the tasks which the expedition set itself. To this day, scarcely any Gandharan site which was found unexplored has been scientifically excavated; dated inscriptions are few, and the era to which they refer mostly unknown; for political reasons it has all too often been impossible to attempt exploration and preservation of the monuments still extant. The aim of the present expedition was to collect archaeological evidence, and to produce the beginnings of a trustworthy chronology of Gandhara sculpture.

The main camp was set up at Barikot, in lower Swat; all the ancient remains of the district were surveyed, and excavations conducted at several important sites. In all, trial excavations were undertaken in various parts of a mound at Charbagh, some twenty miles up the valley, under conditions of considerable hardship. The scarcity of the sculptures remains unearthed, and their damaged condition, have led the excavators to conclude that the result of willful destruction at the hands of the White Huns in the fifth century A.D. has been over-estimated. Damage from natural causes, gradual decay, and perhaps a 'retreat' of the treasures of unproctected mountain settlements into the monasteries of the plain—both because of the gradual decline of Buddhism, and for reasons of general security—cannot account for their present condition. It would appear, therefore, that the sculptures which have not come to light in such huge quantities in 'repositories' in the river valleys, in the plains, were not strictly speaking found in situ.

Though the immediate results are not of the first importance, the knowledge gained by the members of the expedition and laid down in this memoir is an important step towards a solution on a scientific basis of the many problems set by the archaeology of the region. It is to be hoped that a way has now been paved for future research on similar lines.

H. BOGHRAI
several were transported to America, some to the Louvre, the majority are still in Syria; the material is impressive in quantity and popular in appeal. A large number of floors were published with collotype reproductions in The Mosaics of Antioch on the Orontes II, and the image was actually found, season by season, and a long catalogue gave the colours of the tesserae, sketch-plans of some of the floors and notes of datable objects such as coins or lamps found under them. A critical review of the quality and significance of the new material is badly wanted. Professor Morey's book, The Mosaics of Antioch, is a brief introduction to the subject from one aspect. The first half is taken up with an essay on the city of Antioch and its cultural centre, the second with the history of the development of figural painting at Antioch as illustrated by the new finds. Both essays are full of interest. The mosaics range in date from about A.D. 100 to about A.D. 500, and Morey comes to the conclusion that they show a gradual Orientalisation of art during this period, Hellenistic Syria slipping into the embrace of the East.

The mosaics now republished, about a score in number, may have been chosen with an eye to this theory, but they include most of the finest specimens from Antioch and Daphne. The illustrations are livelier than those in the previous publication, the descriptions full and sympathetic, but we should have been glad of a few references to a number of second- and third-century mosaics which are Hellenistic in subject, feeling and execution: the picture of the Judgement of Paris in a more or less natural landscape setting (i) is plainly copied from a famous painting; (v) is a superbly modelled figure of Neptune or Oceanus on a background of blue and green glass tesserae now sadly decomposed (iv), and a symposium in which figures labelled Agros and Opora are served by Omus (iv); a pedlar catching cusps (iv) which symbolise wayward affections (vii) recalls a Pompeian wall painting; the picture of a love-sick youth in bed gazing at a portrait of his beloved belongs to another genre, but to the same period (xxi). More of the early floors is excellent, but rows of finished pictures of this type, executed with extreme virtuosity and representing original paintings as faultlessly perhaps as the chronomihographies of the last century, do not recur in later pavements. Pictorial elements persist, but they are treated differently, the drawing is simplified and the figures arranged according to new formulas. These changes we find it hard to consider signs of decadence or primitivism. The reproduction on such a scale of elaborate pictures on floors was a comparatively late development in the Hellenistic world and, however interesting the pictures may be to students of ancient painting, something of an aberration; it was absurd to lay in a row on the floor a wall fresco to decorate a wall; from this the pictures could only be seen sideways or upside down, and indications of a third dimension on a floor are positively disagreeable to many eyes; the better the representation, the more out of place it was on a pavement. Consequently the shift to a two-dimensional style, to rhythmic composition and to carpet motifs which Morey regards as symptoms of Oriental atavism were really progressive steps towards a more appropriate floor-covering. Various experiments were made. One experiment is to be seen in an opulent and somewhat overloaded floor (xvi, xvii, and Antioch II, 65) which Morey describes as 'perhaps the finest decorative work' surviving from Como's age: an octagonal fountain in the middle, on the outer border of panels with various subjects facing towards it. The same formula—the replacement of the single composition by four loosely related themes, one facing each side of the panel—is exemplified on a great hunting floor (xx) which is divided side-wise by a groove. A decorative panel in a geometrical design, and another labelled Kitis is placed in the centre; the second (xxi, xxii) has a trellis woven

The Buildings at Samaria (Samaria—Sebaste I). By C. W. CROWFOOT, KATHLEEN M. KENYON and E. L. SEUKEN. Pp. xv + 139; pl. 89 + 55 text figs. London: Palestine Exploration Fund, 1942. 40s. (subscribers 21s.).

The earlier remains at Samaria have little bearing on Hellenistic architecture: the proto-Ionic plaster capitals are already well known, and the only other discovery worth mentioning here is a somewhat hypothetical ramp entrance which the excavators compare with that at Seleucia on the Orontes. The most interesting pieces of classical building are three cylindrical towers of about 300 B.C., projecting from an eighth-century wall which seems to have still enclosed the summit and the near terrace of the hill. This acropolis was re-built shortly before 100 B.C., no doubt because of the Maccabean troubles. At first the new fort abutted at its comer against the inner segments of two of the round towers, but these were soon removed and a rectangular salient took the place of one at least. The authors do not attempt to explain this substitution of an apparently inferior means of defence, but it may be suggested that the towers were demolished after the siege of c. 110 at the same time as a breach was deliberately made in the wall of the city; the fort was not built up again when that gap was mended—probably c. 50 B.C. by order of Gabinius.

Samaria was much enlarged when Herod refounded it as Sebaste, c. 25 B.C. His great temple, presumably dedicated to Augustus (and as usual to Roma) is a useful prototype for Baalbek. It is raised upon an artificial platform, most of the space being occupied by a forecourt, at the back of which was a flight of steps leading to the temple proper, which stood on a high podium. It seems to have had a deep prostyle porch and side colonnades. Herod may also have been responsible for an early alteration, the construction of basement corridors along the edge of the great platform; apparently they had a flat ceiling resting on a double row of slender arches. The other Herodian remains described are the town wall, a set of painted crow-steps from a parapet, and the painted walls of the stadium, which originally had a Doric colonnade round the interior.

Most of the ruins of Sebaste can now be dated between about 180 and 230 A.D. They include the previously excavated west gate, the fora colonnades and adjoining basilica, the Corinthian order in the stadium, the temple of Kore, the theatre (with a stage-front which has African analogies), two small shrines, some extremely handsome tombs, and extensive alterations to the Augusteum (including a renewal of the porch, in antis, and the vaulting of the basement corridors with a single span). Domestic remains are insignificant, but the tombs clearly resemble houses, having atrium courts off which large vaulted rooms, lined with niches for sarcophagi, with carefully adapted to the same period, deserves and receives detailed study.

The Christian ruins are summarily treated: they comprise two shrines of John the Baptist and a possible conversion of the basilica into an apsidal cathedral with north orientation.

The report discusses some of the buildings published by the Harvard excavators, supplementing and correcting their material without superseding it. In the main, however, it is devoted to the finds made by the British Academy and a group of subscribers associated with the firm of Marks and Spencer—an encouraging portent. The excavations were obviously most carefully and intelligently conducted. The book gives a conscientious, well-reasoned and clear account of the site, with an adequate, though not lavish, allowance of illustrations. The production retains the best of peace-time standards, except for a slight increase in minor printer's errors, and the price would have seemed very reasonable before the war.

A. W. Lawrence


The American Expedition to Antioch found about 300 pieces of mosaic pavement worth lifting and presenting;
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of chains of little flowers and, except in the middle, where there is a noble lion, the meshes are filled with birds and other objects; on the third (xxiv), now in the Louvre, the tesselae are laid scale-wise over the field, with little flowers on the hinges of the scales, and the pattern is broken in the middle by the figure of a nimbed Phoenix standing on a low mountain, the floor appearing through the rays of the nimbus being lightened in tone.

Only one of Morey's interpretations seems to be at fault: the subject (xxiii) is a lion looking meditatively at a humped bull or buffalo with a tree behind and a stele inscribed Philiae, one of several pairs of animals; Morey suggests that Philiae refers perhaps to the fighting qualities of the Asiatic buffalo, the lion's prey, but a much-mutilated replica of the pavement has been found in a church at Mal' in Transjordan with remains of a passage from Isaiah xvi. 7 which shows that the mosaicist was depicting the Messianic Golden Age when the lion shall eat straw like the ox and the leopard lie down with the kid.

The floor from which this scene comes is probably the latest and the weakest in the book; the other late floors we have cited may stand in the phrase which Morey uses of the Ktiss, as 'a permanent rebuke to current notions of the decadence of art in the last centuries of the Empire.' Do they really show any significantly progressive Orientalisation? Changes in manner between the second century and the fifth and reasons for them have been already mentioned; much of the subject-matter remained the same—personifications of the seasons, months and other notions, few of which would have been intelligible without a rudiment, and nature-studies of animals, birds and fishes. The second-century Neptune mosaic contained pictures of fishes so carefully rendered that nearly forty distinct species of Mediterranean fish have been identified; a collection of birds is the subject of a third-century panel (viii). In the Neptune house there are reclining figures labelled Bios and Truphe (vi); they are precursors of the later busts of Ktissus or Ananias or Dynamis. At all times things in Syria have been very inventive, but Morey's conclusions stand in sharp contrast with those reached by other critics of the much greater mosaics made much later by Syrian craftsmen for the Umayyad mosques in Jerusalem and Damascus; after a patient analysis of the various influences at work in Jerusalem, Miss Marguerite van Berchem finds Greco-Roman traditions dominating the Oriental, and adds a reservation that 'those types which are called Sassanian belong perhaps just as much to Syrian art' (Greswells Early Muslim Architecture, I, pp. 227, 228). At Antioch during the period we have been discussing Greco-Roman traditions seem to us dominant from first to last.


This is an account of a small religious house founded in the latter half of the sixth century, and used as a burial-place by the founder's family. It stood on high ground north of the great tell at Beisan, two walls of it abutting on the city wall. It was cleared in 1930 by the Phaulonia University Museum Expedition, and this account has been written by Mr. G. M. FitzGerald, who was Director of the Expedition.

Very little of the walls remained standing, but the mosaic floors were in exceptionally good condition, and practically the whole of the ground plan was recovered. The chapel was in the north-east, approached through a wide porch or narthex from the central hall or court off which other rooms opened. Eleven of the rooms of the Phaulonia pavements, and the inscriptions they contain tell us all we know about the complex; two date which are almost certainly to be equated with the years 567 and 569–9 or 559–4. Coining the conclusion, which were the latest found on the site, suggest that the house had a short life, which may explain the good state of the floors.

The mosaics date from a period when representations of birds and animals, personifications of the months and seasons, vignettes of huntsmen and veterans—the subjects which occur so often on the earlier floors at Antioch—were becoming increasingly common in ecclesiastical buildings in the Palestine and Transjordan, and three of the pavements have figures of this type. The central court had an all-over geometrical pattern of octagons, squares and rhombi filled with animals, birds, flowers and so forth, and in the middle a circular panel with the sun and moon and, radiating from them, full-length figures of the months, which may be contrasted with similar figures on a second-century floor at Antioch (Antioch on the Orontes, II, p. 191, pl. 52). At Antioch the months are gracious figures standing firmly on real ground, across which shadows fall, these inscriptions with the month-name are written in a band above them: the Beisan months are sketchy, floating as if they were on a plain background, and the names, now Latinised, are scattered about anyhow under or between the feet of the figures. A small religious house could not command craftsmen of the same calibre as the owner of a rich villa, but the tradition is the same. North of the court was a small room, perhaps a parlour, with a more attractive floor: the all-over pattern is a rather skimpy version of the popular vine trellis, with lively hunting and vintage scenes in the medallions and various birds and beasts in the interstices; one medallion has a negro in a gaudy skirt leading a giraffe, which is a new subject to the writer. The nave of the chapel was less happy; it was covered with a design of linked medallions, eighty-two in all, each containing a figure.

A fourth floor in a room south of the chapel consists of three strips with wholly different all-over patterns enclosed by a single border; it has the same effect as three rugs laid side by side, an effect pleasanter, perhaps, than a floor covered entirely by any one of the three alone would have. All these mosaics must be judged as floor-coverings, not as works of fine art.

The mosaics have been admirably reproduced in what looks to us now in war-time a most lavishly styled, and Mr. FitzGerald's accounts of both mosaics and inscriptions are models of what such things should be.

J. W. Crowfoot


Though published in 1940 in America, this book has only reached the reviewer's hands recently. A complete work on Santa Sophia is certainly an event, though the great church has been studied and recorded to an extent perhaps only recently. As the only perfect domed basilica, whose designers ultimately succeeded in solving a structural problem that was outstanding for its time, not attempted again on a similar scale for another ten centuries, and who obtained a complete mastery of spatial effect combined with splendour and beauty that is unique in the annals of architecture, the building has exercised an irresistible fascination, in spite of, and perhaps even because of, its comparative inaccessibility in modern times. Yet there are few books that deal with it in all its aspects: Lethaby and Swainson's was the first; Antoniades' (1931), the second; the book under review, which is dedicated to the late Howard Crosby Butler, is the third, and from its date, it might be imagined as the final one. Through circumstances for which the author was not responsible, it can hardly be called that, but it can fairly be said that it has justified the very considerable amount of research that it discloses.

Structurally, Santa Sophia has been well studied. In 1832 and 1834 came Fossati's repairs and Salviati's great monograph, giving the first reliable data for all subsequent investigation. In 1884 came Choisy's penetrative analysis, accompanied by his wonderful diagrammatic drawings, in L'Art de bâtir en les Byzantins;then Lethaby and Swainson's work, in 1894; the latter a good study of the dome (not mentioned by Professor Swift) by the late Percy S. Worthington. The problem of the first dome, the true form of which had been per-

1 'Five Famous Domes; their History and Construction' (R.I.B.A. Transactions, New Series, V, 1889, pp. 155 ff.).
ceived by Lethaby, received attention from Millet in 1933. Traquair in 1927 and Conant in 1939. Professor Swift had the advantage of being able to incorporate all the relevant facts of the last-mentioned investigation, with drawings. Up to the publication of Fossati's last edition were in his *Histoire de l'architecture*, (1899), an overhaul of Salzenberg's geometrical drawings was wanted; this was supplied in great part by the late James E. Fulton, and well-published as four small and "Architectural Association Sketch Book" (London) for 1910. Professor Swift's good sections on Pls. V and VI are unscientificaly presented; each pair could easily have been combined as one unit, which would have made them more intelligible, and (for a building on an additional plate might have been made, to the same scale as Pl. III, by using part of the material of Pl. V for a complete longitudinal section through the south aisles looking north, with the elevation of the main building in relation, as was done by Fulton; while Pl. IV could, with advantage, have been reduced to this scale. Attention to these matters would have made the geometrical drawings of the building reasonably thorough.

The following sections on the History and Description of the Church, the remaining ones deal with Principles of Design, the Church in Detail (considerably the longest, divided into Ground level, Triforium, and Superstructure), and Particulars. The last is mainly a thorough expansion of the theories of Andrease (1931), Sedlmayr (1935) and Zaloziezky (1936). The historical conclusions of these authors, particularly Zaloziezky, are sound in their emphasis on late Hellenistic and Roman prototypes for the basic principles of the design, but the 'illusionists of their aesthetic theories is apt to lose touch with reality, as Professor Swift himself apprehends in Sedlmayr. Though the designers of Santa Sophia may have hused the elements of a Hellenistic pillared court and a Roman basilica hall, and though the vistas obtained thereby are extremely varied and interesting—as can be seen from Fossati's drawings—these were, as in all great buildings of the result of a resolution of structural fact by the designer. Groups of columns [in the aisles] apparently at random (Andrease) are absurd: a glance at the plan will show that no more orderly arrangement could be made. To say (p. 38): 'The doors to the aisles are obviously so placed as to afford the most picturesque, restless (sic) and fragmentary views, and even more extreme in this respect are the adjacent doors which open just behind the exedrae (Zaloziezky) is to ignore what any practical examination of the placing of these doors will disclose. Professor Swift does not mention Sedlmayr's statement that the proportions of classical buildings were commensurable: it is clear that they were not so, and all attempts to square Vitruvius' theories with the facts have proved fruitless. The work might be regarded as the most authoritative work on the subject as a whole, to date, though any full treatment of the mosaics could not be included, and we must share the author's regret that the latest investigations of these were not available. He does full justice to what other writers—particularly the most recent ones—have said on various aspects of Santa Sophia, and has supplemented this by personal observation during the course of his extended visit to Constantinople not many years before the mosque was secularized [1935] . . . specifically for the purpose of studying, measuring and photographing the Church, and to this end more than a month of intensive activity was devoted on the spot. He was convinced that the construction of the dome 'were laid radially and in such a way as to have required a wooden center'; which is important, as it has been believed, hitherto, that in at least the lower part of the dome, the bricks were laid more flat. He might have given more information about the nature and extent of the remainder of his own practical study than can be gathered from the Preface, and the absence of reference to the exact source of his drawings and photographs is a serious defect. The photographic Plates VII to XVI and XX to XLVI are excellent, particularly those of the exterior and the details of the interior. General photographs of the interior have been a problem—though Professor Swift's Pl. XLVI is very good—and Sebah and Joaillier's fine series had the great handicap of the Turkish distortions and accessories; but Fossati's coloured plates still give the best view of the interior in all general aspects. The figures in the text, especially under 'Structure and Decoration,' are good, usefully supplemented to those in Lethaby and Swainson (to which important book there should have been more than footnote references) and to Fulton's detail drawings.

A few minor matters should be mentioned. On p. 158, the word 'oblake' is hardly an accepted architectural term. On p. 161, the explanation of the 'Erratum' is unscientific, especially in reference to the plan, where the lines referred to are obviously much more than 'approximately' out of straight. There is no explanation of the three small circles (one near the northern, one near the southern, and one near the western exedrae) on both the Ground Plan, Pl. II, and the Eastern Plan (Pl. II), the name given to both straight and curved dotted lines to mark the closure of the semi-domes of the church and of the eastern and western barrel-vaulted terminations—a constantly recurring problem in the plans of Saint-Sulpice that have been explained, and these lines, together with the dotted lines showing the great arches and the dome, should have been omitted on the Ground Plan. The term 'Triforium,' consistently used for the Gynaeceum windows, is inappropriate. On p. 7, 'Mylvian' should be 'Milvan,' and in the title of Pl. XXXV A, 'Sanctuary' should be 'Sanctuary.'

The Bibliography, apart from exceptions noted above, is exhaustive, but it would be more useful if the works dealing expressly with Santa Sophia had been listed separately. In the Index, the reference to S. Sophia at Salonika on p. 200 is not mentioned; there may be other cases of the kind and fuller cross-referencing, e.g., the separate Ravenna churches under the heading 'Ravenna,' would be an advantage. As might be expected from its publishing source, the book is very well produced.

T. F.


This volume presents us with the final publication of a series of excavations carried out in the years 1921, 1922, and 1923, with the assistance of the French troops of occupation, and finished off in 1933 by means of a few additional trenches.

The first chapter is devoted to a survey of the work undertaken; the second contains an historical study of the Arsenal; the third is devoted to the most important complexes of buildings of the area, the Monastery of the Mangana, with its church of St. George, constructed in the reign of Constantine Monomachos (1042-54). The church had an important role to play in the history of the area; it was a richly decorated church. It was, however, pillaged and destroyed at the time of the Turkish conquest, and to-day only the very considerable brick substructures remain.

The same fate overtook the neighbouring Church of the Saviour and the other buildings in the area which are identified by the authors in the chapters that follow. The first is the Church of the Palace of the Mangana (Ch. IV), constructed by Basil I (867-886) and demolished at the end of the twelfth century. It was an unusual building, and it is especially sad that nothing remains above ground. Chapter V is devoted to the Monastery and Sacred Spring of the Saviour, the site of which the authors believe to be the site of the Turkish knot illustrated by nineteenth-century travellers, but itself destroyed when the railway was built. In Chapter VI the
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sea-wall, dating in the main from the time of Theophilus, is examined, as well as a cistern called that of the Powder Factory. For descriptive interest, however, is a curious hexagonal building with a marble basin at the centre, the form and location of which suggests that it was originally a Baptistery. The authors believe that it was associated with a sacred spring and described in the Virgin Hodegetria. Several such springs existed in Byzantium, and one of them was known to be in this area; identification of the building is thus probable.

The finds are discussed in two appendices. The first of these contains a descriptive catalogue of the most important objects, sculpture, pottery, and inscriptions; the second is devoted to a single piece of sculpture, the Manganina Virgin. Most of the sculpture discussed is architectural, but there are a few interesting fragments of reliefs bearing religious subjects. The glazed pottery is all of types well known in mid and later Byzantine times. In addition a large number of coarse earthenware jars are published, which were mostly designed to be used in the construction of domes and vaults, to give lightness and strength to the structure. Most were factory marks in the form of graffiti.

The Manganina Virgin, published in greater detail in the second appendix, is one of the finest pieces of mid Byzantine sculpture that have come down to us. Similar, but less fine, sculpture of the same subject is seen at Venice, Athens and in the Ottoman Museum, are reproduced for comparison; they furnish interesting iconographical parallels, but artistically, even the finest of them, that at Venice, serves to emphasize the superb quality of the Manganina relief. This publication is neither exhaustive, and a deal more remains to be said not only on the sculpture of this period, but also on reliefs of the same subject, the Virgin Orans.

The volume is well printed and the plans and main plates are excellent. The half-tone plates, on the other hand, often leave much to be desired, and some of the originals from which they were made had been marred by titles written over vital portions of the photographs. But apart from these small defects, the volume is a most welcome addition to our scanty material on the monuments and topography of Byzantium, and the authors are to be congratulated on and thanked for its production.

D. T. R.


The title of this book is in a sense a misnomer, since practically all the works reproduced are of the post-Byzantine rather than the Byzantine period; that is to say, the material had dated subsequent to the fall of Constantinople in 1453. Of all the heritors of Byzantium, Roumania was second only to Russia in the quantity and quality of the works of art she produced, and much of the material illustrated in this book is worthy to be termed Byzantine as far as quality is concerned. The book should thus be of interest not only to the specialist, but also to the student of art in general.

In the short text the author draws attention to the links binding Wallachia and Moldavia to the Byzantine area, both in Byzantine and in post-Byzantine times. He then illustrates a selection of objects of Roumanian workmanship, produced from the early sixteenth century onwards. Like the name of the country to which they belong, they show a western character in their composition, but the Byzantine strain is dominant. The two elements are blended in a distinctive manner to form an art which is clearly Roumanian, and there is something in all this material which at first sight distinguishes it from contemporary work produced in Russia, Greece or the other Balkan countries.

One of the finest of the objects illustrated is perhaps the silver casket in the form of a five-domed church decorated with a fountain, in the Monastery of Dionysius on Mount Athos; it is actually an archeological repository for the sacred bread. Fine again are some of the embroideries of the early seventeenth century. But the most delicate and subtle work is perhaps to be seen in the illuminations, more particularly in the Glykophilousa's Gospel at Dionysius or Prince Jeremia Movila's Gospel in the Sinai Monastery, dated 1598. So far as it is possible to form a conclusion from a few—though very excellent—reproductions in colour, a predilection for green seems to be a characteristic feature of all the Roumanian illuminations, whether they are religious or secular in subject. So lavish a use of green is absent in contemporary Greek or Roumanian painting. At an earlier date, however, it appears to have been a distinctive feature of East Anatolian and Caucausan painting. Strzygowski has suggested that a relationship existed between the Caucausan and Roumanian on the grounds of architectural similarities and because of the popularity of exterior decoration in both areas. The predilection for green may prove to be another factor illustrating this cultural link.

Such intriguing problems are not, however, dealt with in the text of the book under review. This tells us but little. The excellent plates offer an inspiring incentive to further research.

D. T. R.


This is the publication of a paper MS. in vernacular Greek, c. 1650 of the Apocalypse by Maximos the Peloponesian bought by Miss Elizabeth Day McCormick in the Rue D'Albret, Sulpice in Paris in March 1932 and edited in 1940, the first volume by Harold R. Willoughby and the second by Ernest Cadman Colwell.

In the first volume the MS. is analysed in every technical detail, and in the second is the history of the MS. followed by the Greek text.

This elaborate publication is the result of expensive far-reaching and painstaking research, which enables the authors to compare their MS. closely to some in the libraries of Mount Athos and in other libraries of Greece and the Near East, all of which they must presumably have visited for the collection and collation of their data. Considerable scholarship is displayed in the description of the MS., especially in the comparative study with other contemporary ones.

The MS. is claimed to be unique, on the grounds that 'it is the only Greek MS. of the Apocalypse known to scholarship to-day that is illuminated with text tables. Such is its prime distinction' (Vol. I, p. 3), and that it has 'no parallel in any medieval manuscript' (Vol. I, p. 6). Owing to their date the collections are presumably not to be considered as Byzantine but may be termed 'Byzantinesque.'

Controversy is opened, the ultimate aim of which is not clear. It is to prove that Maximos of Gallipoli, the translator of the New Testament into vernacular Greek published in Geneva in 1638 under the auspices of Calvinists, was the same person as Maximos the Peloponesian, to whom the McCormick MS. is ascribed. Maximos of Gallipoli is stated to be 'a pupil of Cyril Lucar's' (Vol. II, p. 36), whereas Andronikos K. Demetrakopoulos in his work 'O Σεβαστός Άγιος Ανατολίης ἤ Ο Άγιος Φωτιστής τῆς Βυζαντίου Ἐκκλησίας: Μια Ερευνή για τη Μεταγενέστερη Εποχή του Μεσοζωικού Και Αναγέννηση της Βυζαντινής Διαδοχής Εκκλησίας της Κωνσταντινουπόλεως' (A Study of the Early Byzantine Church: A Study of the Early Byzantine Church), published in 1919, states that the manuscript was written by a pupil of Cyril Lucar's. However, the manuscript is not considered to be of the same period as the Gallipoli manuscript.

Every ornament of the binding, however small, is closely examined with the same precision that characterizes the whole work, and, being so prominent, it is not easy to reach exact conclusions. The chief data on which these conclusions are based is the similarity of the binding with that on some covers in the Benaki Museum, also ascribed to the eighteenth century by the general editor of the Patrimony of the Metropolitan of Larissa' (Vol. II, p. 135), and with that on an Epitaphios of the same period in the Gennadeion. It is, therefore, confidently guessed that the two [latter] bindings were
produced at the same time and in the same atelier' (Vol. II, p. 193). To this is added similarity of binding and of tooling to that found on the covers of a Prokainiorion of a century later, also in the Gennadeion, belonging to the period when the Metropolitan of Larissa acquired the McCormick MS. for his library, and in which luckily the nineteenth-century binder’s name and particulars are recorded in a note as being Joseph of Douskos in Thessaly and the date of the binding 1825 (Vol. II, p. 196). It is thus conceivable that the manuscripts of the McCormick covers were produced at the order of Patriarch of Larissa when he added the codex to his library early in the eighteenth century and that they [tooling stamps] were designed and fashioned at the monastery of Douskis near the town of Pheneos valley' (Vol. II, p. 195). Monastic bindings are usually accepted as being very conventional, as were most crafts practiced by members of the Church. This consideration should greatly add to the difficulties of exact dating.

P. F. A.


Of the three main types of text in the Acts and the Pauline Epistles, the Pauline Epistles are the least well known and the least studied, the Pauline, the Western and the Byzantine, the Western in Acts is poorly represented by Greek authorities. These consists of two papyri, of codices Bezae and Laudianus, and in a modified form, some groups of minuscules. Bezae is a text of the Pauline Epistles, the Pauline Epistles provide the only evidence for the Western text in Greek. In the Pauline Epistles where the uncial representation of the Greek text is fuller, the importance of the minuscules is not great, but here also they are frequently significant. Of the eight Praxapostoloi, all of them curiosi, collated in Dr. Clark’s work, four belong to the Western type of minuscule text, viz. 241A, 2401, 1799, 876, and of these 2412 seems to be the most important not only of all cursives of this type, and superior even to 614. These four collations together with materials in A. V. Valentine Richard’s book The Text of Acts in Codex 614 and its Allies, give us an adequate picture of the minuscules of the Western text.

The other four manuscripts 223, 1022, 1960, 2423 resemble, more or less closely, the textual type current in Byzantine use. Without access to the manuscripts it is impossible to check the accuracy of the collations, but a reading of the introductions and of selected passages suggests that the standard must be high. While Mr. Clark and his fellow-colleagues are to be congratulated on such a book, it is lamentable that in recent years little has been done in Great Britain to explore these manuscripts and sort out those available here despite the imputes that the preparation of the Oxford 'Novum Testamentum Graece' under the editorship of the Rev. S. C. E. Legg ought to have given such valuable work. The torch has been passed to Schenider, Scrivener and their contemporaries, seems to have passed to the United States.

G. D. Kilpatrick


This brightly written and very readable study of Dionysios Solomós contains many features of interest—historical, linguistic, biographical and critical. The greater part of Solomós’s life was passed in the lovely islands of Zante and Corfu, mainly under the English 'Protectorate.' Until 1828 (apart from ten years in Italy) the poet was in his native island and conceived a strong anti-English bias. It is true that the 'Constitution,' under which the Hellenes was governed, was a farce, but the actual rule from 1828 to 1829 was at Bay, when the islanders and residents of Contra and Scarpanto enjoyed the wealth and privileges inherited from the Venetian period. But Solomós, partly from domestic, partly from political causes, became utterly unhappy in Zante, and transferred himself to Corfu with remarkable success. He was welcomed there into the brilliant society of the governing class and the intellectual circle of Giuiford’s Ionian Academy, and became as pro as he had been before anti-English. All this is set forth by Mr. Jenkins in lively fashion. The Modern Greek linguistic question is of peculiar importance in any study of Solomós. Whereas the Byzantine ‘purist’ tradition clung fast to the Athenian of the 15th century, the ‘popular’ language was kept alive in outlying Greek-speaking parts. Such names as Athanasius Christopol and John Vilara are to be remembered with honour in connexion with the movement to make the popular language a vehicle for serious literature for Solomós, under the impulse of Trikoupis, to show that the popular language was fully able to provide the vocabulary necessary for poetry of the highest order. This study traces the steps by which this difficult task was achieved.

The life-career of Solomós is of the greatest interest. Illegitimate son of a father who could trace his nobility through several centuries, he had a mother sprung from the common people—kise who certainly spoke the Greek vernacular. His mother’s standing is of importance, for it goes far to explain how Solomós, who was educated in Italy from the age of ten to twenty and used Italian as the language of his earliest compositions, was able to obtain such a mastery over the popular Greek language. The Dialogue sets forth his views on the use of the living language with no uncertain sound. The character of Solomós—poetry apart—is an interesting psychological study. He was a compound of contradictions, a man of exquisite sensibility, yet forlorn and quarellsome; generous, yet hard in business; tender of poets, yet bitterest of satirists; a prey to intemperance, yet capable of the most exacting effort to create the language. It is only in such codicils inserted in the text of the Diálogos that the language, so often confused, is made clear, and the prolonged family law suit wrought untold harm on such a temperament.

But Solomós’s life, though related by Mr. Jenkings in a highly interesting manner, is not as the background to an excellent critical study of his poetry. The poet’s fame was made by his Hymn to Liberty composed about 1822. Though, as this study shows, the Hymn by no means reaches the high-water mark of Solomós’s poetry, it is probable that it will always rank in the popular mind as the poet’s masterpiece. From 1822 to 1824 it appears in the Hymn National Anthems. It appeared just at the right moment, when Greece was at the beginning of her struggle for independence, and was couched in language well calculated to appeal to a world inflamed with Byronic enthusiasm for that cause. But Solomós’s highest poetry was produced after his migration to the more congenial atmosphere of Corfu in 1828. In his epigrams and lyric tenderness he reminds us of Simodizes. In the longer pieces, such as the Lambros, the Cretan and the Hymn to Liberty, there are passages of unsurpassed lyrical beauty descriptive of Greek nature and atmosphere. Yet with all this, Solomós must rank among the most disappointing of the intellectually gifted men of his generation as the great creative work which he longed for was never produced. For the first time we are being shown the feeling with which we are left. There is no lack of study and striving. Greek folk-poetry and Cretan literature are ransacked for a fitting vocabulary, and in the purely linguistic sphere Solomós’s services to Modern Greek literature are immense. The causes of the poet’s failure to produce a great creative work and his legacy of fragments judiciously examined in this study, and his very critical study must be due to instability and intemperance, but German poetic theories—and in particular those of Schiller—seem to have been mainly responsible. The three sketches of the Free Besiegte are significant. The poet himself, it appears, was not his duty to raise the heroism of the defenders of Messolonghi from the particular to the ideal and that every word used must be exactly fitting. Hence a mass of corrections, but a lack of spontaneity.

Mr. Jenkins in his book works gives verse-translations of select passages of the poetry, and the original Greek is printed in an appendix. He seems to depreciate these translations excessively. It is true that they are free, but on the whole they are very close to the original Greek. Describing the enancing scenery of Crete, may be singled out for special commendation.

The study is one that should be consulted by all those who wish to understand the greatest lyrical poet of Modern Greece.

F. H. MARSHALL
NOTICES OF BOOKS

Pro sefres kai Prosefroynik véhicma kata t;n 'Epanastatik' 1821. By ApolloS BAKALOPOULOS. Pp. xii + 186. Thessaloniki: 1939.

This study of refugee problems during the Greek War of Independence is divided into two parts, the first covering the period from 1821 to the arrival in Greece of Capodistria, and the second that of the rule of Capodistria to the arrival of King Otho, followed by an appendix dealing with the question under the first King of the Hellenes. At the beginning of the work is an index of the preprinted books consulted by the author, and at the end is an index, whose shortcoming is the lack of general subject-matter entries.

The merit of the work lies in the fact that, to the best of my knowledge, it constitutes the first attempt to study in detail the fluctuations of Greek populations during the epic struggle, and thus it may be considered to be a useful contribution elucidating the origins of the Saxon. Good use is made of the early issues of the Official Gazette, and this alone must have entailed long and painstaking research.

It is, however, a little disappointing that, whereas the opening lines of the preface tell us that the refugee problem created after the Asia Minor campaign in 1822 compelled the author to study its counterpart during the War of Independence, and thus make us anticipate comparative tables and analyses, none such are forthcoming.

With great laud the author has collected and collated a valuable material, which is sub-divided geographically into sections according to the homelands of the emigrants, and at the end of 156 pages of such classification he devotes only four pages to the results of these deductions. Here and there undue prominence is given to local jealousies, which tends to obscure objectiveness.

The composition of some sentences is unexpected; for instance, on page 73 we read: 'However, their few dwelling-houses and business premises situated on the seashore, as also the other Roman Catholic inhabitants of the island, ran serious risk a few months after the outbreak of the revolution.' The meaning of other phrases is not always clear; for example, on page 77: 'In an assembly of the inhabitants, which took place in 1825 in the courtyard of the church of the Transfiguration, the name of Hermopolis was given to what had hitherto been an anonymous town. Hermopolis is usually called even to this day by the inhabitants of the Upper Town Gladi or Kato Chora as opposed to Ayano Chora or Castro (Upper Town).'

First we are told that the town was 'anonymous,' and then it is inferred that it had several names which have not been preserved. What is actually meant is that there were several small settlements so near to one another that after the additional building occasioned by the influx of Chians the settlements were fused into one town, which was collectively named Hermopolis, the names of the settlements henceforth denoting districts of the town. Some discrepancies are also noticeable, for on page 56 'loss of considerable capital and of social position' are ascribed to have prompted the Chians to make a bid to free their island; on page 79, however, it is stated that the reason for this action was the decision of the Great Powers definitely to fix the frontiers of Greece, the State which they had decided to create. The real reason for the ill-fated expedition of Colonel Laboro to free Chios in 1827, to which indirect reference is made, was that the central parts of Greece which were in a state of insurrection stood a better chance of being included in the new free State than those whose activities had ceased.

P. P. A.


This account of Venizelos is to be commended, because the author has based it on good sources of information, and particularly because, though he is an admirer of the Greek statesman, he is not, like many out-and-out partisans, blind to his defects. That Venizelos was an extraordinary man, who made Modern Greece familiar to the world, cannot be denied. That he was an opportunist, who sometimes resorted to Machiavellian methods, can, on the other hand, hardly be contested. He was undoubtedly an ancient patriot, but he was obsessed by the idea of a 'Great Greece,' and his major triumph—the 'treaty of Sevres'—was but a success on paper. Though he cannot be blamed directly for the disaster in Asia Minor which followed, there can be little doubt that his excessive territorial aspirations were a contributory factor. It is probable that the reconciliation with Turkey in 1923 was regarded by historians as his most lasting piece of statesmanship. Though he could, for the moment, sway foreign politicians by the magic of his personality and thus affect an important combination such as the Balkan Alliance of 1912, much of his work was soon undone.

As regards home affairs, Venizelos can scarcely be said to have been successful. There is perhaps something in a suggestion mentioned in this book—that as a Cretan born and bred and a natural revolutionary, he was never really happy in the political atmosphere of Greece. His quarrel with Prince George, as High Commissioner of Crete, was the beginning of his anti-Royalist attitude and the source of the seeds of a bountiful crop of trouble to come. The reputation of having been brought to power by foreign support in 1917 clung to him and engendered a bitterness never exceeded in all the bitterness of Greek politics. Add to this the fact that he had acquired the art of choosing his subordinates well. Finally the revolution of 1896 became the tragic figure of the rebellion of 1919. The sanity of his earlier revolutions had degenerated into the hopelessly rising of a broken man.

Yet it would not be fair to make the note. The times in which he lived were of extraordinary difficulty and he faced them with extraordinary courage. If we consider the reputation of Greece in 1897 and its reputation to-day in the midst of grievous calamity, it would not be amiss to attribute much of the high regard in which Greeks are held to the patriotic example of Venizelos. He will remain a great figure in the history of modern Greece in spite of errors and failures.

F. H. MARSHALL

A Short History of Modern Greece, 1821–1940. By E. S. FORSTER. Pp. 237; 5 maps. London: Methuen, 1941. 12s. 6d.

The book is divided into three parts in accordance with the chief periods of the history of the modern Greek kingdom—notably, from the War of Independence to the outbreak of the first European War with a short chapter on Greece as a Turkish province; Greece during the European War of 1914–1918; and, finally the period of 1918–1940, followed by a bibliography of works consulted and an index.

The whole work, the result of careful study, presents a very clear account of a somewhat involved history with the important events set out in high relief. It is a handy chronicle of reference and should prove useful to all who wish to obtain an insight to the development of the modern Greek State. Some may consider that references to certain events in contemporary and controversial periods are not as objective as they might have been, had the study been more extensive and detailed.

Professor Forster does not appear quite convinced as to the validity of the theory put forward by the German historian Fallermayer that the modern Greeks are 'an almost purely Slavonic race' (p. 914). The theory is based upon the fact that Greece was invaded by the Slavs in p. 915.

In this connexion it is suitable to note that Imperial Russia in her political propaganda in Greece, where she maintained a rusepophile party, never so much as alluded to ties of affinity between the two races, ties of common religion being the corner-stone of that political edifice. We may hence conclude that the racial ties between Greeks and Slavs were known to the Teutonic race only and not to the Slavs themselves.
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THE HARPY TOMB: HEADS FROM EAST SIDE
THE SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION OF
HELLENIC STUDIES

REPORT FOR THE SESSION 1941–42.

The Council beg leave to submit their report for the session now concluded:

Finance.
The Accounts for the year 1941 again show a surplus of revenue over expenditure. This is largely due to the postponement of the publication of Vol. LXI of the Journal, though certain costs in the production of the previous volume were carried over into 1941. The letting of the second floor in the late summer does not yet appear to our advantage, owing to somewhat heavy expenses for dilapidations (part of which will eventually be repaid by the War Damage Commission). Insurance of the contents of the Library and Offices against enemy action was another heavy item during the year. Compensation has been received for books destroyed while on loan.

Membership on June 1st for the last three years was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Associates</th>
<th>Libraries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subscriptions have thus fallen by 166, as against 204 in the previous year. As the 1941 figure included Professor Meritt’s 34 new members from America, this year’s figure is not discouraging. American Libraries, too, are likely to renew their subscriptions when the Journal appears.

Obituary.
The Council record with great regret the deaths of two former Presidents, Sir Arthur Evans and Mr. A. Hamilton Smith, and of Dr. Pflügl, who was Honorary Member of the Society, in addition to the following losses among members during the past session—Miss A. E. Barlow, Mr. W. R. Collinson, Mr. R. Cooke, Sir Stafford Crossman, the Rev. R. E. E. Frampton, Mrs. E. Lamb, Sir George MacDonald, Sir P. J. Macdonell, Dame Emily Penrose, Lord Rennell of Rodd, Miss M. D. Rogers, Mr. N. Wedd, Prof. W. H. Woodward.

Among the war losses are Mr. J. D. Boyd (reported missing), F/O J. L. Halstead, and Capt. J. D. S. Perdubley, who was killed in Greece after distinguished service in his country's cause.

Prisoners of War.
Capt. P. M. B. Savage, who is a prisoner of war in Germany, having sent home a request for 'The Bible, Shakespeare, Classical Texts and the Hellenic Journal,' it has been arranged to forward the Journal and surplus volumes of the Classics to him and other prisoners of war. Members who have texts for disposal can receive addresses by application to the Librarian.

Premises.
With the consent of the Bedford Estate, the second floor was let in July at a war-time rent of £145 per annum to Captain and Mrs. L. G. Struthers, both engaged on war work in London. There has been no further raid damage, and fire-watching has been maintained throughout the year by Miss Southan and our caretaker, Mrs. Jones, the latter as Group Leader in the Square patrol.

Presentation to Sir Arthur Evans.
On July 8th, the occasion of his 90th birthday, an address composed by Professor J. L. Myres and written on calf-skin in Chinese ink and English gold by Miss Margaret Hodgson of the Society of Scribes, was presented to Sir Arthur Evans by Professor Myres and Professor R. M. Dawkins. This was read to him then and several times again at his request during the three days' interval between his birthday and his death. The cost of the mounted scroll and case was borne by Mr. Christian Doll, in memory of his association with Sir Arthur's work at Knossos. A photograph of the inscription will be found at the end of this Report.

Joint Meeting of the Hellenic and Roman Societies.
A Committee was appointed in November by the Councils of the two Societies to organise a meeting (to which the Classical Association was invited) to be held at Oxford in the week August 29th to September 5th, 1942, under the Presidency of Professor Gilbert Murray.

Administration.
The following members of Council retire under Rule 19:—Mr. W. L. Cuttle, Prof. J. F. Dobson, Mr. G. G. Hardie, Miss W. Lamb, Mr. D. L. Page, Mr. F. H. Sandbach, Prof. P. N. Ure, Prof. H. T. Wade-Gery, Prof. E. H. Warington and Prof. T. B. L. Webster.
The Council have nominated for election as members of their body for the next three years:—
Mr. R. D. Barnett, Mr. R. M. Cook, Prof. E. R. Dodds, Miss M. Hartley, Miss N. C. Jolliffe,
Lady Nicholson, Dr. F. Saxl, Mr. T. C. Skeat, Mr. G. A. D. Tait and Mr. A. M. Woodward.
A vacancy having occurred with the death of Dr. Pfuhl, the Council have nominated for election as Honorary Member of the Society Dr. William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury, who was a subscribing member for many years.
The Council have pleasure in announcing that Sir George Hill has been re-elected to the Standing Committee in place of Miss W. Lamb, who retires in rotation.
The Council thank their Honorary Member, Mr. C. T. Edge, M.A., F.C.A., for acting as auditor, and have pleasure in nominating him for re-election.
Sir John Forselyke has been good enough to take over the Editorialship of the Journal on the enlistment of Mr. Denys Haynes in the Royal Artillery. Vol. LXI is expected to appear in the early autumn.

Meetings.
The following communications have been made during the session:—
November 4th, 1941. Prof. J. L. Myres at the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, on 'The Life and Work of Sir Arthur Evans.'
February 3rd, 1942. Prof. E. H. Minns at the Literary Lecture Rooms, Cambridge, on 'Greek Plate from East European Hoards.'
May 5th, 1942. Mr. G. T. Seltman at Burlington House on 'Greek Sculpture and some Festival Coins.'
June 23rd, 1942. Dr. Pickard-Cambridge (Presidential Address) on 'The Athenian Theatre in the fifth century B.C.'

The Joint Library.
The following figures show the work done during the last three sessions:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Books added</th>
<th>Books borrowed</th>
<th>Borrowers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1939-40</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>3,958</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-1</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>1,513</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941-2</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1,698</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The drop in the number of books added to our collection was, of course, to be expected in the present state of the book trade, but the number of those borrowed shows an encouraging advance on last year's figure. The number of slides borrowed has also been fairly well maintained.

Additions made during the year include—

Among works on philosophy are Cornford's translation of Plato's Republic, Robinson's Plato's Earlier Dialectic, Shuttle's The Psychology of Aristotle.

On Science, Heidel's Hippocratic Medicine. Archaeology is represented by the tenth volume of Excavations at Olynthus by D. M. Robinson and Vol. 64 of Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India. Publications on Art include Swift's Hagia Sophia and Goldscheider's Etruscan Sculpture in the Phaidon Edition. Among the contributions to Numismatics are the third parts of volume iii of Sylluge Nummorum Graecorum, Milne's Colophon and its Coinage and Mosser's Enigmatic Gifts of Greek and Roman Coins in the American Numismatic Society's Numismatic Notes and Monographs. In Epigraphy there is part xviii of the Oxyrhynchos Papyri. The weekly Greek newspaper 'Hellas' is the only new periodical taken this year.

Reciprocal loans arranged with the National Central Library were again useful. The Joint Library lent 33 books and borrowed 23.

The Councils of the Hellenic and Roman Societies wish to express their thanks for gifts of books from the following:—

Authors: Mr. P. Corder, Mr. N. J. DeWitt, Mr. G. M. Fitzgerald, Mr. G. Kazarow, Mr. L. Nyikos, Mr. E. W. Palm, Mr. A. S. Pease, Mr. L. J. D. Richardson, Mr. C. A. Roebeck, Prof. W. B. Stanford, Sir Aurel Stein, Dr. P. Treves, Mr. R. P. Wright.

Donors of other books: Mr. J. W. Baggally, Mrs. R. S. Conway, the late Rev. R. E. E. Frampton, Mr. G. T. Griffith, Miss M. V. Taylor.

The Presses of the following Universities: Aberdeen, Budapest, Cambridge, Colombia, Cornell, Dublin, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Nebraska, Oxford.


The two Councils wish to record their appreciation of the help given by Mrs. E. B. Cailey, who has continued to work in the breach when the staff was short-handed, by Miss Alford, who has recorded incoming periodicals, and by Miss F. E. Bramley and Mme. Glicou, who have occasionally assisted in the Library.

The thanks of the Councils are due to Mrs. R. S. Conway and Mr. E. S. G. Robinson for gifts to the photographic collections.
ON THE OCCASION OF HIS NINETY-SEVENTH BIRTHDAY
THE PRESIDENT AND COUNCIL OF THE SOCIETY
FOR THE PROMOTION OF HELLENIC STUDIES
OFFER TO THEIR EX-PRESIDENT
SIR ARTHUR JOHN EVANS
F.R.S., B.A., F.A.S., D.C.L., ETC., ETC.,
THEIR CONGRATULATIONS AND BEST WISHES
FOR CONTINUANCE OF HEALTH & HAPPINESS.

They recall with gratitude and admiration his exceptional contributions to learning; his early association with his distinguished father SIR JOHN EVANS in the discovery of human remains in the river gravels of the Somme; his exploration of Kition and Medieval Illyria; his numismatic studies, especially in regard to the monuments of Tomarium and the Syracusean Medallions, and his investigations of Celtic and Italic antiquity.

They recall his memorable Kephala of the Ashmolean Museum, which transformed it into a vigorous and famous centre of archaeological research, and his own unselfish contributions to its treasures.

Most especially, they honour him as the explorer of the Minyan civilization of Crete, the discoverer of its script, the interpreter of its cults, the excavator for many years of the Palace of Knossos, and the founder there of a permanent home for Creton studies.

Above all, they delight in commemorating his unfailing inspiration and encouragement to all workers in those wide fields, his initiative and wise counsel in the advancement of learning and research on many occasions, and his lifelong and strenuous devotion to the cause of freedom in thought and in action.

Scroll Presented to Sir Arthur Evans on His Ninetieth Birthday, July 8th, 1941.
# The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies

**Balance Sheet, December 31, 1941.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liabilities</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Debts Payable</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions paid in advance</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Fund</td>
<td>2039</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(includes legacy of £180 from the late Prof. P. Gardner, £200 from the late Canon Adam Farrar, £200 from the late Rev. H. F. Tozer, and £500 from the late Mr. G. A. Macmillan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Compositions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total at January 1, 1941</td>
<td>2156</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received during year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less carried to Income and Expenditure Account—Members deceased</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus at January 1, 1941</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Balance from Income and Expenditure Account</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus at December 31, 1941</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Cash in Hand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>276</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Cash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit Account</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Deposit Account (Donation from Arch. Inst. of America)</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>763</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debts Receivable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments, At Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*2725</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present values (not reckoned here)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£453 Calgary &amp; Edmonton Rly. Co. 4% Consolidated Debenture Stock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£200 3% Defence Bonds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£764 12s. 4d. 3½% War Stock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£239 17s. 7d. 4% Consolidated Stock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1395 4s. 6d. 3% Conversion Loan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£154 7s. 3d. Nottingham 3% Irredeemable Stock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Premises Capital Account</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount spent to date</td>
<td>5584</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Donations received</td>
<td>4099</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred to Income and Expenditure Account during past years</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now transferred</td>
<td>681</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Valuation of Stocks of Publications</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuation of Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>181</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuation of Photographic Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper in hand for printing Journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* £5984 1 11

* The Investments as at December 31, 1941, had a value of £3326.
## INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT, FROM JANUARY 1, 1941, TO DECEMBER 31, 1941

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>L. s. d.</th>
<th>L. s. d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Members' Subscriptions—</td>
<td>22 1 0</td>
<td>105 1 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrears</td>
<td>11 12 8</td>
<td>115 14 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members' Entrance Fees—</td>
<td>10 15 1</td>
<td>64 4 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Associates' Subscriptions—</td>
<td>25 14 0</td>
<td>34 14 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrears</td>
<td>11 15 1</td>
<td>64 4 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>134 3 8</td>
<td>147 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Salaries and Expenses—</td>
<td>47 2 0</td>
<td>24 18 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationery</td>
<td>64 4 8</td>
<td>91 6 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>34 14 2</td>
<td>36 2 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating, Lighting, Cleaning, Maintenance of Library Premises, etc. (including second floor repairs throughout)</td>
<td>39 10 0</td>
<td>39 3 9 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insurance</strong></td>
<td>19 3 0</td>
<td>19 3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Damage</td>
<td>15 5 0</td>
<td>15 5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less amounts received</td>
<td>19 3 0</td>
<td>19 3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants—British School at Athens, Rome</td>
<td>19 3 0</td>
<td>19 3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance from Library Accounts—</strong></td>
<td>19 3 0</td>
<td>19 3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance from Journal of Hellenic Studies</strong></td>
<td>19 3 0</td>
<td>19 3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance from Accounts due from A. O. America</strong></td>
<td>19 3 0</td>
<td>19 3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance from Account due from A. O. America</strong></td>
<td>19 3 0</td>
<td>19 3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>134 3 8</td>
<td>147 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance</strong></td>
<td>189 9 7 9</td>
<td>189 9 7 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account</td>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>Cr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage on Vol. LX</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing and Engraving</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing and Reviews</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Sales, including back Vols.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Macmillan &amp; Co., Ltd.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenic Society</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipts from Advertisements</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance to Income and Expenditure Account</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>£74</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Dr.</th>
<th>Cr.</th>
<th>From January 1, 1941, to December 31, 1941.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slides and Photographs for Sale</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>s.</td>
<td>d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slides for Hire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance to Income and Expenditure Account</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Receipts from Sales and Hire</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipts from Sale of Catalogues, etc.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>£15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Dr.</th>
<th>Cr.</th>
<th>From January 1, 1941, to December 31, 1941.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Purchases</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>s.</td>
<td>d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of printing Accessions Lists to the Library, and Slides Deparments, less contribution from the Roman Society</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Receipts from Sales of Catalogues, Duplicates, etc.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation (War Damage Insurance) from Board of Trade for Books destroyed</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance to Income and Expenditure Account</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>£23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Dr.</th>
<th>Cr.</th>
<th>For the Year 1941.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>s.</td>
<td>d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates, Transferred from Balance Sheet—Proportion of Expenditure for Year</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>£477</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have audited the above Balance Sheet and Income and Expenditure Account and in my opinion the same exhibit a true and correct view of the Society's financial position according to the best of my information and the explanations given to me and as shown by the books of the Society.

LONDON,
June 2, 1942.

Cyril T. Edge,
Chartered Accountant.