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MEETINGS
OF THE SESSION 1949-50

At the Inaugural Meeting of the Session, held on November 8th, 1949, Prof. R. J. H. Jenkins read a paper on 'The Historical Tradition of 9th Century Byzantium'.

A second General Meeting was held on Feb. 7th, 1950, and Prof. A. J. Toynbee read a paper on 'Greek History as a Key to World History'.

A third General Meeting was held on May 9th, 1950, and Prof. H. D. F. Kitto read a paper on 'The Gods in Greek Poetry'.

The Annual Meeting took place on June 27th, 1950, with the President in the Chair. The Annual Report and Accounts were adopted. Prof. T. B. L. Webster was elected President, the Vice-Presidents and Members of Council were elected. The Hon. Auditor was re-elected. Prof. E. R. Dodds then delivered his Presidential address on 'The Greek Shamans and the Origins of Puritanism'.
The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies

BALANCE SHEET, DECEMBER 31, 1949.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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<tr>
<td>(includes Legacy of £180 from the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Special Deposit Account (Donation</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late Prof. F. Gardner; £200 from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>from Arch. Inst. of America)</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the late Canon Adam Farrar; £400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Debits Receivable</td>
<td>3,520</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from the late Rev. H. Tozer; £500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Investments at cost (valued</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from the late Mr. G. A. MacMillan;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>December 31, 1949, £3,790 16s. 5d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£500 from the late Lady Owen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rates paid in advance</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackenzie; £50 from the late Sir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Library Premises Capital</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hill; £100 from the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Account</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Classical Society)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transferred to Income and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expenditure Account during past</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Now transferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated Valuation of Stacks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of Publications</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated Valuation of Library</td>
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<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated Valuation of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Photographic Department</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,135</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal Fund</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total at January 1, 1949</td>
<td>2,135</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received during the year</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less carried to Income and Expendi-</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ture Account—Deceased Members</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Purchases Fund (Donation</td>
<td>2,072</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Arch. Inst. of America)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance at January 1, 1949</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less utilised for Purchases in</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus at January 1, 1949</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Deficit from Income and Expen-</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diture Account</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus at December 31, 1949</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus at December 31, 1949</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,339</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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,
May 5, 1950.

Cyril T. Edge,
Chartered Accountant.
### The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies

#### Income and Expenditure Account for the Year Ended December 31, 1949

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Subscriptions received</td>
<td>1,939</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Tax recovered</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Compositions (Deceased Members)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividends from Investments of the Society for the Sale of Athenæus Orthia</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions from the Society for Roman Studies</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of Athenæus Orthia</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Receipts</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance from Promises over Income</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excess of Expenditure over Income</strong></td>
<td>2,365</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Shares</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Expenses</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone and Postage</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Cleaning and Maintenance of Library Premises</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant for School at Athens</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British School at Rome</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance from Library Account</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>2,365</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Journal of Hellenic Studies Account for the Year Ended December 31, 1949

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dr.</th>
<th>Cr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>To Estimated Cost of Vol. LXIX—</strong></td>
<td><strong>By Sales, including back Volumes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and Paper</td>
<td>395 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawings and Engravings</td>
<td>75 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing and Reviews</td>
<td>20 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage and Packing</td>
<td>60 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excess Cost of Vols. LXVII and LXVIII over Estimates</strong></td>
<td><strong>£666 19 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£666 19 1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lantern Slides and Photographs Account for the Year Ended December 31, 1949

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dr.</th>
<th>Cr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>To Slides for Hire</strong></td>
<td><strong>By Receipts from Sales and Hire</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Balance to Income and Expenditure Account</td>
<td>50 0 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>£67 2 6</strong></td>
<td><strong>£67 2 6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Library Account for the Year Ended December 31, 1949

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dr.</th>
<th>Cr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>To Binding and Sundry Purchases</strong></td>
<td><strong>By Receipts from Sale of Catalogues, Duplicates, etc.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92 0 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Balance to Income and Expenditure Account</td>
<td>33 19 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>£92 0 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>£92 0 2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Premises Account for the Year Ended December 31, 1949

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dr.</th>
<th>Cr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>To Rent</strong></td>
<td><strong>By Rent from the British School at Athens</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates</td>
<td>408 8 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Transfer from Balance Sheet—proportion of Expenditure for the year</td>
<td>225 11 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Balance to Income and Expenditure Account</td>
<td>20 2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Rent received from Sub-Tenants</td>
<td>631 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The year 1949 has seen a great improvement in conditions in Greece. The Peloponnese and Central Greece have been completely cleared, and archaeological sites in the north can now be visited; excavation has been resumed by the Archaeological Society and the foreign schools. The Italian School has returned to activity with Dr. Doro Levi in charge. Funds have not yet radiated to the provinces, but the metropolitan museums are being restored and a fourth gallery has been opened in the National Museum; the Eleusis Museum is being put in order.

ATHENS AND ATTICA

There is no news from the Acropolis apart from Prof. Orlandos' recent discovery that the cover tiles in every third row on the roof of the Parthenon were bigger than those in the intermediate ones. Orlandos has secured and underpinned the wall and rock at weak points on the south side of the Acropolis, and has made considerable progress with the restoration of the orchestra pavement and cavea of the Odeum of Herodes. J. Travlos has cleared part of an establishment with handsome mosaic floors which preceded the Early Christian basilica by the Arch of Hadrian.

The National Museum has a number of important accessions of which Mrs. S. Karouzou gives an account. A well-preserved red-figured clyx with youths from the workshop of the Pentesilea Painter has been acquired from the old Skoloudis collection, together with small white-ground and r.f. lekythoi, a very fine fragment of a r.f. vase, other vases and figurines, and two folding mirrors with a woman's head on the cover. Corinthian alabastra and other interesting vases have been transferred from the duplicate sales department for exhibition, and a very fine coston with rich polychrome decoration and fine incision has been presented by an American service. The whole of the Empedokles collection has been made over to the museum by the owner, who is now permanently resident abroad; members of his family have generously presented a number of first-rate red-figured fragments, of which the finest come from a delicate loutrophoros of the third quarter of the fifth century with boudoir scenes.

Additions to the bronzes are few but exceptional. A fine statuette of a naked youth with short hair and a wreath round his head has been brought from Kosmá near Sparta; it is of Laconian workmanship of about 500 B.C. The youth is in the posture of supplication, with his right hand stretched forward, while the size of the opening in his other hand suggests that he may have carried an animal as an offering. The figure is remarkably well preserved, and complete with its bronze base measures seven inches high. A bronze figurine of Athena Promachos, six inches high, has been discovered by Prof. Orlandos near the south-west corner of the Parthenon; it is of Attic workmanship of the last quarter of the sixth century (Inv. no. 16364).

The dedicatory relief from Kynosarges with a scene of sacrifice to Herakles has been presented to the museum by the American School. Several gravestones of Roman date known from old publications have been bequeathed by Helen Kalliphronas, the best being the stele of Olympias. Building operations in the suburbs of Athens west of the main-line railway station have brought to light two blocks of a striking relief no less than six and a half feet high, occupied by an unruly horse with a caparison of a panther's hide. The horse's mouth is open, and his forepart is modelled in high relief with the head partly in the round. At the horse's head in lower relief is a young negro groom with woolly hair and projecting cheek bones, who is trying to hold the beast in; traces of red paint are visible on the negro's hair.

1 Hesperia Suppl. VIII, 259 ff.
2 Hesperia XVII, 137 ff. Now Inv. no. 3952.
3 Conze Attische Grabreliefs Pl. 411.
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while his flesh was painted black. It is an open question whether this is one of the latest fourth-century grave reliefs or rather a composition in the spatial manner of the second century B.C. R. V. Nicholls and the writer have identified among the Acropolis sherds some fragments of a nearly life-size terracotta goddess, probably seated, with designs on the drapery in a style not later than the middle of the seventh century.

Mrs. Stathatou's collection has been enriched by the acquisition of a remarkable bronze figurine of Hermes in the Arcadian manner which closely resembles the Boston Hermes, a large bronze statuette of a deer, and a steatite tripod vessel with a carved calf's head (Plate Ib) which is said to have been found in a grave in the Mesogea together with Mycenaean mounted figurines.4

The fourteenth season of excavation at the Agora extended from April to June 1949 under Prof. Homer Thompson's direction. In the area to the west of the Areopagus, where houses and a dikasterion (identified by bronze dicasts' tickets) were uncovered in 1948,5 exploration is now completed; Rodney Young has made a detailed study of this sector for publication in Hesperia. Two more graves have come to light in the angle formed by two early roads at the extreme north-west foot of the Areopagus. One is the cremation burial of a warrior of the early Geometric period. The charred bones were deposited in a large amphora which was accompanied by an oenochoe and three goblets; slightly higher up lay burnt fragments of a second oenochoe and a globular pyxis which had been broken on the pyre. The warrior's long iron sword had been bent into a hoop and laid like a wreath around the neck of the urn; two iron spear-heads, two knives, two chisels and a whetstone rested against its side. The second burial was that of a one-year-old child whose body had been laid in a large pithos together with eight small vases carefully decorated in middle Geometric style; outside the pithos stood a large kitchen pitcher blackened by fire. These two graves, together with that of a woman reported in 1948 (JHS LXVII, 35), form a small burial plot which may be regarded as a continuation of the scattered cemetery of the Protogeometric and Geometric periods that has been traced all along the north slope of the Areopagus.

The decision has been taken to rebuild the Stoa of Attalus as a museum; it will be rebuilt under the E.C.A. programme, and the work will be directed by the American School with Travlos as supervising architect. Piraeus limestone and white and blue marble will be used as in the original building. Large-scale preparations have been carried out this year, and important discoveries have been made in the clearing of the ground. It has now been possible to examine the foundations of a large structure underlying the north part of the stoa and over eleven feet lower down; it centres round a colonnaded courtyard about 140 feet square with a carefully prepared floor of red clay, and is dated in the third quarter of the fourth century. The scheme and size of the building would accord well with its identification as a palaestra. Remains of an earlier building of the late fifth or early fourth century have come to light below this; it, too, had a carefully prepared and well-trodden floor, and in addition a stone basin which may have served as a footbath. These early buildings beneath the Stoa of Attalus will illuminate the early history of the gymnasion and the ephebate in Athens; they are also of capital importance for our knowledge of the early scheme of the Agora square.

It has for years been a matter of regret that the American excavators were prevented by the electric railway from going to the Stoa Poikile, and it is therefore especially satisfactory that the stoa has come to them. In the demolition of a wall of the late Roman period to the west of the Stoa of Attalus many fragments of an early building came to light, all of poros and comprising parts of all the members of a Doric order slightly smaller in scale than the Theseum, together with a small piece of an Ionic column base. The profiles of the mouldings and the painted bands of lotus and palmette, still brilliant in colour, indicate a date in the second quarter of the fifth century B.C. (Fig. 1). The foundations of the building have not yet been discovered,

---

4 Mrs. Stathatou points out the likeness of this vessel to one from a latest Mycenaean tomb at Ialysos (Annuario XIII–XIV, 276 ff., Pl. 20).
5 Cf. JHS LXVII, 34 ff., Pl. 12 c.
but since so many of its members came to light in the north-east corner of the square it presumably stood nearby and can hardly have been other than the Stoa Poikile. Iron pins, of which several remain, set at close intervals and in a regular pattern in the face of the wall blocks may have sustained the wooden panels on which Polygnotus and his contemporaries executed the great paintings which gave the building its familiar name.
The finds of the season include an inscription of the early fourth century B.C. recording the sale of confiscated property, a marble head of a young man of the late Roman period, fragments from two calyx craters by the Kleophrades Painter (both apparently with the Ransoming of Hector theme), and an attractive oenochoe with a descending Nike (Plate IIb). Among the newly discovered clay impressions of fine metalwork is a fourth-century B.C. piece showing a helmeted youth in a reclining posture (Plate_Id). Homer Thompson’s recent study of the colossal second-century A.D. figures of the Stoa of the Giants and their dependence on the Parthenon pediments has been rewarded by the return to the Agora, and to its proper shoulders, of the head of one of the Tritons which was found in Eleusis more than half a century ago (Fig. 2).

Prof. Orlandos has carried out minor repairs at the Byzantine monasteries of Daphni and Kaisariani, and rebuilt the porch and restored the twelfth-century temple of the church of Dsou Pendeli. J. Papademetriou, newly appointed ephor of Attica, has discovered the terrace of a rich sanctuary in marshy ground at Vronda, the ancient Brauron; a temple and treasury are being excavated, and fine red-figured sherds have been found. At Nea Ionia in the ancient deme of Daidalidai four miles north of Athens Papademetriou has excavated a small elliptical grave enclosure of about the tenth century B.C. hemmed in among modern quarries. Graves, properly speaking, were not to be found, but the funeral pyres were cleared and found to contain numerous sherds of lekythoi, pyxides, and oenochoes, and amphorae in the rock-cut pits contained ashes and bronze fibulae, etc. The vases are late Protogeometric in style (Fig. 3); the most notable are the miniature chest with two compartments illustrated here and an unusual open crater nineteen inches in diameter at the mouth. This plot seems to be a continuation of a Mycenaean cemetery on the hilltop. J. Leatham and students of the British School have found Mycenaean remains on the island at Porto Rasti and Early Helladic pottery on a denuded settlement site on the peninsula behind the village.

The Peloponnese

Progress has been made at Corinth with studies preparatory to the publication of the finds from the North Cemetery and the volumes devoted to sculpture and the inscriptions discovered since 1926. R. S. Scranton has conducted limited excavations in the area of the North Stoa and the North Market. The stoa shows several building periods, the best preserved part being datable to the end of the fourth century B.C. when rectangular piers took the place of columns. The eastern part of the stoa has now been recognised as a separate building; it is apparently a hot bath contemporary with the stoa or slightly earlier. This complex of stoa and bath, together with an enclosed area on the north, may have formed a sort of palaestra for the ephebes of Corinth. Soundings have recovered the line of the northern boundary of the market, which now appears as a rectangular space surrounded on all sides by shops like those already discovered on the south and west; the market was originally laid down in the first half of the first century A.D.

Early in September 1949 a small excavation was undertaken at the Argive Heraeum by J. L. Caskey of the American School and P. Amandry of the French School, with the object of investigating a deposit of archaic pottery previously detected by Amandry on the slope of the hill below the East Building. Over nine hundred miniature pots, the majority more or less complete, and fragments of several hundred others were recovered, all being grouped close together in a small space but apparently not buried in a pit or any sort of enclosure. In the same layer were found bronze phialai, small disks, and pins in great number; many fragments of iron rods, a few stone seals, and some figurines and other terracotta objects. The most interesting piece is the lower half of a small bronze kouros discovered by Amandry.

---

4 I am indebted to Mr. Papademetriou for this notice.
5 Mr. J. L. Caskey has kindly supplied reports on Corinth and the Argive Heraeum.
Papademetriou has discovered interesting relics of an archaic shrine on a hill-top above Epidauros.

The British School carried out small excavations in the autumn of 1949 in Sparta and on the site of the Eleusinion at Kalývia Sókhás under Taygetus. The excavation in Sparta was undertaken on behalf of the Greek Antiquities Department with a view to testing the plot between the modern city and the acropolis on which the municipality is proposing to construct a stadium. Deep-level soundings were made and gave evidence of regular occupation in late Roman to early mediaeval times and earlier levels going back to the archaic period. A commodious building of the third-fifth centuries A.D., which had been detected in trenches cut by Ph. Stavropoulos earlier in the year, was cleared over a sizeable area; the floors, with geometrical mosaics in five colours, seem to have continued in use when the house was rebuilt on a somewhat different plan. At Kalývia Sókhás the collapse of the rebel movement has enabled the British School to complete the investigation of the remains of the Eleusinion which had been washed out by a flood in 1947.8 Fragments of marble furniture and a number of inscriptions have been recovered. Trenching in the torrent bed brought to light a marble kerb with the dedications KYMBAAEIATAIAMATPI and KYMBAAEIATAIKOPAI. This construction rests on virgin soil, and it is doubtful whether any of the buildings on this part of the site are appreciably older than Hellenistic. At Mystrá Orlandos has renewed the roof of the Afendikôn.

CENTRAL AND NORTHERN GREECE

The work of the French School at Delphi has been directed towards the preparation of sculptural, epigraphical, and architectural volumes of the Fouilles de Delphes. The most notable discoveries include the identification of the base of the statue of Nikostatos of Larissa, who is honoured in the decree Syll.6 613, of the primitive inscription, running from right to left, of the dedication by the Tarantines of a group of statues to celebrate a victory over the Peucetians (Paus. X. 13. 10), of a decree granting promanteia to the Aetolians in the archonship of Sarpedon during the last quarter of the fourth century B.C., and of the base of an offering made by Dropion, king of the Paeones, who also dedicated a bronze bison’s head (Paus. X. 13. 1). The arrangement of the pavement and interior colonnade in the cela of the temple of Apollo has been determined, and the latest of the treasuries, that of Cyrene, which dates to the middle of the fourth century B.C., has been fully studied. Many joins have been made among the sculptured fragments of the metopes in the sanctuary of Athena Pronaia.9

Activity in the north has been continuous in spite of difficult conditions until the last few months. In Salonica Kh. Makaronas has carried out an excavation during the summer of 1949 at Syndríváni, of which he communicates the following report. The aim was to uncover a complex of sarcophagi of which two had been excavated by Kotzias in 1940.10 Seven further sarcophagi of the second-third centuries A.D. have been brought to light. All had been rifled; two marble ones with inscriptions are undamaged, and a third in granite has richly carved garland decoration. The only small find was a gold earring set with an emerald. The adjacent graveyard of the same date has also been excavated and yielded built tombs in a variety of types. The commonest type consists of a square construction of two and a half to three metres side; the outer faces of the walls were plastered with cement, which proves that the tombs were intended to stand above ground level; there is no evidence for the roofing. Inside at a depth generally of about 70 cm. is a floor of unworked slabs with stucco, which cover an oblong built ossuary likewise stuccoed and in one case scored in imitation of orthostates. The scheme of these tombs reminds one of the heroon of Phylakia described by Romaios.11 In one of these tombs a unique arrangement for the passage of liquid offerings was found. In the floor of the tomb was a square hole covered by a marble slab; the shaft under the slab was square in

8 Cf. JHS LXVII, 39 ff.
9 M. P. Amandry has kindly communicated this and the other reports on the work of the French School.
10 AA 1942, 160 ff. figs. 32 ff.
11 AE 1930, 141 ff.
section and blocked lower down by another slab with a small hole in the middle; the shaft finally terminated in unworked blocks covering a small built ossuary 43 by 110 cm. The finds from this cemetery include a relief of a hoplite, four funerary inscriptions, and a variety of cheap offerings. About a mile west of Salonica by the Langadã road a cylindrical milestone has come to light; it has inscriptions in Greek, and the names of emperors and caesars, which appear to indicate that they were cut on three separate occasions between A.D. 284 and 305.

The restoration of the Basilica of St. Demetrios has made great progress; the ceremony of consecration was held on St. Demetrios' day 1948, and the floor and marble revetments are now being replaced. Prof. G. Soteriou has carried out supplementary excavations and solved remaining problems of the earlier building stages. Mr. G. U. S. Corbett has been working on the completion of the plans of the building for an Anglo-Hellenic publication of the church. Styli Pelekanidis has restored the church of St. Catherine.

There is little to report from Thrace. On the Holy Mountain the Antiquities Service has been repairing the tower of the monastery of Stavroniketa, and Pelekanidis is undertaking the cleaning and publication of the wall paintings of the Protaton which includes the original work by Panselenos. Pelekanidis is also engaged in repairing the churches of Kastoria in Western Macedonia; three churches, including the bomb-damaged Koubelitiki, have been restored: two Early Christian basilicas have come to light there, which are all the more significant since no others are known in Western Macedonia save one at Voskhokhorion.

A notable find of recent years is that of a marble bust of a young man at Aino Keponas near Náousa; it is of fine workmanship, with a wealth of hair and carved pupils to the eyes, and is dated to the second half of the second century A.D.; the name Oligos inscribed on the base lends colour to the late tradition which attributes a son of that name to the mythical king Beres, founder of Beroca. Verría (Beroea) itself continues to yield new finds.12 At Elia on the west edge of the town a pedimental stele 126 cm. high was found in 1948; it records the gift by the ephebarch Statius Antigonus of five hundred denarii to supply δειμων for the epheses; the names of the superintendent of this supply, Aurelianos Preimos, and twenty-five epheses are given. The inscription is dated A.D. 177-8. Another stele was found at the same place in 1949; it is of marble, 170 cm. high and inscribed on both faces with a total of 214 lines averaging sixty letters each. It dates to the second century B.C., and gives the γυμνασιάρχικος νόμος of the city. The preamble of the decree, which was proposed in the εκκλησία of the demos by the gymnasiarch Zopyros Amyntas and two other citizens, is quite legible for the first twenty-five lines; unfortunately the rest of this face is badly damaged. The other side is well preserved. Apart from the oath given by the gymnasiarch, the topics are: the gymnasiarch's rights and responsibilities, the supervision and control of paidotribai and paidagogoi, the procedure at the festival of the Hermaia with the sacrifices and games that went with it, and the rendering of accounts by the retiring gymnasiarch. The passages on the subject of cults, administration, magistrates and law-court procedure should prove especially illuminating.

From the Dikasterion Square in Verría come a fine first-century A.D. marble head of a woman with the himation worn as a veil, which came to light in a Roman fill, and an arched dedicatory stele of late Roman times showing a facing Asklepios and a female figure (Hygieia?) in relief. At Mouarif, where a sarcophagus fragment with a Nereid on a dolphin came to light in 1947,13 Kallipolitis in 1948 excavated four box-shaped tombs which form part of an extensive cemetery of Roman times.14 One of the tombs was built of baked bricks 55 by 50 by 7 cm. in size; the others are of marble or limestone blocks. Only one tomb contained offerings, which consisted of two high-necked glass aryballoi, a glass tube containing a black cosmetic, a circular bronze mirror, and bronze coins apparently to be assigned to the reigns of Elagabalus, Alexander Severus, and Gordian. At Mýlo to the north-west of the town a rock-cut vaulted chamber tomb has come to light which seems to carry the tradition of Macedonian tombs down into the end of the Hellenistic era.

---

12 The reports from Náousa, Verría and Kozáni are due to the kindness of Mr. B. Kallipolitis.
13 Cf. BCH LXXI-III, 438.
14 Cf. AA 1949, 272.
Kallipolitis has excavated a number of tombs at Kozáni where the new Vérria road leaves the town. One, with simple vertical sides, was found in 1948 and produced two skeletons laid from north to south, six iron spear-heads, a bronze helmet of a type already known in Western Macedonia,\textsuperscript{15} two gold bracelets of which one ends in snakes’ heads, and some plain vases. In September 1949 Kallipolitis investigated other rock-cut tombs here. A collapsed one was found unspoiled; it had a ledge on either side which presumably had carried a roof of planks; no trace of wood was found, and the damp had dissolved every trace of the skeleton except for a white stain in the earth. The tomb contained a pair of gold earrings terminating in lions’ heads, a bronze phiale and oenochoe with acanthus-stalk handle, black-glazed ware and plain vases with floral decoration, and a silver didrachm of Alexander probably struck at the Amphipolis mint in 330–329 B.C.; the burial should date to the end of the fourth century. The neighbouring tombs are of similar date. Among the finds are a sword with two repoussé gold plates at the base of the hilt with a conventional tree pattern, a bronze helmet of Illyrian type, a bronze situla with double handle, jewellery, and vases of local fabrics. The most remarkable single find is the silver phiale mesomphalos illustrated in Plate Ic together with a silver kylix; the phiale, which is decorated with bud and palmette ornament, bears on the outside the dedication

 τὸς Ἀθανάτος ἱερὰ τὸς Μηγαροῦ.

It dates to the beginning of the fifth century B.C. and must have been brought there from Megara as a trophy.

The Islands

On Thasos the French School has proceeded with the uncovering of the aule of the Agora; a plan of the Agora in the light of excavations up to 1948 is shown in Fig. 4. A row of bases has been cleared in front of the north-west stoa, part of which is earlier than the stoa and set at an oblique angle to it; and a rectangular altar and a small building have been discovered in an enclosure which was bounded by a fence of marble posts with wooden bars. The tholos has been cleared, and the excavators have found a circular eskhara with a ring for attaching the victims and two large drains traversing the square. The remains of an earlier building in polygonal masonry have been discovered under the Hellenistic ground level of the Agora; it had a number of rooms whose arrangement recalls that of the building with oikoi in the Herakleion of Thasos. A mutilated archaic kore’s head (Plate Ia), some fine red-figured sherds and bronze coins have come to light; also various inscriptions, including a dedication to a hero and fragments of a fourth-century B.C. catalogue of victories of the athlete Theogenes. The Early Christian basilica, whose visible remains disappeared during the Bulgarian occupation, has been dug down to the foundations and the plan has been recovered; it dates to the fifth century A.D. To the north-east of this a house of Hadrianic times with a central court paved in geometrical and floral mosaic has been discovered; this house and part of the basilica were built over the remains of a huge building of Augustan date, perhaps a warehouse, which was destroyed by fire.

K. Lehmann has continued his excavations on Samothrace. N. Kondoleon has discovered on Paros an inscription relating to Archilochus.

The French School has been active on Delos. The traces of habitation which preceded the foundling of the cult of Apollo have now been cleared; detached houses and a more important complex of rooms grouped round a paved court have come to light. In the main the pottery dates to Late Helladic 3, but the first occupation goes back to pre-Mycenaean times. The line of a fortification wall built by the legate Triarius has been traced between the theatre and the north-east gate of the sanctuary. In a salient of the wall in the middle Inapos valley a three-storied structure has been uncovered. The corbelled staircases leading to the two land-

\textsuperscript{15} Cf. \textit{AE} 1932, 134 figs. 50 f.
Again, various objects: a mosaic in *opus segmentatum*, a niche with a stuccoed bench, a dedication by Dionysios Pakonios Ἐρμη και συνέθεσι, and a perfectly preserved Hellenistic marble head of Hermes. The clearing of the Lake Palaestra, whose eastern part had been built over by the wall of Triarius, has continued; it appears that the first palaestra, which overlies an archaic building, was built in the amphictyonic period and was remodelled with the addition of porticoes on three sides between 284 and 274 B.C.; it was completely reconstructed in the second half of the second century B.C. and destroyed in 69 B.C. In the uncovering of a house with geometrical mosaics on the shore west of the Terrace of the Lions a long inscription of the

![Diagram of Thasos Agora](image-url)

**Fig. 4.—Thasos. Plan of Agora.**

second century B.C. defining the duties of the Athenian epimelete in Delos has come to light. The archaic, classical, and Hellenistic sculpture and the Dodekatheon and sanctuary of the Syrian gods have been prepared for publication; during the work on the former many joins have been made resulting in the completion of the statue of Apollo Citharoedus, one of the Muses from the theatre, and of five korai.

Miss S. Benton has continued her work on the finds from her excavation at Aetos in *Ithaca* and has made up many more vases; one of these, a crater in the local Geometric style, is shown in Fig. 5. Miss Benton has also arranged a provisional exhibition of the finds in the museum at Vathy. A portrait head of Julio-Claudian date has recently appeared in the same museum.
There has been limited activity in Crete. At Knossos P. de Jong has made considerable progress with repairs to the Palace of Minos, and has carried out a small excavation in a field east of, and adjoining, 'Hogarth's Houses', in consequence of exposure by ploughing of two gypsum blocks which proved to be house walls. A terracotta figurine (head and shoulders only) of LM 2 date, and a marble pommel of a dagger of the same period were found, but examination of the site is still not complete. The Greek Antiquities Service has recovered a number of small objects and 482 coins carried off from Crete by General Ringel, but has not been able to trace the sculptures taken from Gortyn. The labyrinth of Gortyn, which had been damaged by German demolitions, has been reopened by the Greek army; the galleries of the interior have not been seriously damaged. N. Platon has excavated an Early Christian basilica at Panormos near Eleutherna; its construction and acme are dated in the fifth century A.D.; it had a tomb beneath the chancel, approached by an arched door under the floor, and a women's gallery above the aisles. Platon concludes that the diocesan see, which in middle

Byzantine times was re-named Aulopotamos, had already in the fifth century been transferred from Eleutherna to Panormos. The French School has continued its excavations at Mália and uncovered three Minoan houses near the palace; one of them, which continued to be occupied until the Late Minoan III period, offers the first evidence of reoccupation on the site of the Minoan city in the post-palatial epoch; among a large number of vases found in the magazines of another house is one, of LM 1b–LM 2 date, with nautilus decoration—the first of its kind to come to light at Mália. H. Gallet de Santerre has written a brief account of the history of this important Minoan centre.

Various chance finds in 1948, including that of two unusually large steatite pedestal lamps which has led to the recognition of an important Minoan megaron or group of megaras at Arkánes behind Knossos, are reported by Platon in Κρητικά Χρονικά II. 584 ff.; the remarkable inscribed stele found at Fortétsa near Knossos referred to in a previous issue is now fully published by Platon ib. 93 ff.; it is in dialect and pronounces the exclusion of outsiders from a shrine (presumably that of Artemis Skopelitis) and the assumption of arbitrary powers by the citharist; Platon dates it in the second century B.C. Platon contributes in the same journal articles on the topography and history of Cretan sites and publishes a notebook of Xanthoudidis' which contains observations in the field and references to the discovery of the Boston gold and ivory statuette.

---

16 See Κρητικά Χρονικά II. 586 ff.
17 Κρητικά Χρονικά III. 563 ff.
J. M. COOK

TURKEY

The Anglo-Turkish excavation at Old Smyrna begun in 1948 was continued in May–July 1949. The principal task undertaken was the clearing of a sector about 95 feet by 80 feet in the inhabited quarter on the north side of the site. At plough-level the foundations of a block of fourth-century houses were uncovered; in the higher part of the trench, where the remains were better preserved, two main levels were distinguished. The houses, like those discovered last year, were cramped and poorly built; many fragments of roof-tiles and wine-amphorae were found among the foundations. Within the block was a yard containing a well, which has been dug out to two feet below the modern sea-level where large pieces of the pinewood frame supporting the stone shaft were found in good condition; a number of fragments from the bottom of wine-amphorae found in the water still contain a hard sediment of resin sufficient to give the strong tonic flavour which distinguishes the wines of Greece to the present day. This complex of houses, like that excavated last year, seems to have been built in the late fifth century; as yet no building traces can be attributed with certainty to the preceding hundred years, but some signs of occupation in this period have been noted, including the discovery of fragments making up the greater part of the neck of a volute-crater painter by the Niobid Painter.

Under the fourth-century levels lies a sixth-century housing estate, whose walls are preserved to an average height of about three feet. A number of small buildings can be identified, with doorways opening on to yards which are sometimes flagged. The houses were less spacious than those of the seventh century but sturdily built. A view of part of this sector is given in Fig. 6, where re-used seventh-century foundations can be seen behind the sighting pole on the right. A sixth-century stratum was also found in one of last season's soundings which was dug down this year to the seventh-century floor level. A house had been built here in the sixth century on a diagonal axis to that of the seventh-century walls, and cut down into the earlier floor level; it was divided by a partition wall built of large mud bricks, and had doors (one blocked up with bricks) leading on to cobbled streets on two adjacent sides; a covered drain ran down the side of one of the streets. Inside the house was a small stone-lined hearth sunk in the floor with fire-irons and other gear lying around it. This house was burnt down in the middle years of the sixth century. A number of fragmentary vases were found here which had been blackened and distorted in the fire, among them an Attic stooded crater with arched handles, bearing five zones of animals, and on the piano nobile a picture of the Marriage of Helen and Menelaos—a scene hitherto little recognized in vase-painting. The crater came from the workshop of Sophilos and takes a central position in his work close to the signed crater fragments from the Acropolis and the Marathon amphora.\(^{18}\) A curious feature of the sixth-century levels was the large number of shallow unlined pits in which some of the best Ionic black-figured vase-fragments were found. These included a 'Clazomenian' drinking-horn terminating in a plastic ram’s head and a number of fragments of classes of vases which have not hitherto been distinguished; one of the most remarkable of the vases is a crater with a picture of a hairy man leading a bituberos camel, another fragment comes from a closed vase, perhaps of Aeolic manufacture, on which was painted the combat of Achilles and Memnon. Some fragments of Laconian ware have been found and substantial pieces of a number of Naucratite chalices which indicate that the 'Orientalising' outline style was still in vogue in the middle years of the sixth century. Attic black-figure cups are also well represented. No monumental inscriptions have been found; the two longest graffiti on vases appear to be in barbarian. Vigorous habitation on the site in the sixth century seems to have been shortlived.

In the new excavation in the north sector the seventh-century habitations still await disengagement except in one corner where the archaic levels had been denuded. Here a small private bathroom of the late seventh century has been cleared; it was a stone-built shaft sunk into the

\(^{18}\) Cf. Mrs. S. Karouzou's list in AM LXII, 133 f.
ground with a short monolith staircase leading down into it from the outer ground level and two niches in the walls (Fig. 7). The bath itself is of terracotta, and was broken into many pieces in the sack but has been restored; it is about four feet long with a barrel-shaped bottom and a sump with two plug-holes at the foot; a piece of an earlier bath was found incorporated in a repaired wall of the bathroom. Beside the ruins of the bath lay the fragments of a Chian one-handled ewer with linear decoration, which may have been used for pouring water over the bathers. Fragments of six or seven other baths have been found in the course of the season's excavations; the majority are of the seventh century and show how large a part the old ἄγαμος played in the life of the early people of Smyrna. A hundred yards to the east, in the biggest of last year's soundings, a late seventh-century house has been cleared; the lower-lying part was practically destroyed in the construction of the sixth-century 'Burnt House'; a wall of the upper part of the house was illustrated in *JHS* LXVII, 42, fig. 6. In some places the mud-brick can still be seen sitting in position on the stone walls, and at one point courses of matting were detected which separated the layers of brick. In the destruction levels on the site a number of jars and jugs with linear decoration have been assembled and a few vases decorated in the Orientalizing figure style (both outline and incised)—among them the Wild Goat style oenochoe shown in Pl. IIa. Once again fragments of Early Corinthian vases were found in the destruction levels.

Soundings were made at many points to locate the city wall. Its general line has been ascertained from the south corner of the site along the east to the middle of the north side; a hundred yards farther along a high-stepped platform seems to continue the line of the wall, and may have been constructed as a glacis where the escarpment was high and steep. On the west side near the neck of rock which joined

**Fig. 6.—Old Smyrna. Detail of Sixth-century House Complex from South: Fourth-century Wall in Centre.**

**Fig. 7.—Bathroom at Old Smyrna.**
the hill to the mainland a cambered causeway has come to light about the modern water level, but it has not been dated back beyond the fourth century. A stretch of massive archaic wall has been revealed in a very successful excavation by the Monopoly Wine Company which was primarily undertaken for the improvement of their vineyards, but was allowed to contribute much to our knowledge of the site. This wall lies on the rocky isthmus and may perhaps have flanked the main entrance to the city; it is built in the 'Lesbian' style, most blocks having five edges of which at least one is curved. On the east side the city wall has been tested at various points and two sections have been cut across it. The long stretch which the Mitlers followed is the outer face of a wall of the late seventh century which seems to incorporate in its rubble and mud-brick filling an earlier wall with a filling of smaller bricks. A late Geometric level was touched on the inside of the wall; the pottery included an amphora which presents a flotilla of fishes in one panel and two owls and a goose in the other (Fig. 8). At the north-east corner, where the outer faces of the two walls are farther apart, the face of the earlier wall has been exposed; the lower part of the wall face was built of roughly shaped andesite blocks and carried a superstructure of sawn ashlar in a soft limestone which has been squashed under the weight of modern terrace walls (Fig. 9). When the outer wall was built the face of the earlier wall was bricked up. Soundings for the city wall on the north side of the city a short distance from the north-east corner revealed a platform in whose revetment towards the city wall three unfinished column drums had been laid; the excellent finish of the walls that flank this platform suggests that a public building once stood on it. A shallow sounding there uncovered a small cache of faience, ivory, and amber objects, together with fragments of small Corinthian vases of the second half of the seventh century.

Little work was done in the gravefield this year, though surface examination has shown that the cemetery extends considerably farther to both flanks than had hitherto been supposed. Various sarcophagus-burials have been noted, but only one sizeable figured fragment was recovered. More signs of burials of the village period have been found, but there is still no trace of a single grave of the time before the sack.

One of the two soundings of the 1948 campaign, in which Bronze Age strata had been penetrated, was carried deeper through a succession of second-millennium levels. The sounding was continued in water in a part of the trench, but had to be abandoned at nearly three feet below sea-level where pot-sherd was particularly dense. The discovery of a fiddle-shaped marble idol at sea-level suggests that the culture here, which yields little else but brown and grey monochrome pottery, should reach back to the beginning of the second millennium. Another sounding was opened near the 'isthmus' where living rock had been detected, with a view to discovering the earliest occupation on the site at a point where it had not become waterlogged through the sinking of the coast. A sequence of third-millennium levels was uncovered with three firm building stages and hand-made pottery showing connections with Troy I and II and the Anatolian Copper Age. The middle level contained a building with low walls stoutly built of water-washed stones on which a number of courses of mud brick can still be detected; one room, separated off by a mud-brick party wall, had plastered walls and floor. Two faces from wide-mouthed wheel-made face urns were found in the vicinity of this sounding; together with other sherds casually discovered here they seem to be debris from eroded levels of the turn from the third to the second millennium.

The joint excavating party also made reconnaissances round Smyrna and found further traces of late prehistoric settlement at Gryneion and at Başlar Tepe and Eğrigöl Tepe in the lower Kaikos valley, and a third millennium site at Akhaimon Limen on the Eclatic Gulf; at Aeolic Kyme the foundations of two buildings, probably temples, have been noted. A collection of pottery from Ionic and Aeolic sites is being formed in the Izmir Museum. A handsome polychrome mosaic from Kadife Kale, the Pagos of Smyrna, has been brought into the museum.

\[19\] ÖJh XXVII, Bbbl., 162 ff.
Arif Mufid Mansel has continued his excavations at Side in Pamphylia.

M. Akok has published the recent excavation of mixo-barbarous tumuli near Samsun, and W. Ruben illustrates some late Greek inscriptions from Phrygia (Belleten xii. 835 ff.; ib. Pl. 41 ff.).

Cyprus

Mr. A. H. S. Megaw, Director of Antiquities of Cyprus, kindly communicates the following notice.

There has been no excavation on Neolithic sites, but the Curium Expedition (University of Pennsylvania Museum) have decided to resume work at the Sotira site following the trials carried out by P. Dikaios on their behalf (JHS LXVI, 120). Dikaios' report on his excavations at Khirokitia is in the press. Vases of the Philia type with Anatolian connections (ILN, March 1946, 245) figure among pottery which has reached the Cyprus Museum from tombs clandestinely excavated at the locality Ammos, on the Ovgos river about half-way between Philia and the sea. A number of Early Bronze Age tombs came to light during building operations in the Ayia Paraskevi cemetery near Nicosia and in the village of Kalanassos. They were excavated by the Department of

Fig. 8.—Old Smyrna. Early Seventh-century Jar from City Wall.

Fig. 9.—Earlier Archaic City Wall at Old Smyrna.
Antiquities. The Kalavassos tomb groups contain some notable paste bead necklaces and bronze hair ornaments. A middle Bronze Age group from the former site contained an imported jug of the wheelmade, painted type common to Syria and Cilicia (Fig. 10). The late J. F. Daniel returned to the Curium Expedition's late Bronze Age settlement at Bamboula for a brief supplementary season, during which he examined a further section of the town wall and collected evidence of continuous occupation down to the archaic period.

The excavation of the town site at Enkomi, now a joint enterprise of the French Mission under Dr. C. F. A. Schaeffer and the Cyprus Department of Antiquities, has acquired increased interest through the identification of the site as the capital of the kingdom of Alasia, which René Dussaud proposed in a communication to the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres. Dikaios' opening campaigns for the Department of Antiquities laid bare part of an impressive palace complex near the centre of the site (Pl. IIIc). The earliest floors so far reached produced Mycenaean pottery of about 1400 B.C. The original lay-out was overlaid by structures of inferior masonry which were abandoned in the twelfth century. From the latest level came a fine bronze statue of a young male god, 55 cm. high, which combines Aegean features with the horned headdress of the oriental deities. The statue, which may represent a Bronze Age ancestor of the classical Apollo Alasiotis, has been published in an account of the excavations in ILN, August 20th and 27th, 1949.

Miss J. du Plat Taylor, working on behalf of the Antiquities Department and with the support of the Ashmolean Museum, undertook a search for a well-stratified Iron Age site. Trials near Myrtou disclosed excellent ashlar masonry and deposits of pottery, ranging from Mycenaean down to about 800. Miss Taylor also tested a number of sites in the eastern Mesoaoria but with disappointing results. By chance discoveries of archaic sculpture (now in the Cyprus Museum) two new sanctuary sites were located. The one, near Koutkia, produced fragments of stone statues approaching life size and of bases with syllabic dedications; the other, at Kokkina on the coast east of Marium (Poli), terracottas of good quality. Neither has been excavated. At the Pernera sanctuary site west of Nicosia, where soundings in 1947 produced archaic figurines, a further trial was conducted for the Department by Mr. John Seltman in conjunction with the Army Education Scheme, the labour being supplied by volunteers from the Services. Below Hellenistic floors a series of circular rock-cut pits was found, some of them containing fragmentary terracottas, perhaps debris cleared from the sanctuary.

At Laxia, south of Nicosia, the remains of a large building, brought to light by villagers excavating for stone, was cleared by the Department. Subdivided into three parallel compartments, it appears to be an administrative building in a sanctuary area and to date from the late Hellenistic period. Dikaios and T. Bruce Mitford examined the cave shrine on the summit of Kaphzizin hill, which had produced syllabic and alphabetic dedications to the nymph in the στόβοιες dating from the third century B.C. (RDAC, 1937–1939, 124 ff.). Subsequent occupation by shepherds had left little in situ, but a useful harvest of new inscribed pot fragments was recovered, including parts of an imposing multiple lamp with three tiers of nozzles (Fig. 11). In the Hellenistic cemetery of Ayios Ermouyios at Episkopi G. McFadden did some supplementary work for the Curium Expedition, without opening any new tombs. Of this period the Cyprus Museum has acquired a tomb group from Limassol, a hoard of Ptolemaic staters and a good-quality limestone head of a youth.

On the acropolis of Curium the Pennsylvania University Museum expedition concentrated its attention on the 'Palace', now seen to be a bath-complex of the fourth century A.D., and the theatre. In the former Mr. D. C. Fales uncovered a new mosaic with, in the central medallion, a bust of Ktisis, and from the fills beneath it secured nearly 100 coins mostly of Constantius II. Below the building he opened a series of rock-cut cisterns. Fales also cleared the whole area of the adjoining theatre, which in part at least is of Roman date. It had a vaulted passage encircling the cavea, round the upper part of which are traces of a colonnade. Little of the seating remains and only the substructures of the scene building, but where the masonry is preserved it is of fine quality. At the Apollo sanctuary, west of Curium, excavations
directed by McFadden on the eastern perimeter led to the discovery of a small Roman bath in a good state of preservation just outside the peribolos wall. The floor of one of the hypocaust rooms was found almost intact and evidence was recovered of the extension of the heating system in a dado round the walls, which was closed by a heavy stone moulding.

The partial excavation of a large basilican church in the town site on Cape Drepanum has added to the number of Early Christian monuments in the Island, which remains unduly small. Conducted by A. H. S. Megaw for the Department of Antiquities, the excavations revealed a three-aisled church with three apses, an annexe to the north—perhaps a baptistery—and an atrium to the west. The nave had a mosaic pavement, which is preserved only at the east end (Pl. IIIb). Some of the marble columns and capitals were found and some fragments of the marble chancel screen. They indicate a date in the late sixth century.

For the medieval period a notable discovery was made at St. Sophia, the former Latin Cathedral of Nicosia. In the arches over the main west door some of the original marble figure sculpture, dated about 1320, was discovered behind plaster—a series of eighty-eight little figures of prophets, kings, queens, and prelates (Pl. IIIa); also some damaged figures from the central tympanum composition, evidently a Transfiguration. In Famagusta Th. Mogabgbab continued his investigations in the citadel, where the removal of Venetian fills is revealing the disposition of the Frankish Castle.

The British School at Athens.

J. M. Cook.
THE DATING OF HORSES ON STANDS AND SPECTACLE FIBULAE IN GREECE

[Plates IV-V]

In *Evolution*, I tried to date tripod-cauldrons by the development of their shape and decoration, and by the style of human and animal figurines upon them, particularly by the style of horses on tripod-handles. I now want to compare tripod-horses with horses on stands, but first I must examine the foundations, and cast a glance at dating evidence afforded by fibulae.

In my former study I ventured to tamper with the order laid down by Furtwängler. Not unnaturally, some of his successors at Olympia resisted. They have not met my contention that tripods with solid legs and handles show a consistent development in section from solid to flat, in decoration from simple to elaborate, but they still find it necessary to insert elaborate plated tripods, decorated with advanced horses, into the sequence, so that late solid tripods can imitate their patterns. Plated tripods cannot go in the middle of the series, as Furtwängler said, because too many solid tripods are hybrids between his classes I and III. Hampe puts plated tripods before the decorative period of solid tripods and equates the horses of the last-named with Boeotian rabbits of the seventh century. A horse is a horse and rabbits are different. Early seventh century horses are not at all like rabbits. Let him look again at his own Boeotian brooches.

Kunze's latest pronouncement appears to accept my order, but his dates for the figurines on plated tripods may be a little higher than mine. There are of course unattached horses and with these I do not meddle.

My account in 1935 had two weak points: I was able to point to few patterns on vases contemporary with those on solid tripods, and to no predecessors, and few possible contemporaries of the horses. New discoveries and further study, especially of vases found in Ithaca and soon to be published, have in part remedied these defects.

**Comparison of Vase Patterns and Tripod Patterns**

Plain lines on legs and handles present no difficulties. They are the background of expanding Geometric vase painting. Zig-zags between lines are everywhere. In the running spirals of *Evolution*, pl. 14, we have a design close to the running spiral of vase painting. The design on Ithaca tripod leg 11 (*Evolution*, pl. 17) is just like a slice of a Late Geometric Attic pyxis. Of the panel at the top of tripod legs I have already spoken; it comes in at the end of solid tripods and is universal on plated tripods.

*Evolution*, pl. 24, 1 has an orientalising rosette. Rays like those on the Ashmolean handle may have set the fashion for rays on aryballoi and elsewhere. Kunze's confronted lions in a panel are fully orientalising. Their date must surely be close to that of the 'Late

---

1 Constructions:
   AO: Artemis Orthia.
   AO: Benton, Evolution of the Tripod Lebes (BSA, XXXV).
   M: Heurley and Skeat, Marmarion (BSA, XXXI).
   O: Olympia IV, die Bronzen.
   P: Payne, Protokorinthische Vasenmalerei.
   V: Johansen, Vasen Sicyonien.
   W: Weinberg, Corinth, VII, 1.

2 R. Hampe and U. Jantzen (JDI) Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Olympia, 1937, 65-69. Markman, The Horse in Greek Art, 21, quotes these authors (op. cit. 42, fig. 18) as his authorities for an absurd dating. On reference to this passage it appears that he had translated 'das mittlere achte Jahrhundert' as 875-825 B.C. with disastrous results to the chronology of his first 200 years.

3 I mean tripods made of thin plates of metal.

4 R. Hampe, op. cit. 70; Sagenbilder pl. 18.

5 Or at PC pl. 10, 6.

6 Neue Meisterwerke griechischer Kunst aus Olympia. It contains first-class illustrations of lovely bronzes.

7 Ithaca 3.

8 E.g. Robertson, BSA XLIII, pl. 1, 1, perhaps to be dated about 750 B.C.

Geometric Lion Painter. This tripod leg, discovered since my paper, would persuade me to shift my terminus ante for solid tripods from 725 B.C. to 700 B.C.

A detached ‘ess’ pattern, is common on plated tripods, but does not occur on solid tripods. It is the logical outcome of disintegrating running spirals, a pattern we have seen to be common on solid tripods. These esses tend to be seventh rather than eighth century patterns on Ithacan vases.

Latest of all is the leaf edging on the plated tripod O. 815, the usual edging pattern of classical art, too late for any tripod cauldron.

Coiled Wire Patterns

Why should the coiled wire patterns on solid tripods be taken from a different medium (incised plates) when there were contemporary objects in coiled wire to be copied, namely tripod-stands with coiled wire spirals? The Pnyx tripod should now be dated later than the ninth century, perhaps to the first half of the eighth century.

Another tripod with coiled wire spirals has been found in a tomb at Knossos with Protogeometric vases. This need not mean that it is much earlier, for Protogeometric lasted long in Crete.

I was never happy about Furtwängler’s statement that such complicated objects as tripod-cauldron legs and tripod-cauldron handles were cast each all in one. The handle of pl. 20, 2 has certainly not been cast with its strap, the horse was cast separate too, and I am sure the spirals on Ithaca 9 (op. cit., pl. 18, 6) are made of real wire added after casting. Still it may be argued that these stands were rare and exotic: what about spectacle fibulae which were better known and had a wider distribution?

Date of Spectacle Fibulae in Greece

No-one now connects spectacle fibulae with Mycenaean spirals, but Myres thinks they came to Sparta with the Darians from the Danube about 1140 B.C. and then seemingly lasted on for centuries, and Childe would date them about 925 B.C. at Marmariani. They are found in many sites in Greece, but I shall examine five which might give us a date.

(1) Artemis Orthia.

Bronze spectacle fibulae 900–700 B.C. Ivory spectacle fibulae ninth to sixth century.

The figure 900 is obtained as follows:

Deposit 0.25 m. deep contained Protocorinthian sherds,

\[
\text{it lasted from 740–660 B.C.} = 80 \text{ years.}
\]

Below this was a Geometric deposit 0.50 m deep containing no Protocorinthian pottery.

\[
\begin{align*}
0.25 \text{ m. lasted 80 years,} \\
0.50 \text{ m. lasted 160 years,} \\
740 + 160 = 900 \\
\text{the temple was founded in 900 B.C.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[10 \text{ Cook, } BSA \text{ XLII, 143. See below p. 21.} \]
\[11 \text{ E.g. on the plated handle } \text{op. cit., pl. 19, 9.} \]
\[12 \text{ The pattern on the edges of a late solid tripod-leg at Olympia (Hamp, } \text{Die Antike XV 33, Abb. 17), depicts birds, not debased spirals.} \]
\[13 \text{ E.g. Ithaca tripod No. 9. (Ibid. pl. 17); no. 3 (pl. 14d).} \]
\[14 \text{ E.g. Robertson } BSA \text{ XLIII, pl. 21, 322. There are dozens of examples.} \]
\[15 \text{ AM XVIII 414, pl. XIV: for vases found with it see } BSA \text{ XXXV 125, n. 4.} \]
\[16 \text{ BSA XXXV.} \]
\[17 \text{ Who were the Greeks? 304, 425.} \]
\[18 \text{ Festchrift für Otto Tschumi 73.} \]
\[19 \text{ AO 196, 198.} \]
\[20 \text{ AO 224.} \]
\[21 \text{ AO 18.} \]
\[22 \text{ It should be till } 625 \text{ B.C. but no matter.} \]
This is a dangerous argument, and difficult to check; the excavator has given us the strafication of only one sherd; but one too many. It was found 'almost on virgin soil'; it is listed as Geometric. It is the shoulder of an orientalising globular aryballos, of a type common at Cumae, and to be dated at the earliest to the end of the eighth century. If it is a Laconian imitation it will be later. One sherd out of place will not necessarily wreck a stratification, founded on positive evidence, but so wrong a diagnosis wrecks all faith in the argumentum ex absentia. Let us have done with it and date the sanctuary by the objects published and a few unpublished sherds to after 800 B.C. There is no published evidence that any object except a Mycenaean gem is earlier than 750 B.C. Moreover, it is not necessary to conclude with the excavators that every object was thrown out in strict chronological sequence. Kunze has already objected to AO, pl. XCV. 2, a rider on a Clydesdale, being dated before 740 B.C. We can, however, accept the stratigraphic evidence that the wire spectacle brooches are a little earlier than the ivory. This is important to our inquiry and gives us an additional reason for dating plated tripods and their horses after solid tripods. The patterns of the plated tripod O 585 are extremely like those of bone and ivory spectacle fibulae, whose floruit is the seventh and not the eighth century.

(2) Thera.

The contents of Schiff's Grave in Thera certainly go back to the eighth century and probably earlier, for it has a hump-backed fibula and a rolled pin; but as it also contained Daedalic statues, it does not give us a fixed date.

(3) Chauchitsa.

The last half of the eighth century seems a good date for the spectacle fibulae from Chauchitsa in Macedonia. Close dating is not really possible, but objects of Hallstatt c date occur in two of the graves, nos. 10 and 13, which contained spectacle fibulae. All were single burials. The excavator was probably right in believing the cemetery to be homogeneous. It contained one of the disputed cups with concentric semicircles but see below.

(4) Delphi.

The stratification of the tomb in which the fibulae were found is unsatisfactory, but nothing in it is earlier than globular aryballoi (end of the eighth or beginning of the seventh century).

(5) Marmariani.

The Marmariani fibulae would seem to be 200 years earlier than the rest. There is no doubt that they were found with pottery some of which has Protogeometric patterns, but what is their date? There is an ominous absence of both Early and Middle Geometric pottery in Thessaly.

In reconsidering the Marmariani vases we have the enormous advantage over the authors that the Kerameikos tombs have been dug, and that their contents are set out in order in
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23 *AO* p. 63, fig. 37 A.
24 See below n. 64.
25 * Lancet* has found some more of it and classes it as Laconian I, Orientalising (*BSA* XXXIV, pl. 25 c, 112).
26 He tells me that he thinks it is too rough to be genuine Protocorinthian.
27 *Kretische Bronzereliefs* 254, 23.
28 C. Smyth and E. Boardman, *Perachora*, 274: 'The other Corinthian fibula of the seventh century is the ivory spectacle fibula.'
30 Cason, *BSA* XXVI, 1 ff.
31 *Op. cit.* 9. I have not been able to use W. Reichel, *Griechisches Goldrelief* which I see gives an earlier date for Chauchitsa.
32 *Op. cit.* Tomb 2, p. 10, fig. 3c. Tomb 2 is beside tomb 3, which contains a cup of late 8th century date: similar gold bands in both tombs.
33 *Fouilles des Delphes V*, 110, 154. All the vases look seventh century.
34 *Heurtey and Skeat, BSA* XXXI. I apologise for the length and dullness of this section. General readers (if any) please skip on to the horses p. 21.
35 Desborough has called my attention to imported Middle Geometric vases found at Kapakli near Volo. This is just the sort of indirect influence that I had supposed to be at work on Marmariani.
36 Publication to date, *Kerameikos*, I and IV.
the Kerameikos Museum from Sub-Mycenaean to Late Geometric and beyond, an enduring monument to German scholarship.

Shape is of paramount importance, but it has often been overlooked because patterns are easier to see. All the vases of Marmariani have been called Protogeometric and dated 1000-850 B.C. because of some concentric circles and semicircles with hour-glass centres. Now the truth is that four vases, M 66, 77-79, are like canonical, but late, Attic Protogeometric vases, in pattern and shape; the rest are different. The authors picked out the kantharoi and jugs with cut-away necks as of local origin. These, then, are as yet undateable; let us examine the others.

Oinochoai.

M 66 is oval and canonical, all the rest have broader and often ovoid bodies, a development found in Corinthian and Attic Geometric oinochoai. M 48, 49 are among the earliest of these and look Early Geometric. The oinochoe from Megara looks to be between the two; Ithaca, where there is a complete series of Corinthian shapes, helps us to date M 50 and 54. Ovoid half-decorated body; fully decorated, broad, stiff, tall neck; horror vacui in the decoration. These qualities are not found together before Late Geometric times. Bands of solid rays of a similar size to those round the middle of M 56 occur in Ithaca in the orientalising period and outlined solid rays belong to the same period.

Amphorai.

Same story: M 74, ovoid body, very tall, fully decorated neck.

Mugs and Cups with sharply everted lips do not reach Attica and Corinth before the late eighth century. They may have been earlier in the East and so come earlier to Thessaly. Cups like those on M, pl. VII, with concentric circles, do not reach Athens. They occur in a late eighth-century context in Chauchitsa and El Mina.

Pyxis or Cup.

I refuse to believe that the handle of No. 131, a wide plastic strap with upturned ends, is unconnected with exactly similar handles on Attic Late Geometric bowls. Weinberg (Early Geometric) is a forerunner. There is a Middle Geometric krater strap-handle with straight plastic ends which is still closer (W 74). The shape developed in the South and what happened in Macedonia in the Early Bronze Age does not matter. It is not just a question, 'Did it develop in Athens or Thessaly?' but, 'Did it appear fully fledged in Marmariani in 950 B.C. and then start to develop all over again in the South?'

Krater.

This is a rare shape in Attic Protogeometric. If the foot is high it is always conical, sometimes with a ring added; the rim is seldom everted. The feet of Marmariani kraters show development like that which occurred in Athens between 900 and 700 B.C.

Medallions with dark and reserved crosses at the centre are common in Geometric and very rare in Protogeometric pottery. They appear in metopes round the centre of Attic vases of 'Severe' Geometric style and they are like the medallions on Marmariani kraters. The earliest foot at Marmariani, M 140, is broader than the Attic Protogeometric
foot, which is either conical or conical with a ring round it. The foot of \( M 135 \) is rather like that of the Isis krater.\(^{48}\) \( M 137 \) has a foot like that of the krater from Thebes.\(^{49}\) The more spreading feet on \( M \) pl. X can be compared to the foot of a krater from Analeatos,\(^{50}\) which is rather late. The general shape, the sharply everted rim and the ribbing are not unlike that of Kahane's 'prothesis' krater,\(^{51}\) and it too has medallions, though these are more advanced.

\( M 135 \) has tall double axes as on Ithaca 444\(^ {52}\) and enclosed triangles in double axes, as on another Middle or Late Geometric oinochoe in Ithaca. Its two-piece handle is seen on \( W 70 \) (Early Geometric). On the base it has groups of vertical wavy lines (Late Geometric). The inscribed meander pattern must come from Athens, where it was very popular in Early Geometric. The solid meander is later (\( M 143 \)). There is also the handle pattern of \( M 136 \).

Tombs should be dated and (I think) called after the latest objects in them, Marmariani then is backwoods Geometric of the late eighth century. The vases look so barbaric with their flashy black and red that one feels they ought to be early, but they are not. This or that feature might have been early in Thessaly and have reached Athens in the late eighth century—probably this actually happened with the kantharoi with vertical handles—but not so many features, not fundamental shapes and schemes of decoration, unless Geometric style not only originated in Marmariani, but happened there in its most pronounced form and then developed all over again, slowly and logically, in the South.

Canonical and fairly Early Protogeometric pottery did reach other parts of Thessaly. Tomb B at Theotokou\(^ {53}\) has oval, closed shapes and straight-rimmed drinking vases with conical feet; these latter are reassuring if not obligatory. Tomb A is like Marmariani and later than Tomb B. The Skyros\(^ {53}\) tombs contain only early Attic Protogeometric pottery.

### Evidence for the Dating of Other Fibulae

The Kerameikos discoveries have done much to clarify the history of fibulae. They confirm the fact that of the safety pins only the leaf-shaped variety survived to Sub-Mycenaean times, and even that died out before the Protogeometric era, like the hump-backed fibulae. Note the absence of spectacle fibulae, though the decoration of the vases would seem to invite them. A thin, stilted fibula with two knobs is present in the Sub-Mycenaean graves\(^ {54}\) in Athens, as at Mouliana. I do not doubt that it reached Athens from Crete. Bows of such fibulae in the Protogeometric cemetery are rather more swollen.\(^ {55}\) From these develop the 'Boat fibula with eyes'\(^ {56}\) and various kinds of 'leech fibulae'. These and the 'Boeotian' fibulae\(^ {57}\) and doubtless all the beaded and compound fibulae are Geometric or later.

Applying this test to Thessaly, it is clear that Tomb A at Theotokou\(^ {58}\) with pottery like Marmariani, contains a 'Boeotian' fibula and one that looks like a compound fibula, a slice of bone between other substances, though this is not stated.

To sum up, the earliest dateable vases at Marmariani do go back to the tenth century, but the tombs last on till 725 B.C. If spectacle fibulae cannot be earlier than 800 B.C. at Sparta, and are probably late at Chauchis, it seems rash to put up the date of their arrival in Greece on the evidence of Marmariani.\(^ {59}\) They must have been clumsy, brittle and typologically earlier than his monster fibulae. Their designs are simple like Illyric fibulae and their bows are semicircular, i.e. hammer half-way to flat. Incidentally he has transposed the designs; there are two horses on one fibula. A chain of fibulae of a fully developed type is dated about 800 B.C. (not early ninth century as stated in the text) by a grave in the Kerameikos (\( JD I \) III, 582, Abb. 9 and 11).

\( ^{48} \) CVA Greece I, pl. 6, 5.
\( ^{49} \) VS pl. 1, 2.
\( ^{50} \) Wide, \( JD I \) XIV, 213, fig. 92. Compare also the krater Hampe, pl. 29.
\( ^{51} \) See \( JD I \) cit. pl. XXV.
\( ^{52} \) Robertson, \( BSA \) XLIII, pl. 30.
\( ^{53} \) Wace and Thompson, \( Prehistoric Thessaly \), 208 ff.
\( ^{54} \) Kerameikos I, 82.
\( ^{55} \) Kerameikos IV, pl. 39, Inv. M 2, M 22.
\( ^{56} \) Perachora, pl. 73, 5.
\( ^{57} \) The bow of this fibula is hexagonal in Crete (\( BSA \) XI, pl. 32, 39) from Praisos, and in Athens, where it has grown a large decorated plate (\( JHS \) LI 167 in Toronto). The typology of this fibula is sound, even if, as I think, the grave group is at least two groups. Hampe should have seen that the Elgin gold fibulae (\( Sagenbilder \), pl. 7) are
unsatisfactory, apt to get wet and stain cloth. They probably had a short vogue even in backwood areas. Ornamentation in spiral wire of course kept turning up after the first discovery of wire.

Horses.60

At last we reach the horses and I have only to offer a few dates and to let the illustrations speak for themselves. The earliest post-Mycenaean horses in Greece are those represented on Protogeometric amphorae found in graves in the Kerameikos.61

Class I. They are astonishingly like the horses on tripods with solid legs (Pl. Ia), same weedy limbs and long bodies. These characteristics both share with the horses on 'prothesis' vases, which I still regard as contemporary with the cauldron horses. Only as prothesis vases are now generally relegated at least to the second quarter of the eighth century,62 horses on tripod cauldrons will have to go there too. The Geometric amphora in London which I show (Pl. IVa) is a late specimen of its class, but it is clearly earlier than the Late Geometric amphora (Pl. Va): it has a good deal of black on the body and an extravagantly long neck. The legs of the horse are still weedy, not properly articulated, though better than those of the horse on Ithaca tripod g (Pl. IVb) which I have set beside it. Tripod horses are represented galloping, horses on stands are standing.

Class II. All the horses that follow have acquired a new tension. No horses on solid tripods have it, all plated tripod horses have it (see Pl. IVc). It seems to be a discovery of the second half of the eighth century and not all Late Geometric horses on Attic vases are affected by it.63

As a confirmation of my dating, I am allowed to show a grave group from a single burial, in Taranto Museum. Mr. Dragó most kindly adds the interesting news that it was found in Bari. The Protocorinthian globular aryballos with a single reserved line in a dark base said to be found with it should date from the last quarter of the eighth64 century. The little horse has few graces but he is sturdy and stiff (Pl. IVd).

The horse on a stand (Pl. Vb) found at Actos, Ithaca, adds exaggerated neck and flanks to the new tautness, and his body has become much shorter. He cannot be very far away in date from the horses on the vase beside him (Pl. Va), last quarter of the eighth century.65 He is so like the horses from Perachora that he too must come from Corinth. Payne’s66 date is 750-700 B.C. The horse was actually found inside a monochrome kyathos.67 I am allowed to figure a delightful little horse from Syracuse which is said to have reached the Museum before Orsi’s excavations. The shape of his body is like that of the Lions of the ‘Late Geometric Lion Painter’68 at the very end of the eighth century (Pl. Vc).

Class III. A mannered creature on a stand with a longer body and shoulders reaching down to the ankles (Pl. Ve) continues the story of the horse in Ithaca. His position at the

---

60 Pl. IV, a: From JDS LVIII, 15, Abb. 8. Geometric Attic Amphora.
61 b: BSA XXXV, Pl. 15 c. Ithaca tripod g. Scale 1:1.
63 d: Grave Group in Taranto. Scale 1:1.
65 b: Horse from Actos; Ithaca, Bronzes No. 3. Scale 1:1.
66 c: Horse at Syracuse. Mr. J. M. Cook’s photograph. Scale 1:2.
68 e: Horse from Actos; Ithaca, Bronzes No. 8. Scale 1:1.
69 Kerameikos IV, pl. 27.
70 See G. Nottbohm puts them later still, JDS LVIII, 28.
end of my sequence, and the Corinthian provenience of the Ithaca horses, are confirmed by his striking resemblance to the horses of the Dioskouroi on the Early Protocorinthian aryballos in the Ashmolean Museum ⁶⁹ (Pl. Vd).

I have to thank the British School at Athens, the Directors of the Museum of Taranto and Syracuse and of the Ashmolean Museum for permission to publish these photographs.

SYLVIA BENTON.

NOTE.—Mr. Robert M. Cook has just shown me sherds from two vases said to have been found at Artemis Orthia which are unquestionably of Protogeometric style. If we can assume that they were actually found in the shrine deposit, are we to conclude that they date the shrine, or that the shrine dates them?

⁶⁹ Payne's date for this vase is 'end of the first quarter of the seventh century', CVA Oxford, pl. 1, 5.
ORIGINS OF THE BERLIN PAINTER

[PLATES VI–IX]

The vase illustrated in pll. VI–IX(a) and figs. 1 and 2 is a red-figure volute-krater belonging to the Museum of Ethnology and Archaeology at Cambridge, and now deposited on loan at the Fitzwilliam Museum. It came to the Museum of Ethnology and Archaeology in 1886 with the Barrett Collection, but nothing further is known of its history. It was attributed to the Berlin Painter by Professor J. D. Beazley in Attische Vasenmaler, and in his Berliner Maler he classed it among the half-dozen earliest works of the master. Until recently it was severely repainted, but has now been cleaned. Much is missing; the surface is rubbed, and the restorer had not hesitated to plane away the edges of fragments where he could not arrange a clean fit; but it remains a fine and interesting piece.

Modern are: foot, with much of the lower part, including most of the rayed area and lower part of reverse figure; volute of one handle; rim, upper register and most of lower register of neck on obverse; patches on body and reverse neck (evident in photographs). The foot has been restored on the model of a complete volute-krater decorated by the same artist some years later. In the body pictures relief-contour is used rather sparingly, as usual in this artist's work; the small figures on the neck, like those on the London volute-krater, show a much fuller use of it. Thinned glaze is used for the usual inner body-markings; on the youth on B, however, they have all been obliterated, except for the end of one line on the back and of one on the upper arm. On this figure it is also used for drapery folds running from the right-hand contour, both in the area about the waist and across the leg. Red is used for the wreaths of the figures on the body and for the plectrum string. The hair-contour is reserved, and engraved by means of dots of glaze; in the case of the reveller the background line is waved to correspond to these dots.

The patterns are mostly canonical to the shape: ivy on volutes; running key on lip; tongues on shoulder and at handle-roots; rays at base. The running palmette on the upper register of the neck is of a class that has been exhaustively studied by Dinsmoor in connection with the date of the Athenian Treasury. It belongs to his type I, though the artist shows a underside of foot of second figure from right. Neck-figures on B; whole preserved contour of left-hand figure except parts of right hand and right shin (both of which may originally have had it) and part of lower edge of spear-shaft towards the head; whole preserved contour of second figure, except back of crest immediately above right arm; whole preserved contour of third figure, except lower edge of spear-head with contiguous part of shaft; whole preserved contour of fourth figure (the relief outlines of the crest-tail continue beyond the point where the reserve stops, as far as the right knee); whole preserved contour of two right-hand figures. In the palmette frieze relief-contour is used throughout except for the inner curvs of the volutes.

1 82, no. 75. I have to thank the Museum authorities for permission to publish it.
2 14 and 18, no. 93. It also appears in ARV, 137, no. 99.
3 London, E68; Berliner Maler pl. 29. Sir John Beazley tells me of a splendid new volute-krater by the Berlin Painter in the Villa Giulia: body, on each side a young warrior running; neck, palmettes above, below A, Herakles, assisted by Athena and by a falling thunderbolt, in combat with Kyknos, at each end chariots, B, athletes. To be dated between the Cambridge and London vases.
4 Body: reveller on A: forehead and nose (enough of parted lips preserved to show that there was none); drapery in front of chest; both sides of upper-arm but not fore-arm; forefinger of right hand (rest of hand not preserved); with right hand edge of kantharos stem and bowl; thumb and forefinger of left hand; shell of lyre and curved ends of frame with cross-bar and supports; upper contour of left foot with toes and ball of foot; toes and lower contour of right foot; back of right thigh; small of back; relief line is also used for the zig-zag fold-ends which partly impinge on the contour, and for the seven lyre-strings, across reserved and black areas alike. Youth on B: whole face and throat; both sides of right upper arm but not of fore-arm; upper edge of forefinger with both sides of stick above it; knuckles, and both sides of stick immediately below; back of neck; drapery on left shoulder; interior of overhang behind back. Remains of neck-figures on A: whole preserved contour of left-hand figure, and of right-hand figure except back of right calf and thigh and perhaps chiton; at least toes and

* AFA I, 98 ff.
Fig. 1.—Figures from Body of Vase in Plate VI.

Fig. 2.—Remains of Neck-picture on Obverse of Vase in Plate VI.
faint tendency to turn the palmettes alternately upwards and downwards as in type II; on the other hand he has in error broken the alternation of the connections in one place. The closest parallel I know to it is on a hydria in London, of the same time and the same general circle. Below the figure on A is a stopped maenander of unusual form, below that on B a running key.

On the front of the body (Pl. IX (a) and VIII (b) and Fig. 1 (b)) a bearded reveller, naked but for an ivy-wreath and a voluminous cloak thrown over his shoulders, moves carefully to the right, holding a lyre in his left hand and a kantharos, evidently full, in his outstretched right. His mouth is open, presumably in song.

The only unusual feature here is the kantharos. This type of drinking vessel is normally carried by Dionysos and his meimie and occasionally by Hermes in a Dionysiac connection and by Herakles (though he more often has a special and slightly different form) and the Centaur Pholos, but it is very rarely seen in the hands of common men. An example is that carried by Komarchos (or the 'Komarchos'? on the Munich amphora signed by Euthymides, under whose immediate influence the Berlin Painter was working when he painted our vase.

On the back (Pl. VI and VIII (a) and Fig. 1 (a)) a youth, wreathed but not with ivy, stands to the right, left leg forward, right arm holding a stick, his himation over his left shoulder muffling arm and hand which holds it bunched in the small of his back. His right forefinger points forward, an unusual gesture; he is perhaps keeping time with it to the reveller’s song.

The neck on the front of the vase is largely missing, and it will be better to describe the back first (Pl. VI and VII). Here a fight is taking place in which six warriors are involved. All are naked and armed only with helmets, shields and spears. On the left a beardless youth, on his shield (seen in profile) a tripod, retreats, brandishing a spear, before a blonde and beardless opponent, seen in three-quarter back view, who advances thrusting with lowered spear, on his shield the forepart of a bridled horse. Both wear Attic helmets, the fleer’s cheek-pieces down, the pursuer’s turned up. Next a bearded warrior in a Corinthian helmet attacks to the right with raised spear. His shield, seen from within on his extended left arm, is pierced by the spear of his youthful adversary, who however is down on his left knee. He is seen from the back, his head turned towards his assailant. His shield, seen in profile, bears a bull’s head and he wears an Attic helmet with the cheek-pieces down. From the right runs up a beardless rescuer, spear raised, Attic helmet with cheek-pieces down, the forepart of a lion on his shield. The last figure, like the first, looks back indeed, but although unpursued makes off at full speed out of the mêlée, shield before him, spear held low. He too is beardless and wears an Attic helmet with the cheek-pieces down. His shield, seen in profile, bears no device but the inscription [καὶ λαός].

To return to the front of the neck: on the left (Fig. 2 (a)) are the advanced right leg and foot, with the pubes and front of the left thigh and knee, of a naked figure moving rapidly out of the picture. At the right-hand end (Fig. 2 (b)) are the badly preserved remains of two figures; one in a short chiton and cloak was striding into the picture; right leg and foot remain with

---

7 Et42; Form II with picture on shoulder; palaestra: running palmette below picture. BCH 1896, 164; JHS 27, 32; Norman Gardiner, Greek Athletic Sports, 334, and Athletics in the Ancient World, 166; CV pl. 71, 2 and 74, 1. Not in Beazley: it seems to me very an in competent imitator of the Kleophrades Painter’s earliest works.

8 See below p. 29ff.

9 E.g., on the Berlin Painter’s name vase. On a black-figure hydria by the Andokides painter in London (Bryoz; Jkh XXI, pl. 1; ARV 4 no. 26) Dionysos, reclining among satyrs and maenads, holds one handle of a kantharos while Hermes standing by him holds the other. At the farther edge of the picture stands Hephaistos, and I take it that Dionysos is handing Hermes the cup to take to the same god; for this is surely the party at which Dionysos made Hephaistos drunk in order to get him back to Olympus. Pernier Jkh, XXI, 40 ff., observing that Dionysos’ cushion is a full wine-skin, gives a different explanation.

10 Another is carried by a poor relation of these r.f. revellers, on a black-figure lekythos by the Gela Painter, Hespels, pl. 24, 2 (5) who started his long career in the time and circle of Euthymides. (See also n. 36 below.) A kantharos is carried by a man in a ritual-seeming procession of vessel-bearers on a vase of nearly a hundred years earlier, the Komast Group kotyle in Athens, AM, LXII, pl. 50 (a).

11 On a later work of the artist’s, a charming hydria in Boulogne (ARV 140, 139) Dionysos, who holds a horn in his right hand and a knotted staff in his left, extends his right forefinger and the first two fingers of this left hand in a similar manner, apparently directing the dance of a maenad who herself wags her right forefinger to admonish the steps of a lion-cub. On his Heerst amphora (ARV, 131, below, no. 3; JHS XII, 72–3 and pl. 2; Berliner Maler pl. 21) the eucharade-singer’s trainer uses the forefinger of his free right hand to beat time, while the man on the back of his Montpellier panatheniac (ARV 152, no. 5; JHS XII, 75; ReA, pl. 1 and p. 187) uses the first two fingers in the same way.
part of the edge of the chiton, the two hanging points of the cloak and part of the calf of the advanced left leg. Crossing this are the advanced left leg and foot of a figure moving to the right.

Fig. 3 shows a fragment of a volute-krater neck in Leipsic, also a very early work of the Berlin Painter.\textsuperscript{12} The lip bears a running key, the upper register a running palmette very similar to ours, the lower a palaestra scene: apoxyomenos; dandy; two lines. These lines might be a pair of javelins,\textsuperscript{13} or a border. Borders of this or similar form are sometimes found on volute-krater necks, and the Berlin Painter perhaps put one on another seemingly very early vase, whose surviving fragments are entombed in the pastiche Louvre G166.\textsuperscript{14} The youth

\textsuperscript{12} ARV 197, no. 100; Berliner Maler 14 and 18, no. 94. I am indebted to Sir John Beazley for the photograph and to Professor Schweitzer for permission to publish it and for very kindly providing the following details: 145 cms. high and 24-5 long; many foot-marks on the inside and traces of them on the outside which has been cleaned, but none on the breaks, suggesting that these are later than the finding of the vase. From Hauser's collection.

\textsuperscript{13} cf. Berliner Maler, pl. 15, 1, also the Villa Giulia krater, p. 23 n. 3 above.

\textsuperscript{14} See CVA fasc. 2, III, lc. pl. 18, 3 left. ARV 197, no. 101 also 124, Kleophrades Painter no. 44, with refs.
FIG. 4.—Calyx-crater Fragment from Corinth.
(Corinth Museum.)

FIG. 5.—Picture on Hydria in British Museum (E 162).
with the strigil seems to have had a cloak over his arm.\textsuperscript{15} The other figure recalls, though he does not equal, Onesimos’s exquisite in his much-illustrated Vienna cup.\textsuperscript{16} The question arises whether this fragment is not part of our vase. Against this: (1) from the measurements given the Leipsic fragment appears to be on a slightly larger scale than our vase; (2) the palmettes on the fragment have nine petals, against seven on our vase, and their hearts are more elaborately drawn, though this would not be an impossible difference between front and back; (3) the right-hand figure on our neck-front wears a short chiton and hanging cloak; this costume is suitable for hunters, travellers and fighters, but as far as I know unparalleled in the palaestra. It seems safest to assume, then, that the Leipsic fragment is from another vase and that the scene on the front of our neck, like that on the back, was a battle, but perhaps an amazonomachy, as the mixture of clothed and unclothed warriors seems very rare in other forms of combat.

That the Cambridge vase is the work of the Berlin Painter needs no demonstration. Details of anatomy and drapery folds are exactly his, with some unusual simplification in the small figures on the neck. The reveller on the body is own brother to the siren on the back of the Berlin amphora,\textsuperscript{17} a piece which, though it does not belong to the same very early phase of the master’s work as our vase, I take to be not much later. The siren, who naturally wears no cloak, has paused and brought the kantharos to his lips to drink, in the motion straightening himself and lifting the lyre a little, but the two pictures are essentially successive moments in a single motion of one figure. The figure on the reverse resembles in pose the youth on a work of the painter’s maturity, the charming little neck-ampyra in Boulogne with Eros.\textsuperscript{18} His face is strikingly like those of the athletes on a very early panathenaic in Munich.\textsuperscript{19} Closer kin to the Cambridge youth, however, than any on a vase hitherto ascribed to the Berlin Painter is one who stands behind Theseus as he slays the Minotaur on the Vienna Painter’s pelike in Florence.\textsuperscript{20} The Vienna and Florence pelikai were ascribed to Euthymides by Furtwängler and others, and the attribution accepted by Beazley in \textit{FA} 33. In \textit{AV} 65, at Langlotz’s suggestion, he withdrew them from Euthymides and remarked (p. 76) that they were forerunners of the Berlin Painter’s style, repeating this more hesitantly in \textit{ARV} 27. In view of the close resemblance of our youth to the young Athenian on the Florence pelike, it seems worth considering whether these splendid vases may not in fact be masterpieces of the Berlin Painter’s extreme youth.

The vases already classed by Beazley as \textit{Berlin Painter’s} are, besides the Cambridge and Leipsic volute-kraters and the Munich panathenaic already discussed: the wonderful hydria in New York with Achilles and Penthesilea;\textsuperscript{21} a calyx-krater fragment in Corinth (pl. IX (b) and fig. 4);\textsuperscript{22} and a fragment in the Louvre, known to me only from Beazley’s description, of a large vase, perhaps a volute-krater, with a fight (bearded warrior running to right).\textsuperscript{23} To these I would add two hydriai of black-figure shape, one in London, with Herakles and Nereus (fig. 5),\textsuperscript{24} and the other in Aberdeen, with Peleus and Thetis (figs. 6 and 7).\textsuperscript{25} These two vases were in 1918 grouped with others by Beazley as the work of a \textit{Nereus Painter.}\textsuperscript{26} Seven years later\textsuperscript{27} he transferred another vase from the Nereus to the Berlin Painter and adumbrated the possibility that the former was only a phase of the latter. In 1927\textsuperscript{28} he expressed the view that such was the case, but the next year\textsuperscript{29} he questioned whether

\textsuperscript{11} Cf. the plate in the Robinson Collection, Baltimore \textit{CV}, ii, pl. 23, 2; \textit{ARV} 396, no. 3, by the Bryn Mawr Painter, whose curious style owes something to the Berlin Painter.
\textsuperscript{12} \textit{ARV} 222, no. 38, with refs. \textit{Berlin Maler}, pl. 4.
\textsuperscript{13} \textit{ARV} 131, no. 1; \textit{Berlin Maler}, pl. 4.
\textsuperscript{14} \textit{ARV} 134, no. 37; \textit{Berlin Maler}, pl. 16.
\textsuperscript{15} \textit{ARV} 132, no. 5; \textit{Berlin Maler}, pl. 7, 2.
\textsuperscript{16} \textit{ARV} 28, top no. 21; part, \textit{Max. II, 3}, pl. 4; whence FR. ii, 81 and Hoppin, \textit{Euth. F.} pl. 23; augmented by new fragments \textit{CV}, ii, pl. 31, 2 and 32. The figure is incomplete, but one of the new fragments gives more of it.
\textsuperscript{17} \textit{ARV} 140, no. 193 with refs.; \textit{Berlin Maler} pl. 22, 1, and pp. 12, 14, 15 and 20 no. 129.
\textsuperscript{18} These photographs and permission to use them I owe to the kindness of Prof. Brome. \textit{ARV} 137, no. 88; \textit{AIA XXXIV}, Prof. Brome points out that the palmette and lotus frieze on the rim is of unusual elaboration, the lotuses being of two different forms which alternate with one another. \textit{ARV} 143, no. 104, ‘early’; \textit{Berlin Maler} 14 and 21, no. 180 (‘sehr früh’).
\textsuperscript{19} E1627; \textit{ARV} 149, no. 128. I have to thank the Trustees of the British Museum for permission to publish this vase.
\textsuperscript{20} 865, \textit{ARV} 140, no. 127. I have to thank Sir John Beazley for the photograph and the University authorities for permission to publish it.
\textsuperscript{21} \textit{FA} 61.
\textsuperscript{22} \textit{ARV} 140, S. 121-2.
\textsuperscript{23} \textit{BSR} XI, 20, note 2.
\textsuperscript{24} \textit{Berlin Maler} 14, note 1, 15 and 19, nos. 123 ff.
the three hydria of black-figure shape \(^{30}\) were not copies or school-pieces. His latest list (1942) of the Berlin Painter’s works includes them without comment.\(^{31}\)

It seems to me that the Aberdeen and London hydria are works of the Berlin Painter’s own hand but belong to an extremely early period, before even Beazley’s ‘very early’ group, and linking that to the Vienna and Florence pelikai. Look first at the patterns under the

![Image of a hydria](image)

**Fig. 6.—Hydria in Aberdeen (695).**

pictures. The Nereus hydria (Fig. 5) has pairs of stopped maeander separated by dotted chequer-panels. The members of each pair are separated by vertical lines, and the lines that form the maeander themselves spring at the bottom from these two lines and at the top from the lines bounding the chequer-panel. A stopped maeander of precisely this form makes the pattern under the Cambridge reveller, only here the eight pairs are separated from each other

\(^{30}\) On the third, a fragment in Boston \((ARV 139, no. 126)\), see below pp. 52 ff., fig. 3.

\(^{31}\) \(ARV 140, nos. 127 and 128\). When this article was already in proof, Sir John Beazley drew my attention to a third hydria of the same shape and scheme of decoration, with Apollo and Herakles struggling for the tripod \((Mon. Pió XX, pl. 5\), from a drawing. Now in the Gumá Collection, Havana). From a photograph it is clear that it is inseparable from the London and Aberdeen hydria. There appears to be some repainting, especially on Apollo’s body. Under the picture is a running key.
not by a panel of different pattern but by two verticals like those that form the centre of each pair. The stopped maeander on the New York hydria is of the same form, but here there is a panel of different pattern (framed saltire) not only between the pairs but in the centre of each pair. In the various forms of stopped maeander used by the Berlin Painter in his mature work, the maeander always springs from the horizontal lines above and below the pattern band, never, as in the Cambridge, New York and London vases, from the vertical dividing lines; nor do I know of other examples of this peculiarity in Attic vase-painting. Beneath the picture on the Aberdeen hydria (Fig. 6) is a maeander of the type conveniently called by Miss Haspels a labyrinth. The distinguishing mark of the labyrinth is that two lines cross in the centre of each reach of the maeander. The labyrinth as a vase-pattern occurs only once again, I believe, in the Berlin Painter's work, but is the only form of maeander apart from the simple running key found in the work of his master Euthymides, or of any other painter of the Pioneer Group. The labyrinth as used by the Pioneers is formed of two running lines, in which key and step pattern alternate, crossing each other and enclosing panels of other pattern. This form is also sometimes used by painters of the Berlin Painter's generation—the Kleophrades Painter, the Sycleus Painter, the Troilos Painter, the Triptolemos Painter, the Eucharides Painter not infrequently, Douris and the Pan Painter. An ingenious stopped version of this form occurs on a hydria in the Louvre described by Beazley as 'Manner of the Berlin Painter. Later.' The Eucharides Painter uses another stopped form—stopped key crossed by stopped step—and this is found also in the vases of the b.f. Gela Painter. The form on the Aberdeen hydria is different from any of these: a running key crossed by a stopped step and without panels of any other pattern. The same form occurs to my knowledge only on the Berlin Painter's Villa Giulia volute-krater and on the corset of Orestes on the Vienna pelike; (there the left-hand end is confused, but most of it is certainly of this form). The style of the figures on the London and Aberdeen hydriae links them even more closely to the Vienna and Florence pelikai than to the 'very early' group of the Berlin Painter. Compare the London Herakles with the Florence Theseus in the Minotauroctony—rather awkwardly managed pose of shoulders, long body, broad short thighs with short and steeply stepped chiton—the likeness is remarkable. Scarcely less striking is the resemblance in drawing of the lower part of the Aberdeen Thetis and that of Chrysothemis on the Vienna vase—the back leg drawn as though naked, the skirt clinging to the line of buttock, thigh and calf, and the bunched folds springing from the front line of thigh and knee. The two figures are close to each other in other points too, especially the drawing of the heads; the difference in build is due I think to the Thetis being spread, like the Nereus, over the front of a broad vase, while the Chrysothemis is crowded into the corner of a full panel. Differences in constructing a restricted and a spread picture account too for the heaviness of the Nereus against a light Clytemnestra, but the composition of these two pictures is in other respects extraordinarily similar. One could multiply the points of likeness: compare Herakles' right hand grasping Nereus' arm with that of Theseus grasping Skiron's foot; Talthybios' head with Nereus' and the curiously formal dots on his hair and beard with those on Herakles' lion-skin; Peleus' torso with Skiron's and the Minotaur's; and the drawing of the feet throughout. It is perhaps also worth noting that the Nereus hydria, like the pelikai, is circled below the picture by a band
of red—an early feature not found, I think, in the Berlin Painter's mature work. I feel no doubt that these five vases are the work of one hand, and the links that hold them to the work of the Berlin Painter are no less strong. We have already noticed the resemblances between the patterns on two hydriae and those on the Berlin Painter's 'very early' work; also the likeness of the youth on the Florence pelike to the one on the Cambridge vase. The compositions of the Talthybios-Clytemnestra and Herakles-Nereus pictures, as well as of the Peleus and Thetis and the Theseus and Skiron, show a preoccupation with that idea of combining two figures within a single contour which found final triumphant expression in the Berlin amphora itself.

![Image of vase](image)

**Fig. 7.—Detail of Vase in Fig. 6.**

Quality and feeling of the pelikai are echoed in the New York hydria and the Corinth krater-fragment; the Nereus and Thetis hydriae and the Cambridge vase, and even the fine Munich panathenaic, have a touch of the heaviness which overcame the master in middle age. The same feeling occasionally reappears throughout his early years; e.g., to my mind, in the Vatican panathenaic with Athena and Hermes, the Corneto lug-krater with Europa, and the Louvre Nolan with shoulder-pictures. Beazley has already pointed to it in an amphora and some stamnoi transitional to his middle period, and it is very marked in the contemporary Copenhagen hydria with Triptolemos and Kore.

---

38 *Berlin Maler*, pl. 25.
39 H. W. Smith's distinction from bell-krater.
41 This vase differs from most of the Berlin Painter's hydriae in the form of the lip, a double bevel, which recurs however on the hydria of black-figure shape in the Vatican.
42 It is found as far as I know only on the following vases:

1. B.f. hydria of b.f. shape in Frankfort (Schaal, pl. 12).
2. R.f. hydria of b.f. shape in the Vatican, by the Berlin Painter (ARV 140, no. 129).
The detailed renderings on the London and Aberdeen hydriai are nearly those of the painter’s established practice; only the typical ankle is omitted or drawn in brown, as occasionally in his matuer work; on the Vienna and Florence pelikai the divagations are greater and I take them to be slightly earlier. Earlier still, real prentice work, I would place the fragment of a hydria in Boston with Herakles and Cerberus (fig. 8). The Herakles figure is closely connected with that on the Nereus hydria, but the whole effect is hesitant and unsure. Even such an incompetent effort however as Hermes’s hand is closely paralleled in Skiron’s on the Florence pelike. In its picture composition the Boston vase belonged to a group of late sixth-century red-figure hydriai of this shape (including those by Phintias, Hysipis and the Nikoxenos Painter), which take over unchanged the principles of design founded on the contemporary and related black-figure hydriai of the Leagros Group. The London, Aberdeen and Havana vases are the first of this shape in which the black-figure tradition is abandoned and the design conceived for the vase in terms of red-figure.

To the same period as the Boston fragment must belong the much finer fragment of a skyphos from the Acropolis, with heads of a god and goddess seated side by side, which Langlotz ascribed to the painter of the Vienna and Florence pelikai. The resemblances are very great, and I think it must be by the Berlin Painter. The mannerism of the drawing I take to be due to an effort at great elaboration by a still undeveloped artist.

As to absolute dating, Beazley has remarked that the New York hydria must be before 500. The Acropolis and Boston fragments must be some years earlier, but certainly not as early as 510. The Vienna and Florence pelikai, which resemble in character the metopes of the Athenian Treasury at Delphi, will probably have been painted about, or soon after, the middle of the decade.

The resemblance of the ‘ghost’ on the Vienna pelike to the Clytemnestra has often been observed, and it seems almost certain that the original figure was by the same hand. I take that figure to be Polyxena, turning as she flees from Achilles, the horses and Troilos close behind her. The Troilos Painter’s name-verse offers a good parallel, and so does the name-verse of the Painter of Louvre G231. The Berlin Painter represented Polyxena again on the lovely Leningrad hydria; I believe the pendant to this vase, with the omitted Troilos, is to be found in the pretty but slighter hydria in Madrid.

To return to the Cambridge volute-krater: the battle on the neck deserves some remark, for it shows the painter in unusual mood. He was never fond of battles; on his 208 red-figure half of the fifth century. In nos. 1 and 5 the whole lip is black; in no. 2 reserved without decoration. In the rest it is reserved with a tongue-pattern on each face of the bevel.

--

3. R.f. hydria of r.f. shape in Copenhagen, by the Berlin Painter (ARV 140, no. 144).
4. R.f. hydria of r.f. shape in Naples, by the Kleophrades Painter (ARV 126, no. 66; the Vivenzio hydria).
6. R.f. stamnos in London, E439; unattributed, about 490–480 B.C.
7. R.f. dinos in Würzburg, by the Achilles Painter (ARV 698, no. 5; Langlotz, pl. 198-9).
8. Oenochoe, shape Vb, in London, old nos. 1035 and 1154 (Durand Collection); black glaze, with r.f. palmette at handle-base.

---

Nos. 1 and 2 as Beazley points out to me are almost replicas in shape and must be by the same potter. Beazley, in JHS XXX, pointed out the connection of nos. 4, 6 and 7 and Poulton (Einbl. 10) of nos. 2, 3, 4 and 8. Nos. 1–4 have the same form of foot, which is that normally used in the Berlin Painter’s hydriai. I suppose them to be all by the same potter. No. 5 has a disc foot, and does not look like a vase of the same potter. No. 6 has a ring foot, and this and its general proportions recall some of the Kleophrades Painter’s stamnai. It might be by the potter of 1–4. No. 7 is later; it was decorated by a pupil of the Berlin Painter, and there may be some link on the potter’s side. Nos. 3 and 4 cannot be long before 480; no. 2 not long after 490; no. 1 might be earlier still. Beazley, publishing an oenochoe of the same type as no. 8 (Oxford, CV pl. 48, 12) observes that the few oenochoai of this shape with figures run through the first
vases listed in *ARV* there is only one other certain mêlée, the beautiful fragments in Erlangen,\(^{61}\) and possibly two others, the Louvre fragment \(^{52}\) and the Corinth calyx-krater fragment; \(^{53}\) and even of these the last is much more likely to be from a single combat. Besides this there are four certain single combats.\(^{54}\) Apart from these stand the informal fight of Ajax and Odysseus\(^{55}\) and the deaths of Aegisthos, the Minotaur and Skiron on the Vienna and Florence pelikai; also Achilles lying in wait for Polyxena on the Leningrad hydria,\(^{56}\) and four late vases with Menelaos pursuing Helen or a related subject.\(^{57}\)

![Fig. 8.—Hydra Fragment in Boston (03.838).](image)

The painter is comparatively fond of warriors and amazons not in action: single figures, arming, hoplitodromoi and the like occur in 22 scenes. What especially distinguishes the fight on our vase from those in the painter's maturer works is the use of shields seen in full view from the outside. He uses them commonly enough for single figures, whether in motion or repose, and in quiet scenes of several figures, like armings or preparations for departure, or Achilles in ambush; but it is as though he felt that the big bare circle with the silhouetted figure in the middle arrested the movement of a group of figures in action. At any rate not one is so shown despatching a bearded opponent is surely Achilles killing Hector. He must also have figured fighting Memnon on the Erlangen loutrophoros (see note 51) and perhaps pursuing Troilos on the lost vase represented by a ghost on the Vienna pelike. Lastly he appears as a child, being presented to Chiron, on the charming stamnos in the Louvre (ARV 136, no. 109). Prologue to these are the stamnos in Palermo (ARV no. 108), closely connected with the last, showing his parent's honeymoon visit to the virtuous centaur, and the Aberdeen hydria with their stormy courtship. The little neck-amphora in Madrid mentioned above gives us the epilogue—Ajax and Odysseus quarrelling over the dead hero's armour.\(^{57}\)

\(^{1}\) *ARV* 131, no. 4, not from a pointed amphora, but, as Beazley now points out, from a loutrophoros; Buschor, *Krooche* pl. 3; *AJA* 1935, pl. 9.

\(^{2}\) *ARV* 143, no. 184 (p. 20 above).

\(^{3}\) *ARV* 137, no. 88.

\(^{4}\) *ARV* 138 ff. nos. 102 (both sides), 166 and 132. Add Herakles in combat on the neck of the Villa Giulia volute-krater, p. 23 n. 3 above.

\(^{5}\) *ARV* 134, no. 39.

\(^{6}\) Our painter had a partiality for Achilles. Apart from this vase (which probably takes it with, as we saw above, the Madrid hydria) he appears in three of the four certain single combats, and almost certainly in the fourth: the young warrior on *ARV* 138, no. 145, supported by Athena, *VOL. LXX.*
in the four other fully preserved combats, nor on the surviving fragments of the other three; always it is the narrow profile view or the interior of the circle, where it is broken by the arm with its inner markings, the cushion and the tassels. Yet in our scene there are two shields seen fully from the outside. Indeed the whole effect of the picture, like so much of the artist's earlier work, recalls his masters' rather than his own mature style. Euthymides has left us no fights, as he has left us no vase of this shape, but a fragment by Phintias ⁵⁸ shows a combat from the body of a volute-krater, and gives a parallel for the unusual motive of a shield pierced by a spear. The general composition however is not closely paralleled in any picture of the Pioneer Group but rather recalls the cup-exteriors of Epiktetos, Oltos and their generation, whose later work is nearly contemporary with our vase. ⁵⁹

**Martin Robertson.**

---

⁵⁸ *ARV* 22, no. 3; *JHS* LI, 41, fig. 1. The shield pierced by a spear recurs in Phintias's work on B of the calyx-krater *ARV* 22, no. 4, there described as 'Fight at Troy'. Sir John Beazley, who points this out to me, adds that he now accepts Löwy's interpretation of the scene as the wounding of Telephos.

⁵⁹ The lost Epiktetos, *ARV* 48, no. 39, a late vase, parallels the unheroic way in which the outermost figures bolt from the field, but Epiktetos's fighters have the excuse of being pitted against Herakles. There are inscriptions on two of the shields on this cup too, as not uncommonly at this time, but the practice continued later, and the Berlin Painter himself writes *καλός* on a wine-skin on a rather later vase (*ARV* 138, no. 111). Other late Epikteten fights that recall our composition are those on two London cups, E35 (*ARV* 47, no. 36; again with *καλός* on a shield) and 1929.11-11.1. (*ARV* 47, no. 32).
THE SANCTUARY AND ALTAR OF CHRYSE IN ATTIC RED-Figure VASE-
PAINTINGS OF THE LATE FIFTH AND EARLY FOURTH CENTURIES B.C.

Two vases exist on which the sanctuary of Chryse is definitely identified by inscriptions. The first is an Attic red-figure stamnos, Louvre G413, attributed to Hermonax, on which is depicted Philoktetes being bitten by the snake at the altar of Chryse.\(^1\) The second is an Attic red-figure bell-krafter, Vienna Inv. 1144, of the late fifth century B.C., which depicts Herakles sacrificing at the altar of Chryse. With the first vase may be associated an Attic red-figure calyx-krafter, Louvre G343, attributed to the Altamura Painter, which bears no inscriptions, but undoubtedly represents the same scene;\(^2\) and with the second may be grouped four other vases of the late fifth and early fourth centuries B.C., which resemble it sufficiently closely to suggest that they too represent the sanctuary of Chryse. The interpretation of the two Louvre vases has never been in doubt, since they obviously illustrate the story of the biting of Philoktetes by the snake in the sanctuary of Chryse,\(^3\) but the interpretation of the other group of vases has been the subject of some dispute. In this article, therefore, I propose to discuss the connection of these vases with one another and with the two Louvre vases, and to examine their relation to the literary treatment of the legends concerning this sanctuary.

The group consists of the following five vases:

1. **London E494 (Fig. 1).** Fragments of an Attic red-figure bell-krafter of c. 430 B.C.\(^4\) A bearded man stands to the left of an altar built of large rough stones, on top of which parts of the victim are burning in a fire of logs. Behind the altar and a little to the right is a Doric column supporting a draped female image, the upper part of which is missing; and to the left of the column is a tree with three vine pinakes hanging from the branches. Between the bearded man and the altar a youth (\(\Phi\Lambda\) \(\Omega\) \(\Psi\) \(\kappa\) \(\varepsilon\) \(\kappa\) \(\tau\) \(n\) \(\lambda\) \(\eta\) \(v\)), of whom only the top of the head remains, holds meat over the fire on a double spit. On the other side of the altar stands a second youth (\(\Pi\) \(\alpha\) \(\nu\) \(\rho\) \(\alpha\) \(\nu\) \(\zeta\) \(n\) \(\nu\)), who is also roasting meat on a double spit. To the right of him is part of a draped female figure, and to the right again stands Athene. On the far left of the scene is a curious object which has not yet been identified with certainty.

2. **Vienna Inv. 1144 (Fig. 2).** Attic red-figure bell-krafter of the late fifth century B.C.\(^5\) In the centre is an altar of rough stone slabs with a fire on top, and behind the altar is a Doric column supporting a draped female image (\(\chi\rho\upsilon\gamma\upsilon\ς\).\(\Theta\)). To the left of the altar Herakles (\(\Pi\) \(\rho\) \(\alpha\) \(\kappa\) \(\alpha\) \(\nu\) \(\zeta\) \(n\) \(\nu\)) turns and beckons to a youth on the left (\(\iota\omicron\alpha\gamma\omicron\iota\omicron\omicron\alpha\omicron\nu\).\(\omega\)), who is bringing to the altar a bull with a fillet on its horns. On the other side of the altar stands Nike (\(\Pi\) \(\kappa\) \(\iota\) \(\mu\) \(\nu\)), holding a basket containing three twigs in her left hand and a small pot in her right. On the right a naked boy is taking the lid off a casket.

3. **Taranto (Fig. 3).** Fragments of an Attic red-figure calyx-krafter classified as in the manner of the Pronomos Painter and dated late fifth century B.C.\(^6\) To the left of an altar of rough stones stands a man with a sceptre resting against his left shoulder. Behind the altar is an Ionic column supporting a draped female image, and in front of this appears a small pot evidently held by an attendant on the other side of the altar. To the left of the man a youth brings a bull to the altar, while above him a sitting youth converses with a standing youth. Another fragment from the same vase has the legs of a male figure wearing chlamys and boots and the foot of a second figure to the left of these, indicating the presence of at least two figures to the right of the altar. In front of the altar is a casket.

4. **Leningrad 43f (Fig. 4).** Attic red-figure pelike attributed to the Kiev Painter and dated late fifth century B.C.\(^7\) In the centre is an altar of rough stones with wood on the top, and behind the altar is a Doric column supporting a draped female image. To the left of the image stands Herakles resting on his club and holding a spray of leaves in each hand. On the left a youth brings to the altar a bull with a fillet on its horns. On the other side of the altar stands a youth holding a small pot in his right hand and a basket containing three twigs in his left. On the right Dionysos (?) talks to Apollo, and above them is Athene. Above the youth with the bull is Hermes conversing with Ares (?)

5. **Leningrad 33A (Fig. 5).** Fragments of an Attic red-figure volute-krafter attributed to the Painter of

---

\(^1\) CVA III Id. pl. 18.1-4.
\(^2\) CVA III Id. pl. 4.2-3, 5.1-2.
\(^3\) D. Chr. 59.9; Tz. ad Lyc. 911; Eust. 390.1; Sch. II. 2,722; Sch. S. Ph. 194.
\(^4\) Scheffold, JdL II, 50.
\(^5\) Professor G. M. Robertson is of the opinion that the $ in this inscription is confused as if the painter had tried to correct it.
\(^6\) I am indebted to Sir John Beazley for the dating of this vase.
\(^7\) A similar vessel appears on an Attic r.f. fragment (JHS LIX, 23) where the priest appears to be putting his hand into it. Sir John Beazley there states that it was a kind of measure and suggests that it may have contained the barley-groats for sprinkling on the altar. This function, however, seems less probable here where Nike is also holding a sacrificial basket in which the barley was usually carried along with the sacrificial knife and fillets (Sch. Ar. Pat 956). Perhaps the measure here contains incense, which was sometimes burnt on the altar in the same way.

---

\(^8\) ARV, 859.
\(^9\) Ibid. 852. Scheffold, loc. cit., attributes this vase to the Pronomos Painter and dates it c. 390 B.C.
Fig. 1.—Fragments of Attic R.F. Bell-krater, London E494.
(By permission of the Trustees of the British Museum.)

Fig. 2.—Attic R.F. Bell-krater, Vienna Inv. 1144.
(By permission of the Kunsthistorisches Museum.)
In the centre is an altar of rough stones with wood on top, and behind it is an acanthus-column. To the left of the altar Herakles (--- ΚΗΣ) is in a sitting posture leaning on a stick and holding a fillet for the victim. On the left is a boy (ΔΙΑΙΣ) bringing a bull to the altar, and behind the bull is a Doric column supporting a tripod. To the right of the altar stands a youth holding a pot in his right hand and a basket containing three twigs in his left. Above and to the right are the knees of a seated figure, while the drapery above Lichas may belong to a second seated figure.

These vase-paintings have been variously explained. Vienna ΙΙΙ44 was first published by Uhden,[11] who explained the scene as representing the sacrifice offered by Herakles on his way to Troy[12] and read the inscription over the youth with the bull as ΙΩΛΕΩΝ for Iolaos, quoting Suidas for ΙΩΛΕΩΣ as the Attic form of the name.[13] The unnamed boy he identified as Philoketes, who was said to have been present at this sacrifice. Millingen,[14] however, took the inscription as ΙΗΣΩΝ, marking the second two letters as doubtful, and explained the episode as the founding of the altar by the Argonauts.[15] This interpretation was generally accepted,[16] the subordinate position of Iason being explained by traces of a tradition according to which Herakles and not Iason was the leader of the Argonauts.[17] The inscription has also been restored in various other ways.[18] Dr. F. Eichler of the Kunsthistorisches Museum, however, has sent me a tracing of the inscription, in which it clearly appears as ΙΟΛΕΩΝ, and he states that, although the Α is faint, clear traces of it can be seen under a lens. This entirely rules out the reading ΙΗΣΩΝ, and supports Uhden's theory that the two youths are Iolaos and Philoketes.

In 1845 Gerhard[19] for the first time connected London E494 with Vienna ΙΙΙ44, interpreting both as the Argonautic sacrifice. The British Museum Catalogue of Vases of 1851[20] also described these fragments as representing a sacrifice offered by Herakles to Chryse, but identified the youth on the right as Philoketes, the inscription ΦΙΛΟΚΕΤ. . . having been found on one of the fragments. Others took the inscription as a κολάρος-name[21] or a potter's signature,[22] but these theories were soon disproved by the discovery of the inscription Ἀ[ . . ., and in the British Museum Catalogue of 1896 A. S. Murray[23] described the two youths as Philoketes and Lichas. He also stated that it had been found impossible to join Athene to the draped figure without ruining both the shape of the vase and the proportions of Athene.[24]

The presence of Lichas on London E494 led Murray to connect these fragments with the scene on Leningrad 33A,[25] which had been explained by Stephani[26] as the sacrifice performed by Herakles on Mt. Kenaion just before his death. He accordingly described the object behind Herakles as the poisoned robe[27] and took the whole scene to represent a confusion between the sacrifice to Chryse and a sacrifice to Zeus Patroos on Mt. Oite.[28] More recently this theory was discarded by Schefer,[29] who took all three vases as representing a sacrifice to Chryse and

---

[14] Suid. s.v. ΙΔΙΟΛΕΩΣ.
[17] Inghamini pl. 17, p. 39; de Witte, Catalogue Durand 113 no. 329; El. 2 p. 371; Guignart & Creuzer, Rel. de l'ant., pl. 94-95; Gerhard, ΔΣ (1845) 161 ff., pl. 35 (reading ΙΑΩΝ in text, δΟΛΕΩΝ in illustration). AVS p. 21 no. 5 & 6; Muller, Denkm. 1.10, pl. 2; Milani, Filolote 61 f., pl. 11, Annali LIII 284 ff.
[19] ΙΟΛΕΩΝ, Labordé 2 no. 31; ΙΩΛΕΩΝ, Arnett, Das K.K. Münz- und Antiken-Kabinett, 22 no. 276; ΙΟΛΕΩΝ, ΔΣ (1845) pl. 35.1 (this is stated by Gerhard to be the reading of Anthes); ΙΟΛΕΩΝ, Jahn, Arch. Anz. (1845) 451 pl. 275 and von Sacken & Kerner, Die Sammlungen des K.K. Münz- und Antiken-Cabinets 243 no. 276; ΤΕΛΣΩΝ, Stephani, CRend (1873) 272 and Flasch, Angehörende Argonautenhauser 17 f.; ΙΩΛΕΩΝ, Stengel, Die Griechischen Kultstätter in pl. 3, fig. 11.
[20] Gerhard, ΔΣ (1845) 176 f., pl. 35.2. Raoul-Rochette, in his Perafr. ant. indu. 401 ff., pl. 6, had already published it simply as a sacrifice of the heroic age.
[25] C. Smith had wished to join the head of Athene to the draped figure and take the scene as a sacrifice to Athene on the Akropolis at Athens.
[26] He was followed in this by A. H. Smith (JHS XVIII 274 ff.), who quoted Bockhylides 16.13 ff. to account for the presence of Athene on the London fragments.
[27] CRend (1869) 179 ff.
[28] This is highly unlikely. If the scene represented the sacrifice of Mt. Kenaion, Herakles would be wearing the poisoned robe; but here we have the very end of the sacrifice, with the meat being roasted over the altar-fire, and the robe is supposed still to be hanging up behind Herakles!
[29] The reference to Mt. Oite is surely an error. Herakles made no sacrifice on Mt. Oite, for he was already dying when he was brought there. The description of the sacrifice to Zeus Patroos in the Trachiniae of Sophokles (S. Tr. 237 ff., 287 ff., 752 ff.), which Murray cites, refers to the sacrifice on Mt. Kenaion.
Fig. 3.—Fragments of Attic R.F. Calyx-krater, Taranto. (By permission of the R. Museo Nazionale, Taranto.)

Fig. 4.—Attic R.F. Pelike, Leningrad 43f. (By permission of the Hermitage Museum.)
THE SANCTUARY AND ALTAR OF CHRYSE

compared with them Leningrad 49f, which he himself had already published.\(^{30}\) He further assumed the existence of a wall-painting dated c. 440 B.C., from which all these vase-paintings were copied. The object to the left of Herakles on London E494 he explained as part of a ship,\(^{31}\) an explanation which had already been suggested by Hauser. The Taranto fragments have now been added to the series by Sir John Beazley,\(^{32}\) who suggested that they might represent a sacrifice to Chryse.

In spite of the plausibility of the theory which interprets London E494 and Leningrad 33A as the sacrifice on Mt. Kenaion, there can be little doubt that all the vases in this group represent the same scene. In each instance Herakles\(^{33}\) is shown sacrificing a bull at an altar of rough stones with the assistance of two youths.\(^{34}\) On four of the vases is the statue of a goddess set on a pillar behind the altar, while on the fifth its place is taken by an acanthus-column, which may have been conceived as supporting an image, just as similar columns support tripods in another red-figure vase-painting.\(^{35}\) These marked similarities make it probable that all five vases depict the same episode, which can be certainly identified, by means of the inscriptions on Vienna 1144, as a sacrifice to Chryse. This interpretation is supported by the presence of a similar image and altar on Louvre G342 and G413, which are also known to depict the sanctuary of Chryse. The presence of Athene on London E494 might be explained on the grounds that Chryse was sometimes identified with Athene,\(^{36}\) but it is more probable that she is present as the patron and helper of Herakles, as she frequently appears in Greek art.

The sacrifice is evidently that offered by Herakles on his way to Troy, as is indicated by the presence of Philoktetes on London E494. The theory which explained the sacrifice as that offered by the Argonauts at the founding of the altar is far less probable. Its main support was the reading of the inscription on Vienna 1144 as ἹΗΣΩΝ, and this has now been shown to be untenable. Moreover, the legend attributes the founding of the altar, not to Herakles, but to Iason; and there is no evidence for supposing that Philoktetes accompanied Herakles on the Argonautic expedition, whereas it is specifically mentioned that he was with Herakles at the sacrifice to Chryse on the way to Troy. It is simplest to suppose that all five vases represent this sacrifice and that in each instance one of the two youths is Philoktetes, as required by the legend, while the other is variously described as Iolaos or Lichas, who were both known to have been attendants of Herakles. The fact that Lichas was present at the sacrifice on Mt. Kenaion is no reason for supposing that he could not also have been present at that to Chryse, for Philoktetes is known to have been present at both and Lichas may have been also.

The appearance of the sanctuary on all the vases agrees with the descriptions of it in literature. The presence of trees on London E494 and Vienna 1144 indicates an open-air sanctuary, as described by Sophokles.\(^{37}\) The form of the altar is especially significant, for rough stone altars are rare in vase-paintings,\(^{38}\) and it is therefore noteworthy that not only is the altar of this type on all five vases in this group, but the altars on the two Louvre vases, though somewhat different in general appearance, are of similarly crude and improvised construction. We should be justified in assuming from this that legend ascribed a rough stone altar to this sanctuary, and in fact we have traces of a literary tradition to this effect. The metrical argument to the Philoktetes of Sophokles refers to the altar of Chryse as βρομον ἐπίκεκσαμον, while Tzetzes speaks

---

\(^{30}\) Scheefold, U., figs. 70, 71.

\(^{31}\) Cf. parts of ships on other red-figure vases, e.g., Bologna 303, Mon. sup. pl. 21, and Ruvo, Jatta, 1501, ΑΞ (1846) pl. 44-45.

\(^{32}\) Beazley, bk. cit., 850.

\(^{33}\) The identity of the sacrificer is less certain on the Taranto fragments, where he has no attribute and there are no inscriptions, but the similarity between these fragments and the two Leningrad vases makes it highly probable that all three depict the same scene.

\(^{34}\) On the Taranto fragments only one youth appears assisting at the sacrifice, but there was probably a second youth on the missing part of the vase. The small pot held in front of the column clearly indicates the presence of an attendant to the right of the altar.

\(^{35}\) Leningrad (St. 1790), Οἰλεν (1866) pl. 4-1.

\(^{36}\) Arg. i 6. Ph.; AP 15, 25 (Besant, Ara); Tz. ad Lyc. 911; Sch. II. 2, 722; Sch. S. Ph. 194, 1326. Sophokles, however, seems to have regarded Chryse as a separate goddess (S. Ph. 194, 1327). Cf. Eu. 330-1.

\(^{37}\) S. Ph. 1936.

\(^{38}\) An altar of this type is depicted on a red-figure bell-krater (Naples Market, ΑΞ, 1853, p. 59); and low altars of rough stones appear on a red-figure hydria (Berlin 6280, ΑΞ, 1867, pl. 222), on a red-figure column-krater (Louvre K939, ΡΡ, 9 p. 365), and on a red-figure bell-krater (Syracuse 41621, ΚΥΑ III 1, pl. 22 1.), all depicting Orestes taking refuge at the altar from the Erinyes. There is a low altar of small pebble-like stones on a white-ground lekythos (Berlin 2251, Benndorf pl. 273). There seem to be no other examples of rough stone altars in vase-paintings.
of it as κεχωσμένον βωμόν.\textsuperscript{39} Jebb was puzzled by these epithets,\textsuperscript{40} since he felt that they should mean 'heaped-up', but could see no point in so describing an altar. He therefore took it as meaning 'defiled with débris' and suggested translating ἐκθάρσεως in Tzetzes as 'cleansed' rather than 'purified'. This description of the altar, however, evidently reflects the tradition which was followed by the vase-painters when they depicted the altar as a heap of stones. \(\chi\omega\) is more usually used of mounds of earth, but there is no reason why it should not here be used of a mound of stones, and there seems to be no doubt that the epithets do in fact denote an altar of the kind depicted in the vase-paintings.

\textbf{Fig. 5.—FRAGMENTS OF ATTIC R.F. VOLUTE-KRATER, LENINGRAD 33A.}
(By permission of the Hermitage Museum.)

Scheffold supposed that the vases in this group were copied from a wall-painting of c. 440 B.C., and this seems at first sight to be highly probable. There are, however, certain differences between the vase-paintings, which one would not expect if they had been copied from a single original or from one another. London E.494 represents the end of the sacrifice with portions of the victim burning on the altar and the meat being roasted on spits, while the other four vase-paintings represent the beginning with the victim being led to the altar. The persons present at the sacrifice vary: Nike is present on Vienna 1144 and perhaps also on London E.494, but not on Leningrad 43f; Athene appears in company with other gods on Leningrad 43f, as the sole spectator on London E.494, and not at all on Vienna 1144; the two youths are Philoctetes and Lichas on London E.494 and probably on Leningrad 33A also, but one of the youths on Vienna

\textsuperscript{39} Arg. i S. Ph.; Tz. loc. cit.
\textsuperscript{40} Jebb, Sophocles: the Philoctetes 4 n. 1.
1144 is Iolaos; on the Taranto fragments several youths take the place of the assembly of gods on Leningrad 43f. On Leningrad 33A the usual column and image of Chryse are replaced by an acanthus-column, while the exact form of the altar differs slightly in each instance. It is possible that the two Leningrad vases and the Taranto fragments may be copied from a common original, since their differences of detail are to some extent offset by a general similarity in the grouping and attitudes of the figures and in the shape of the stones of which the altar is constructed, but these resemblances are not shared by London E494 and Vienna 1144, which differ markedly both from one another and from the other three vases. Such differences would be strange if all these vase-paintings were copied from a single wall-painting; but they are quite reasonable if we suppose them to be based on a single verbal description which mentioned a sanctuary at an altar of rough stones set in front of an image of Chryse and named Herakles and Philoktetes as present, leaving most of the other details to the imagination of the hearers. Such a description may well have been contained in the Philoktetes of Euripides, which was produced in 431 B.C., shortly before the probable date of the earliest of the vases in this group. It is quite likely that in the course of this play Philoktetes described how, as a boy, he accompanied Herakles to the sanctuary of Chryse and how he subsequently visited it on his way to the Trojan War and was bitten by the snake; and it is possible that a vivid description was given of the sanctuary with its ancient altar and image. Many vase-painters of this period drew their inspiration from the theatre, and the influence of a successful play might well continue for many years after its original production, since the memory of it would be strengthened by revivals at the lesser dramatic festivals outside Athens. It is probable that the later vases of this group owe their existence to such a revival. The absence of theatrical costumes in these vase-paintings need be no objection, since the episode in question did not form part of the action of the play, but would merely be described by one of the characters, so that the paintings would not have been influenced by the scene upon the stage.

The two Louvre vases, which depict the biting of Philoktetes, also differ from one another in a way that suggests that both were based on a description rather than on a picture, but the vases are earlier in date and appear to follow an earlier tradition in which the appearance of the altar was less clearly described. The original account of the altar evidently made it clear that it was an improvised structure, but did not define the exact method of its construction, so that, whereas in Louvre G413 it appears as a few stones grouped together on the ground, Louvre G442 depicts it as a mound of earth, or possibly a roughly shaped piece of rock. By c. 430 B.C., however, the altar is established as a pile of large stones, and so it appears in all the five vase-paintings under discussion. As to whether there was an actual sanctuary of Chryse in existence in the fifth century B.C. with a primitive altar and image, it is impossible to be certain. It is more likely that Euripides, if he did indeed give an account of the sanctuary, derived the details partly from some earlier poet's description and partly from his own imagination, than that he had any first-hand knowledge of the sanctuary itself.

My thanks are due to Mr. Bernard Ashmole, Sir John Beazley, Professor C. M. Robertson and Professor T. B. L. Webster for their many helpful suggestions and comments; to Lady Beazley for supplying me with photographs of the Taranto fragments; to Dr. F. Eichler for information about the Vienna krater and for a photograph of it; to Mr. M. Goukovsky for photographs of the Leningrad vases; and to Dott. Ciro Drago for a drawing of the Taranto fragments.
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Edna M. Hooker.

41 The attitude of Herakles is identical on the two Leningrad vases, except that on Leningrad 33A a stick is substituted for the club of Leningrad 43f, and a fillet for the two sprays of leaves.
42 Thus, even if the two Leningrad vases and the Taranto fragments are to be grouped together, there must have been at least three independent representations of this scene:
London E494 of c. 430 B.C.; Vienna 1144 of the late fifth century; and a wall-painting or a third vase-painting of about the same date, from which the Leningrad vases and the Taranto fragments may have been derived.
43 Arg. 2 E. Med.
44 Bieber, Greek & Roman Theater 49 ff.
THE LYCURGEAN REFORM AT SPARTA

Prior to 1918 the so-called Lycurgean reform at Sparta was dated not later than the ninth century B.C. As Grote ¹ aptly said, 'it would seem, in the absence of better evidence, that a date [about 830–820 B.C.] . . . is more probable than any epoch either later or earlier'. In 1918 Wilamowitz-Möllendorff ² published what he considered to be better evidence—a fragmentary poem which was ascribed by him to Tyrtaeus and which was believed to indicate that in the latter part of the seventh century B.C. the Spartan army was still brigaded by the three Dorian tribes, Hyllæis, Pamphyloi, and Dymanes. In the light of this new evidence—new, that is, to us but not to the ancient authorities—he and other scholars have shifted the date of the reform by a couple of centuries or more into the late seventh or middle sixth century. The shift of date flouts all the other evidence of the ancient authorities (Tyrtaeus, Herodotus, Thucydidès, Aristotélès, Pluțarch, etc.); in consequence these authorities are held to be mistaken, their manuscripts to be corrupt, their meanings to be other than they appear, or their views to be due to misconceptions which modern scholars can dispel. The result is that the ancient evidence has been severely tousled. The more logical the scholar is, the further he is impelled to discountenance all the other ancient evidence—once he has accepted Wilamowitz-Möllendorff's interpretation of the meaning of the new fragment. In this paper the view is advanced that the ancient authorities are in general sound both in manuscript and in meaning and that the new fragment does not yield the conclusive evidence for a late dating which has been supposed.³ It should also be noted that two of the supports on which the late dating once rested have been undermined by the re-dating of the archaeological evidence at Sparta and by the realisation that hoplite warfare commenced at Sparta c. 700 B.C. In Part I of the paper the ancient evidence is re-considered and in Part II the general conclusions are stated.⁴

I

THE GREAT RHETRA (Pluțarch Lycurgus VI)

The authenticity of the Rhetra is discussed in Part II of this paper. It is assumed here that the Rhetra is genuine in the sense that Pluțarch's text deriving from a text in Aristotle Ῥακωνον Ροιτεία is based on a document at Sparta which was believed to record the original reform of the Spartan state. Our text is not a transcription of the Spartan document, for it is mainly in Attic and not in Laconian (or Delphian) dialect. Yet in a document of such importance to a constitutional historian it may be assumed that Aristotle's text is true in other respects to the original.

Διὸς Συλλανίου καὶ Ἀσαίας Συλλανίας ιερὸν ιδρυμάτινον (MSS. -ος), φυλὸς φυλάζωντα καὶ ὁμός ὄρθωσαν, πρι公开招聘 γενοῦσιν σὺν ἀρχαγγέλας καταστάσεις, ὥστε εὐς ὧς ἀπελλάξειν μεταξὺ Βακχίας τε καὶ Κυκλικόπων, οὕτως εἰσφέρειν τε καὶ ἀφίστασθαι, ἃ γαμοῦν γορίαν ἣμιν ἀμέτροδος καὶ κράτος.

¹ History of Greece II 458; Busolt, CG I 519 ff., though disagreeing in any sweeping reform puts the institutions of Sparta in the same early period. The view of Meyer Forschungen I (1892) that the evidence is all an invention of c. 400 B.C. seems to me untenable.
² SBB 1918 728 ff.
³ The most thorough advocate of the date c. 600 B.C. is Wade-Gery, whose articles in CQ XXXVII–XXXVIII support his account in CAH III, and of the date c. 550 B.C. Ehrhberg, Neugründung des Staates (1925) inimportant modifications in Epitomina Scironides (1927) 19 f. and in
⁴ Part of this paper was read to the Cambridge Philological Society in January 1949. I am most grateful to Professor Adcock, Professor Wade-Gery, and Mr. R. M. Cook for their generous advice and criticism. The views and the synthesis set out in this paper are my own, but they have been formed in part by some of the many works on this subject. It has seemed best not to cumber this article with too many detailed references to these works, for it is in the nature of the subject that almost everyone agrees with someone at some point.
⁴ ὅπως GL; ὥστε Z.
The punctuation of the sentences in the Rhetra is dictated by the parallelism of the aorist participles and by the parallelism of the present infinitives. Thus τρίαντα goes with γερουσίαν, and the division between Κυρίωνως and the following clause is marked by συναίνεσε. The meaning of the aorist participles is clearly shown by ἰδρυσαμένοιν: ἵπποι ἔρχονται this marks a new foundation, and the other aorist participles should have the same meaning. The opening part of the Rhetra should therefore be translated: ‘Found a (new) sanctuary to Zeus Sullanios and Athena Sullania, form (new) tribes and obes, set up a (new) membership of thirty for the Gerousia including the archagetai.’ In this translation emphasis is given, as it should be, to the order of the Greek words. Thus τρίαντα is the significant word in the last phrase. For that reason therefore Plutarch discusses this number. The break with the past lies in the establishment of a new cult, of a tribal-obel organisation, and of a membership of thirty including the kings for the Gerousia. It does not necessarily follow from the Rhetra that the Gerousia itself was a new feature. This, however, is certainly implied by Plutarch (Lyc. V) and, as we shall see, by Herodotus, but their meaning may be that the Gerousia, as it was later known (i.e. of thirty members including the kings), was founded at this time. But, whatever their meaning, the wording of the Rhetra stresses the number and not the Gerousia.

In the following sentences the word-order is again important, and the three infinitives in the present tense indicate a continuous and not a single process. ‘From season to season assemble between Babuka and Knakion.’ The phrase ὅρα ἐς ἡρας probably means ‘ever and ever’, that is ‘in perpetuity’, rather than from one specific time to another, e.g. monthly or annually. The word-order emphasises the continuity of the practice henceforth. The place of meeting is presumably mentioned because it was an innovation. The emphasis on συναίνεσε is presumably intended to stress the antecedent conditions under which business is to be conducted. ‘Under these conditions introduce-and-adjourn.’ The meaning of ἐσφέρεων τε καὶ ἀρχισαυδέως is not clear at first sight. In Attic ἐσφέρεων is used absolutely for introducing a proposal before a deliberative body (whether Ecclesia or Boule). Those who introduce the proposal in this case are presumably the Gerontes and the Kings, as Plutarch states in his commentary, and they introduce their proposals to the assembly.

The meaning of ἀρχισαυδέως depends upon the decision whether the form is middle or passive. The decision is given in favour of the middle form by Plutarch in the same chapter; for when he is commenting on the rider to the Rhetra he uses ἀρχισαυδέως in the middle voice in

---

* The emendations καὶ τοις, συναίνεσε and τοῖς (cf. W-G, Q, XXXVII f2) for συναίνεσε are unnecessary, because συναίνεσε is perfectly intelligible, and are not in keeping with the brevity and form of the Rhetra. W-G, Q, XXXVII 117, argues that ‘the sanctuary of Zeus and Athena, the ordering of the Phylai and Obai, have been prescribed in detail already,’ and that ‘the things which are left unspecifed have no doubt been specified in earlier enactments’. Neither the first nor the third of the participial phrases are unspecific (at least if my interpretation of the third is acceptable). The clause giving the Phylai and Obai is not specific, and it is true that some specification is required; that may have come later in the same rhetra or in an earlier one (for it is unlikely that any clause could precede Zeus in this rhetra). But the specification is presumably close at hand, not as Wade-Gery would have it in the traditional ‘Dorian Tribes . . . which purport to be descended from Herakles’ three sons’. If these are the Phylai referred to by the Rhetra they are age-old and need no emphasis or mention here.

* From season to season assemble between Babuka and Knakion. This is emphatically stated by W-M SBB 1918 734, ‘darin kai ich auch jetzt nur die Schaffung von neuen Phyllen vinden’, although the admission compels him to date the reform to a date later than Tyrtaios fr. I. Aristotle Pol. 1727a, in drawing the similarities between the constitutions of Crete and Sparta, also dwells on the number of the Gerousia. That prophecy is accusative and not (as Treu Hermes LXXVI supposes) genitive, is clear from the parallelism of the participial clauses; cf. also von Blumenthal Hermes LXXVII (1942) 212 ff.

* Similar phrases such as ὅρας εὶς ἔροι mean ‘for all time’ (cf. L. S. ἔτοι 43 and 45), their meaning being often emphasised by association with αἰών or a similar word as in Homer Od. IX 195 ἔτοι ἕροι, Arist. Theor. 950 Σκμίδοις ἐκ τῶν ἔρων ἄνθρωπον ἐς τῶν ἔρων πεπονθήσατο πᾶσιν καὶ πάσιν, and Theoc. XV 74 καὶ ἔροι κρατεῖτε; the closest and clearest parallel is Isidius Bis (ed. W-M. Philol. Unteruch. IX) ἔροι εἰς ἔροι νόμου καὶ συνήκεια σύμμετρων ἐς σύμμετρα ἐν ἑαυτῷ, where the phrase may be inspired by the Rhetra. However, W-G, Q, XXXVII 68 states ‘the meetings were surely monthly’, with the note ‘ὅρας εἰς ἔροι must mean either monthly or yearly; so too Ehrenberg ἔτος 26 ‘regelmäßig jeden Monat’; and Treu Hermes LXXVI 39 ‘von Zeit zu Zeit (Vollmond zu Vollmond)’, reading ἔροι εἰς ἔροι, and adducing the Scholion to Thuc. I 67 τὸν ἔτοιδα λαγόν οὐκολογον, ὅτι ἐν ἐποχὴν ἔγγυτον αὐτί, which may be evidence for fifth century Spartan practice but sheds no direct light on our LXXVI 68. For the essence of the phrase lies in its general character, and it can no more be said to imply a specific date in terms of months, seasons or years than our phrases ‘year in, year out’, ‘in and out of season’, and ‘forever and a day’.

* That it continued into classical times as the Spartiates’ place of assembly is clear from Plut. Philo. XVII 105 ἔρος ἔρως of ἔρως ἔρως ἔρως ἔρως. Ἰ.昆仑 ἔρος, ἔρως ἔρως ἔρως ἔρως. It was during this period that the wood of the Gerousia, which produced fire, was cut. Aristotle Pol. 1273b and Plato Laws 772c.
the phrase τούτης ἢ τι οὐκ ἔστι μή κυριόν ἐς ἅλλον ὄλος ἀφιεσθαι καὶ διαλύειν τὸν δῆμον. His meaning is that the Gerontes and the Kings do not ratify the crooked opinion of the people but in short adjourn and dissolve the (assembly of the) people. On Plutarch's interpretation the subject of ἀφιεσθαι in the Rheata is the Gerontes and the Kings. The injunction is that they should introduce proposals to the assembly and adjourn the assembly.11

Any attempt to emend the text of the last clause must take account of the following facts. As the corruption is common to all three MSS. and as these are of the tenth and eleventh centuries, the earlier text from which the corruption springs was probably written in capitals. Plutarch's text of the Rheata is not in Lacoian dialect 12 and employs only one Doricism, the substitution of α for η. His commentary explains the unusual words in the rest of the Rheata; therefore his text here contained no unusual or obscure word. The sense of the restored text should conform with Tyrtaeus fragment 3 (quoted on p. 47) and with Plutarch's explanatory sentence: τούτω δὲ πλῆθους ἀφιεσθέντως εἶπεν μὲν οὖν γνώμην τῶν ἄλλων ἑρετὶ τήν δὲ ἱπτὸ τῶν γερόντων καὶ τῶν βασιλεῶν προτεθέντα ἀπίστως κύριος ἢ δαίμων.

These factors militate against the emendation 13 δάμω δὲ ἀνταγωσίαν ἢμεν καὶ κράτος. For ἀνταγωγία does not occur in Greek and its meaning, if it be 'to speak against the proposals of the Gerousia', is not reflected in Plutarch or in Tyrtaeus. The form δάμω is inconsistent with Plutarch's text, e.g. Συλλαβῶν. The emendation also adds two letters to the text, introduces the connexion δαμωδαν whereas the other clauses of the Rheata are in asyndeton, and affords no explanation for the corruption of Δ into Γ. A recent emendation 14 δαιμαδαν γορίας ἢμεν καὶ κράτος has the disadvantage that γορία does not occur in Greek and has to be explained as an early Indo-European form. Yet Plutarch could not have failed to comment on so strange a word. The Teubner text, reading δαμωι δὲ τῶν κυρίων ἢμεν καὶ κράτος, supplies a sense compatible with Plutarch and Tyrtaeus. But the use of the article and of two synonymous terms does not fit the terseness of the Rheata; nor is the corruption easily explicable. A simpler emendation is δυσμούν ἀγοράς ἢμεν καὶ κράτος. The sense and diction conform with Tyrtaeus' words in frag. 3 ἐπειτα δὲ δημάρτους ἀνδρας — — — — — μυθείας — — — δημον το πλῆθος νίκην καὶ κάρτος ἐπεστει. With Plutarch's phrase τούτω δὲ πλῆθους ἀφιεσθέντως The words are common and require no commentary.15 The corruption from ΔΑΜΟΤΑΝ to ΓΑΜΩΔΑΝ may be attributed 16 to a scribe's error in transposing Δ and Τ, the latter becoming Γ. Once this corruption occurred, the Τ might become Ω and ΑΓΡΙΑΝ become ΟΡΙΑΝ, leaving the total number of letters the same.

The most satisfactory emendation then is δυσμούν ἀγοράς ἢμεν καὶ κράτος, although it is far from certain. Fortunately little depends on its certainty for the purposes of the present

11 Examples of the middle use of ἀφιεσθαι are given in L & S; they take their meaning from the context in each case, and the literal sense of the verb is consistent with the translation given above for Plut. Lyc. VI. a passage for which there is no parallel. The middle use of the verb in a similar context but with a different compound occurs in Thuc. I 79, μεταπεραίων τάντας and V 111, μεταπεραίων τί ἡμῶν, where the meaning is 'to make to adjourn'; this interpretation is also in harmony with the use of ἀποστημίων in the Rider (below p. 45). On the other hand W-G, CQ XXXVII 69 translates ἀφιεσθαι in the Rheata as 'to decline to bring motions forward' and in Plutarch's phrase as 'that is they shall not validate it but simply reject it'. He admits that Plutarch cannot be giving this sense to ἀφιεσθαι, but he holds that Plutarch 'must be wrong'. In support of his view W-G adds Thuc. IV 188, οὕτως ὡς ἄρει ἀποστημίων γίνεται διὰ τῆς Βικῆς ἔγγυης, οὔτε οἱ Ἀκαδημοῦνοι οὔτε οἱ σύμμαχοι, where he translates ἀποστημίων as 'to decline to entertain a proposal'. This is however a paraphrase. The literal translation is 'they will not stand aside from any of the claims you (the Athenians) may make'. Here ἀποστημίων is passive in meaning and governs a genitive. The same is true of his other analogy in Findar Ol. 152. Neither is analogous to ἀφιεσθαι in the Rheata or to δυσμούν in Plutarch's commentary. There is also a further difficulty in W-G's interpretation. In the Rheata he takes δαμωι to refer to proposals in the assembly but he refers ἀφιεσθαι in his sense to the 'preliminary probouletic process', that is to the process in the Gerousia. But as δαμωι τι καὶ ἀφιεσθαι is so closely coupled it is unnatural to suppose it to refer to procedure in different places. Another interpretation is given e.g. by H. W. Parke, The Delphic Oracles (1909) 105 who paraphrases the Rheata as 'proposals are to be brought forward and divisions taken'. The normal phrase however is διηγεσθαι, cf. Thuc. I 87, 3, and this compound seems essential for such a meaning. For the interpretation 'Abstimmungslasse' cf. Ehrenberg Hermes LXVIII 298. Cf. below n. 21 for the word ἀποκριτη.

13 W-G, CQ XXXVII 64 and Treu Hermes LXVI 22 f., who supplies a list of earlier emendations in an interesting article which I could not access to me only when this paper was in the final stage.
14 Von Blumenthal in Hermes LXVII 212.
15 The demes of Attica had their agora (e.g. IG II 358 and C. L. d'Apia i.) and this word is explained as σοφοσ ὄρηκαν ἢ δημοτικ in Bekker Anecd. Gr. I 927. The assembly in Crete was also styled agora cf. Bekker Anecd. Gr. I 210. Law of Gortyn X 33 f. and XI 10 f.

16 This suggestion I owe to Professor Robertson; cf. also Ziegler Rh. Mus. 76 (1927), 24. I have also had the advantage of discussing the passage with Mr. Beattie.
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argument. For Plutarch and Tyrtaeus have supplied the sense of the passage, which is now corrupt, and they enable us to grasp the procedure enjoined by the Rhetra. Under the new conditions, which the participial phrases lay down, the Gerousia (including the Kings) and the people meet in the Apella: There the Gerousia alone has power to introduce proposals and to adjourn the Apella; the commons form the assembly which receives the proposals and has power of decision thereon. At the time of the Rhetra, the term ἄγος probably implied not a passive assembly but one possessing the right of speech; whether this was implicit or not, Tyrtaeus asserts that right of speech in reference to the First Messenian War, and Plutarch assumes it for the earlier period when he states that subsequently to the passage of the Rhetra the people violated and distorted the proposals by addition and subtraction (ἀφαίρεσι καὶ προσβολής Lyc. 6 and 13). In other words, discussion by the people might lead to modification of the original proposals; such modification would be made by the Gerousia, in whom the right of proposal is vested, and not by the people, who only discuss and decide by vote. The right of discussion was therefore at the time of the Rhetra an important factor in the constitution.

The fact that the Rhetra is in the accusative and infinitive is not surprising. This usage is a common alternative to the imperative in archaic documents. The subject of the first infinitive ἀπελλάσσαι is also subject of the three participles. Plutarch's comment δι' ἀπελλάσσαι ἀκολουθοῦσαι enlightens us at this point; for the classical use of ἀκολουθοῦσαι is to assemble in an assembly and not to convene an assembly. Therefore the subject of ἀπελλάσσαι is the entire people, who are divided in the following infinitives into the Gerousia and the Demos. The foundation of the shrine of Zeus and Athena shows that the assembling of the people was held under religious auspices, which continued in classical times to be implicit in the word ἀπελλάσσαι and its derivatives. Both in form and in brevity the Rhetra is similar to other early documents of state.

THE RIDER TO THE GREAT RHETRA (Plutarch Lycurgus VI)

αἱ δὲ σκολιάν ὁ δίκαιος ἐργατὸς τοὺς πρεσβυγενές καὶ ἄρχοντας ἀποτατατρίας ἔμεν. 'But if the people declare wrongly the Elders and Kings shall be adjourners.'

The decision whether the declaration of the people is right or wrong evidently lies with the Elders and Kings. In exercising this decision the Elders and Kings do in fact limit the sovereignty granted to the people by the Rhetra, and in enforcing adjournment they use their power to adjourn in a manner which was not intended by the phrase ἐξερήμεσι τε καὶ ἀφίστασιν in

\[\text{17 In Homeric diction ἀγορά is used of the assembly in opposition to the house, cf. L. & S.}
\]
\[\text{18 This is apparent in the early use of the word by Homer and by Solon.}
\]
\[\text{19 Hesych. x. ἀπελλάσσαι: IG V 1, 11441 cf. L. & S. The suggestion, that ἀπελλάσσαι refer to the whole people and ἄγος to the commons only, seems to dispose of Treu's objection (Hermes LXXXVI 29) that mention of the former excludes mention of the latter. The derivation of ἀπελλάσσαι is disputed, cf. W-G, CQ XXXVII, 66, f.; Plut. Lyce. VI seems in the word a reference to Pythian Apollo.}
\]
\[\text{20 For instance the alliance of the Eleians and Heraeans (Tod GH I 5). In the original the participles of Plutarch's text may have been infinitives, but speculation on this matter is hazardous.}
\]
\[\text{21 Here I keep the MSS. reading ἀγοραῖος (for arguments against the emendation to ἀγοραῖος cf. Eumenenberg Nös 20 and 125 and von Blumenthal loc.cit. 213). The derivation of ἀγοραῖος may be from ἀγορά or ἀγοραῖος (future ἄγος); as the latter does the meaning 'say, declare' which best fits the context, it should be preferred. The imperfect middle is used in this sense in Homer II. 1.519 and Od. XI 542. The use of ἀκολουθέω in an adverbial sense is paralleled by its opposite in the phrases ὡς ἐν ἄγοις (Aristoph. Thesm. 1249) and ὡς ἐν ἄγοις (Aristoph. Neks. 1): the word to be supplied with ὡς ἐν ἄγοις or ὡς σκολιά is originally ἄγος (the contrast of σκολιά ὡς and ὡς σκολιά being common in a metaphorical application in Pindar e.g. Pyth. II 133), but it falls out in compendious phrases. W-G, CQ XXXVI 83 supplies ὡς σκολιά 'for skolias to agree with'; he cites no parallel for ὡς σκολιά ἀγορά and it is more probable that ὡς is the cognate form to ἄγος, as in the Homeric phrase ἔτοι ἄγος ιππίων II. 338 etc. He is supported by von Blumenthal loc. cit. 213. W-G, CQ XXXVII 69 maintains that ἀποτατατρίας ἔμεν has the same sense as ἀποτατατρίας in Thuc. IV 118, 9 (cf. above p. 44 n. 11), and although he does not translate the two words he presumably takes them to mean 'are decliners in the entertaining of the proposal'. This, however, misconceives the meaning of ἀποτατατρία: for this form is always active in meaning, i.e. 'one who makes to go away', as can be seen in the case of ἀποστροφητεον in Asch. Cho. 303 and Thuc. 105 and of ἀποστροφή cf. Liddell and Scott i.e. In this connexion the use of ἀποτατατρία at Cnidus should be mentioned (GDI 3505, 19 and Plutarch QG 4). The title is that of the presiding officer at a committee, and Plutarch's comment δὲ τὸ τὸν χώραν ἐπιτιμῶν ἀποτατατρία describes one of his duties. The derivation is most probably from ἀφέω, and the literal meaning is 'one sitting apart'. This is supported by the title of Boeotian magistrates of ἀποστροφητεον. The word then does not throw any light on the meaning of ἀποτατατρία. Cf. Halliday, Plutarch's Greek Questions, 49.}
the Rhetra. The text alone forces one to agree with the view expressed by Plutarch that the sentence is a later addition to the Rhetra; for it is intelligible only in relation to the Rhetra.

The procedure in the assembly needs some clarification if we are to understand the point of the rider. The right of introducing a proposal, that is of proposing a motion for decision, is the monopoly of the Gerousia in the Rhetra and in the fragment of Tyrtæus quoted to illustrate the rider. The right of discussion by the commons is explicit in the rider and in Tyrtæus; as it figures in the rider, it also existed under the terms of the Rhetra, whether it was stated or not in the corrupt passage. The sovereign right of the commons to pass judgment on the proposal is stated in the Rhetra according to Plutarch and is reiterated in Tyrtæus. Thus the commons possess the rights of discussion and of decision but not the right of proposal under the Rhetra and the rider. The innovation contained in the rider is that the right of discussion is now curtailed in certain circumstances; for 'the Elders-and-Kings' (τοὺς προεξουσιωτέρους καὶ ἀρχοντέσ, as a unit under τοὺς), that is the unanimous Gerousia, is accorded the discretion of determining that the people's discussion is incorrect and of dismissing the assembly. Moreover the presumption underlying the rider is that in such a case the proposal of the unanimous Gerousia becomes law; otherwise the deadlock is not resolved.

Such an innovation is generally credible because it accords with the development towards oligarchy which is a feature of the later constitution at Sparta. Whether this particular curtailment of discussion was enforced in classical times is not certain from the evidence at our disposal, which dates from later centuries and after the emergence of the Ephorate as an effective part of the constitution. The probability is that it was so enforced. The general evidence on this point applies to the fourth-century constitutions of Crete and Sparta. In Pol. 1272a Aristotle, summarising points of resemblance between them, remarks ἐκάλησας δὲ μετέχουσι πάντες, κυρίω δὲ οὐδενός ἔστιν ἅλλον ἢ συνεπιφέρεσθαι τά δόξαντα τοῖς γέρωσι καὶ τοῖς κόσμοις. As Aristotle says that the Kings at Sparta held the position of the κόσμος in Crete, it follows that where the Gerontes and the Kings at Sparta introduce a proposal as the unanimous recommendation of the Gerousia, the people's right is simply to confirm the proposal by vote. This is supported by a further passage (1273a), where Aristotle is discussing the deviations from aristocracy towards democracy which were common to the constitutions of Carthage, Crete, and Sparta: τοῦ μὲν γὰρ τὸ μὲν προσάγει τὸ δὲ μὴ προσάγει πρὸς τὸν δήμον οἱ βασιλεῖς κύριοι μετὰ τῶν γερόντων ἢ ὑποκυνομοῦσι πάντες, εἰ δὲ μὴ, καὶ τούτων οἱ δήμοι· δὲ δὲ τῶν εἰσφέροντι σύντακτοι, οὐδὲ διακοῦσα μόνον ἀποδίδομαι τῷ δήμῳ τὰ δόξαντα τοῖς ἄρχοντεσ, ἀλλὰ κύρια κρίνειν εἰς καὶ τῷ βουλημένῳ τοῖς εἰσφερόμενοι σύντακτοι εξίσται, ὅπερ ἐν ταῖς ἐτέραις πολιτείαις οὐκ ἐστίν. The deviation towards democracy which is common to all three constitutions is contained in the words εἰ δὲ μὴ, καὶ τούτων οἱ δήμοι (sc. κύριοι). For the first clause (τοῦ μὲν κτλ.) is concessive and describes an aristocratic feature, and the second clause (εἰ δὲ μὴ κτλ.) is antithetic and describes the democratic feature. The next sentence contains a deviation towards democracy which is peculiar to Carthage; for at Carthage, when members of the Gerousia introduce a proposal as their unanimous recommendation (τὰ δόξαντα τοῖς ἄρχοντεσ), the people not only listen to the proposal but have the right to decide and can even make a speech (or a proposal, if ὑπερτυπεῖν has a technical meaning as the aorist tense suggests) against the original proposal. The inference is that in Crete and Sparta, whenever the Gerousia was unanimous, the people only listened to the proposal of the Gerousia; their right was in fact merely συνεπιφέρεσθαι τὰ δόξαντα τοῖς γέρωσι καὶ τοῖς κόσμοις and not to discuss. It is then clear that at Sparta procedure was different when the Gerousia was unanimous and when it was not. In the former case the people heard the proposal without discussion and confirmed it automatically, their participation being a formality. In the latter case the people also had sovereign power of decision (εἰ δὲ μὴ, καὶ τούτων οἱ δήμοι). That this was a real power is clear from Aristotle's emphasis on it as a deviation towards democracy. The division of opinion among the members

---

22 This passage is discussed by W-G, CQ XXXVII 71. ἐστιν to refer to the whole sentence from ἅλλον ἢ συνεπιφέρεσθαι.
23 I take the last clause ἐπερ ἐν ταῖς ἐτέραις πολιτείαις οὐκ down to ὑπερτυπεῖν ἐστίν.
of the Gerousia would lead to two or more proposals being put before the assembly, and these proposals would be discussed and decided by the people. Here the activity of the people is no formality but a real factor in the constitution. This appears to be the case in the account in Diodorus XI 50 of the debate where Hetoimaridas differed from his colleagues in the Gerousia and in the assembly. In Thucydidès' account (I 79 f.) of the debate in the assembly which followed the hearing of complaints against Athens and the reply of the Athenians, it is possible that the Gerousia met before the assembly or that the difference of opinion between King Archidamus and his colleagues made an ad hoc meeting of the Gerousia unnecessary. The accounts in Plut. Agis 8 f. and Cleomenes 10 f. contain too many difficulties to be discussed here and are perhaps of too late a date for our argument.

**The Evidence of Tyrtaeus**

IIIb (ascribed to Tyrtaeus by Plutarch Lycurgus VI)

Φοιβοῦ ἄκούσαντες Πυθωνόθεν οἴκακ' ἐνεκακ' 24
μαντείας τε θεοῦ καὶ τελεύτη' ἐπεκα-
ἀρχεῖν μὲν βουλής θεοτιμίως βασιλίας,
οίσι μέλει Σπάρτης ίμερόσεα πόλις,
πρεσβύτας τε γέροντας, ἐπείτα δὲ δημότας ἄνδρας
ἐυθείας ἄρτηρας ἄνταπαμεῖβομενοὺς.

It is clear that Plutarch has not completed the quotation. The sentence beginning ἔπειτα δὲ δημότας must have an infinitive; 25 for it is not possible that the infinitive ἄρχειν, which is stressed by its position under μὲν, should be supplied with ἔπειτα δὲ δημότας ἄνδρας, nor if it could be so supplied would it yield satisfactory sense. The function of the Kings and Elders comes first and is contrasted with that of the Demos which comes later: 'Counsel shall be begun by the kings honoured of heaven, whose charge is the lovely city of Sparta, and by the aged elders, and thereafter the men of the commons...'. The meaning of the last line, as it stands, is obscure. The word ἀνταπαμεῖβομαι occurs only here. While ἀπαμεῖβομαι is used by Homer perhaps with an accusative (Od. xix 405) and by Theocritus with an accusative and dative (VIII 8), the compound ἀνταπαμεῖβομαι in Archilochus 66 governs an accusative and has an associative dative. The simple form of the verb in Homer is either absolute or governs an accusative and has an associative dative (e.g. Od. xi 57 ὁ δὲ μὲν οἷον δὲ ἠμείροτο τῷ τίμητο πόλις he groaned and answered me with the words 1). This construction, which arises from the root meaning of the verb, is the only one in early Greek; it is first modified by Herodotus who uses the double accusative (e.g. II 173 τοῦ τούς φιλόν ημείωσε). In the time of Tyrtaeus it is probable that the pre-Herodeote construction was in use: the meaning then is 'answering (the kings and elders) with straight rhetrai' 26. The word rhetra has several meanings; the one which best fits this hanging participial phrase is 'law' 'enactment'. That is, the sense may be that the people answer with the finished product, the straight laws.

The problem of the missing infinitive is solved by the version in Diodorus vii 12 = Tyrtaeus IIIa:

(ὁ)δὲ γὰρ ἄργυροντος ἅναιρα ἐκάργας Ἀπόλλων
χρυσόκαμης ἔρχῃ πίνοντος ἐξ ἁδρούτων
ἀρχεῖν μὲν βουλής (5) θεοτιμίως βασιλίας,
οίσι μέλει Σπάρτης ίμερόσεα 27 πόλις,

---

24 MS. ὀρθοσκώκων.
26 W-G, CQ XXXVIII 1 and 6 maintains that the line can also mean 'replying to the straight proposals' (so also Treu Hermes LXXVI 36) or 'replying to the proposals without distorting them'. No examples of such a construction are given in Liddell and Scott, and the root meaning of διπαμεῖβομαι makes it highly unlikely that it could take such a construction.
27 MS. ίμερόσεα.
The text needs little correction: the changes from δέ to τε and vice versa are not essential, the two wrong letters are not unusual, and the diplography in εὑρετός is no rarity. The lines are not written as verse; thus the omission of the word in line 8 and the reduplication in line 6 are less striking than they appear when the lines are set out as verse.

The infinitives in 7–8 determine the meaning of the whole sentence: 'and thereby the men of the commons answering the rhetrai straightly shall say what is fair and do all that is right and no longer give <crooked> counsel for this city. And victory and supremacy shall follow the main body of the commons.' From the whole poem it is clear that three stages are described: the kings and elders introduce proposals for debate, the commons discuss in the just and proper manner, and the majority decision of the commons is binding. The construction in the line εὑρετέαν ῥήτρας ἄνταπαμειβόμενος is the usual one in Greek of all periods, and the rhetrai to which the commons respond are the proposals of the kings and elders. It is in responding to the proposals that the commons are to be correct in debate and no longer <crooked> in counsel. This meaning of rhetra, i.e. 'a proposal laid before the people' (similar to the προβολέων at Athens), is well attested. The emphasis in the sentence dealing with the δήμοτος ἰδρυσε falls on εὑρετός by virtue of its position; the adverbial use of the accusative feminine has been discussed above in the commentary on σκολῖν in the rider to the Rheta. The analogy of σκολῖν and ὄρθον supports my interpretation; and examples of εὐθέως (with which ὕδωρ is to be supplied) occur in Aeschylus fr. 195 and Euripides Medea 384. The contrast, too, between σκολῖν in the Rheta and εὑρετέαν in Tyrtaeus is paralleled by the remark of the crab to the snake: εὖθεν χρή τῆν ἑταῖρον ἐμαι καὶ μὴ σκολίον φρονεῖν (Solon 9).

If we leave aside the two introductory lines in Tyrtaeus IIIa and IIIb, there is no doubt that the better text is given by Diodorus (Tyrtaeus IIIa). Plutarch's quotation stops short of the main verb; when the main verb is supplied by Diodorus' version, it is clear that Plutarch's reading εὐθέως ῥήτρας ἄνταπαμειβόμενος cannot be correct. For the debate in the assembly cannot be contemporary (as it must be in view of the present participle and the present infinitives) with responses in the form of straight 'enactments,' that is laws finally passed. If the text of Diodorus is preferred and that of Plutarch is emended, then we see why Plutarch did not trouble to continue the quotation. For the line εὑρετέαν ῥήτρας ἄνταπαμειβόμενος demonstrated his

---

28 MS. δέ. 29 MS. εὕρετεν (Maius) εὕρετες (Herwerden), cf. Spiecl. Vat. 3. 15. 30 MS. δέ. 31 MS. μὴν ἐπιβολέων. 32 MS. τέ. 33 The text is given in W-G, CQ XXXVIII 3: his conclusion 'we need not shrink from correction' implies a higher degree of corruption in the text than is apparent. In line 8 I read μή instead of μήδεν because Tyrtaeus does not use the neuter μή and Homer uses μήδεν with a simple accusative. The form ἐπιβολέων first appears in fifth-century Attic, and L. & S. are mistaken in adopting it here. As W-M remarks, προβολέως is better than Plutarch's προβολώς. Indeed the remark of Plutarch (5.586 εἶδε τὴν μὲν ἐν προθέσει μακριγενήσεις ἀνατιμίᾳ τῆς παραδοσίας ὁ πρὸ τοῦ προβολέων ὅ δέ Λυκομήδης ἄνεργος γέροντος αὐτοῦ ἄνεμον suggests that, while γέροντος is added from the γεροντίσιον of the Rheta, προβολεων may have stood in Plutarch's text of the oracle in Tyrtaeus, which Plutarch quotes, and not προβολέων.

34 For the genuineness of line 9 Treu (Herms LXXVI 36 f.) refers to the use of ἐπίθεος and πρᾶξις in Tyrtaeus 9, 15 and 8, 3, ἐπίθεος in 6, 10, and τικές καὶ κρατούς in Hesiod Theog. 647; κρατός is also used in a political sense in Plutarch's version of Solon fr. 5 and in Alcæus 31. Treu however considers the preceding couplet to be spurious. Yet the citation is equally Homeric, and Tyrtaeus has ἐπίθεος in 8, 27: the poverty of the lines in poetic thought is paralleled in Tyrtaeus (e.g. 9, 37 f.), and the contrast of positive and negative is most common (e.g. 7, 1-4). On my interpretation the vagueness of the lines is intentional, for it conceals a limitation of the people's power under a general phrase.

35 Cf. W-G, CQ XXXVIII 5 f. discussing the use of the word in Plutarch Ages. 5 and 8-11 etc. (Epitabus) βραχὺς ἐρευς, ἐπηκάν τὸν ἱερᾶς τοὺς πατέρας...κηφήνας...βασιλεύει...παροικώσεις...οἰκίας...κοινώτατος. The same use occurs in the spurious decree of Byzantium in Dem. XVII 90. The two meanings—the proposal and an enactment—originate from the original meaning of βραχόν, a verbal agreement or bargain (between two parties) as in Homer Od. xiv 395: the word can be used to describe a treaty between two states (e.g. Tod GHI 15), an enactment enshrining an agreement between two parties (e.g. IG xiv 645 93 f. and 145-9), and a proposal for agreement between constituent parts of the state, as here and in Plutarch Ages. The original meaning, a mutual agreement between parties, is emphasized in Tyrtaeus by the compound ἀνταπαμειβόμενος, elsewhere unknown, and by the sense of exchange in the verb ἀνατίμεως.
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argument that Tyrtæus was referring to the rider αἱ δὲ σκολιὰν ὁ δᾶμος ἐρωτὸ τοὺς πρεσβυγενὲς καὶ ἀρχαγέτας ἀποστατήσας ἦμεν, whereby crooked debate in the Apella was to be foreclosed by the adjournment of the assembly.

The opening couplets of Tyrtæus IIIa and IIIb are different from one another. As they stand, neither couplet is likely to have formed the opening of a poem, and it therefore seems probable that the lines are quoted from the body of a poem or poems. Even if they are quoted from one and the same poem it is not necessary to suppose that one couplet is genuine and the other is a forgery; for both couplets might have occurred in the preceding part of the poem. If so, the reason for quoting one couplet rather than another is to be found in the context of the author who makes the quotation. Plutarch, referring to the activities of the kings Theopompus and Polydorus, quotes the couplet with the plural subject, which he takes to be those two kings; Diodorus, who is citing oracles of Delphi, chooses a couplet more appropriate to his aim. An alternative explanation, which is less probable but should not be excluded, is that the quotations IIIa and IIIb are from two different poems of Tyrtæus.

The relation between Tyrtæus III a–b and the Rhetra with its rider is fairly clear. The oracle in Tyrtæus enjoins the initiative of the kings and gerontes in counsel, limits debate in the assembly to straight responses to their proposals, and affirms the sovereignty of the people. The first and the third points are in the Rhetra; the second point is contained only in the rider to the Rhetra αἱ δὲ σκολιὰν ὁ δᾶμος ἐρωτὸ τοὺς πρεσβυγενὲς καὶ ἀρχαγέτας ἀποστατήσας ἦμεν. As we have seen, the rider only makes sense if it was attached to the Rhetra; for it qualifies the last clause in the Rhetra δαματὰν ἄγορὰν ἦμεν καὶ κράτος by giving a discretion to the kings and gerontes which impairs the people’s sovereignty. But the oracular response as quoted in Tyrtæus is so couched that this limitation is camouflaged by its insertion between two points drawn from the Rhetra itself. The occasion of this tactful response by Delphi is supplied by Plutarch. For the kings Polydorus and Theopompus, having subjoined the rider to the Rhetra, persuaded the state (to adopt the rider) on the ground that the god prescribed it, as is mentioned somewhere by Tyrtæus in the following lines. As Plutarch, or at least Plutarch’s source, may be presumed to have had the full poem of Tyrtæus before him, there is no reason to suppose that Polydorus and Theopompus were not the subject of the line οἱ θεοὶ οὐκοῦντες τὴν ἀπειφονήν ἰδίκες ἦκαν and that their names had not occurred earlier in the same poem. Thus Plutarch’s explanation of the relation between Tyrtæus IIIb and the rider is satisfactory and reasonable in its own right; and it carries with it the deduction that the Rhetra itself is earlier than the addition of the rider by Polydorus and Theopompus, the hero of the First Messenian War.

Plutarch’s explanation is, however, not compatible with the comment attached to Tyrtæus IIIa in Diodorus’ text Η Πιθία ἔχεις τῷ Λυκοῦργῳ περὶ τῶν πολιτικῶν όντως. For this comment attributes the oracle to the time of Lycurgus, that is to the time in which Plutarch puts the Rhetra itself. The choice between the comment in Diodorus’ text and the comment by Plutarch is not difficult. In the first place the verses of Tyrtæus IIIa do not illustrate the sense of the Rhetra alone; in the second, the comment is in fact a marginal note, which lacks the authority even of Diodorus. In the text of Diodorus a lacuna precedes the quotation of Tyrtæus’ poem; before the lacuna a reference is made to Lycurgus. It is probable that the marginal note was added to bridge the lacuna; that it is mistaken is shown by the considered commentary of Plutarch. The marginal note may then be dismissed as incorrect.

36 The word πορηγηθοῦσα may mean either 'subjoin' or in a bad sense 'interpolate'; the context does not suggest that the latter meaning is to be preferred here (as it appears to be by W-G. ΟQ.XXVIII 47).
37 W-G. ΟQ.XXVIII 4 translates ἐκ τοῦ ἄκρου τάλατα προστάσασον; on the grounds that it was part of the god's command Plutarch does not mention any 'part' προστάσασον means to enjoin whereas προστάσασον is necessary for the meaning 'enjoin in addition'.

38 This is implicit in the hypothesis of Andrews ΟQ.XXII 8g and W-G loc. cit. 2, that the Heracleidae are the subject of ἱστορια.
39 W-G. ΟQ.XXVIII 4 note remarks that the marginale has been unfairly spat upon Plutarch; for one or other must be so treated. Of the two the known Plutarch is a less deserving target than the unknown hand of the marginale.
In his footnotes Diehl publishes three complete restorations of these lines; the margin of variation is such as to show that complete restoration is inconclusive. Even the restorations in the text above are not agreed; those in lines 12–13 win most general acceptance. It is also uncertain whether the lines all belong to the same poem, for the lines forming Tyrtaeus VI and VII are written consecutively in Lycurgus Leocr. 107, despite the fact that they constitute two separate poems.

If, however, we assume that the lines are part of one poem and that the fragmentary lines of the other columns of the papyrus belong to the same poem, the context and the meaning of the lines remain obscure. The author of the fragment is not known. The suggestion that the author is Tyrtaeus is highly probable; and the mention of Messenians in line 66 establishes a presumption that the poem is concerned either with the First Messenian War (as Tyrtaeus IV is) or with the Second Messenian War, at which time Tyrtaeus was writing.

When we turn to the lines which have survived, we can make some safe deductions. The use of εί in lines 9, 14, 18, and 21 gives a clue to the arrangement of the sentences. Elsewhere in the fragments of Tyrtaeus εί is followed by a main verb, except on two occasions (IV 3 and VIII 5) where balancing infinitives and participles are contrasted under μέν and εί. In our fragment the εί in line 18 and in line 21 introduces a main verb. The odds are therefore high in favour of this being so in line 9 and in line 14. Moreover, in the case of line 14 the alternative possibility, that εί goes with the participle [πρέπειν] and corresponds to a lost μέν preceding the two participles φραζάμενοι [ενοι] and [ν][ασχόμενοι], presents considerable difficulties. For it is hard to suggest a suitable word before εί which will be capable of carrying an emphatic contrast within the participial phrases, and it is still more difficult to explain the sense of the two aorist participles if they depend on the future verb πεισομένεια. We may then conclude that a main verb has fallen out of lines 9, 10, or 11, and that this main verb is correlative, and perhaps contrasted, with πεισομένεια.

The clue to the meaning of the sentence in lines 10–13 is afforded by the words [ν][αδροφόνους μελας χερσιν [ν][ασχόμενοι]. Here the restoration [ν][ασχόμενοι] is generally accepted, for it 40 The text of column A2 of the papyrus was first published by W-M SBB 1918 728 f. In the text as printed above only some of Diehl's restorations are reproduced.
is almost demanded by the preceding words. The meaning of ἀναστήσθαι is not in doubt: it describes the attitude of raising the spear, preliminary to thrust or throw, and the aorist tense of the participle is usually employed with a main verb of striking or of standing ready to strike. 41  

The aorist participle πράσαζαι[νος] is used of assuming position behind one’s shield as a preliminary to combat. 42  

It is then practically certain that the sentence in lines 10–13 describes a force of men either poised in the attitude of combat or engaged in the act of combat. A good parallel is afforded by Callinus I 9 f.,

αλλά τις ἱδέας τω
ἐγχος ἀναστήσας καὶ στρατιάδος ἀκμίου ἔτορος
tο τρόπον μεγανύπαν πολέμου.

Here the warrior steps ready into combat, at the moment when battle is first being joined (the aorist participles being in contrast to the present participle).

In the two sentences which follow (lines 14–16) the emphasis lies with the opening words. Not the least recommendation of the restorations [ημεῖς] and [ἐκων] is that they can carry such emphasis. With ἀλλά ἐνδυόμενην the emphasis is fully driven home; and these words obviously contrast with the only word which carries such emphasis in the preceding lines, namely the initial spondee χωρίς. The sense may then be that the Pamphyloi Hyleides and Dymanes fought 43 separately; but we [perhaps the Spartans of ‘Tyrtaeus’ day] shall obey our steadfast leaders without flinching, but 44 we shall one and all combine forthwith to beat down [the foe? . . .] as we stand at close quarters to the spearmen’. In that case a contrast is drawn between the tactics which the Dorian tribes employed in the past and those which the Spartans are to employ in a future battle. If we assume that the poem is by Tyrtaeus and that he uses the future tense to signify a battle in the Second Messenian War, then such a contrast between past and future is not inept. The poems which are known to be by Tyrtaeus make frequent reference to the past: II to the Heracleidae’s invasion of the Peloponnesus, III to a reform in the reign of Theopompos and Polydorus (if we accept Plutarch’s statement), IV to fighting in the First Messenian War, and IX to mythical events. In this poem, then, reference may well be made to the invasion of the Peloponnesus by the three Dorian tribes who are mentioned elsewhere in this connexion. 45 The contrast in tactics is also a natural one in Tyrtaeus. The change from Homeric tactics to hoplite tactics took place at Sparta not later than c. 700 B.C. 46

There is little doubt that the tactics described in lines 16–24 are those of hoplite warfare. 47 There may also be a contrast between the epithet εὐκίλος in line 19 and the epithet κολα in line 11. The former is used in Homer II. V 797 to describe the ‘telemanion’ shield of pre-hoplite warfare, 48 but it is also appropriate for the hoplite shield. The latter is a most unusual epithet for a shield; if we think of Homer’s κολαί νῆς, then it is best fitted to describe the ‘basin-like’ shields shown on the Tiryns votives which are of the pre-hoplite type. On the other hand, it can be argued that it may describe the hoplite shield with its offset rim. 49 Thus no firm conclusion can be drawn from these two epithets; 50 in their context, however, κολα

41 Homer Hell III 903 πλάθαν ἀναστήσας: V 655 ὃς ἄναγχη μὲν ἰλαρος γυγής ἀποπλώματος καὶ τῶν μὲν ἔμαρτιν δοῦρα δοῦρα ὧν καὶ τὸ χείριν ἤτοι; XI 592 9 ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ πλανίαν ἔπεσεν, σταῦρος ἐμάζων κλάταντος, δοῦρα δοῦρα ἀναστήσαντος. Cf. H. L. Lorimer BS XII 114.
42 Cf. Homer IIad XI 592 quoted in the last footnote and Callinus I 10 quoted in the text above.
43 An aorist or imperfect verb in the third person plural can be as easily restored in line 11 [———] as a form of the first person plural.
44 I take ἀλλά to repeat the antithesis begun by ἐκ in the preceding couplet and also to stress [ἐκων] ἄρτο. The same use of ἀλλά appears in Tyrtaeus VII 1, VII 31; VIII 1, VIII 21; and in Callinus I 9.
46 Lorimer, loc. cit. 92–3, that from c. 700 B.C. onwards hoplite equipment was general at Sparta is clear, and, in view of the interpretation sometimes put on certain passages in Tyrtaeus or the poetry which goes under his name, the fact is of importance.
47 Ibid. p. 128.
48 ὄμοι πλακώδως τελεμανίου ἀσπίδι ἐκκώλου.
49 Ibid. 129 n. 2, the word basin-like is used by Miss Lorimer. Her interpretation is different from mine, because she thinks both epithets refer to hoplite warfare. I agree that both might do so; but in this case if a distinction is drawn, my interpretation seems to fit her description better and also to fit the fragment of Minermus quoted below.
50 In general Tyrtaeus’ evidence on weapons, armour and tactics is, as Miss Lorimer says, perplexing. One reason may be that the Messenian Wars were not struggles between hoplite forces but partook more of guerrilla tactics; and, as it takes two hoplite sides to make a hoplite battle, the Spartans may have been compelled by their enemy to modify their equipment and their tactics.
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may well be used of the pre-hoplite shield and the epithet ἐκκολός of the hoplite shield. The other example of κολής ἄστυρις occurs in the new fragment of Minnemorus: 41

Minnemorus[ς] 86' [ά] τῆι Συμωνή[ς] [1] 18'[ά]
ως ο[p] πάρ βασιλῆς, ἔποκε[ρ] [ά] ἑξαπτωτο μῦθον[,]

Of this fragment the elegiac line is the same (save the missing letters) as line 11 of our poem. It might even be held to indicate that this part of our poem may be by Minnemorus and not by Tyrtaeus. It certainly shows that the missing word in our poem may be ἥξεν, or at any rate a past tense in the third person plural. Moreover, the fragment of the Smyrnaid depicts the warfare between Smyrna and Gygges of Lydia c. 660 B.C. 52 and the actions are those of the king's men; they are then definitely not hoplite tactics and the same unusual line in Tyrtaeus' poem (if it be his) should also describe non-hoplite tactics. This conclusion is equally supported by Callinus I 9 f. (quoted above); the action of his warrior is closely similar to that of the Hyllies Pamphyloi and Dymanes in lines 11-13 of our poem. And Callinus was exhorting men to act against the Cimmerians not later than 660 B.C., and such action cannot have been of the hoplite type. 53

As the interpretation set upon this fragmentary poem is so vital to this paper, it is necessary to consider briefly a few statements which have been made on the matter. Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, 54 ascribing the poem to Tyrtaeus, assumed that the mention of the three Dorian tribes proves their actual existence in the time of Tyrtaeus; accordingly he put the Lycurgean reform at Sparta later, i.e. towards the end of the seventh century B.C. Gercke, 55 making the same assumption, noted the contrast between χορίς in line 11 and σύμμετα τοι in line 16 and remarked that for the first time in world history the axiom appears 'getrennt marschieren und vereint schlagen'. For he took lines 10-12 to describe the march 'im Schutze der Schilde und die Lanzen geschult'. But the phrase μάλις χρωνίς ἄσπισειν φρασάμουι means not spears at the slope but spears poised for combat, and as the fragment of Minnemorus has shown (since Gercke wrote) the phrase κολήσ ἀσπίσει φρασάμουι describes a position in combat. 56 Wade-Gery writes as follows: 57

'It is comparatively recently, with Wilamowitz's publication of the Tyrtaios papyrus in 1918, that we learnt for certain that Sparta had once a Tribal Army. In that papyrus, a prospective battle is described, in which the Spartans are to go into action χορίς πάνωφολο γι καὶ Ἡλίας ἥξες Δαμνήμες. In the Messenian Revolt, then, the units of the Spartan army were those three 'Dorian tribes', the same as we find in many Dorian cities, racial or 'kinship' groups which purported to be descended from Herakles' three sons, Hyllos, Pamphylos, and Dyman. The evidence is conclusive, but there is little other trace of it in our tradition: Aristotle in his Constitution appears to know only the two later stages, the Obal Army and the Morai.'

The main assumption here is that lines 10-13 belong to the prospective battle. As we have seen, such an assumption is far from necessary when we study the text. Indeed, the balance of probability inclines towards these lines being not dependent on πεισόμεα and being rather in contrast to lines 14 f., so that the 'Tribal Army' was a thing of the past and not of the future. I am, however, not concerned to show that any one view is necessarily right per se. It is sufficient to state that either view is possible and that the evidence is therefore far from 'conclusive'. Its double edge should rather deter us from dogmatism at the expense of all the other ancient evidence.

41 Wyss, Antimachii Colophonii Reliquiae (1906) 83 and 88. The restoration ἢξες seems necessary to explain χορίς which depend on a verb of motion: cf. Xen. Anab. I 11, 5 τῶν παρα βασιλέως.
42 Paus. IX 29, 4-7.
43 Lorimer, loc. cit. 120 inclines to put the introduction of hoplite warfare in Ionia generally to a period not much earlier than 660 B.C.
44 SBB 1916, 734.
45 Hermes LXI (1931) 347-8.
46 The position of the spear when a hoplite is marching and when he is about to engage is well illustrated by the Chigi Vase, cf. Lorimer, loc. cit. 81.
47 Bovera, New Chapters in Greek Literature, III 64 shares the view of Gercke and remarks 'the description of the marching here is reminiscent of some Homeric passages': he refers to Iliad XV 710 and XXI 162 f., both of which concern close combat. He also maintains that the triple division by tribes re-appears in lines 68-71 of the fragment, but four groups are mentioned if one reads further and notes 58 in line 74.
50 CQ XXXVIII 119-20.
Herodotus describes the reform at Sparta in a parenthesis. After quoting the oracle delivered to Lycurgus at Delphi, Herodotus gives two alternative traditions about the origin of the reform: some say that the priestess at Delphi went on to expound to Lycurgus τὸν νῦν κατστειούσα κόσμον Ἐπαρτήμητι, while the Lacedaemonians themselves say that Lycurgus brought (sc. τὸν νῦν κατστειούσα κόσμον Ἐπαρτήμητι) from Crete. The date of the reform is given according to the Lacedaemonian tradition in the reign of Leobotes to whom Lycurgus was guardian. The nature of the reform was a change of all customary usages (μετέστησε τὰ νόμιμα πάντα), next the introduction of military measures, the enomotai and trikades and sussitia; and in addition the establishment of the ephors and elders. In this description the divergence of tradition seems to affect only the origin of the reform; the date and the nature of the reform appear to be drawn from the Lacedaemonian tradition and not to be in dispute. The dating by the reign of a king at Sparta is common in Herodotus; he supplies the list of kings of both royal houses, and Leobotes appears in the Agiad list as eighth in descent from Heracles and as the twelfth king before Leonidas. Thus Herodotus and his informants knew the time of the reform in relation to the kings' list. Whether he conceived the time numerically as so many years before a fixed date is doubtful. Where he does equate lists of kings with numbers, he varies hugely: the Heracleidae reigned in Lydia for twenty-two generations, a space of 505 years (I 7), and the list of kings of Egypt is reckoned at three generations to a century (II 142). If one applies these two methods dating backwards from the death of Leonidas to the beginning of Leobotes' reign, the answers will be 781 and 913 B.C. But the vagueness of Herodotus' early chronology makes such calculations of little value.

The parenthesis in which the activity of Lycurgus is described springs from the account of Sparta's power which reached the ears of Croesus c. 547-6 B.C. He heard that the Spartans 'after passing through a period of great depression had lately been victorious in the war with the people of Tegea; for, during the reign of Leo and Agasicles, kings of Sparta, the Lacedaemonians, successful in all their other wars, suffered continual defeat at the hands of the Tegeans'. Herodotus then inserts his parenthesis; its purpose is to explain the cause of Sparta's military predominance in all her wars, including that against Tegea. The fact that his explanation takes him back to the reform of Lycurgus, which established the military and social system of that and succeeding generations, is neither alien to the mentality of Herodotus nor surprising to the modern historian. For Herodotus saw the original cause of the Greco-Persian war in much remoter events, and the modern historian who tries to account for Sparta's predominance in the fifth or fourth century B.C. finds himself compelled to refer to the military and social system which originated in the same reform, whether he ascribes the reform to this or that century and legislator. Undoubtedly the derivation of Sparta's power from such a reform is the correct one.

The introduction of the parenthesis is formed by the following sentences: τὸ δὲ ἦτα πρότερον τοῦτον καὶ κακονομῶσαν ἔσαν συγεῖν πάντων Ἀθηνῶν κατὰ τὰ σφέας αὐτῶν καὶ διὰ τὰς ἐπαρτήμησις. μετέβαλον δὲ οἰκεῖ δὲ εὐνομίαν. (I 65, 2). When the parenthesis is concluded, the following sentences mark the transition to the narrative. οὕτως μὲν μεταβαλόμεθα εὐνομήσωμαι, τὸ δὲ Λυκούργου τενευμήσαντι ἵπποι εἰσόμεθαι σέβομαι μεγάλως. οἷα δὲ ἐν τῇ κορίᾳ ἀγαθῇ καὶ πληθεῖται οὐκ ἀλίγυν ἀνώρθω, ἀναὶ τὸ ἔθραμον αὐτίκα καὶ εὐθεῖως ἔτοιμα. καὶ δὴ σφήματα ἐπήκειται ἦσοντε ἄγων, ὥστε καταταρακοῦσαντες Ἀρείαν πρέσσουντον καὶ κτλ. (I 66, 1). The opening phrase to δὲ ἦτα πρότερον τοῦτον, that is still earlier than the reign of Leon and Agasicles in the first half of the sixth century B.C., is vague and reaches indefinitely into the past, but its meaning in chronological terms is made more clear by the parenthesis and by the closing sentences. The change to εὐνομία brings about by Lycurgus' reforms in the reign of Leobotes; in consequence of these reforms, the Spartans shot up at once and prospered—that is at once after the reforms. Herodotus then returns to his point of departure, that is to the time of Croesus: this time had been immediately preceded by defeats in the war against Tegea (I 67, 1), and these defeats are evidently among the great disasters which had affected Sparta.
54
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(I 65, 1), but by c. 547–6 B.C. Sparta had already got the better of Tegea (I 65, 1 and 68, 6). The period of κακοομορία at Sparta to which τοῦ πολιτικῶν τοῦτον refers is then seen to be antecedent to the εὐνομία brought about by Lycurgus in the reign of Leobotes. If we confine our attention to a few sentences only of Herodotus (I 65 1–2), his chronology may be confusing; but, if I 65–8 is read as a whole, no real ambiguity remains. As Herodotus is only concerned to account for Sparta’s supremacy at the time of Croesus, it is enough for his purpose to describe the war against Tegea and the stability of Sparta arising from Lycurgus’ reforms. It is only in passing that he hints at the intervening period, touching on the expansion of Sparta (in which the conquest of Messenia in the First Messenian War suggests itself as the salient point), and on the disasters from which Sparta had escaped (notably the Revolt of Messenia in the Second Messenian War and the defeats at the hands of Tegea).58

Thucydides I 18, 1

ἡ γὰρ Λακεδαίμων μετὰ τὴν κτίσιν τῶν οὖν ἐνοικούστων αὐτῆς Δωρίδων ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ὁ άμι

ισευρ χρόνον στασιάσασσα διός ἐκ πολιτικῶν καὶ ἡμοιομετάβας καὶ σφετέρος ἀπαράνευστος ἦν. Ἡ γὰρ ἡ εἰς τὰ μέλλοντα τεταρκίαν καὶ ἄλλως πλεῖον ἢ τὴν περισσότερον τοῦ πολίτην ἀρχὴ ὧν οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι τῇ αὐτῇ πολιτείᾳ χρόνου, καὶ δί’ αὐτὸ δυνάμειον καὶ τὰ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις πόλεσι καθάστασιν.

‘After its foundation by the present Dorian inhabitants Lacedaemon underwent the longest known period of faction and yet from the earliest times both received a well-ordered government and was continuously free from tyranny; for the Lacedaemonians have used the same constitution now for a little more than four centuries, dating back from the end of this war, and on that account being powerful they settled affairs in the other states too’.59

Thucydides introduces these sentences as a parenthesis to explain the ability of Sparta to depose the last of the tyrants, including those at Athens. He, like Herodotus, does not hesitate to explain the power of Sparta in the latter part of the sixth century B.C. by reference to a reform some three centuries earlier in date. Again like Herodotus he mentions the troubled period before the reform (cf. Hdt. I 65, 2 κακοομορία τούτου ἄθικα σχεδον πάντων Ἑλλήνων κτλ.). The fact that Herodotus and Thucydides treat with confidence of Spartan history before the late ninth century suggests that they are both drawing on a tradition which was accepted in their own day; for the alternative, that Thucydides drew directly on Herodotus, is less probable in view of Thucydides’ tendency elsewhere to be critical of Herodotus. The source of the tradition, which they accepted, is most reasonably to be found at Sparta; and it is this tradition which Herodotus appears to favour and to follow in his account of the reform.

58 In CAH iii p. 362 Wade-Gery writes that ‘the same date (i.e. shortly before 600) is implied in Herodotus’ account of the Eumonia, where he relates the Arcadian Wars of the early sixth century as the immediate consequence of the reform. . . . Herodotus stultifies his narrative by implying that the reform took place some centuries before those immediate consequences which gave him occasion to mention the matter at all’. W-G here makes Herodotus imply two different things, first that the reform is dated to shortly before 600, and second that it took place some centuries earlier. What Herodotus says is unfortunately more precise: the reform according to the Spartan tradition was in the reign of Leobotes. This statement outweighs any implications which may be held to transfer the reform to a later date. It is true that Herodotus reverts abruptly from the digression to the narrative: the phrase καὶ αὐτῷ Ὑποφήγησεν ἥρως Ἀχαιών παῖς suggests that he envisaged three stages at Sparta, first expansion after the reform, second recession under defeats (causing them ἰσόπλευρον ἰσόπλευτον, and third a return to aggression against Arcadia. Now this interpretation of the passage is the only one with which the text of the manuscript can be reconciled, and it implies that Sparta’s development may be good or bad history; but the implication that the reform really took place shortly before 600 B.C. fits with Wade-Gery and not with Herodotus.

59 In translating this passage I take the superlatives ἐτ’ ἀρχηγῶν, χρόνοι and ἐτ’ ἀρχηγῶν to contrast with one

another, emphasising the point that Sparta was longest in distress but earliest to achieve ordered government; the double καὶ, each being emphasised by strong hiatus, to mean ‘both . . . and’; and ἀφί, being under the double καὶ, to take its starting point from ἰσόπλευρον and to mean that consecutively from the time of the early achievement of orderly government Sparta was free from tyranny. This last point is relevant to Thucydides’ mention of tyrannies in other states. For a different interpretation of the passage see Andrews CG XXXII (1956) 94, who holds that ἰσόπλευρον is to be taken only with the first καὶ clause and who expands the passage to mean ‘yet at a very early time she brought herself to order, without undergoing a tyranny; indeed she never had a tyrant, for it is about four hundred years etc.’. If Thucydides meant to say this, he expressed himself badly and this is possible enough; but the explanatory sentence, which follows, states not that Sparta’s power was due to the lack of tyranny but that it was due to the continuity of her constitution over four hundred years. This point makes me reject Andrews’ view that ‘the end of the στάσεις, the change to άρχηγός, is not dated, except by the words ἐτ’ ἀρχηγῶν and the presumption is that it comes within the four hundred years’. Gomme, Commentary on Thucydides, I 131, is critical of Andrews’ interpretation.
Another point common to Herodotus and Thucydides is the verb ἑυκρόσεθασθαι in the aorist tense. The meaning is clear in Herodotus I 66, 1; having described the nature of the reform he concludes δύντω μεταβαλθέντες εὐκρόσεθασθαι ‘by such a change the Spartans received a well-ordered government’. In the same way Thucydides’ words τῇ ὑστῇ πολιτείᾳ χρόνιτα illustrate the meaning of ἑυκρόσεθασται. Now ἑυκρόσεθασται occurs only here in the work of Thucydides and only twice in that of Herodotus, the second case being in the future tense (I 97, 3 καὶ δύντω ἑτε χώρῃ ἑυκρόσεθασται). The verb, and particularly the aorist tense, is sufficiently rare for its appearance in the same context in Herodotus and Thucydides to be striking. It looks like a technical term in relation to the reform at Sparta.

Both Herodotus and Thucydides supply a date for the reform, the one by reference to the list of kings and the other by reckoning back from the end of the war (whether 421 B.C. or 404 B.C. is not certain). The method of dating is different in each case; but they may have aimed to supply the same date, and that a date derived from the Spartan tradition. But if they are held to give different dates, then our preference will be given to Thucydides as a more competent student of chronology.

Aristotle Politics and Lakanon Politeia

Although the fourth-century evidence in general may have been distorted by philosophical and chronological theorists, the Politeia commands respect. References to the reform or reforms at Sparta are of two kinds, those to which the name Lycurgus is attached and those which are introduced as the work of δ νοοτῆς. From the former cases we learn that ‘when Lycurgus relinquished his post as guardian of the king Charilaus and went abroad he subsequently passed most of his time in Crete ’; as this follows the remark that ‘the Spartan constitution appears and indeed is actually stated to have been copied in most of its provisions from the Cretan’, it is clear that Aristotle dated the reform to a time after Lycurgus’ return from Crete and after the end of his guardianship of Charilaus. Aristotle was sufficiently confident of his dating of the reform to dismiss the alleged meetings between Thales Lycurgus

60 Andrews, loc. cit. 89 f. has shown correctly that ἑυκρόσεθα can mean orderliness in the citizens as well as orderliness in government. Aristotle Politeia 1394a defines these two meanings neatly to illustrate his views on constitutional government. Having stated that in aristocracy the highest posts are assigned to the best citizens, he concludes ‘it seems an impossibility for a city governed not by the aristocracy but by the base to have well-ordered government (ἐνορθωτα), and similarly for a city that has not a well-ordered government to be governed aristocratically’ (trans. Rackham). His point is that in a well-ordered government the best govern ex hypothesi, i.e. such a government is an aristocracy. He is dealing here with government and not with the orderliness of the citizens, and the verb ἑυκρόσεθασθαι has a constitutional meaning. In the next sentences he remarks that ‘to have good laws enacted but not obey them does not constitute well-ordered government (ἑυκροσυλικα). Hence one form of good government comprises both ideas, that of well-ordered government and that of orderliness in the citizens; either idea without the other is an incorrect usage of the word, whether it be to disobey good laws or to obey bad laws. Myres CR LXI (1947) 80 f. stresses the double significance of the word. Andrews appears to me to err in taking one meaning of ἑυκροσετα and excluding the other—e.g. p. 93 ‘Then, ἅπασις ἐς ἑυκροσια, they decided to lead better lives. There is here no word of the constitution, though it is clear that there was an important change of some kind.’ Both ideas are implicit in the phrase: orderliness in the citizens in contrast to their being ἑνορθομενωται in earlier times and orderliness in government, as is shown by what follows. For Herodotus wrote ἑν ἐς ἑυκροσεται, and ἑς ἐς in the following manner:

61 My preference is for the later date, on the ground that the early chapters of Book I show some signs of revision after the outbreak of the Decelean war.

62 1271b 20; cf. 1316a 34, where the tyranny of Charilaus is said to have ended in a change to aristocracy. This latter passage evidently refer to the reform of Lycurgus; the aristocratic nature of his constitution was later modified by changes in the reign of the king Theopompus.
and Zaleucus. He also considered Lycurgus to be of the middle class, οὐ γὰρ ἦν βασιλεὺς, and to have instituted both a code of laws and a constitution, as Solon did. The only other reference by name to Lycurgus concerns his failure to bring to the Spartan women under his laws; his attempt was preceded by wars against Argos Arcadia and Messene. A second reform is attributed to Theopompus, who limited the kingship in various ways and in particular set the office of ephors over them, τὴν τῶν ἑρυθρῶν ἀρχὴν ἐπικαταστήσαντος. In the passages where Aristotle refers only to 'the Nomothetes' at Sparta, he clearly means Lycurgus in some cases, and it may be assumed that this is so in others. These passages yield the following information. Lycurgus made matters of property communal by virtue of the sussitia; he aimed to make the men staunch, but was negligent in the case of the women; he made it dishonourable to buy or sell a family's existing estate, but he granted the power of alienating property at will by gift or bequest, and he allowed free disposal of an heiress in marriage. He encouraged a high birth-rate at Sparta by his law relieving the father of three sons from military duty and the father of four sons from taxes. In his discussion of the (I understand, fully developed) constitution, Aristotle remarks that the ephorate holds the constitution together, his point being that this office being democratic gives the people an interest in maintaining the status quo: 'Thus the Ephorate is advantageous', he remarks, whether this is due to the lawgiver or has come about by chance.' This sentence suggests that the Ephorate was originally instituted by Lycurgus (for 'the lawgiver' cannot mean the king Theopompus), but in a form of which the political results could hardly have been foreseen by Lycurgus. The lawgiver is stated to have used the ambition of the citizens in his regulation of election to the Gerousia, and not to have trusted the kings; and to have aimed at war and supremacy.

It is probable that there is also a reference to Lycurgus in the words οὐ καλὸς οὐδὲ τέρι τὰ συστήματα καὶ καλοῦσας φράσεις νεομοδήθηκα τῶν καταστήσαντι πρῶτον; Aristotle's criticism here is that all Spartiates whether rich or poor had to contribute, and those who could not contribute lost their citizenship (ὁρος δὲ τῆς πολιτείας οὐκόν οὕτως εἶναι αὐτῶς τὰ πάτρια). For Aristotle derives the Spartan sussitia from Crete, whence Lycurgus copied some institutions. It would seem then that Aristotle ascribed the introduction of the sussitia at Sparta to Lycurgus.

While the Politics is from the pen of Aristotle, the historical section of the Lakonon Politeia, as in the case of the Athenaios Politeia, may have been written by a pupil of Aristotle and not by Aristotle himself. The fragments have come down to us through the medium of different authors, and in the case of those in Plutarch's Lycurgus through the medium both of Hermippus and Plutarch. Yet, if we bear in mind the analogy of the Athenaios Politeia and Plutarch's Solon, we may be fairly confident that the fragments are correctly transmitted. The first fragment which is relevant dates Lycurgus to the Olympic truce on the evidence of the quoit bearing his name at Olympia, that is c. 776; Plutarch then mentions that this view was not accepted by other writers. A view common to Plato, Aristotle and Ephorus states that Lycurgus made visits continually to Delphi to consult Apollo and was instructed in his

63 1274α 30. 64 1296α 20. 1273b 33. 65 1270a 17. 66 1276b 41; 1269b 20; 1270a 20. 67 1269b 20; 1270a 20. The context of the last passage shows that Aristotle is thinking of landed property; despite a lacuna in the text the sense is not in doubt. It is probable that a distinction was drawn between the acquired property and the original lot of land, cf. Heracleides Ponticus fr. 2 (7) ἄρχατα μάλις γιά τῆς ἀρχατος μέρος οὐδὲ ἔρχεται, probably deriving from Arist. Lec. Pol., and Plut. Inst. Lac. 22 τῆς ἀρχατος διενεργούσαν μέρος; cf. Ziehen Hermes LXVIII (1935) 227 and Meier Kith. Beih. XLII (1939) 38 f. cf. Hdt. IV 57. 4 on heireses at Sparta.

68 1270b 1. The word ἄρχασιν is probably Laconian, cf. ζωοῦ ὄνομα, and refers to service in the levy, and is not Attic, referring to garrison service.

69 1270b 18. 70 1271a 13 and 23; 1333b 11.

71 1271a 27. 72 1272a 3 τὸ γε ἄρχασιν ὠοίλων οἱ λακωνοὶ ἀνόητοι ἀλλ’ ἀπόκεισκαν καθὼς κριτεῦσι, καὶ διδέην ὑπερέχει ἄρχατος; cf. 1271b 20 for Lycurgus and Crete.


THE LYCURGIAN REFORM AT SPARTA

constitutonal measures. The most important fragments ascribed by Rose to the Lakonon Politia are Plutarch Lycurgus 5 and 6, which contain the discussion of the number of Lycurgus' gerontes and the Rhethra and its rider with the commentary thereon. The institution of the Cryptea is also attributed to Lycurgus.

II

CONCLUSIONS

(a) The Origin of the Reform

The evidence available to ancient writers who investigated the early history of Sparta must have been considerable. In the seventh and fifth centuries oral tradition was still strong in Sparta. This medium is presumably responsible for transmitting and narrating the lists of early kings, the invasion of the Heracleidae, the institutions of Eurythenes and Procles, the inauguration of the Helot system, the antecedents to the colonisation of Thera, which included the enfranchisement of the Minae at Sparta, and the capture of Amyclae with the help of the Theban Aegidean. The brevity of the allusions made to such events by Tyrtaeus and Pindar, for instance, shows that the traditions were widely known in the seventh and fifth centuries. In the eighth century oral tradition was reinforced by the keeping of records, such as those of the victors at Olympia, the ephors at Sparta, and the foundation-dates of colonies. The course of the First Messenian War was also handed down for Tyrtaeus to describe in the next century. Oracular responses from Delphi in the eighth and seventh centuries were transmitted in a form which has been recognised in some cases as genuine. In the seventh century the evidence multiplies with the development of elegiac iambic and lyric poetry.

Much of this evidence was genuine and historical. In the hands of a competent historian such as Thucydides it yielded a convincing picture of early Greece and a chronology of the western colonies at least, which is becoming more and more acceptable to modern historians. In the hands of a competent constitutionalist such as Aristotle it provided a penetrating study of early institutions in Greece. There is therefore no a priori reason to suppose that the traditions concerning the institutions of Sparta in the ninth and eighth centuries are necessarily fictitious; it is sounder to begin with the hypothesis that a basis of truth underlies them. Nor should we forget that the body of evidence was considerable and that much of it was earlier in origin than the fifth century. Herodotus was not the fountainhead of traditions about the Spartan state.

Herodotus and his successors were unanimous in ascribing the reform to Lycurgus. It is a commonplace of the tradition about archaic Greece that sweeping reforms were thus ascribed to individual Nomothetae. That a basis of truth underlay this tradition can hardly be doubted; for in cases where we have more evidence individuals such as Draco, Solon, and Cleisthenes certainly carried out sweeping reforms. The statement in Herodotus that a cult was established in honour of Lycurgus is confirmed by later visitors to Sparta and by inscriptions. The relationship between Lycurgus the legislator and Lycurgus the recipient of cult-worship was already accepted in the time of Herodotus, both at Delphi and at Sparta. Beyond this point there is no certainty; we can only hazard the opinion that the reform was probably carried by one man and that the man was probably named Lycurgus.

75 Fr. 335 ap. Clemens Alex. Strom. I 152.
76 Fr. 536 and 537; cf. Lex Patm. 152 and Heracleides Ponticus fr. 2 (4), 5.
77 Fr. 538 ap. Plut. Ly. 28. 1 do not agree with Kessler op. cit. 111, that Rose has not included sufficient of this chapter in the fragment. Cf. Heracleides Ponticus fr. 2 (4).
78 As exemplified by Tyrtaeus' poems and as indicated by Thucydides 1.4 and 9.

80 Parke The Delphic Oracle 67 'curiously enough, the original and historic oracle about Gela appears to be preserved', and 70 (of the foundation of Syracuse) 'in fact there is no reason for denying its claim to be authentic'.
81 Dunbabin The Western Greeks 179 'it is established that the accepted tradition of the foundation of the colonies, found in Thukydides and Antikhos and in the main followed by later sources, contains a great deal that is historical and substantially accurate'.
82 The evidence is cited by Wide Lakanische Kulte 281 f.
83 For a summary of views on this topic cf. How and Wells, Commentary on Herodotus I 85.
That Delphi was consulted in the archaic period by Sparta as well as by other states is not in doubt. The earliest citation of an oracular response from Delphi to Sparta occurs in Tyrtaeus IIIa and b (whether one of the opening couplets is discarded or not). As Tyrtaeus appears to have been a traditionalist himself and as his audience at Sparta was versed in the tradition about Theopompus and Polydorus, it is not reasonable to suppose that Tyrtaeus could have fabricated this oracle himself and then convinced his contemporaries of its authenticity. Moreover, the verse oracle in Tyrtaeus is found to be closely related to parts of two prose documents, the Rheta and its rider, which are accepted by modern scholars as authentic. If then a genuine oracle of the eighth century was known in seventh-century Sparta, there are some grounds for believing that oracles of the ninth century referring to Lycurgus may also have existed. In particular, the oracle quoted by Herodotus (I 65, 3) to illustrate the fame of Lycurgus may well be genuine.

In the account of Herodotus there is no difference of opinion about the oracle which illustrates the fame of Lycurgus. In the next sentence he records two contrasted views as to the origin of the system inaugurated by Lycurgus; the first view, that the priestess at Delphi instructed Lycurgus in the matter, was given to Herodotus by τινες (presumably the priests at Delphi), and the second, that Lycurgus brought the institutions from Crete, was given to him by the Spartans themselves. Herodotus evidently regarded the two views as incompatible. Aristotle, Plato, Ephorus, and others regarded the two traditions as compatible: they believed that Lycurgus copied the institutions from Crete but was also instructed by the oracle at Delphi. In general, this seems a reasonable procedure; for when intending legislators or intending founders of a colony visited Delphi it may be presumed that they wanted a blessing on the programme they already had in mind. We may then accept the two traditions as compatible, and we may explain the form in which Herodotus puts them as due to his informants wishing to claim a monopoly for Delphi or for Crete.

Aristotle neatly summarises the case for the Cretan origin of the Spartan system: καὶ γόρ δὲ η ακέ θη καὶ λέγεται τὰ πλείστα μεμβρασθὲν τὴν Κριτικὴν πολιτείαν ἢ τῶν Λακώνων (Politics 1271b 23). ‘It is probable and indeed it is stated’ invites the sceptic to argue that the statement has grown out of the probability. Aristotle rightly introduces the statement as a further piece of evidence: for, as it was stated by the Spartans themselves, the statement can hardly be suspected as inspired by any patriotic or other tendency. Even without the Spartan tradition the probability would be high in its own right. The two constitutions are so similar and the general relations between Sparta and Crete are so close that one must have been copied from the other. As the Dorians were installed in Crete before the Dorian invasion, it is natural that they should have reached political maturity before the Dorians of the Peloponnese. And the ancient belief was that Crete was the first to evolve a constitution, this belief dating back to the seventh century. Nor is the reason for Sparta turning to Crete difficult to grasp: both states were faced with the problem of holding down a very large subject population.

---

84 For example cf. Pind. Isth. vii 12 (of Amyclaes).
85 E.g. Parke, op. cit. 105 (of the Rheta) ‘its traces of archaic Spartan diction prove that it is a genuinely ancient traditional document’; Busolt Statist. (1920) 46.
86 The oracle is frequently quoted in later authors, cf. Wide loc. cit. It is cited in Diod. vii 12 (Ephorus) and in Const. Exc. with two additional lines:

ημέρας δ' εὐσινίου σωτήρος αὐτῶν ἤγγεσεν δίδοσα τὸν ὅλην ἐπικρατήσας πόλις ἐξενεργία.

One explanation is that these lines were added at some later date, in order to support the ascription of the constitution to Delphi alone: another is that the lines belong to another oracle (for Diod. loc. cit. refers to several such oracles) and were wrongly added to the oracle cited by Herodotus. The former is the usual explanation, cf. Parke op. cit. 102 who refers to Pausanias’ pamphlet mentioned in Strabo 366 as a possible source for the addition. It should be noted however that Strabo does not say that the oracles cited by Pausanias were not genuine and Pausanias’ case would certainly be a better one if they were already accepted as genuine before he wrote. Nor is it clear how the addition of these lines would help the case of Pausanias. The evidence is hardly sufficient to justify any choice between the two explanations.


88 Herecles Ponticus fr. 3 (2) cites Archilochus as an exponent of this view: ἔτη δὲ τῆς ἀρχαϊκῆς τῶν πολιτων ἢ Κριτικῆς, ἐσώμενος καὶ ὁμορρούς λέγων τὰ πόλις αὐτῶν ἐν κοινεῖσθαι καὶ Ἀρχιλόχος ἐν αὐτῇ ἔπαθον ταύτην φανέται... οὐ τοῦτῳ διδάσκει. Although the fragment is short, it seems to give more support to the view (probably Aristotel’s) than does the citation from Homer.
The tradition concerning the post-invasion period at Sparta is that the Spartans maintained the laws of Aegimius under the early kings, reduced the bulk of the earlier population in the plain to the status of serfs called Helots, and incorporated in their citizen body some non-Spartan peoples. This tradition is consistent with our knowledge of other Dorian states on the mainland. It means that the organisation of society at Sparta was based on the three racial tribes, the Hyllaeis, Dyanes, and Pamphylai, with their constituent phratries and gene. The adoption of unrelated peoples into the racial tribes was paralleled in other states of a similar type.

This initial period was marked by disorder and strife which were long-lived but came to an end with the reform of Lycuragus.

The nature of the reform is summarised in the Rheta, the original charter of the new order at Sparta. The previous organisation by racial tribes was outlawed, and a new organisation by tribes and obes was introduced. The nature of the οδός is fortunately agreed: they formed five regions or wards of Sparta, being by name Pitana, Mesoa, Kynosoura (or Konouora), Limnae, and Amyclaes. Of these only Amyclaes lies outside the area of Sparta town. The other four existed both before and after the reform of Lycuragus as the villages which constituted Sparta town. The new tribes which were based on the obes were also five in number. At the time of the reform the membership of the five tribes corresponded with the residents of the five obes; but as membership of the tribe was hereditary, this correspondence ceased to exist when a family moved its residence from one obe to another. In the same way the ten tribes of Kleithises originally comprised the residents in certain demes, but they soon ceased to do so because the hereditary principle operated after his reform. The names of four tribes are known, the Limnaeis and Kynouries from inscriptions and the Pitanatai and Mesosatai from lexicographers; the fifth was probably the Amyclaicis.

This indicates that the new tribes were once based on the obes, as the Rheta itself suggests. From the new organisation of the citizens sprang a new organisation of the army in five λόχοι; their names were Αδιώλος, Σίνις, Σαριος, Πλάς, and Μεσοάτης. The fact that the Μεσοάτης λόχος bears the same name as the obe Meseis and the Phyle of Meseis is an indication that the λόχοι were drawn each from the eldest φίλατην by the father; this suggests that the child belonged by birth to the same tribe as the father.

The adoption of the phylai and the phyle is decided by identification (Ερέμιος Obai col. 1604) and that the terms are applied in late inscriptions to the same unit (W.G. CO.XXXVIII 117). If they were synonymous and interchangeable the retention of both terms would be surprising, as Kahrstedt (G. Staatsrecht 29) has remarked. But the fact that they are homonymous does not mean that they are synonymous; in the same way 'Jerseymen' can be used both of men not resident in Jersey but descended from original Jersey families, and belief that the phyle and the obes are 'identisch' (Ehrenberg Obai col. 1604) that and the terms are applied in late inscriptions to the same unit (W.G. CO.XXXXVIII 117). If they were synonymous and interchangeable the retention of both terms would be surprising, as Kahrstedt (G. Staatsrecht 29) has remarked. But the fact that they are homonyms does not mean that they are synonymous; in the same way 'Jerseymen' can be used both of men not resident in Jersey but descended from original Jersey families, and belief that the phyle and the obes are 'identisch' (Ehrenberg Obai col. 1604) that and the terms are applied in late inscriptions to the same unit (W.G. CO.XXXXVIII 117).
one ward and tribe of which the personnel were originally the same; whether recruitment was based subsequently on the hereditary Phyle or on the residential divisions in oibis is not known.101

The precise significance of the reform is not immediately apparent. While the earlier state was based on the three racial tribes, Hyleis, Dymanes, and Pamphyloi, this particular racial principle was abandoned and the new principle of a residential qualification was introduced for the organisation of the franchise and for political representation.102 As each oibis may be assumed to have been peopled by members of all three racial tribes, the new system cut across the old system. Yet each oibis, being in essence a village, may be assumed to have contained the gene and phratries which were subdivisions of the racial system; thus the racial principle at the level lower than the three tribes still persisted, and the five new tribes each comprised clans which had a local organisation and a loyalty of kinship within their oibis. In this vital respect then Lycurgus' reform is totally unlike the electoral reform of Cleisthenes in Attica.103 It seems probable then that the Rhetra gave a new definition to the Spartan state. It marked the ξυνοικία of five villages which now become the wards of the πόλις Sparta, and it replaced the tribal state of Hyleis, Dymanes, and Pamphyloi with a system of five tribes based upon the five wards. It appointed the area between Babuka and Knakion (within the synoecised state) as the place where the πολίτης in their new divisions should assemble henceforth 'for ever and ever' (όρος εξ ορός οποιολιθείς μεταξύ Βαρκώκου τε και Κριάκου).104 This momentous ξυνοικία was consecrated by the foundation of the shrine of Zeus Syllianios and Athena Syllania, the protectors presumably of the new state,105 and was blessed by Apollo of Delphi. In this respect then the parallel at Athens is to be found not in Cleisthenes' reforms but in the ξυνοικία of Theseus as described by Thucydides (II 15, 2) and as celebrated in perpetuity by a festival of state.

The political reform was strengthened by a reform of the social system. The strict family control of property, which was inherent in the system of racial tribes, phratries, and gene, was impaired by new laws. The right to alienate property by will and the free disposal of heiresses in marriage were innovations due to Lycurgus. At the same time steps were taken to prevent the growth of a serious inequality in wealth among the citizens which might ensue from the liberation of property. A moral stigma was attached to the buying or selling of the (probably post-invasion) κληρον of landed property.106 And it was from these κληρον, and not from public land as in Crete, that the Spartiate had to contribute to the sussion in order to keep his citizenship.107 Thus the family control of property was weakened without upsetting the existing system of land-tenure.108

Up to this point the reform of Lycurgus is similar to later reforms in other states. But,

101 As Hdt. IX 53 names the Πειραιανής λόγος and the Περσανής λόγος (if the MS. reading is retained) and also refers to Πειραιας as a deme (III 55), he probably derived the name of the λόγος from the one. Thucydides I 20, 3, however, asserts that no such λόγος ever existed. Despite the view of W-G, CQ XXXVIII 121, the 'Thucydides has slipped up badly', there seems to me little doubt that Thucydides is correct; for he would have been rash indeed to be dogmatic on a point which could be settled by reference to Sparta or Spartan prisoners of war. Thucydides was, I think, drawing attention merely to an error of nomenclature (for Aristotle too includes no λόγος of this name) and not to an error about the method of recruitment. In the fourth century, when the Spartan army was brigaded by σπάσει, the evidence of Xen. Hell. IV 5, 10–11 suggests that male members of the same family were in different μύροι and that of άμιλαδον or άμιλαδών were also in different units, whether the latter were members of an one or in the tribe after Amyclae. But this itself may have been an innovation introduced at the time of the new organisation by μύροι.

102 I take it that the phrase in the Rhetra φιλός φιλάδεφος καὶ σύμπλοκς συμπλοκής refers to divisions of the people for different purposes, for instance for purposes of election and military service on the one hand and for purposes of local government and representation on the other.

103 In taking separate demes from each of the three regions of Attica to form a new tribe Cleisthenes cut across the local centres of clan organisation; cf. Arist. Ath. Pol. XXI, 3 where it is pointed out that Cleisthenes abandoned the earlier πράγματα.


105 The importance of Zeus and Athena in the state-cult of classical Sparta is emphasised by Wide. Lakedaimonie Kleine 6 and 54, citing Zeus Agoraios and Athena Agoraios, Zeus Amphiboulos and Athena Amboulia, Zeus Xenios and Athena Xenia, all associated in Pausanias' time with the contemporary Agora or the old Agora. Athena Chalcioios is also named Athena Poliochos, and besides her shrine stood the statue of Zeus Hypatos; there were also cults of Zeus Lakedaimon, Zeus Boulaios, Zeus Tarpeia and Zeus Agetor. The sacrifice to Zeus and Athena, which the king made before leading the Spartan army out of Spartan territory (Xen. Lex. Pol. 13), probably dates back to the time of the ξυνοικία. It is possible that the cult title Syllania is peculiar to the act of the ξυνοικία.

106 Arist. Pol. 1270a; the sentence concerning the disposal in marriage of the heiresses seems to refer back to Lycurgus' legislation.

107 Ibid. 1271a; and 1272a.

108 The story of a Lycurgan γάτος φωκάδας in Plut. Ly. VIII is clearly a late invention. When the demand arose in the second Messenian War, Tyrtaeus opposed it in his 'Euonimia' presumably because it was a novelty (Arist. Pol. 1307b).
whereas Solon and Cleisthenes, for example, left the phratries and gene intact in social life. Lycuragus severed the roots of family and clan loyalty by the institution of the agoge which took the boy out of his family environment at the age of seven and trained him for citizenship at the age of thirty. Under the previous social system admission to the phratory had presumably been the final qualification for the franchise, as in other mainland states; this was replaced by admission to the sussision on successful completion of the agoge, with the obligation henceforward of contributing to the sussision. Under this new orientation of society towards the state all Spartiates (save the kings) were entitled ὀικος; for all the traditional distinctions of blood and wealth which marked the racial aristocracies of the Greek world had been swept away. Within the franchised class a new basis of equality had been established. In this equality, and not in the military prowess which developed later from it, Lycuragus found both the cure for the longest stasis known to Herodotus and Thucydides and the guarantee of stability which made Sparta unique for centuries to come.

In order to secure his political and social reforms Lycuragus carried the constitutional reform which is recorded in the Rhetra. The pre-Lycuragan constitution is not known. But the analogy of other primitive states suggests that the monarchy was powerful, that the Gerousia was composed of the heads of tribes, phratries, or gene, and that the assembly was of very limited competence. Under the Lycuragan constitution the inclusion of the kings in the Gerousia probably indicates a diminution of their powers, as Aristotle suggests. The membership of the Gerousia was changed in number and presumably in personnel, and its powers were defined as probouleutic with the right of proposal and of dismissal in relation to the assembly. The assembly possessed the right of discussion but not of proposal. Its decision on the proposals of the Gerousia was binding. As an elective assembly the people chose members for the Gerousia from among all Spartiates of the age of sixty. Thus the sovereignty of the franchised class was firmly based in the new constitution. As a pact between a strong executive and a sovereign assembly the Rhetra was well designed to ensure stability and to safeguard the political and social reform of Spartan society.

According to Aristotle, Lycuragus carried reforms in law as well as in the constitution. Among these we should probably include the institution of the five Ephors, whose original powers are concerned with the maintenance of the laws and of the social system. At this stage, however, the Ephorate did not possess a place in the constitution. Its rise to political power is marked by its becoming the Eponymous office of the year in 757 B.C. and receiving important powers in the reign of Theopompus. The ultimate result of its rise was to strengthen the hands of the executive at the expense both of the kingship and of the assembly. In the same reign the rider to the Rhetra was enacted on the initiative of the kings and with the sanction of Delphi; its effect was to curtail the assembly’s power of discussion, and it led to the later system whereby the assembly was required to ratify the unanimous proposals of the Gerousia (including the kings) and was entitled to discuss only those issues on which the Gerousia was divided. These modifications of the Lycuragan constitution did not change the fundamental character of the Spartan state. Tyrtaeus, Herodotus, and Thucydides were justified in attributing the greatness of Sparta to the Eunomia of Lycuragus.
(c) The Date of the Reform

If we except the after-thought of Aristotle which was based on the discovery of the quot at Olympia, the ancient tradition is unanimous in dating the reform to within the hundred or so years between the late tenth and the late ninth century. The variation within the hundred years is not surprising, for the ancient like the modern systems of dating between the Sack of Troy and the beginning of eponymous lists in the eighth century were tentative and controversial. Space does not permit a review of these systems or of such complicating factors as the kings’ lists at Sparta and the relationship of Lycurgus to either of the royal houses. I am concerned only with the fact that the early dating is unanimous, as compared with the late dating to c. 600 or 550 B.C. by modern scholars, and I must be content to state my preference for Thucydides’ chronology which places the reform in the late ninth century.

That this chronology is consistent with all the literary evidence and in particular with the fragment ascribed to Tyrtaeus as fr. 1, has been demonstrated in the earlier part of this paper. The Rheta then is the record of an enactment of the late ninth century; hence the omission of the Ephors (who became eponymous magistrates only later in 757 B.C.) requires no explanation, and the addition of the rider by Polydorus and Theopompos in the eighth century is to be accepted, together with Tyrtaeus’ paraphrase in his Eunomia and Aristotle’s commentary in Plutarch’s Lycurgus. Nor is any surprise occasioned by mention of the ζυγόν in the founding of Tarentum (Arist. Pol. 1306b 30), of συστίσια in connexion with Terpander, or of ἄνθρωπος in Alcan (fr. 71).121

The final test is whether this chronology fits in with our scanty knowledge of the archaic period as convincingly as it apparently did with the ancients’ much fuller knowledge. Here we must be clear about certain aspects of the Lycurgan reform. Firstly, it concerns the organisation of Sparta and of the Spartiates, not of the Lacedaemonian state in the later significance of the Spartans and the Perioeci. Secondly, the Lycurgan system and the Lycurgan constitution did not exercise a repressive and degenerating influence on the Spartiates; rather they gave a strength and a stability which were unparalleled in the Greek world because they fitted the psychology of the Spartan people and gave expression to those qualities so eloquently summarised by Archidamus (Thuc. I 84, 3). Thirdly, the association of the reform with the practice of ἔνθrosis rests on no good authority;122 there is in fact no trace of this practice before the fifth century. The truth lies rather with Herodotus (I 65, 2), that before the reform the Lacedaemonians were ἔνθροισι σύστεματοι.

These preliminary considerations should govern our approach to the evidence of archaeology, which is limited in quantity and difficult to interpret. As the reform marked the change from a very long period of stasis to a period of settled conditions and expansion, we should expect to find a gradual development of art and of culture. The advocates of the late dating looked for the opposite effect from the reform, in my opinion wrongly; the first dating of the excavators at Sparta appeared to support them, but the later and now accepted dating is combined to conoci: a falsehood which by the standard of their time was impious, and it is hard to believe that the Spartans would be persuaded that the Rheta was a revival of an old one never enacted. Ehrenberg Naß 33 and 49 cuts the Gordian knot more boldly ‘Dass sie den Inhalt der grossen Rheta widergeben, kann kein ernstlicher Zweifel sein. Dann aber konnten sie nicht von Tyrtaios stammen’. ‘Der Gezüchter Lykurg ist eine Schöpfung des wahren Gezüchter von 550.’ It is however difficult to imagine how the lawgiver of 550 was able to convince his contemporaries that the reform was really due to the remote Lycurgus and how the famous poem Eunomia was foisted into the poems of Lycurgus after 550 B.C. In Epithumia Xenoboda Ehrenberg has modified his position to the extent that he regards the poem of Lycurgus as genuine.

120 The existence of this list of Ephors from 757 is generally accepted both in its own right and because Ephors are found in colonies of Sparta (Thera, Taras by implication from Heraclea, Siris, and Cyrene).

121 These are all points which weigh heavily against the dating of the reform to c. 600 or 550 B.C. The most awkward is the fact that Tyrtaeus IIIa and b paraphrases part of the Rheta with its rider. W-G, CQ XXXVIII 115, taking the Rheta to be contemporary with Tyrtaeus, argues that Tyrtaeus ‘sought to reinforce its authority by asserting that there was (presumably in the Royal Archives) an ancient oracle enjoining the substance of Clauses II and III [i.e. the latter part of the Rheta and the rider]’. This hypothesis is far from convincing. Faced with a fundamental reform the Spartans would be swayed not by an oracle of academic antiquity but by the sanction of Delphi at the moment—a sanction which could doubtless be obtained and which the tradition says was in fact obtained. It is necessary to assume that the Kings, the Pythii at Sparta, and Tyrtaeus...
opposed to their view. For Spartan art does not decline rapidly until after 500 B.C. This fact and the fallacy of their assumption were vigorously pointed out by Blakeway. On the other hand, excavation in Laconia has revealed that the earliest settlement which may be equated with the Dorians is at Amyclae, where the cult of Apollo was presumably instituted. The next site to be occupied is on the Acropolis of Sparta, where the cult of Athena Chalkioikos was instituted. Both these sites were in occupation in the Protogeometric period, not later than the tenth century, and they both used a slipless pottery of red-brown clay; but the site on the Acropolis soon developed the ornamentation of concentric circles on less coarse pottery. Before the end of the tenth century the site of the Artemisium, where the cult of Artemis Orthia was established, shows evidence of occupation in a style of slipped pottery in which the concentric-circle ornamentation dies out. These three sites are for a time contemporary, but have different styles of pottery. Although the evidence is very scanty, it suggests that in the late tenth century Sparta was not yet synoecised. In the Geometric period (900-700 B.C.) the Artemisium is an important site with a continuous style for some two hundred years, which is also found at the Acropolis, Chalkioikos, Heroon, Menelaion, and Amyclae. This suggests that in the ninth century Sparta became synoecised, and settled conditions in Sparta yielded a continuous if dull style. In the late ninth century there are two important indications of contacts with the south-east, the first known at Dorian Sparta: the earliest temple of Artemis Orthia, which is similar in date and style to that at Dreros in Crete, and the first imports of ivory, which come ultimately from Phoenicia. As Demargne has shown, Crete was the intermediary between Phoenicia and the southern Peloponnesus from the ninth to the seventh century. In fact, this evidence points to two conclusions which are consistent with the early dating of the Lycian Reform, namely the formation of Sparta itself as a state and the opening of contacts with Crete, whence the inspiration of the reform was derived. The subsequent development of Spartan art and music is closely linked with that of Crete and Rhodes in the eighth and seventh centuries, and its acme in art covers the period from 700 to 550 B.C., after which decline sets in gradually as it did also in the case of Corinth and had already done in the case of Crete. For the centre of gravity in trade, in art, and in currency was moving northwards to Athens. Thus in so far as the break between a long period of stasis and the inauguration of settled conditions is to be traced in the archaeological evidence, it occurs in the late ninth century and it points to a derivation from Crete.

We have already seen good reason to accept the literary tradition that the Lycian Reform was modelled on the institutions of Crete. Now those institutions were created for the city-state proper in Crete and they continued to operate for centuries in the numerous Dorian city-states, of which some fifty are known by name. It is reasonable to see in the Lycian Reform the corresponding creation of the Spartan city-state from the five independent villages in the late ninth century. But the ultimate development of Crete and of Laconia differed widely: Crete remained a disunited aggregate of city-states, a ἐκτόπισμοι in the words of Homer, but Laconia, which was also originally a ἐκτόπισμοι, became united into the Lacedaemonian state under the hegemony of Sparta. This all-important development cannot have been consummated during the long period of stasis; it must have followed the creation of the Spartan city-state, and have fallen therefore in the period between 800 and 730 B.C. if the latter year is taken to mark the beginning of the First Messenian War. The reduction of the numerous Dorian communities of Laconia, which were each autonomous and independent in

123 CR XLIX (1935) 185.
124 Buschor AM XII (1927) 12. Desborough BSA XLIII (1948) 267 notes the wide gulf between the latest local Mycenaean and the Protogeometric style at Amyclae.
125 Ibid., and Dawkins Artemis Orthia 19, 49, 62.
126 AO 62.
127 AO 18. The small percentage of slipless pottery at the Artemisium may represent the earliest period of occupation, contemporary with that of the Acropolis and of Amyclae.
128 AO 54, 62; AM 14.
129 Lane BSA XXXIV 96 f.
130 AO 19. It is not likely that any great error will be made if it (the archaic altar), and the early temple with it, are assigned to a date earlier than 800 B.C. AO 239, the oldest ivories being needles for applying kohl to the eyelids: 'they cannot be dated later than the 9th century B.C.'
131 La Creté Didalique (1947); cf. Lane loc. cit. for possible influence of Crete and Thera on Laconian Geometric.
133 Strabo 362, adding that in his own day the declining population lived in thirty χώρα.
The conclusion of this paper may seem strange to those who place the end of the Dark Age at about 600 B.C. The origin of this view is to be found in the predominance of the Attic tradition in Greek history, for until the late seventh century Athens was a minor power in the Greek world. Archaeology has, however, opened the new vistas of Daedalic Crete, Protocorinthian art, and Laconian pottery, and has tended to confirm the Thucydidean chronology for the colonisation of the West.\textsuperscript{135} We now realise that by the early sixth century several states had passed or were passing their acme in the development of art and culture; Chalcis, Eretria, Crete, and even Corinth and Sparta were approaching the first stages of a declining power in the creative fields of colonisation and art. The great achievements of the late eighth and of the seventh centuries were the results of settled conditions in these states.\textsuperscript{136} Thus Corinth before the colonisation of Syracuse in 734 B.C. and Megara before the colonisation of Megara Hyblaea in 728 B.C. had become settled states in the same sense that Sparta had become a polis. The traditions of their early composition form an interesting analogy to the case of Sparta: oi de (φασιν) άληθές κατά χρησιμός τός Κορινθίους συνοικίσκον όκτω φίλας ἐποίησε τός πολίτης καὶ ὀκτώ μέρες τήν πόλιν (Suidas s.n. πάντα ὀκτώ) and τό πολίτην ἢ Μεγαρίς ὀκεῖτο κατά κόμις, εἰς πέντε μέρη νευμηνίων τῶν πολίτων, ἐκλαύνοντο δὲ Ἡραίας καὶ Πιθαι Καὶ Μεγαρίς καὶ Κυνοσαυρεῖς καὶ Τριποδισκαῖοι (Plut. GQ 17).\textsuperscript{137} It may well be that the formation of these two states fell in the early eighth century; being near successors in time to the reform at Sparta. Both, however, were still based on racial kinship and on aristocratic government; at a later time they passed through the stages of tyranny and of stasis which Lycurgus had averted from Sparta.

The late ninth century has a further contribution to make—the art of writing of which the origin was Phoenicia and of which the earliest examples occur at Crete, Thera, and Melos.\textsuperscript{138} Sparta had close contacts with these islands. It may be that the original Rheta was a written document of the late ninth century, preserved among the monstes of the Spartan state, which Herodotus VI 57 tells us were in the keeping of the kings and of the Pythi.\textsuperscript{139} It may even be that the influence of Phoenicia affected wider spheres than those of art, letters, and trade. For the similarity of the constitution and of the social system of Carthage with those of Crete and Sparta\textsuperscript{140} may not have been fortuitous. It is perhaps significant of an inter-relation between them that Carthage was traditionally founded in the latter part of the ninth century.\textsuperscript{141}

N. G. L. Hammond.

---

\textsuperscript{134} The cities of the Perioeci are styled πόλεις by Hdt. VII 234, Xen. Hell. VI 5, 21 etc.; their independence dated from the pre-Lycurgan period presumably, cf. Isoc. Panath. 176 f. That the bulk of them were Dorian is implied in the legends of the conquest and settlement of Laconia and is stated by Thuc. VII 57, 6 in the case of Cythera. The tradition in Plut. Lyg. VIII that the Perioeci held their land by δήμοι, although misapplied in the context, may reflect a historical fact, that their system of land-tenure was Dorian in character. The tradition that the towns of Laconia were reduced after the Lycurgan reform appears in Paus. III 5.7.

\textsuperscript{135} Dunbabin The Western Greeks 435 f.

\textsuperscript{136} Thuc. I 12, 4 χῶρας τε ἐν πολις χρόνω ἰορχάσας ἢ ἦλθας ἐπικραίος καὶ οὐκέτι ἀναπαύσις ἀποπαύσις ἐξεστώς.

\textsuperscript{137} Thuc. VII 38 and in Isyly E15 τοὺς Φοιβόν χρησμοῦ αἱς μαντεῖοι πορίθει πολὺς λυσόγραφος. Plut. 1116 F states that the Lacedaemonians preserved the oracle concerning Lycurgus in τὰς παλαιότατας ἀναγραφές. The earliest records at Delphi were written on skins (Eur. fr. 659).

\textsuperscript{138} Arist. Pol. 1276d mentioning the sussitia as well as the constitution. It is possible that the former survived into the Roman period, cf. Livy XXXIV 61 in circuitis constitutionibus.

\textsuperscript{139} No reference has been possible to Chreim's Ancient Sparta (1919) which was published when this article was in page-proof.
PLATO AND THE 'ΑΡΧΗ ΚΑΚΩΝ

Cook Wilson remarks that one of the chief doctrines of the Timaeus relates to the existence of evil...all cosmogonies which attribute the world to some divine activity find a difficulty here. Some assume another spirit, an evil one, though partly subordinate to the good one; others, to avoid making an evil spiritual principle, assume an unintelligible matter, or in general some form of Necessity beside the Good Spirit. We should suppose that Plato, if not monist, would incline to the latter and should have thought he clearly adopted it in the Timaeus. In Laws X, soul is the cause of evil as of good. So Plato says one thing at one time, another at another. But his interpreters do not like to admit this. Professor Cornford found the spiritual view of evil lurking in the Timaeus too. Mr. Vlastos and lately the Rev. Père Festugière, though they differ about the meaning of Laws X, agree that for Plato the κακοτόιον is always matter. I think that we should not try too hard to smooth over the discrepancies in what Plato says about evil. They call attention to something obscure, perhaps incoherent, in his metaphysical thinking.

Cornford reads the Timaeus with the help of Laws X. Irrational and merely necessary motions and changes, with casual and undesigned results, actually occur in nature at all times, as well as those which are subservient to rational ends...And since, on Platonic principles, all physical motion must be due to a living soul, I do not see how to escape the conclusion that the World-Soul is not completely rational. There is no trace of a Devil in the Timaeus; the source of evil must be the World-Soul itself, that is to say, if Plato always assumes that ψυχή is the ἀρχὴ κινήσεως. But to a reader coming fresh to the Timaeus, unbiased by recollections of any other dialogue, ἡ σοφία καὶ ἡ κακοτοικία is still the κακοτόιον. The Timaeus accounts for evil in terms of a contest between Reason and Necessity, the struggle of a workman with materials that are recalcitrant, that limit his purposes, and make perfection unattainable even by God. These are the Forms, Space and γένεσις. ὅτε ταύτα χώραν καὶ γένεσιν εἶναι, τρία τριχῷ, καὶ πρὶν ὑπροσφυγνον γενέσθαι. (52d.)

For the most part the Divine Workman's difficulties are a hackneyed theme. He is making a copy of the world of Forms in which not all Forms combine: their want of κωνοσία will be reflected in the product; all conceivable advantages will not be realised. Then Plato assumes that embodiment involves a certain degradation for the Form. He is not saying that the Potter's hand shakes, rather that the very being of a particular thing is imperfection, for the ἀπαρατόν element in the mixture keeps it from being a perfect instance of the Form. Χώρα is the ἀπαρατόν here, Plato's matter. For Plato a material thing is a region of space in which causal properties are manifested. What properties a thing will have depends on its spatial configuration, and the διακόσμησις is simply the delimitation of these regions within the original ἀπαρατόν, whose nature the Demiurge must accept and make the most of.

Γένεσις is more mysterious. Here it is not the sensible world, for that is the product of the διακόσμησις, not a prerequisite. I take it to be the same as κωνοσία in Laws X, and I shall use the word κωνοσία by preference, assuming it covers coming-into-being, motion, and

1 Statement and Inference II, 867.
2 CQ XXXIII, 71 f.
3 Rev de Philologie, XXI.
4 Plato's Cosmology, 209-10.
5 We must distinguish the matter which is equivalent to ζών from the Workman's materials, of which χώρα is one, and from the material world, the product.
6 That is, the physical object is a fiction: the fact that causal properties are manifested in a certain region of space is an ultimate fact. The objection is that if a region has causal properties, it is a substance and not a region. (Perhaps this is the real cause of Taylor's reluctance to call χώρα VOL. LXX.
7 Cf. Tim. 274 f.
change of all kinds. In the state of chaos space is a receptacle filled with strange contents, εἰδόντα καὶ ἔξωντα τῶν ὄντων δὲ μοιματα (50c), in ceaseless change and motion. Questions can be asked about the cause of their coming-into-being; they must have some shape and some colour, and if νόσ is responsible for νοσει wherever it is found, νόσ is already at work in chaos. But we need not pursue these anomalies. Whatever we may think of the time-question, we must agree with Cornford that the description of chaos will not bear close inspection, but it is particularly obvious that change and motion in chaos make nonsense. (It would require a continuity of being these ‘contents’ cannot have.) For all that, Plato’s intention is plain—to declare that κινήσεις in all its forms is an ἐνεργεια, waiting to be given order by the Demiurge.

Νόσ struggles to subdue ἄνοσια. The Demiurge does his best with these materials and succeeds on the whole, but to some extent they resist, and the evil of the world is simply this element of disorder that survives from chaos. So matter, τὸ σωματικός, is the κακότατον. But this simple interpretation is often questioned. Professor Cornford thinks we can dig deeper.

As we have seen, in the Timaeus κίνησις is represented as something ‘given’; it has no origin, any more than the Forms or Space. But Cornford is sure that the thought that ψυχή is ἀρχή κινήσεως was constantly present to Plato’s mind, as much in the Timaeus as in the Phaedrus and the Laws. Apart from 46c which echoes at least the words in which the ἀρχή κινήσεως argument is expressed elsewhere, Cornford can point to the earlier part of the dialogue where the world is called a ὁμοιόμορφον with a soul, and there is a faint suggestion that the soul is responsible for its movement. When God shaped the world’s body, ‘he caused it to turn about uniformly in the same place and within its own limits and made it revolve round and round’ (34a), but when the World-Soul is inwoven, I think it is implied that the Soul is responsible for the motion. In Plato’s scheme this revolution of the world as a whole is the physical counterpart of the mental movement of the Same, while the movement of the different is imparted to the planets (36cd). With it Plato comes nearest to making the World-Soul the cosmic ἀρχή κινήσεως, but he nowhere represents it as the ultimate cause of all events in the comprehensive sense required by Laws X. Nothing is said to connect ψυχή with the other κινήσεις of all kinds within the world. In the central part of the Timaeus describing the struggle of Reason with Necessity, there is not the smallest hint that ψυχή is responsible for κινήσεις. It may be replied that this is the myth of νόσ δημιουργός and, to νόσ, κινήσεις is ‘given’; that Plato

---

8 Both γίνεσις and κίνησις have a wider and a narrower meaning. In the Timaeus γίνεσις includes κίνησις = loco-motion. In Laws X κίνησις includes γίνεσις = coming-to-be. (See also Parm. 156a-156b and Cornford, Plato and Parmenides, 195.)

9 Mr. Vlastos argues that we should be satisfied to accept Aristotle’s statement that Plato thought time γνώστης (251b 17), on the ground that he thought of it in terms of circular movement, which is a feature of cosmos, not chaos. (CQ XXXIII, 73-77. Cf. Cornford, op. cit., p. 163.) Chaos is not a world already in existence before God intervenes. The materials of creation are not the sort of entities that exist in time; Plato is hard put to it to describe the odd kind of being Space has, timeless like the σόμα of the Forms, but far less ‘real’ (Tim. 52a-c), while there can be no κίνησις in the absence of all order. But we can deny that chaos existed before creation, without asserting like Cornford that there never was a moment of creation (p. 37). Some philosophers find a meaning in the idea of continuous creation, but the Design argument need not be so understood. The First-Cause argument requires a beginning. Plato has not given us a satisfactory theory of time, but he clearly implied in the Timaeus that it is not infinite. We do best to take him at his word.

10 ‘Necessity’ is a name for τὸ σωματικός, more precisely for the causal powers of matter, for the σώμα, δύναμις και προτεσθον. τὸ πάντα ὄντων δὲ καταστάσεις ἐνεργεια (496). Professor Dodds writes, ‘In the Timaeus, however, besides these physical σῶμα which are popularly but falsely described as causes, we meet also with a real cause which is non-rational—the παγκόσμιον, or Errant Cause, alias “Necessity,” which shares with Mind the responsibility for the constitution of the Universe.’ (JHS LXV, 40.) I think that σωματικός means ‘is caused’, though the sole sufficient causes of any event in the material world—Plato remarks δωδεκάτα ὥσπερ τῶν πλανητών ὁ σώματα ἄλλα σώματα εἰς τῶν πάγων because he does not want us to forget the teleological action of νόσ—and I think that ἄνοσια does not stand for anything distinct from these σωματικά. When they are described in 46c as ‘pushed by other things and pushing a third lot of things ἀνοσιαί’ the phrase refers to that mysterious bond for which Hume professed he had looked in vain; it is sometimes called ‘enforcement.’ The words δῶρα μοναθῆναι φυσικοὶ τῷ πάντα ὄντων ἄνοσια ἐνεργεια (46c) forbid us to interpret Necessity in terms of Regularity of Sequence or natural law. Any order in the world is the work of νόσ, ‘Necessity in Plato was the very antithesis of natural law’ (Cornford, Plato’s Cosmology, 71). What we mean by natural law was expressed by Plato in terms of order.

11 κακότατον but not κακόν. See Robin La Théorie Platonicienne des Idées et des Nombres, 573-80.

12 ‘ἀνοσία’ is the condition of κίνησις, not the ἀρχή, (57e, with 58c and 55a. Cf. Vlastos, CQ XXXIII, 80.)

13 ‘Since no bodily changes can occur without the self-motion of soul, the other factor present in this chaos must be irrational motions of the World-Soul, considered in abstraction from the ordered revolutions of Reason’ (op. cit., 205).

14 This motion is surely inconceivable, but see Cornford op. cit., 82, n. 1.

See 36c and 37a-c and Cornford’s Tables of Celestial Motions, op. cit., 136.
need not account for its origin while the artistic shape into which he had cast his work made it awkward to do so. I think we shall find a reason why we should not assume what Plato has so carefully not said. Aristotle did not think the *Timaeus* uniform with the *Laws* in this respect or assume that it is impossible that Plato should change his tune.\(^{16}\) His πνασμός ψυχή is not likely to rest content for ever with the same idea. It may be that even within the one dialogue his doctrine is not entirely homogeneous.

Cornford, who assumes that the immanent World-Soul is the ἀρχή κυρίσσεισ, inclines to the view that νοῦς δημιουργός is simply the rational element in this World-Soul, for ever trying to impose discipline on the vagaries of its ‘lower self.’ He searches for indications of this conflict.

Qua ‘mental motions’ of the World-Soul, the Circles of the Same and the Different, for all we are told, have a purely cognitive function. The Different is responsible for true judgements and beliefs about the sensible; ὅτι δὲ αὐτὸ τὸ λογιστικὸν (λόγον) ἦ καὶ ο ὁ τοῦ ταῦτοῦ κύκλος εὑρεξῶν αὐτὰ μισάζει, νοὺς ἔστιν ἀνάγκης ἀπολύεται (37bc).\(^{17}\) But Cornford makes the Same ‘rational’ and the Different ‘irrational’ in a questionable sense. He argues that, since the Different (in its physical aspect) is associated with the planets and the Wandering Cause (πλανωμένη αὐτό), the possibility remains that the World-Soul is not wholly rational (p. 76). The planets are set in the circuits in which the revolution of the Different was moving (38c), but their ‘wanderings’ are only apparent,\(^{18}\) and as far as I can follow Cornford’s explanation, involve no interruption in the revolution of the Different. There is no decisive evidence here for a semi-rational element of innate impulse.

Again, referring to 34a, Cornford says that the six irrational motions do occur in nature and argues that since all physical motions are ultimately caused by the self-moving soul, this passage supports the view that the World-Soul has an element of unreason and, like our own souls, is not perfectly controlled by the divine reason it contains (p. 57).\(^{19}\) The new-born baby, when it ‘comes to be without intelligence at first,’ moves with these six motions. But Mr. Vlastos remarks with justice that the analogy with the infant soul, apposite as it is, is unfortunate for Professor Cornford’s hypothesis. It does not tell us how an irrational soul originates irrational motions, but how irrational motions throw out of gear the infant’s soul.\(^{20}\)

It is made clear in 43a-44a that τὸ σωματειδὲ is to blame.

In order to cause the two physical motions specifically assigned to it, the World-Soul must be more than a mere thinking thing. But we are left to make this bare inference ourselves. Though it is an embodied soul, nothing is said to suggest that it is not λογιστικόν all through. In contrast the human soul is given parts that will conflict. To make it, the Gods got from the Demiurge an immortal principle of soul (ἀρχήν ψυχῆς ἀθανάτον) similar to the World-Soul, and for a vehicle gave it the body as a whole and built round another form of soul, the mortal, ἄλλῳ τε εἴδοσ ἐν αὐτῷ προσωποκεφόμενον τὸ θεῖον, δείκτειν καὶ ἀναγκαίον ἐν ἄλλῳ παθήματα ἐξου (69cd). 42ac and 89e refer to the old tripartite division. Are we meant to argue from microcosm to macrocosm? But it is clear that the World-Soul has no such parts ‘built on.’

Yet it is a συνάθον, put together from the intermediate kinds of Existence, Sameness, and Difference, and M. Robin has argued that 35a indicates that its unity is precarious. καὶ τρίς λαβών αὐτὰ ὑπὲρ συνεκράταν ἐλῆ πάντα ἰδέαν, τὴν τειχῆς φύσιν δύσμεκτον ὅπως ἀπὸ ταῦτα συναρμόττων. He fixes on δύσμεκτον. Ce qui arrive, c’est que l’Ame du monde, qui a été faite aussi bonne que possible, mais dans laquelle, comme dit le Timée (354a),

\(^{16}\) ἄλλα μην ὁδεῖ Πλατόνι γε οἶδα τε λέγων ἦν οἰκτῆ ἐνόπλος ἀρχήν εἶναι, το αὐτὸ ἐστὶν κινῆσαι ὅποιον γὰρ καὶ ἄλλο τὸ ὄρασις ἢ ψυχή ἢ ψυχή ἢ ὄρασις (1071 b 37). The reason suggested for Plato’s silence is not satisfactory. If ‘earlier’ and ‘later’ have any temporal meaning, the World-Soul is older than its body. (34bc.)

\(^{17}\) το λογιστικόν here = αὐτὸ το μορφὲν. (See Cornford, *cf. cit.* 95 n. 3.)

\(^{18}\) It is, according to the science of Plato’s time. (Tim. 396c 46b and *Laws* 822a.)

\(^{19}\) *Six irrational motions* is misleading, for they are irrational only in the odd sense that they are not axial rotation—τῶν ἐν τὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ συνθ. μέλλων ὕποσ γένος (34a). Again in *Laws* 897c κυκλοφορία is the physical πρὸς τοῦ κινήσιν. But the other six motions need not want τὰ τέ. (In Tim. 43ab they have none because they is not operative in infancy.) The Laws suggests that the impulse to aesthetic activity is the pleasure we get from the perception of τὰ τέ, i.e., pattern, in all kinds of κίνησις (see *Laws* 653a. Cf. Ar. *Problems* 920 b 53.)

\(^{20}\) *cf. cit.* 78.
M. MELDRUM

l'Autre ne s'est laisse accommoder au Même que sous la contrainte, cesse de se rappeler "l'enseignement qu'elle a reçu de l'Ouvrier qui fut son père." (Pol. 273b): le cercle de l'Autre prétend tourner à sa guise sans obéir au cercle du Même, et il se produit alors dans l'Ame du monde des perversions analogues à celles que les passions produisent dans nos âmes.' 21 But there are stages in its making. In 35a the intermediate kinds of Existence, Sameness, and Difference are mixed; then from this mixture what are called the Circles of the Same and the Different are both made (36c), so that any difficulty of mixing in 35a, however serious, cannot explain why the Circle of the Different should give trouble, while the Same turns peaceably on its course. 22

I am inclined to think that δυσμεικτον is a casual comment let slip without any deep design. In Sophist 255e f., the Same mixes with the Different in the sense that everything is the same as itself and different from other things, but on another occasion Plato might well call the Same and the Different δυσμεικτον. The word has no echo in the rest of the Timaeus.

Certainly the construction M. Robin puts upon it is not borne out by the behaviour of the World-Soul. A merely potential discord will not account for the actual evil in the world, and there is no suggestion anywhere that the World-Soul is divided against itself, no hint of these "perversions," and as Mr. Vlastos says, "Of irrational motions in the World-Soul we know nothing in the Timaeus." 23 This silence is surprising if M. Robin and Cornford are right. 24 Of course the description of the World-Soul is mythological, but it is reasonable to expect that their interpretation, if it is the true one, should be reflected in the details of the myth.

Then the theological situation is extraordinary if evil springs from a conflict between parts of the Divine World-Soul. The victory of νοος is admittedly incomplete, which must mean on this view that νοος has only partial success in making its 'lower self' see reason. But it is one thing to allow that God is not omnipotent, another to maintain that the cause of divine weakness lies within. Is God, like man, betrayed by what is false within? If Plato is preaching so startling a doctrine, why does he not speak out more plainly? 25 Cornford should explain Plato's silence. Theology apart, the dramatic interest of the struggle would be heightened if it were a conflict within the Divine World-Soul.

In the Timaeus there is no question of two souls at strife. Even if we do not accept Cornford's view that νοος δυσμεικτον is a mere hypostatisation of reason in the World-Soul, still the World-Soul seems very much the creature of the Demiurge, a submissive creature never in rebellion against its Creator. It corresponds, if anything, to the Good Soul of Laws X, not the Bad. Read without prejudice, the Timaeus gives no support to the view that evil has a spiritual origin. For all the skill that Cornford employs to draw forth this idea from the Timaeus, we see that it is not there—but a different idea, that evil comes from matter. Professor Dodds says that Plato blames 'the Irrational.' 26 But we have seen that on Plato's view a

21 Plato, 228.
22 M. Robin may connect the Different with change and even disorder on the more general ground that he equates the Different with 'l'Imimité' (p. 156). He argues that Forms, as well as particulars, are mixtures of para and δυσμεικτον. 'Toute Idée est, comme le disait Aristote, un mixte déterminé d'Un et d'Infini: l'infini de l'Autre limitée par l'unité du Même' (p. 152). Is the Different to be identified with the Indeterminate Dyad? I venture no opinion on so difficult a question. But the Different cannot be a very subversive element if it is present in every Form, when Forms are notoriously changeable.
23 op. cit., 78.
24 M. Robin assumes that the rebellion of the World-Soul against the Demiurge in the Politics has a parallel in the Timaeus. It is true that the Same is given supremacy over the Different in Tim. 35c, where the κράτος has an astronomical significance, but there is not the smallest hint that this supremacy is ever threatened in the World-Soul. In the infant human soul it is, but not really by the rebellion of the Different. δι και τότε ἐν τῷ παρόντι κελεστὶ καὶ μεγίστην παροχώμαι κίνης, μετὰ τοῦ βουτὸς ἐνδεχόμενο οὐκοῦη καί ἄκοδοι καὶ σφόδροι σειμερούσι τῷ ἡγεσί περίπολοι. τὸν μὲν τάσπισσαν κινής ἐκτὸς ἀντὶ μέαςκατ οἰκεῖον ἀρχαῖον καὶ λώτοι, τὴν δ' β' ἐν τῷ θαλάσσῳ διάκρινον . . . . (430d. Cf. 44a)
Matter is to blame. Even in the Politics the material view of evil is fundamental. (See Vlastos op. cit., 80.) The World-Soul grows forgetful and careless—τοῦτον δ' το ἐξωτερικος τῆς συγκεκριμένης αὐτῶν (273b).
According to M. Robin the responsibility for evil falls on the World-Soul but in his view the World-Soul is not God (Platon, 229).
25 Cf. p. 72 infra.
26 Professor Dodds thinks primarily of the contrast between Reason and the Passions. When he turns "from Plato's view of man to his view of Nature," he suggests that Plato 'has projected into his conception of Nature that stubborn irrationality which he was more and more compelled to admit in man' (op. cit., 21). Plato may have grown more despondent over human nature, but recognition of the surd-element in the world is not in itself a proof of pessimism. If you choose to describe the world in the Pythagorean πάγος ἄτομος language, you cannot have one term without the other.
surd-element is present in the world independently of any mind, human or divine. Matter is essentially ἀλογον. A mindless universe would be irrational in this sense.

Of course, it is useless to pretend that the activities of νοσ and its relation to the World-Soul are perfectly comprehensible. When Plato warns us that we shall not understand his myth of creation, it is obviously rash to assign a literal meaning to each part of the complex symbol and expect that by combining these meanings we shall construct a theory a philosopher will accept or reject on strictly philosophic grounds. The most we can hope to do is to seize the main ideas it illustrates. Comford takes the World-Soul very seriously, on the ground that for Plato it is 'literally true' that the world is a 3ονον and suggests that the Demiurge may be an element within that soul. I shall try to show that this reading involves difficulties that make it seem unlikely that Plato wished the myth to be understood in this way. And I suggest that Comford has allowed too much weight to considerations that are not native, or at least not central, to the *Timaeus*, and so obscured the main theme.

That theme was set by Anaxagoras—νοσ παντα διακοσμειν. Order in the world is the work of divine προνοια. The *Timaeus* might be called a dramatised version of the Argument from Design—only the Demiurge is not the Architect of the world; he does not plan, but executes, making a copy of αρτο το 3ονον. The argument is not stated in the *Timaeus*. We do not find Plato 'proving a priori both that order is from its own nature inseparable from thought, and that it can never, of itself, or from some unknown principle, belong to matter.' In other dialogues there are many indications of a συγγνωσια between νοσ and ταξις. For example in *Philebus* 26c–39d νοσ is the efficient cause of every mixture in which περας is united with σπερμα, while in 65a–66b νοσ is said to have a special affinity with the formal elements responsible for the goodness of the mixture. This conviction that intelligence is linked with order and value has its roots in metaphysical depths which are not plumbed by the *Timaeus*. In 30a Plato says simply that God being good, and desiring all things to be good, brought cosmos out of chaos.

No one would dispute that this is the message of the *Timaeus*. But what of the suggestion that the benevolent Intelligence is simply an element in the World-Soul? It is only a suggestion—Comford points out the danger of dogmatism—but still he regards it as based on a certainty. For, in his view, one thing is certain and the rest is lies—the world is an animal. Hume says this notion was 'common to almost all the theists of antiquity.' 'For though sometimes the ancient philosophers reason from final causes, as if they thought the world the workmanship of God: yet it appears rather their favourite notion to consider it as his body whose organisation renders it subservient to him.' In the *Timaeus* the word 3ονον is used without much apology. Plato does not try to show that the world has the unity peculiar to an organism. Plato says perfunctorily that nothing has such value as νοσ, and νοσ cannot exist apart from υγεια; so God made the world a 3ονον (30ab). What is at the back of his mind is the thought of the world as an animal that can move itself. In his *History of Western Philosophy* Lord Russell has some interesting remarks on the imaginative background of Aristotle's physical theories. He explains how 'animals have lost their importance in our imaginative picture of the world'; how 'to the modern man of science the body of an animal is a very elaborate machine,' while 'to the Greek it seemed more natural to assimilate apparently lifeless motions to those of animals.' Plato shows the same tendency, but not continuously, as we have seen. Hume was right

---

27 It is surely misleading to suggest that the notion of scientific probability is applicable to a metaphysical theory. Cf. Vlastos, *op. cit.*, pp. 71–3.
28 See Comford, *Plato's Cosmology*, 34, n. 1. He assumes that in 30b το 3ονον stamps the 3ονον language as literal truth, whereas the rest of the sentence δια του του του γενεσθαι πρεπειν is 'myth.'
29 Hume, *Dialogues concerning Natural Religion*, 224.
30 Unless those who regard the Demiurge as a symbol for the Form of the Good or who identify Forms with Minds (see p. 72, n. 49). In spite of 50d, I assume that νοσ διακοσμειν is not a Form.
31 *op. cit.*, 211.
32 Comford has to add—'Of course it is not made; it is an eternal animal.' With some *malice* Hume had remarked that, if you say the world is an animal, you more or less have to say it arose from generation. 'Plato, too, so far as he is intelligible, seems to have adopted some such idea in his *Timaeus*.'
34 Consider the reasoning of *Laws* 995c or *Phaedrus* 245f. We easily imagine that the sight of an animal moving itself suggests the principle that υγεια is the ἄφων σωματε, and that Plato, having reached the general principle, should then on the strength of it feel justified in calling the world an animal. Yet as *Laws* 996e f. shows, he realised that it is not necessary that the soul which is the ἄφων should be related to the body moved as our soul is to our body.
in saying that the ancient philosophers are torn between the Divine Animal view of the world and the Divine Workman—obviously the favourite notion in the Timaeus. Where the Divine Workman holds the stage, the idea of motion as the self-movement of an animal is suppressed; we have already seen how carefully Plato abstains from making the World-Soul responsible for κίνησις in chaos. The two notions are perhaps not compatible with one another.

I doubt if it is possible to treat νοῦς διημορφώς as a symbol for an element in the World-Soul. If it were, we should have to construe the διακόσμητος entirely in terms of the control a rational soul exercises over its body. In our case that is limited, to say the least of it, but νοῦς διημορφώς is supposed to be the source of whatever order is to be found throughout the world, unless in corners where other minds have been at work. Νοῦς brings the cosmos into being, that is, if Cornford is right, νοῦς makes its own body. If an organism can be said to make itself, the parallel is vague in the extreme. Of course, Aristotle would maintain that an organism owes its σύστασις, its organic unity, to the fact that it is animate, though not to πρόως on its own part. 36 But surely 'unconscious teleology' is Aristotelian, not Platonic at all. For Plato order is always the work of νοῦς acting with conscious purpose.

Accordingly in the Timaeus νοῦς is a Workman struggling with materials external to himself. Of course, we can think of our body as so much material for the exercise of τέχνη, but then we are treating it as an external object like any other, oblivious of the unique relation in which we stand to our own body. If Plato wished us to conceive of God's relation to the world after the fashion of our body-soul relation, why did he not say so plainly without introducing the misleading image of the workman? 37 The truth is that the teleological argument for the existence of God does not require immanence, and the designing intelligence does not need to have a body. I think that the Timaeus is best understood in terms of this argument, and that νοῦς is a transcendent intelligence.

The material view of evil accompanies the Divine Workman. When ψυχή comes to the fore as ἄρχη κινήσεως, the ‘cause of all things’ (Laws 896d), the spiritual view replaces the material. Is the spiritual view more positive? (The material view is privative of course; evil is a lack of order.) Laws X does not bear this out. The not very well defined ἀφάτεια and ἀρρότεια, in which moral evil consists according to Laws 863d (cf. 734b), suggest some evolution in Plato's ethics, but not so complete a break with the past. The material view says that disorder originates in matter, the spiritual, in mind. Thus far Plato's view of evil varies as νοῦς διημορφώς or ψυχή ἄρχη κινήσεως predominates.

Those who disdain the Divine Workman as mere embroidery take the ψυχή ἄρχη κινήσεως principle very seriously, as indeed it deserves. (It is the parent of Aristotle's Unmoved Mover which inspired the First-Cause argument, which was refined by Leibniz into the cosmological argument.) According to Mr. Vlastos it has little or no significance apart from the Design argument of the Timaeus. The proposition that the soul is πρῶτον γενέσεως καὶ φθοράς αἰτίαν (Laws 891e) merely denotes the supremacy of the soul's teleological action within the created universe. 38 But the two arguments, starting from different premises, are logically distinct, and we cannot be sure that ψυχή ἄρχη κινήσεως is indistinguishable from νοῦς διημορφώς. 39 I think that Mr. Vlastos is mutilating the Laws to force conformity with the Timaeus. Laws X has something important of its own to say.

On the other hand, those who pin all their faith to the First-Cause argument sometimes

---

36 411 b 7.
37 Philebus 30 a–c does suggest that the σωματικά and ἐφαρμοσμένα we apply to our own bodies will illustrate the activity of the cosmic νοῦς, but the argument is most obscure. 38 cf. cit., 81. Mr. Vlastos asks, ‘How much could Plato mean when he says that the soul is the cause of all becoming and perishing? At its face-value this asserts that the soul is itself the cause of the instability of becoming; that apart from soul reality would be untroubled by transience. But this is grotesquely unPlatonic. When Plato does ask himself, “Is soul more akin to being or becoming?” he can only answer, “It is in every way more like being.” (Phaedo 79e).’ Vlastos has surely forgotten Sophist 265d f. where change and life and soul are given a place in that which is perfectly real.
39 The Design argument is formally impeccable, if it does not insist on omniscience and omnipotence. The First-Cause argument is based on the false assumption that every series must have a first term.
suggest that Laws X will explain what is puzzling in the World-Soul of the Timaeus. Do they recognise what a vague account of ψυχή we are given?

In Laws 896e we are confronted with a surprising catalogue of actions and passions. For the First-Cause argument to have force, ψυχή must surely be an ἄρχη in the full sense. Plato is surely not saying that all these are absolute beginnings, having no cause. Unless by Existentialists such a claim is not made, except for acts of will. To be an ἄρχη, ψυχή must be first and foremost a will. We cannot pretend that this is what Plato is saying; it is what he ought to be saying. For fundamentally the argument of Laws X is 'the metaphysical argument from our own inalienable experience of ourselves as causes and voluntary agents to the conception of God as will and source of power.' If so 896e is rather misleading.

Again is the cosmic ἄρχη a single soul? In 896e 8 (as in d 19) ψυχή is undifferentiated 'soul' rather than 'a soul' or 'souls' — 'mind,' as one might speak of 'mind and matter.' But in 894 the Athenian has raised the question of number. Μία ἡ πλείοςσι πλείοςσι ἐγὼ ὑπὲρ σφόν ἀποηνυμόμην. δυοὺς μὲν γε ποι ἔλασσον μηδὲν τιθάων, τῆς τε οὐράνεως καὶ τῆς τάπαντος δυνατοῦ ἐξεργάζεσθαι (i.e., we are to assume for the purposes of argument not less than two.) But we see the motion of the ὀμήρους is like 'the motion of reason.' ἀλλὰ ἐκ γε τῶν ψυχῆς ἐνεργοῦν ὄντας ὀστοι ὀστῶν ἠγείρον ὄργανον ἕνωσυν ἐξουσίαν ψυχήν μιὸν ἢ πλείον ἐπηρεάζει οὐτὰ (896c). So we hear no more of a Bad Soul. It seems that Plato has raised the Devil only to lay him again. He was not needed to explain the motion of the world as a whole. But what of disorder within the world? We must grapple somehow with the problem of evil. If Laws 896d is a serious statement and evil has a spiritual cause, it is caused either by a Bad Soul, or by discordant elements in the Good Soul. That Plato should invoke a hypothetical Devil to explain hypothetical disorder in the motion of the world, affords a slight presumption that in this frame of mind he would choose to attribute the evil within the world to a Bad Soul. That is all we can say in defence of the Devil. But no text in Laws X gives positive support to the alternative.

On the other hand, a Devil would prove an embarrassment if the Good Soul is thought of as animating the world. Laws X is not clear on the question of immanence. 896d—ψυχή δὴ διοικοῦσα καὶ ἐνοικούσα ἐν ἀπασον τοῖς πάντως κυνομένως—might seem decisive, and in 895c it looks as if Plato is taking the world to be an animal self-moved by its soul, but immanence is not required by the ψυχή ἄρχη κυνήσεως principle, and raises an obvious problem. (If all changes in the world are caused by conscious states of activities of its soul, the world is very unlike any other known animal.) In fact, it is after ψυχή is proved to be the ἄρχη that Plato asks whether the sun, for example, is driven round by a soul animating it as our soul animates its body, or whether soul pushes it from outside or moves it in some other way, without committing himself to an answer. The question is left open. Presumably the same reasoning applies to the world as a whole. If so, the cosmic ἄρχη may be ψυχή σώματος like Aristotle's Unmoved Mover. But if the star-souls animate the star-bodies in the ordinary way, probably the Good Soul is immanent in the world. Then how will it tolerate a rival? A Pantheistic system may find room for star-souls—it must accommodate humanity somehow—but two cosmic ἄρχη of comparable rank is another matter. I do not think that we can assume that Plato is saying that the world is animated either simultaneously or successively by a Good and a Bad Soul. It is easy to see why Professor Cornford dropped the Devil and chose the other

39 Assuming that the existence of a Devil is definitely denied in Ph. 270a, and that the words διὸ καὶ δόκησα δημοσίως λατρεύειν εἰκότως διακαίρωσα indicate a Good and a Bad Soul, this denial is irrelevant to our interpretation of the Laws, as the general attitude to evil is different in the two works. The Politicus takes the material view, the Laws the spiritual. (The R. P. Feuerriegel traces above all in the Politicus 'one certain influence du dualisme iranien,' with definite limits. Rev. de philologie, XXI 43-4.)

40 Or by human souls. Perhaps this possibility should be considered.

41 Professor Dodds will not take the Devil seriously on the ground that 'the inferior soul has no more than a potentiality of evil, which it realises, as we are told further on (897b), only when "it associates with mindlessness"' (JHS LXV, 21 Plato and the Irrational). But in 897b ψυχή is not yet differentiated into souls good and bad. (See note 43.) We might as well say that the Good Soul is only potentially good.

42 See Laws 896d-899b. The question of number also is left unsettled in the summing-up. ἐπεὶ ψυχή μὴ ψυχὴ πάσης τούτων εἰρήνης, ἀλλὰ δὲ πᾶσας ἀρετὰς (898b5). It was not the number so much as the quality of souls that interested Plato.
form of the spiritual view of evil, which, however, is not stated in the Laws. There is no hint that the Good Soul contains any alloy. 43

Thus the clear outlines of the φυσή portrayed in Laws X on closer scrutiny dissolve in vagueness, and we feel less and less confident that it will help us to explain the Timaeus. Yet we want to see Plato's thought as one, if we can, and it is not easy to refrain from assimilating the Good Soul to the World-Soul, which, we have seen, Plato connects sometimes with κύρισις. 44

Then we are faced once more with the problem, How is the Principle of Motion related to the Principle of Order? 45

Evil provides a touchstone for any scheme we construct.

Cornford's synthesis, in which νος δημιουργὸς becomes reason within the World-Soul, has a clarity and consistency it seems senseless to mar, but it does make what is divine not wicked but weak, and largely responsible for the evil of the world. Plato would have been shocked. θεὸς οὐδεμείη οὐδεμῶς ἀδῖκος, ἀλλὰ ὡς οἶνος τὸ δικαιότατον. 46

Cornford did prepare a line of retreat. Perhaps τὸ θείον, τὸ θείαττον rather, is not a mind at all. If the Demiurge represents an element in the World-Soul, 'the desire for goodness will then reside in the World-Soul: the universe will aspire towards the perfection of its model in the realm of Forms, and the model will hold a position analogous to that of Aristotle's Unmoved Mover, who causes motion as the object of desire.' 47 Αὐτὸ τὸ τῷον is the Eire Suprême. But what corresponds to the Unmoved Mover in Plato's scheme of things is φυσή itself, τὴν δυσμαθήνα αὐτὴν αὐτὴν καὶ καλήν κύρισιν. 48 Cornford does not insist, but his suggestion reminds us of more radical interpretations which merge the Demiurge in a Form. Sooner or later we must ask ourselves, 'Is the Demiurge nothing but a symbol for the formal cause of order, the Good or the One?' There is no inconsistency in this supposition—only, if we adopt it, we must be ready to admit that the Timaeus does not explain how this world has come to be—not even in the limited sense in which the Design argument can explain the world. The Forms 'stand immutable in solemn aloofness.' Nothing will bridge the gulf between that world and this—unless we can be persuaded that the Forms are meant to be efficient causes. 49

There is no evidence to justify our foisting this paralogism on Plato. Of course, the Phaedo claimed too much for the Forms, 50 but the later dialogues demand a mind to account for the world. Sophist 248e, giving change, life, soul, understanding a place in 'Reality,' marks a step in self-criticism as decisive in its way as the beginning of the Parmenides. The Philebus, Timaeus, Laws, all make some mind an ἀρχή which is apparently ultimate. Yet the Good or the One is still for Plato the ens realissimum; all minds may somehow depend on it, 51 but Plato does not explain how this can be, and in the absence of an explanation from him, it seems we must accept mind as an ἀρχή, and count it divine. 52

43 In 897a 'soul' includes plenty of evil passions, but at once in b7, a division is made into souls of opposite quality. Πλευρὸς σώς ἐν φύσει γένος . . . . . . . . τὸ φύσιν καὶ φατῆς πλάζει, ἢ τὸ χολίτα κατιμητοῦν; 44 See p. 66, supra.

45 The Laws is not altogether silent about νος τῶν δωσισαντικῶν (56e f.). It looks like an element in the Good Soul (896c). In 897b (νος μὲν προσλαβέται . . . . . . . .) the meaning of νος is fixed as 'reasonableness' by contrast with δοσιασμός, and φυσή is not necessarily importing an ally from outside.

46 Timaeus 176b (Rep. 379c was more explicit).

47 Plato's Cosmology, 39.

48 Laws 96a.

49 M. Robin says that Forms are minds. 'Quel est en effet dans le théâtre de Platon le rôle du Démérateur? C'est de conférer la réalité à un vivant qui soit l'image d'un autre vivant. Il isole donc mythiquement le pouvoir causatif des Idées, l'efficacité génératrice qui appartient aux réalités du monde intelligible à la fois formelles et vivantes' (Platon, 245b). On the next page, 'le Démérateur symbolisait donc l'Intellect contemplant l'Intelligible et en organisant une copie . . . .' (246a). For a clue we turn to M. Robin's interpretation of Sophist 248e. 'Comment l'Ille 'qui est totalement être, ' qui est à la fois être et le tout, pourrait-il ne pas posséder l'intellige? . . . En les rapprochant de ce morceau du Sophiste, on est incliné à considérer en effet le monde idéal comme un intellect dans laquelle chaque pensée est un être ou chaque être une pensée et qui possède vie et activité.' (p. 154). 'Enfin, si l'Ille "totalement" ou "absolument existant," dont il est question dans le Sophiste (248e sqq.) est la même chose que le Bien et si le Bien est la même chose que Dieu, ou réciproquement, on ne s'étonnera plus alors que Platon ait justement attribué à cette pléitude de l'Ile la vie, l'amé et l'intelligence, c'est à dire la plus haute personnalité.' (251).

50 See Cornford, Plato and Parmenides, 79 n. 1. Aristotle's criticism is a fair inference from the Phaedo, but I think that Plato saw he had claimed too much and withdrew. (Cf. Robin, La Théorie Platonicienne des Idées et des Nombres, 98–99, 110–11, 106–14.)

51 Brochard maintained that νος δημιουργὸς, Plato's God, is a 'mélange d'Idées,' subordinate to a superior principle. (Etudes de Philosophie Ancienne, 95–8.)

52 Ditsum sums up the ambiguous position. 'Ainsi, pour la pensée platonicienne, on peut et l'on doit dire que l'Intellect est Dieu, mais que l'Ille est plus divin que l'Intellect, parce que l'Ille ou le divin est la source à laquelle Dieu lui-même participe. La pensée philosophique est restée,
But in the divine there is no shadow of unrighteousness, only the perfection of righteousness.' "Si Dieu se définit comme la cause de l'ordre, il ne peut donc à aucun titre être cause de désordre." 53 The Rev. Père Festugière, who agrees in the main with Cornford—he thinks that νοῦς is not distinct from the World-Soul, the ἄρχη κινήσεως, 'le vrai Dieu du Timée' 54—takes a different view of evil. He blames matter. Does he mean χώρα, or the Divine Workman's materials in general?

(A) If matter is χώρα simply, Plato's ὄλη, 55 what of disorderly κίνησις? Can we make χώρα entirely responsible by arguing that the κίνησις in the external world with which we are concerned here, is always an event in space, and that the surd-element that Plato sees in every particular is introduced by χώρα? Then the World-Soul is the cause of κίνησις, 56 but not of its στροφή. (On the other hand, κίνησις qua 'mental motion' can be στροφή too. And in his version of the material view Plato himself distributes the blame more widely.)

(B) Alternatively 'matter' means all the materials of creation, and κίνησις is itself an ἀπεριον. The distinction between A and B seems tenuous, perhaps artificial, yet the theological consequences are not trivial. If the World-Soul causes κίνησις, and κίνησις is an ἀπεριον, and evil consists in the absence of order, then the World-Soul shares in the responsibility for evil. Perhaps 'responsibility' is too moral a word; we might refuse to say more than that the World-Soul initiates κίνησις in the world, treating it as a cosmic force rather than a personality. Still it is the cause, the στροφή. If he chooses this line of thought, I do not think that the Rev. Père Festugière succeeds in vindicating Plato's God—if the World-Soul is God.

But what if the World-Soul is only a lesser spirit? The Timaeus gives the impression that νοῦς is a transcendent intelligence which makes the World-Soul, and whatever 'making' means, it suggests some kind of subordination. 57 As the principle of Order, withdrawn from the world in this way, God may be freed from all responsibility for evil. Then if we are bent on synthesis we may assume that the World-Soul is the cause of κίνησις, and still trace evil to the recalcitrance of the Workman's materials. For God, κίνησις is so much material. The World-Soul is partly responsible, but God is absolved. θεὸς ἀναστίς.

Thus the spiritual and material views are reconciled, or rather something is conceded to each, but the compromise leaves us uneasy. Our construction is very obviously a pastiche. The fact that the World-Soul is made by νοῦς is disquieting. As we said, the making indicates at least some kind of dependence—what, is not easy to say. [Professor Hackforth quotes Proclus—εἰ δὲ τὸ πᾶν ἐννοούν γενέσθαι, δεῖ καὶ ψυχῆς ὑποδοχή γὰρ ἐστιν αὐτή τοῦ νοῦ, καὶ δι' αὐτῆς ὁ νοῦς ἑμαυισάται τοῖς ἄγονοις τοῦ παντὸς . . . . 58 But Proclus does not help us greatly.) The notion of a spiritual hierarchy is not obviously unPlatonic. In Plato and Aristotle the tendency towards monotheism is visible but by no means triumphant. (I have assumed that Plato uses ὁ θεὸς to indicate the highest among divine minds, and I think it likely that this God is dependent on the Good or the One.) It is strange, however, that the cosmic ἄρχη κινήσεως should be placed in a position of inferiority to any mind whatsoever. If we explain this by Plato's prejudice in favour of the changeless, another difficulty threatens. Νοῦς is not merely a 'mental motion'; it brings order to an endless world. Even if its priority is not temporal, νοῦς might challenge the claim of the World-Soul to be First Cause.

Our scheme may include more of what Plato actually says, but it cannot give so simple

depuis Xénophane, profondément hostile à tout anthropomorphisme. Elle ne peut créer l'intelligence et le monde sans faire appel à quelque chose de vivant qui tend, quoi qu'elle fasse, vers la personnalités humaine et vers des modes humains de penser et d'agir. Mais elle se protège contre ce danger en accentuant toujours davantage l'immuable et immeasurable impersonnalité de l'Etre, et, pour elle, des vocables masculins comme ὁ νοῦς, ὁ θεός, ne sont que secondaires et dérivés par rapport aux vocables neutres, ὁ θεός, ὁ ἄνθρωπος. (As a man of Plato, 564.)

53 Festugière, Rev. de philologie XXI, 41.
54 op. cit., 20.
55 See note 5.
56 Festugière calls χώρα 'une possibilité de mutation' (p. 34), but the World-Soul is the ἄρχη (p. 39).
57 Professor Hackforth takes this to mean that the soul is a γίγαντα, not a thing created in time, but one whose being depends on something more ultimate. (CQ XXX, 5) This doctrine will not suit with Laws X. There ἄρχη κινήσεως is itself the cause of becoming and perishing of all things. It is not made dependent on νοῦς. Hackforth tries to explain away Plato's silence on this point by arguing that, in the Laws, 'his object is to lay down the necessary minimum of philosophical doctrine required for a sound basis of religion and morality.' 58 Proclus, In Tim. I p. 40 (Diehl). See Hackforth, op. cit., 8, n. 1.
an account of the relation between νοῦς δημιουργός and ψυχή ἀρχὴ κινήσεως as Cornford's. But if we are determined to bring them together, we might do better to adopt his general view, stilling our doubts about the immanence of νοῦς, and replace his view of evil, which proved a stumbling-block, by the suggestion that evil is caused by matter in the sense of χώρος.

But perhaps the two are both apart. The obscurities that surround each are not dispelled by attempts to unite them. We cannot help wishing to make a system of Plato's thought, but we must regard any proposed combination with suspicion and ask if it is wise to impose a unity whose form is not clearly indicated by Plato himself. Except in the most superficial way he has not brought the two together; in fact, he drew them apart. In the beginning πάντα χρήματα ἤν οἴκος, for Anaxagoras had announced in his cryptic way that νοῦς gave order to the world and set it in motion. Plato seized on these suggestions and followed each separately where it led him. He had learned the lesson that Socrates taught—that we must follow wherever the λόγος leads, pursuing each line of reasoning to its own conclusion, and prepared to discard anything that seemed satisfactory before if it will not agree with the new idea. For the most part Plato thinks in this truly philosophic spirit.

The Timaeus myth brings the Divine Workman and the Divine Animal together, but the combination is fanciful, not reasoned. Our first impulse was sound, to take the Timaeus as a picturesque presentment of teleological metaphysics, complete enough within its limits, and assume that while the World-Soul has its place in the story, philosophically speaking its relation to the Divine Workman will not bear scrutiny.

If Plato ever reached the stage of synthesis and made a system out of his ideas περὶ τὰ θεῖα, he did not record it for us. We get no help from outside; Aristotle never mentions Plato's God. After all we possess only enigmatic fragments of his thought. It is only fair to remember this when we are tempted to agree with Bayle. "Vous croirez peut-être qu'un Platonicien qui donne à Dieu une nature incorporelle aurait mis à bout facilement les sectateurs de Straton; mais ne vous fiez trop à cela, car en 1. lieu la doctrine Platonique touchant la divinité n'est pas uniforme dans les œuvres de Platon: on y trouve tant de choses qui se combattent les unes les autres, qu'on ne sait à quoi s'en tenir. 2. Ce n'est qu'un tissu de suppositions arbitraires qu'il debite magistrallement sans les prouver. 3. Il est si obscur qu'il rebute tous les esprits qui ne cherchent que la lumiere". Bayle is severe, but not altogether unjust. There is no entity that we can call 'Plato's theology.'

M. MELDRUM.

59. The Timaeus is against the hypothesis that νοῦς and ψυχή form one transcendent mind. But ψυχή need not be immanent, as Plato admits in Laws 89B f., so the single transcendent mind is a possible development of Plato's thought.

60. Continuation des Pensées diverses. (CVI p. 508).
The Battle of Tanagra.—The account given by Thucydides (I. 107. 2–108. 2) of the Spartan expedition to Central Greece that culminated in the battle of Tanagra is not entirely satisfactory. The main problem that arises out of it may be put in the form of a question: why did the Spartans need such a large force, namely 1,500 hoplites 

\[\text{τευτων}\] \[\text{ωπτων}\] \[\text{ωπτων}\], for the purpose of coercing the Phocians? Is it not, I think, an unreasonable criticism to say that the aim and strength of the expedition, as given by Thucydides, seem quite out of proportion, and most modern historians have found it difficult to accept his account in full. The problem has usually been solved by assuming that the Spartans had an ulterior motive, namely the re-establishment of a strong Thebans as a check to Athens. But a careful reading of Thucydides should make it quite clear that he at any rate knew nothing of any ulterior motive. For at the beginning of his account he gives the Spartans’ desire to protect the people of Doris as the sole motive for the expedition. And it is certain that the Spartans were not moved merely by a desire to impose their will on the Phocians. The Spartans started out on the homeward journey ("ιδρυσαρεί διομήν μεγάλην") and that finding that they were cut off by the arrival of an Athenian squadron in the gulf of Corinth, while the land route was already blocked because of the Athenians’ control of the Megarid, they decided to remain in Boeotia and consider what was the safest way for them to get home. The Athenians thereupon marched into Boeotian territory to oppose them, and the result was the battle of Tanagra. This account, I think, makes it sufficiently plain that in Thucydides’ opinion the battle of Tanagra was entirely the result of an Athenian attempt to trap the Spartan expeditionary force, and that if left to themselves the Spartans would have gone straight home after dealing with the Phocians. Thus the usual answer to the problem involves a serious departure from Thucydides’ account of the affair. But in addition this theory of an ulterior move directed by Sparta against Athens does not fit in at all well with what is known of Spartan policy during this period. For it is remarkable that throughout the fifteen years of the First Peloponnesian War Spartan activity against Athens was almost nil, in spite of many attacks on members of her confederacy, the complete subjugation of at least one of them, Aegina, and several raids on her own territory; apart from the Tanagra campaign, the only positive action taken by the Spartans themselves was the rather half-hearted invasion of Attica led by Pleistoxen in 446. It is beyond the scope of this note to consider the reasons for this inactivity on the part of Sparta, but the fact that they were so little active at this time gives very good grounds for believing Thucydides’ account of the original cause of the campaign under consideration.

Consequently the usual solution of the problem does not seem at all satisfactory. There is, however, another possible solution. It has generally been assumed that the whole of the force of 10,000 allies mentioned by Thucydides came from the Peloponnesus, since Diodorus in his account of the campaign (XI. 70), which follows the version of Thucydides very closely, gives the same figures for the strength of the army of the original expedition but substitutes "\n
\[\text{τῶν ἀλλον Πελοποννησίων}\] \[\text{συμβολῶν}\]" for the Thucydidean phrase '"\n
\[\text{καὶ συμβολὴν}\] \[\text{τῆς συμβολῆς}\]'. But this assumption raises two difficult questions, one of which must be answered adequately if this assumption is to be considered valid:

(a) If the 11,500 troops mentioned by Thucydides all came from the Peloponnesian, and if that figure represents the total force that fought on the Spartan side at Tanagra, why did the Boeotians take part in the battle (which was fought on their territory, and against their invertebrate enemy, Athens), and how was it that the Athenians, after heavy losses in the battle, could inflict such a decisive defeat on a Boeotian army presumably fresh and at full strength only nine weeks later at Oenophyta?

(b) If on the other hand the Boeotians did take part in the battle (and there is some evidence that they did), how did the Athenians with a very mixed army of 14,000 contrive to fight what was very nearly a drawn battle against 11,500 Peloponnesians reinforced by anything up to 7,000 Boeotians, and that too in spite of the defection of the Thessalian cavalry in the middle of the battle?

If no adequate answer can be given to either of these questions, and I do not think it is possible to give one, the basic assumption must be invalid.

The answer to the problem, I would like to suggest, may be found if it is assumed that the 10,000 Spartan allies at Tanagra really included a considerable force of Boeotians, an assumption that immediately removes all the difficulties that have just been discussed. As it happens there is some slight evidence for the presence of Boeotian troops at Tanagra in Pausanias (I. 29. 9) and the Plutonic ‘First Alcibiades’ (112c). This is admittedly not evidence on which too much reliance should be placed. Pausanias’ statements can be used only with the greatest circumspection, and, although the ‘First Alcibiades’ is most probably a product of Plato’s school and written during the fourth century, it is only fair to assume that his pupils were as liable to error as Plato himself, whose references to the history of the fifth century are by no means entirely reliable. Nevertheless a late authority is not necessarily incorrect; and since in the present case the evidence of Pausanias and ‘Plato’ fits in so well with the probabilities of the situation, it would be very rash to reject it without careful consideration. The only evidence to the contrary, if we assume that Thucydides’ phrase can be interpreted either way, is the statement of Diodorus that has already been quoted. But this can very easily be explained as nothing more than an inference derived from a too casual reading of Thucydides’ account, and in any case it is difficult to claim that the unsupported testimony of Diodorus is really more reliable than that of Pausanias and ‘Plato’.

But the assumption that the phrase ‘\n
\[\text{τῶν συμβολῶν}\]’ in Thucydides’ account can be interpreted either way has been challenged on the ground that he regularly uses the words ‘\n
\[\text{καὶ συμβολὴν καὶ συμβολὴς}\]’ in the sense of the general levies of the Peloponnesian League. It is of course quite true that Thucydides often uses the phrase with this particular significance. But examples can be found of the same words being used without any special significance (e.g., II. 66. 1), and in any case it is worth noting that in the passage under discussion he carefully avoids using the normal formula. Consequently it is not easy to see why the word ‘συμβολή’ in this passage should necessarily be interpreted as meaning ‘Peloponnesian allies’. Furthermore, in case it should be objected that

\[\text{καὶ συμβολὴν καὶ συμβολὴς}\]
the Boeotians cannot fairly be called ‘allies’ of Sparta at this date, it should be remembered that, according to Diodorus (XI. 81. 2–3), in the course of the Tanagra campaign the Spartans restored Thebes to its old position of supremacy in Boeotia. If this is correct, and there is no reason to doubt it, this restoration to power may well have involved membership of the Spartan confederation and therefore the duty of supplying troops. The conclusion therefore is surely that there is no real objection to acceptance of the evidence of Pausanias and Plato. On the basis of this evidence it may be suggested that the course of the campaign was more or less as follows:  

(a) The first stage was that a small force of 1,500 Spartans and perhaps four or five thousand other Peloponnesians crossed the Gulf of Corinth and dealt successfully with the Phocians.  

(b) Finding their retreat cut off both by land and sea the Spartans moved into Boeotia, re-established the power of Thebes, as stated by Diodorus, and were reinforced by a contingent of Boeotian troops, making their numbers up to the forces recorded by Thucydides.  

(c) After the battle the Peloponnesian contingent went off home, leaving a rather battered Boeotian army to be soundly defeated by the Athenians soon after at Oenophyta.  

In support of this interpretation I would point out that in the first place it agrees rather better with the general trend of Spartan policy at this period, and secondly that it makes much more comprehensible not only the reluctance of the Spartans to force a way home via the Isthmus but also the rather daring attempt of the Athenians to isolate the expedition in Central Greece. It is of course quite true that this interpretation also does involve a departure from Thucydides’ account, as it assumes that he has referred to the beginning of the campaign figures for the Spartan force that were true at the time of the actual battle. Nevertheless it seems to me that this is a considerably smaller departure than the one involved by the usual theory, which attributes to the Spartans underlying motives of which there is not the slightest hint in Thucydides’ text. If his account cannot be accepted as it stands, it seems to me that the account here given is the most natural and satisfactory one. In conclusion, it must be pointed out that, if this interpretation of the Tanagra campaign is correct, it removes all the force of the main historical argument for Krüger’s proposed emendation of the text of Thucydides I. 103, to make the fall of Ithome happen ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ οὐκέτας instead of ἐν τῇ καθήμερη, as given by all the MSS. The, however, is a problem which requires more discussion than is possible in this moment, and I hope to be able to consider it in detail on some future occasion.  

D. W. REECE  

Dept. of Classics, King’s College, Aberdeen.

Pericles Monarchs.—In a lecture on the Working of the Athenian Democracy delivered to the Hellenic Society at Burlington House on 3 May, 1949, Professor A. W. Gommé attacked the view that the ἐνώπιος or pricipate ‘describes with sufficient accuracy, not only Pericles’ actual position, but Herodotus’ and Thucydides’ conceptions of it.’ The presence of ἐνώπιος Gommé attached the meaning of absolute rule, typified in fifth-century thought, and to Herodotus, by the Persian kingship: by ‘principate’ he meant the direct, single rule of an Augustus. To both he drew the parallel of modern dictatorship in a totalitarian state. Since he cited me as subscribing to this view in its most extreme form, in so far as I approved of E. M. Waker’s remarks on the strength in the Persepolis Tavant History and took Darius’ arguments in favour of a monarchy for Persia in Herodotus iii 80–2 as ‘Herodotus’ own justification for Pericles’ unique position at Athens,’ I feel that I should make some reply; and am grateful to the editor of the Journal for this opportunity of doing so. I am also grateful to Professor Gommé for letting me consult his MS. so that I have been able to take up the point with him on a surer foundation than that of memory, and have had the privilege of a second acquaintance with a brilliant lecture.  

What I said, in fact, was this: ‘The growth in importance of the board of generals and in particular the virtual domination of Athenian public life by Pericles during the twenty years which preceded the Archidamian war had led to a new theory of the principle of government. The Cleisthenic theory had been that the city’s will would be done if an indiscriminate selection of the equal people ruled in turn. On the new theory, the people, still holding the supreme power in its hands, is advised and led by the men who are most suited for leadership by talent and position. The theory is certainly undemocratic in the Cleisthenic sense but it would be rash to say that the people was any less powerful under it. It was as before: it was rather that the means of exercise of popular power had changed, either to meet new conditions or because the Cleisthenic theory had proved unsatisfactory in practice.’ I hold that the new theory was essentially true, even if one phrase, at least, is obscure and misleading. By saying that the new theory was ‘undemocratic in the Cleisthenic sense’ I meant that it was democratic but not in the Cleisthenic sense: I did not mean that it was really undemocratic and regarded Pericles as a tyrant or as an aristocratic or oligarchic ruler. In fact, we know well, Pericles was none of these. The new theory arose to explain an actual situation, the ascendency of Pericles in a democratic state. He was not an aristocratic ruler, like some of Pindar’s patrons. The Cleisthenic constitution, with its election of the archons by vote and its powerful Areopagus, was more aristocratic than the Periclean. Indeed, to the next generation the Cleisthenic constitution seemed an aristocracy. Neither was Pericles a tyrant like Peisistratus. To assert that Pericles’ position could be accurately described as a ἐνώπιος or pricipate would be rather more misleading than to say that Churchill’s or Roosevelt’s position during the last war could accurately have been described as a dictatorship. But, at the same time, if we can gauge the spirit of the Cleisthenic democracy from the device of ostracism which, according to Ephorus, Theopompos and Aristote, was originally designed to check ἐνώπιοι, the ascendancy of Pericles must be regarded as clean contrary to that spirit. Such a development was a modification in the practice of democracy produced by the special circumstances of the time. Churchill’s war presidency and Roosevelt’s war presidency are close analogues.

Gommé’s second point was that Herodotus and Thucydides could not have thought of Pericles’ position in terms of a ἐνώπιος or pricipate. I had proceeded to assert that the debate in the third book of Herodotus is plainly designed to lay the Athenian public by the ears; it dramatizes the constitutional struggle which was being fought out at Athens in the first decade of the second half of the fifth century between the supporters of the Cleisthenic democracy, the oligarchical party under the leadership of Thucydides the son of Melesias, and the supporters of Pericles. The ground for this assertion was the remarkable similarity in terminology between the descriptions of

1 For a similar case of a Spartan commander leaving his allies in the lurch cf. the action of Menedes after the battle of Olpe (Thuc. III. 105–6).

2 Gommé’s words.

3 ATh. 1, 3.

4 See Plut. Cim. 15: τὴν ἐπὶ Κλαδανόν ἐγιγμα ἀριστοκρείαν Also Busolt Gr. Gesch. II. 340 n. 1.

5 See also Sandys on Arist. Const. of Ath. 22, 1. The principle of rotation in office had the same intention.
democracy and oligarchy in Herodotus and current political phraseology at Athens; and the striking way in which the μοναρχία is described; nothing could be better than the one best man, who, being best also in intellectual and ability, would be a blameless guardian of the people's interest, and whose head would be the safest repository of the plans for the defeat of the city's enemies. Democracy (of the kind described) leads not to rivalry in the practice of virtue but to conspiracy in the practice of wickedness; τόπως δέ τιονάτος γίνεται ἵνα ὃ ἀν προστάτη τοῦ δήμου τοῖς τοιούτους παῖς εἰς δὲ αὐτῶν ὑπακούεται αὕτη δε ἔπει τοῦ δήμου, ὑπακούειν ὃ ἄν ἐφέρετο μοναρχία ἔνω. In the interpretation of this passage lies the point at issue between Gomme and myself. He regards the language attributed to Darius by Herodotus as 'proper to the rise of tyranny in Greece.' On the other hand it seems likely to me that Herodotus, in telling this story, made use of arguments that he had heard used in Athens for and against the ascendency of Pericles, and that although he knew well enough that Pericles' leadership was in fact quite different from an eastern despotism the word μοναρχία gave the cue for his topical digression. Gomme argued that the ideas connected with the words μοναρχία and μοναρχία were so utterly different from those on which Pericles' ascendency was based that he could never have used the terms if he had been thinking of Pericles. But μοναρχία is the most colourless of all the words for 'ruler.' Admittedly, in most cases it is used of an absolute ruler; but if Herodotus was speaking in parables, words which were suitable enough in the apparent context of the Persian story may surely hint at an ascendency of which Thucydides could say: 'διόνυστός τις λόγος μὲ δημαρχία, ἐργος δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ πρῶτου ἄδερφος ἀρχῆς'. This hint would be all the more easily taken if Pericles' enemies had referred to him as μοναρχία. Gomme admitted that 'people talked loosely of Roosevelt, during the war, as dictator almost in the same breath in which they spoke of Hitler and Mussolini.' It is not difficult to imagine similar loose talk about Pericles. There was certainly talk of μοναρχία in 422, at the moment when Alcibiades was embarking upon his career.

In proof of his point that Herodotus could not have hinted at Pericles with the word μοναρχία Gomme quoted a number of passages witnessing the conventional contrast between Greek republic and Persian, or absolute, monarchy. Such a contrast was undoubtedly drawn. But it is equally clear from the literature of the fifth century that the age wrestled with another, and perhaps subtler, problem: how personal leadership was to be reconciled with democratic institutions. Thus there is the contrast of the good monarch with the tyrant. Curen in the Antigone and Oedipus Rex become tyrants before our eyes, after an initial appearance as beneficent rulers; and illustrate the corruption of power. In the Supplices Euripides presents a solution to the problem. There Theseus, who is described as 'a young and noble shepherd,' for the want of which many cities have perished lacking a leader, rules a democratic city. Euripides' solution lies in the Periclean type of personal ascendency, where the people have the power, but in fact do what their shepherd wants. In the debate of Theseus with the Thesolian herald this constitution is placed in the strongest possible contrast with tyranny. The play is, I think, a parable in which Theseus figures the Periclean ruler, and its message a lesson which the Athenians needed to be taught, that such a ruler was indeed different from a tyrant. The theory of the Periclean ruler may have been brought out again in 421 in connexion with the debut of Alcibiades, and was the sort of anti-democratic, intellectual, propaganda to provoke the epithets of Aristophanes' chorus in the previous year: 'ὁ μαρτυρός καὶ μοναρχής ἄρατη'. A similar use, or misuse, of terms is probable in the 'forties, when with Pericles, as with Pompey after 70 B.C., there was developing the rule of the first man. That a principe never actually took shape at Athens was due partly, as Gomme so clearly pointed out, to the resolute spirit of the Athenian democrats; but partly also to the weakness of the Athenian aristocracy, which bred for that hour no Caesar, but an Alcibiades.

J. S. MORRISON.

My expression with Professor Morrison can, I think, be best expressed as follows. (4) In Herodotos' debate there is no compromise between democracy and oligarchy (any more than between either of these and oligarchy), no comfortable Polynesian mixture of good elements. Otanes especially is quite uncompromising: ὃποι δ' οἷος μὲν ἡμῖν μοναρχίας ὑπήκοος ἦν ἵνα γαρ ὃν ἄν οὗτον ἔγραψαν . . . πλέον δὲ ἄρχον . . . τοῖσι τῶν ὁ μοναρχῶν τοῖσι οὖν, καὶ σαφῶς. The μοναρχία is autocratic or nothing. And the remarks of Megabuxos and Darcios on democracy remind one of the Old Oligarch, no friend to Perikles. (c) Although it is Greek thought and not Persian that informs the debate, it is not for nothing that it is Darcios, the best of μοναρχῶν, who defends μοιχεία; that is, at this stage Herodotos has the Persian monarchy in mind. And (3), in as much as it is Greek experience, not Persian, that is behind Darcios' description of the failures of oligarchy and democracy that lead inevitably to μοιχεία, it is Greek experience of the rise of θυγατρία—έχουσαι γεγονός ἄλληθαι: ἅπασαν, ἐξ ὦν γὰρ ἐγγενεία, ἐκ δὲ τῶν συνετῶν φύσεως, ἐκ τοῦ φύσεως ἀνήπετο ἐκ μοιχείας;' and from democracy, τοῖσι τοιοῦτοι γίνεται ἵνα ὃ ἀν προστάτη τοῦ δήμου τοῦ τοιοῦτου παῖς ἐκ δὲ αὐτῶν διαμείκτη ὁ δέ τοῦ δήμου, διαμείκτης δὲ αὐτῷ ἐφέρεται μοιχεία ἔχων. The enemies of Perikles likened him to Peisistratos and his power to a tyranny; but was Herodotos among these enemies? (Alkibiades might have read the last sentence quoted above as its justification for aiming at a tyranny). And not Peisistratos, but other Herodotean tyrants are in some measure like the oriental μοιχείας, Kleisthenes of Sikyon (compare him with Croues) and Polyraktes: does Herodotos wish to suggest that Perikles was like either of these? More particularly since he was a wise man and knew that Xerxes was as much a μοιχείας-type as Darcios?

A. W. GOMME.

11 Note 403 ff. ὥστε γὰρ ἄρχεται ἄνδρας ἔξος παράδειγμα, ἀλλ' ἠνενήθη πάλιν δήμῳ 6' αὐτάσκει διαδοχίαν ἐν μέρε ἐνεματισθήσατο . . . and again 349 ff. ὑμᾶς δὲ ὑμᾶς καὶ πάλιν τὰς τάξεις. οὖν δὲ ἐμοὶ θησαύρος ἄλλα τοῦ λόγου προφανές ἐγώ δ' ἐν δήμῳ εὐσχίας καὶ γάρ καταπτάσθη αὐτὸν ἐν μοιχείας ἐνεφυγόντα κατ' ἐναντίον πάλιν.

14 Ἀριστοφανῆς Wasps 474.


16 Note 403 ff.
NOTICES OF BOOKS


This volume of 'The Year's Work' consists of chapters on Greek Literature, by Dr. P. Maas; on Latin Literature, by Professor G. B. A. Fletcher; on the Forms, by F. W. Walbank; on Roman History, by Dr. H. H. Scullard; on Greek and Roman Religion, by Professor H. J. Rose; on Ancient Philosophy, by Professor Dorothy Tarrant; on Greek Archaeology, by Mr. T. J. Dunbabin; and on Italian Archaeology, by Professor A. W. Van Buren.

One cannot but admire at the outset both the learned world as a whole for its vigorous activity throughout so difficult a period, and the contributors to this volume for their industry in collecting the results of that activity. Beyond doubt there is much material here that scholars will be eagerly seeking.

But they will not find the search altogether easy. The book suffers from a fundamental conflict between matter and form. A bibliography of this kind is by nature a catalogue, and to attempt to present it as continuous prose is to make it obscure without making it readable. Some of the contributors have coped more successfully with this problem than others, but there are many strings of sentences like 'A. writes about so-and-so. B. writes about something else.' In such passages attempts to relieve the monotony by verbal variation are merely irritating. Moreover, when the whole is written discontinuously, nothing stands out on the page; in the chapter on Latin Literature we are not even favoured with a new paragraph for each new author. The reader's task is made harder still by the separation from the main body of the text of the references, which are given all together at the end of each chapter. The inconvenience thus caused is only partly mitigated by the presence of an index.

It is greatly increased by the lack of uniformity among the various contributors. Dr. Maas confines himself to 'first editions' and new critical editions, but Professor Fletcher covers all work dealing with Latin Literature. Some contributors mention reviews in the main body of the text; others in the notes at the end of the chapter, where the references are given. Some are more ready than others to express opinions (and expressions of opinion confined to single, unsupported epistles should surely be suppressed).

We badly need a general introductory chapter. The first paragraph of Professor Rose's chapter, on the difficulties under which scholars working during the war, would have been an admirable opening for the whole work; and such an introduction could also have dealt with P.W. and other works of reference equally relevant to all chapters. As it is, such works are mentioned by some contributors and omitted by others.

The general standard of accuracy is high, and there are few misprints. Occasionally notes are misplaced or duplicated; for example, articles on Aristotle, 'A., 'B., are not relevant to Ancient Philosophy, and one of the articles listed on p. 145 has already been more fully summarised on p. 65 in the chapter on Greek History, where it belongs.

D. MERVYN JONES.


An integrated study of Plato's religion is achieved, within the compass of this small book, at some inevitable expense to detailed exposition and to adequate recognition of change and development in his thought. Thus the divine nature is found expressed equally in the Forms, the Good, the Artificer of the Timaeus and also the star-gods, and in the deities of the city in the Laws. The unexplained causality of the Forms and the creative activity of the Artificer are brought together under the formula of 'procension,' a concept nowadays (p. 47) borrowed from Plotinus and not 'explicitly' used by Plato. The Theory of Forms itself appears to be regarded as fixed in its earlier aspect; thus (p. 59) 'every Form, even that of mud or of hair, derives its value from the Good.' The term salutar (as with Burnet's 'salutary') to express this difficulty is sufficient to reconcile with the absolute existence of the Forms, which elsewhere our author recognise and upholds. More consistency proves possible in dealing with the antimony between God and 'necessity,' both in the creative process in the Timaeus and in the element of coercion operating in the religion of the Laws. In studying Plato's theory of the human soul, the facts of free will and moral responsibility are underlined. But the belief in an endless series of lives is found (p. 112) incompatible with any investiture act or decision; and this position is rather curiously connected with Plato's exclusion of tragedy, on the ground that no truly 'dramatic' element is possible in the soul's life. Other examples of over-synthesis might be cited, and they are not altogether to be excused by the small scale of the work. For all that, the book contains much that is valuable and suggestive on its great theme, and its very audacity are παραολογητικα της διονυσιας.

D. TARRANT.


The main emphasis of Professor Field's short study of Plato is upon 'the re-statement of his thought in terms of our own experience' (p. 7). Such re-statement, or the light of modern concepts and problems, is made in a style admirably clear and simple. From this point of view the book fully justifies its place in the Home University Library series. But, even with the promise of its title and special purpose, as a first introduction to Plato (and this, in effect, it surely will be for many readers) it is open to some criticisms. Space has not allowed of the giving of much background information; it is not always clear whether such knowledge is presupposed in the reader, or whether he is expected to follow up this primer by reference to the well-selected list of books that is appended. In any case Professor Field's repeated insistence upon the limitations of the dialogues as a clue to Plato's philosophic meaning, and in general upon the obscurities of the subject, is likely to prove discouraging to any beginner. While the greater part of the exposition is, of course, summary, allusions here and there to specific passages (sometimes as 'well-known') would be much more useful if the page-references were given. The author's chief omission is, it appears, a deliberate one, but none the less distorts his picture. Such references as occur to myth and allegory are in the spirit of the statement (p. 155) that for Plato 'myth and poetry were below, not above, reasoning.' This is, one supposes, the reason why in this introductory book there is not a mention of the similes of the Sun, the Line or (strangest omission of all) the Cave, or of any other of the great parables or allegories. After a brief and fair appraisal (p. 11) of Plato's literary power, this aspect of his work is in effect passed over, and neither humour nor characterisation nor any of his rich and varied imagery is recognised as contributing to his philosophic message. In the resulting atmosphere of prose the problems of his thought are discussed in as stimulating a way as the prevailing austerity will allow. But is this really Plato?

Some matters of detail may call for question, e.g. the disregard (p. 44) of any real distinction between the phantasms of 'participation' and 'imitation' as between Form and particular. On the side of metaphysic, the treatment of the Timaeus (pp. 126 ff.) is particularly valuable; on the side of politics, the masterly brief correlation (p. 204) between Plato's ideas and modern democracy.

D. TARRANT.
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This book appears in the series Bibliothèque des Archives de Philosophie. It aims at establishing, by detailed study along parallel lines for each writer, a special affinity in thought and affection between Pindar and Plato. In the matter of political outlook, they are found to be as the German Kapital is to the city of Kaufmann (which is to be sympathec with their native cities and similar ideals of statecraft and of kingship. In ethical principles, Plato, like Pindar, is credited with essential Donian attitudes. In religion, each refers human success to divine inspiration; each records deep spiritual experience, and each counsels reverence and worship to the gods in general and to Apollo in particular. The chief point of literary affinity is found to be their common love of visual imagery. Plato’s quotations from Pindar are considered in detail, and a number of other passages are cited in which paraphrase of the poet may be more or less surely discovered. Even if these latter instances be admitted, it may be doubted whether the number of Plato’s citations, compared with the far greater number he makes from Homer and with those from other poets, can be held to prove any very special sense of indebtedness to Pindar. The author pursues his theme through a mass of instances, most of which he quotes and discusses the findings of other scholars. Of this detailed exegesis (which is made more useful for reference by the appended list of passages cited from each writer) is at least as valuable as the general conclusions which are finally drawn.

D. TARRANT.


The extraordinary thing about this book is that it should not have been written till now. For the work is rare to which one can with such obvious truthfulness apply the overworked phrase that “it satisfies a long-felt want.” Hitherto there has been no comprehensive book of reasonable compass, conforming to the standards of modern scholarship, which one could put into the hands of the inquiring student or graduate just embarking on independent work, who wishes to have a complete picture of the general framework, the methodology, and the significance of his subject. As a result, it is not unknown for the young scholar to involve himself in the details of a narrow theme or period without any real conception of its importance or how and where it fits into the whole.

For the German or German-reading scholar Dr. Bengtson has now provided a work of first-rate quality, which will not only furnish convenient and method of contacts, but also suggest lines of exploration and stimulate interest in some of the philosophical questions which an intensive concern with ancient history must sooner or later evoke. After a foreword presentation of how his subject is to be delimited in time, and geographically, and whether or not it is regarded as part of one universal history (Bengtson rightly argues with Ed. Meyer against Berve that it is), he treats in turn the sciences of chronology, geography, and anthropology in their relation to ancient history; the tradition and the sources, subdivided into primary and documentary material, the ancient historians, and saga and popular and oral records; ancient monuments and what the historian can learn from them; the basic disciplines on which the historian increasingly relies, viz., epigraphy, archaology, numismatics; Nachbarwissenschaften such as mediaeval history, classical philology, oriental history, Byzantine studies, comparative philology, and Etruscology; and finally the scholar’s tools—the great lexica, prosopographies, handbooks, journals, and learned periodical proceedings (the collections of inscriptions, papyri, etc., have already been signalised in their proper place). Each section is followed with a selective bibliography, critically set out with explanations and warnings; and at the end of the book nearly thirty pages of up-to-date book lists, arranged according to subjects, serve to direct any student along the shortest route to his place of work.

I much prefer an English version of this book. But a mere translation could not suffice, for it has been written with the German student in mind, and quotes German works in preference to foreign where a choice is reasonable and necessary. An English version would not, for instance, once reference to (and bibliography on) the Greek Die Alternative Phöniker oder Götter. . . ist in Wahrheit gar nicht vorhanden) . In particular, the familiar and salutary paragrapges which analyse the role of Rasse and the nature of a Volk—the Völker sind soziale Gruppen. . . . Völker bilden sich, und Völker vergehen, and eben dieser Vorgang ist der Gesinnung der historischen Wissenschaft . . . . [It] is a slight recasting simply on account of a difference in linguistic usage. Whereas Volk and Nation may be synonymous in German (p. 48), in using their equivalents English distinguishes clearly between the Welsh or Scottish peoples and the British nation. The distinction is not important here, and it does not in any important degree affect Bengtson’s argument. I mention it merely as an illustration of the danger of confusion, and even more of anachronism, which may arise in the very framing of our questions, unless we employ the terms used by the Greeks or Romans themselves. Fortunately one of the most fruitful fields of collaboration between the ancient historian and the classical scholar proper has been in the closer definition of ancient abstract concepts. Bengtson’s book deserves a wide public; and it is most regrettable that at a time when at long last German books are once more becoming accessible in English bookshops, an artificial rate of exchange should render them almost prohibitive in price.

F. W. WALBANK.


Immediately before and after crossing the Hellespont in 334, Alexander carried out several reasonably well-attested and symbolic acts, which are of high importance for an understanding of the spirit in which he invested his Persian Empire. Oddly, they have never been given detailed scrutiny all together, and in this attractive and suggestive little book Dr. Instinsky now seeks to rectify the omission. Many will remember the vivid prose of Georg Radet, as he followed Alexander along this pferdtramp homérique. For this In, would substitute a pferdtramp héroïdien. Alexander, he argues, was but little moved by the symbol of Achilles. His indications, the misty romanticism of a Homeric Schwermütigkeit, be a calculated programme based on deep religious feeling, in which he joined issue symbolically with the Herodotean Xeron, and sought to ensure the support of any gods to whom Xerxes was reported to have made overtures. His thesis is worth detailed examination.

The first point more or less imposes itself, and it is surprising that it has not been made more frequently and more explicitly. The sacrifice at Protesilaus’ tomb at Elaeus is to be directly linked with Alexander’s own first leap ashore at the ‘harbour of the Achaeans’ (Arr. Anab. i, 11, 5, 7). The symbolic points to the Panhellenic War, implicit in the decision at Corinth, and the style is that of Agesilas, who precluded his invasion of Asia with a sacrifice at Aulis; in other words the action is a political as well as a religious gesture. Furthermore, Dio. xvii. 17, 9, in a slightly different version, records how Alexander, first of the Macedonians4 threw his spear ashore, leaped after it and declared Asia ‘spear-won land,’ received from the gods. If this story is also true (its source, like much in Dio. xvii. is uncertain), at the outset of his campaign Alexander was making a claim to the Persian Empire (for this is the normal meaning of ‘Asia’ in such a context), and as in this letter to Darius is declaring himself Great King by right of conquest. Here of course it is a mere gesture, a manifesto and an anticipation; but as such its political significance is far reaching.

So far In is convincing; but what follows is more dubious. First, it seems highly improbable that Alexander based his claim to god-given, spear-won land on the Delphic oracle received by Philip just before his death
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(Diod. xvi. 91. 3-4; Paus. viii. 7. 6). The anti-Macedonian context of this oracle may well make it late and unreliable (cf. Treves, Rivista della R. Scuola . . . di Pisa, vii, 1957, 277-8). But even if it were genuine (as Parke assumes it to be), its effective ambiguity must have been apparent immediately Philip was struck down, and it is inconceivable that Alexander should have resuscitated it to confirm his Persian policy. If the reference to the gods needed amplification, it is better sought in the title ἀσεμαῖος, with which the Pythia had recently acclaimed him (cf. Tarn, Alexander, ii, 336 ff.). But the symbolism of the hurled spear might well be reinterpreted in the altered context, which would include the Roman fetal practice outlined in Livy i. 32. 14, where a similar act marks the opening of hostilities.

Midway across the Hellespont Alexander sacrificed to Poseidon and the Nereids (Arr. Anab. i. 11. 6). This sacrifice In. believes to have been inspired by Xerxes' sacrifice in Hdt. vii. 54; and he links it with the further sacrifices made by Alexander on the Hydaspes (Arr. Anab. vi. 3. 1; Ind. 18. 1) and on the Ocean (Arr. Anab. vi. 19. 4; cf. Ind. 20. 10), which represented the farthest bounds of the world. Taken together, he argues, these two sets of sacrifices indicate from the outset a determination to conquer the world—was man seine "Weltrichthiile" zu nehmen pflegt; and this idea, too, came from Herodotus, who records Xerxes' sacrifices at the mouth of the Hellespont (Herodotus viii. 9-10). All this goes far beyond the evidence. First of all, the sacrifices. In. stresses certain common elements which constitute a single 'form' and link them together, in contrast to other sacrifices made by Alexander in comparable circumstances, e.g. on the Dafni (Arr. Anab. i. 4. 5) or on Nearchus' safe return (Arr. Ind. 36. 3). Here, however, he neglects the important fact (cf. Tarn, op. cit., ii. 351, n. 5) that the soteria which celebrated Nearchus' reunion with Alexander link up directly, in the details of the sacrifice made, with that on the Hydaspes; and this would confirm the natural assumption that the latter was intended to ensure that safe return, rather than to mark Alexander's success in reaching the ends of the earth. Indeed, it is clear from Arr. Anab. v. 25. 2ff. that Alexander, having failed to continue his march beyond the Hyphasis, regarded his ultimate aims as unfulfilled.

The common 'form' in the sacrifices which In. groups together lies, he suggests, in the fact that (i) the sacrifice is on shipboard, not on land; (ii) it consisted of the sacrifice of a bull followed by the pouring of a libation from a golden cup. But in fact this common 'form' is attained only by means of selection and confusion. Closer examination shows the following to have happened:

(a) Hellespont (Arr. Anab. i. 11. 6): the sacrifice of a bull to Poseidon, and the pouring of a libation to the Nereids from a golden bowl, in mid-stream.

(b) Hydaspes: two incidents:

(i) (Arr. Ind. 18. 11) a sacrifice on land to the gods ὑδασπίος καὶ ἄμφρυτος καὶ ἀνάχαλος, to Poseidon, Amphitrite, the Nereids, and Ocean, and to the rivers Hydaspes, Acesines, and Indus. This was followed by contests. (The sacrifices to the 'gods' ὧν ψέεις and Hydaspes ὑδασπίος ἀνάχαλος in Arr. Ind. 3. 1 are probably a doublet of this.)

(ii) (Arr. Anab. vi. 3. 1) having gone aboard Alexander poured a libation from a golden bowl to the three rivers, to Heracles, to Ammon (on which see Tarn, op. cit. ii. 351, n. 1) and the other gods ὧν ἀσεμαῖος ἀνέδεικτο (cf. John 4. 26). This was followed by a libation to Poseidon from a golden cup, which Alexander, with golden kraters, was the first to throw into the sea. The purpose was to ask Poseidon for a safe voyage for Nearchus to the Euphrates and the Tigris.

To what extent do these three very varied ceremonies parallel Xerxes' sacrifice at the Hellespont? To be candid, very little. According to Hdt. vii. 54. 2, at day-break Xerxes poured a libation into the Hellespont, prayed to the sun-god for a safe return, and then plunged his krater, and a Persian sword into the water. (The idea of sacrificing something valuable to counter possible divine wrath is commonplace: cf., for example, the story of Polykrates' ring.) Herodotus makes no reference to any sacrifice; and the explanation that the libations have been a gift to τὸν Ἀθηναίον and a sign of Xerxes' repentance for having scoured the Hellespont, he nowhere mentions Posidon. Furthermore, the libation was clearly not carried out on the bridge (pace In. pp. 46-7), for Xerxes did not cross until the next day (Hdt. vii. 55. 2), and he will hardly have gone on to the bridge and then returned. The likelihood is that the libation was poured from the bank between the two bridges. Finally, it took place at Sestos, whereas Alexander crossed at Elea. Thus as far as the sacrifice to Poseidon goes, In. completely fails to prove that Alexander's action was influenced by anything he read in Herodotus.

The third set of incidents took place at Ilium, where, it is argued, Alexander's sacrifice to Athena Ilias (Arr. Anab. i. 11. 7) and libation τοῦ σῶμα (Plut. Alex. 15. 4) were modelled on the visit and comparable sacrifice and libation made by Xerxes and the Magi (Hdt. vii. 43. 1). At first sight, the comparison of the hero and god of Europe (xii. 8-9) is striking as to impose the theory of direct Herodotean influence on Alexander. Given the Panhellenic slogan and the Homeric symbolism already present in the sacrifice to Protesilaus and the crossing at Eleusis, it is clear that it was already familiar to Alexander. But In. notes with reason that he must have visited the venerable shrine of Athena Polias with its ancient traditions going back to the times of the Trojan War. The form of Alexander's offering parallels that of Xerxes; but In., in seizing on Herodotus as the explanation, has ignored the simpler possibility that a libation to the 'heroes' was part of the regular practice of this temple, and that any visitor—especially any notable visitor—was encouraged to carry it out, just as, for example, pilgrims to the Assuromedon at Ephesus went to the Gesi Bambino. Likewise the regular succession of wreaths placed with strikingly similar ritual upon the Genotaph in Whitehall does not depend on any literary connexion between those making the offering.

Thus In.'s attempt to prove the use of Herodotus in shaping Alexander's actions at the Hellespont must be held to fail; we have still no reason to modify Tarn's statement (op. cit. i. 82) that 'there is no sign that Alexander knew him at all'. In an attempt to study Alexander's career for itself, and without the use of 'Asia,' whereas no one ever supposed that Alexander was master of Europe. Thopomopsis, it is true, had said that Europe had never produced such a man as Philip (Polyb. viii. 12. 1), and he is probably behind Diodorus' statement (xvi. 95. 1) that he was the greatest of all the kings in Europe. But that is still a long way from being master of Europe (see also Polyb. i. 2. 4), and Alexander, even if he was aware to the political implications of Europe as a slogan (cf. Momigliano, Riv. fil. 1933, 477-87; Walbank, CQ. 1944, 141 ff.), knew the difference between programmes, policies, and actual achievements. As regards the symbolism on the Hellespont, In. rightly suspects much of it is Archilochus tradition (cf. Tarn, op. cit. ii. 52. 57); but there can, I think, be little doubt that it was current in the Trojan, rather than the Persian War, which governed Alexander's actions at Eleusis and Troy. (The sacrifice to Poseidon was, of course, the normal accompaniment of a nautical operation.)

What remains of In.'s thesis is the symbolism of Alexander's landing and the 'spear-won soil' of Asia. And this, if genuine, does suggest that from the outset Alexander's aim was to overthrow the Great King. In the first instance, wrote Bury (History of Greece (1960) 741), 'he was to conquer the Persian Kingdom, to dethrone the Great King and take his place, to do unto Persia what Persia under Xerxes had essayed to do unto Macedonia and the rest (sic).

A subject of this scope and magnitude cannot be properly treated in a bare hundred pages. Down to the opening of Philip II's reign Macedonian history permits a continuous narrative only from time to time, where it impinges on Greek. On the other hand, a series of special problems—for instance, the nationality of the Macedonians (and how much or how little it matters), the nature of their social structure, the development and reform of the army—must be discussed in detail if they are to be discussed at all; and this implies a command of archaeological as well as literary material. Early Macedon is still a quarry for Forschung rather than Geschichte. But this book slurs over the real problems; and even for Philip II it does not really penetrate the Greek tradition.

Of P.'s failure to face problems I will mention one or two examples. Naturally he discusses the origins of the Argeads. But in his conclusion he never attempts to assess the real value as a source of Thucyd. ii. 99 ff. of the version in Strabo ix. 434 G; or the passage in Kochler (in S. B. Berlin, 1893, 496) that Thucydides' account of the growth of the Macedonian kingdom was deduced from geographical data and not based on sound tradition; and Paola Zancan (Il monarca ellentico nei suoi elementi federativi, 1944, 127) drew attention to the version in Strabo ix. 434 G, which, in place of Thucydides' picture of the Argead family expelling a succession of coastal peoples, suggests that it was the surrounding mountain tribes which were assimilated to Macedonian nationality. Miss Zancan's theory of an expanding ius Macedonicum deserved discussion here; but P. completely ignores the problem, as he does the important evidence in Hdt. i. 56 and viii. 43.

A smaller crux is Thucyd. i. 61, 4, where editors read $\epsilon \tau \rho \sigma \varphi \kappa \sigma$ for $\tau \rho \sigma \varphi \kappa \tau \sigma \omega \nu$. To avoid the difficulties raised by an Athenian attack on Berea he at this juncture. Whether P. thinks Berea or Strupia was attacked, we do not know, for he writes: 'prendendo a pretesto abusi commessi dalle truppe ateniesi nell'attraversare la Macedonia, subito dopo (Perdiccas) era in campo con un corpo di cavalieri alla difesa di Berea.' This statement goes beyond mere geography. It involves the question of who broke the treaty, and so directly affects one's assessment of Perdiccas II's character and policy. Perdiccas's successor Archelaus is given only two pages. Of his conflict with Arrabacus and Sirras (Aristot. Politi, 1171 b) there is no word; but, more important, there is no discussion of his philhellenism and of the significance of his reign for the building up of the official Argead legend.

Carelessness in matters of topography may seem more venial. When the Treska is said (p. 2) to open up a way through the western mountains and empty its waters into the Adriatic, one quickly perceives that this tributary of the Yardal has suffered a temporary diversion into the Drin, because the land happens to be swampy in the hills near Dibora; and no serious harm is done by a reference, (p. 28) to Vodena 'con le belle sue cascate della Bistrizia,' despite the fact that Vodena lies, in reality, on the River Savino (Moegica). But when the domain of Philip, the brother of Perdiccas II, is placed on the Syrian coast (p. 40) instead of on the Axios (cf. Thucyd. ii. 100), the error is more serious, for it leads P. to the hypothesis that it was Philip who ceded the land for Amphipolis to Athens in return for help; whereas the likelihood is that the alliance between Philip and Athens followed the founding of Amphipolis (cf. Geyer, RE, s.v. Macedonia, col. 706). When, on p. 5 Philip II tries to awaken the Greeks to events which had happened two and a half centuries ago (i.e. under Xerxes); or on p. 91 we are told that for the purpose of liberating the Peloponnesse 'si ritenne necessaria non solo la presenza di Filippo nel Peloponneso col suo esercito, ma anche la deliberazione di un tribunale federale elienico,' it is the one concrete gain from a stimulating, but in the main unconvincing, essay.

F. W. WALBANK.
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The phenomenal fertility of the mind and pen of Professor Louis Robert and his astonishing mastery of all the relevant evidence in his special fields of study cannot fail to evoke the wonder, not unmixed with envy, of his readers. That wonder is aroused afresh by the present volume, the seventh, and by far the longest, of a series inaugurated in 1940 and written entirely by Robert himself with the exception of vol. V, which includes a posthumous article by Mario Segre, and vol. VI, in which Madame Robert collaborated. Two only (IV, Épigraphes du Bas-Empire; and VI, Inscriptions de la Gaule) were issued before his death; the remainder consist of a miscellany of epigraphical, numismatic, archaeological and topographical, covering a wide range, though the main emphasis falls on vol. VII, which the author has repeatedly visited in recent years.

The volume before us contains twenty-three chapters, varying in length between two and thirty-three pages, always interesting, if only as examples of the author's specialities, and frequently of considerable importance, but it will attain its highest usefulness only when it appears in the form of the promised index of its rich and varied contents. Six of its chapters (VII–XI, XIX) are primarily numismatic and all of these illustrate the interplay of numismatic and
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epigraphical evidence. Of the rest the longest are XXII (in which an Inscription of Dionysus relative to the temple and cult of Caligula is re-edited with an exhaustive commentary dealing mainly with the vexed question of the conventus of the Roman province of Asia), XV (which contains further addenda and corrigenda to the author's work on Cypriot inscriptions), II, (in which I publish a valuable inscription from Naxos, N.W. of Susa, containing a letter of Antiochus III and enabling us to date and to restore the celebrated document of that monarch.), E (the Ode Dervizae (Welles, Welles, Correspondence, 35, 37), and XVIII (the edition princeps of a dossier discovered by G. E. Bean at Caunus, comprising two decrees of Smyrna and two of Caunus relative to the dispatch from the latter to the former city of three judges and their secretary; in which in turn help to restore much more fully decrees of Smyrna for judges sent to her by Astypalaea and by Thasos, IG XII (3), 172, (8), 269). Other chapters of special interest are V (on Anatolian divinities), VII (a revised treatment of a decree of a Carian symposion found by the author at the temple of Sinu), XIV (a revision of the record-breaking career of a Milesian runner, restored and supplemented by a new inscription from Didyma referring to the same athlete), and XVII (examining the decree banning the introduction of goats on the islet of Heraclea, IG XII (2), 955). The book is not, it is true, flawless, but the very transparency of my criticisms is a tribute to its excellence. The forty slips in accentuation and the like which I have noted, while detrimental to the pleasure of the reader's nose, do not lessen the scientific value of the work. There are occasional errors in Greek forms, such as ἔξωνα for ἔξων (p. 32), ἄρχωσινα for ἄρχωσιν (p. 87), χρυσοῦσις for χρυσόσις (p. 124); on p. 27 σκί should be FS, and on p. 141 the reference-numbers to footnotes 6 and 7 are transposed; G. E. Bean (p. 59) appears thrice as J. G. Bean (pp. 171, 178, 189); on p. 117 Milet, I, n. 368 should read Milth, I, n. 368, and on pp. 185, 188 'IG, XI 170' should be 'IG XII 7', 172. Robert makes many valuable contributions to lexicon, but I cannot accept all his suggestions. He claims (p. 210 n. 1) that the verb ἄρχωσινα is absent from LS², occurs in REG 1906, 251, n. 1-2, 1-22 (this should read 146-146, 1-23), but in note 4 on the same page he rightly says that this inscription must be corrected in the light of another which he quotes, failing to notice that this correction substitutes ἄρχωσινα for ἄρχωσινα. Again, despite the authority of Wilhelm and Robert, I cannot bring myself to accept ἔξωνα in a Tarssian epigram as 'un terme à ajouter aux dictionnaires' (pp. 196 f.), μέγις is often used adverbially in the Homeric poems (e.g. A 158 μεγίστε), Π 46 μεγίστος, Hymn. Cr. 486 μεγίστος, Hymn. Merm. 38 μεγίστος, and in view of 180 μεγίστος, 0 37 μεγίστος, and 266 μεγίστος 1 unhappily translates μεγίστος in the epigram, especially as Homeric echoes are very frequent in Anatolian inscriptions. On p. 97 Robert, calling attention to the word ἄνωθεν in IG I² 3158, 2, remarks: 'Cette emolument ἄνωθεν n'est pas dans le Dictionnaire de Liddell-Scott-Jones.' If I understand him right, he regards it as a noun poetically shortened for ἄνωθεν and meaning 'dedication.' But this leaves the sentence without a verb and calls into being a form derived from τίθησι, of which no example exists either in the simple or in any compound form, for τιθήσι, duly registered in LS², represents not ἄν- ἄνωθεν, but ἄνωθεν. True, Buck and Pettenkofer record στιθήσι (Reverse Index, 225), but the sense is SEG IV, 352, 399, where ἄνωθεν (not ἄνωθεν) stands for ἄνωθεν. As Dr. P. Maas suggests to me, ἄνωθεν in IG I² 3158 must be ἄνωθεν, and, though LS² does not recognize the middle voice as meaning 'dedication,' it occurs in AnTh. X 744, Rec Bibl XXXIV. 579, Ann. Mus. Nat. Bulg. VI, 190, N. Vulik, Spomenik, LXXV, nos. 37, 154. On p. 231 Robert apparently accepts ταμιεύματα, where I prefer, with previous editors, to write ταμιεύσεις, and on the same page he quotes (77) τιθήσαι ἄνωθεν ἀνοίγειν τῷ ἄνωθεν ὕπνῳ δικαίων δικαίων. The book therefore is one to be read. There are many illustrations; but these, considering what opportunities the Aegean offers, are not of outstanding merit.

M. N. TOD.


Because of a certain wooliness of thought (so it seemed to me) in the writer's approach to his subject, because the book is disfigured by the wrong kind of misprints (Phaideon, Panagia Zoodokos Pige, Theocritus' Idylls, and others), and because there is in it much vague and dubious history, especially about Mediterranean and Dorian races and the universal and, it would seem, almost exclusive worship of the Mother Goddess (of whom Thetis was one manifestation—hence the picturesque title), because of all this it takes some time, and a good deal of reading, before one gets into sympathy with the author. Yet the effort should be made, for he has something to tell us.

We are not simplifying overly, if we divide those Englishmen who know Greece well into two classes: first and the more modest—almost all of them professional scholars—whose work has of itself made them, if they can observe at all, well acquainted with Greek lands and peoples; they have a real interest in the observations of these two classes of travellers: all of the first, I think, would agree that the Greeks are, by comparison with others, an extraordinarily sober people in food and drink; the conventional picture of the Greek, of any class, sitting for hours at a café talking over one glass of wine or a cup of coffee, has no truth in it. The other Englishmen, on the other hand, have an uprooted time in Greece; if you want to have a good time drinking, from one café to the next, go there as one of them. There is no doubt that such class Mr. Kinninmouth belongs, and not only from the standpoint in which he names the friends who helped him: for everywhere he went, men drank (and ate, too) all day, more than ever Homer's heroes did, and he had the greatest difficulty in coping with it all. Yet there is this difference between him and the others: he has no small circle of companions, sampling the taverns of Athens, but goes from island to island, to Syra and to Naxos, to Anaphoe and to Crete, to Paros, and to Thera, and in this one respect I should say that he found them all much alike. He always seems to have arrived for some special party. And there is the young man from Spakhia, where no gendarme dares enter, who had killed his sister, his husband and his father, for honour's sake. Fine, awash-ballad-singing fellows.

His description of these islands, their varied landscape, their agriculture, their transport, their houses, and of the people he met, is very well done. He was in Greece before the war, and after the war; and he can write about what is interesting and enduring, and touch very little of the politics—perhaps not enough, partly because politics can queer any pitch so badly, partly because what he does say about them is sensible and sensitive, and he mentions the subject only when he meets it. He was one of the band of men who made that sad attempt to liberate Samos in 1943; and his account of this, very brief, one man's experience and thoughts, is most moving. He is a sympathetic observer of men, and good writer. He is interesting in his philosophy, so to speak, of island life; only when he is musing about Pan, and the Great Mother, does he become dull. His book therefore is one to be read.

There are many illustrations; but these, considering what opportunities the Aegean offers, are not of outstanding merit.

A. W. GOMME.


The meters of the nineteenth century enforced intellectual upon the Greek metres by interpreting them in terms of a familiar music. The modern school, assuming
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dyssey. There is a common type of dance, known as the Syrōs Kalamianos, the rhythmic scheme of which is \( \ddot{a} \ddot{a} \ddot{a} \ddot{a} \ddot{a} \). G. argues that the dotted crochet represents an irrational syllable, intermediate between long and short, and that the whole metre exemplifies that type of dactyl, with a shortened thesis, to which Dionysius of Halicarnassus refers in *comp.* 16. In *Hyper.* 17 Dionysius says held good for the heroic hexameter in general. G. is inclined to trace a historical connexion between the epic metre and this Greek folk-dance. Again, this needs some proving. The difficulties in the relevant passages of Dionysius are too complex for discussion here. But, when G. invokes the testimony of Aristoxenos (rh. *elem.*), and Aristides Quintilianus, there are weak points in his argument: in particular, he overlooks the point that the text is corrupt in *Ars.* G. seems right, however, in regarding the rhythm of the Syrōs Kalamianos as dactylic; and this phenomenon of a dactyl with abbreviated thesis is worth bearing in mind.

This is a stimulating and original book, and its suggestions deserve study, though the author tends to push his conclusions too far and to present them in that clear-cut and schematic form which (perhaps wrongly) provokes scepticism in the English mind.

R. P. WINNINGTON-INGRAM.


The debt which all students of prehistory owe to Dr. Tanh and Dr. Nimet Özogz has steadily increased. Wherever a contribution is made on either or both of these scholars appears, it deserves to be read attentively, often to be re-read: and that can easily be done with the more recent publications, which include a German or English text. Two books on important subjects have now added to our sense of obligation.

Die Bestattungsbrauche, previously issued in Turkish, is by Dr. Tahsin Özogz alone. Its publication is timely: a vast quantity of fresh evidence on burial customs has recently been assembled as the result of intensive exploration and excavation: sites in widely separated parts of Turkey have produced graves, and whereas sensational finds like those from Alaca have become quickly familiar, others, such as those from Tekeköy and Kaledorog, are less known than they deserve. The descriptions and discussions of course, confined to the new material; they deal with new and old, Schliemann's Hanay Tepe, for instance, as well as Turkish colleagues' Ahatlibel. Moreover, references to neighbouring countries are rare, but adequately given if necessary for comparison or contrast.

Among the many interesting facts which this book records, the following may be of special concern to archaeologists and anthropologists. The three commonest types of grave—jars, cists, plain earth—were often used simultaneously in the same settlement or even in the same house. Burial in jars occurred earlier in Anatolia than in the Aegean area, and was a method typical of and much favoured by the population. Some west Anatolian communities chose to inter their dead in extra-mural cemeteries, which preferred the more widespread practice of burial within the settlement, frequently under house-floors; nor, apparently, was there any preference in culture between the adherents of these two dissimilar systems. Before the war, no cemetery had been identified except in the western and middle western provinces, but in 1940 and 1941 two graves were excavated on the north coast near Samsun, one extra-mural at Tekeköy, the other inside the prehistoric village at Kaledorog. Tekeköy is unique in the case because its graves, all of the plain-earth type, were stratified in three layers, none of which penetrated each other. With regard to the disposition of bodies in primitive Turkey, Dr. Ozogz points out that all were flexed or contracted until late in the third millennium; then, and only at Tekeköy, extended.
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burials began to appear. As for grave-goods, he demonstrates that two-thirds of the recorded graves contained none. On lack of equipment, he thinks, have been due to poverty, rather than convention, since well-built graves were often found nearby. Unlike South Russia, Cyprus, or Crete, prehistoric Asia Minor produced no multiple and only a few double burials.

In contrast, a woman buried alone from the graves at other sites. In plan, they look like chambers, and the beliefs and ritual which they reflect are in many ways alien. Yet the objects which they contained included no imports, and are for the most part made of materials indigenous. The native traditions of the different groups have developed in ways different from those of others, but also give much information hitherto available only in preliminary reports. Throughout the book, common sense and scientific caution characterise the explanations which Dr. Özgüç suggests for the various phenomena, especially those connected with possible cults and those which throw light on beliefs about an afterworld. In drawing inferences from physical remains he is cautious too: though intrigued by the cases of human sacrifice in the north-west, he hesitates to conclude that the sacrifice was performed by women because the number of women's skeletons is too small. On the other hand, there is much to recommend the theory, which he and several authorities advocate, that a foreign brachycephalic element was responsible for the non-Anatolian elements at Alaca Höyük — an idea that Anatologists introduced cist-graves in Syria and North Mesopotamia, will, no doubt, be considered carefully by specialists in those provinces.

There are two criticisms which an otherwise appreciative reviewer can offer. One is that Karaja A is dated too high, and its excavator has always deliberately avoided calling it chalcolithic. The other refers to the maps, especially those on Figs. 86-9, which have been reduced too small. But these are minor matters; the whole treatise is excellent, and a special tribute should be paid to its helpful footnotes.

Dr. Özgüç and his wife have collaborated in digging and publishing Karahöyük. The site, in south-eastern Turkey, has an outstanding distinction: it has produced a slab with a Hittite hieroglyphic inscription, erected in a stone socle with a stone libation-trough in front. Dr. Güterbock, who has contributed an appendix, points out that the libation-trough implies a bactylic cult. He also warns us that the inscription contains peculiarities and many signs without exact counterparts: in consequence, the Karatepe bilingual may not give adequate help in its decipherment. The persons named in the text appear nowhere in the Hittite Empire, and it is likely that the culture is known in later historical contexts; the hieroglyphs look as though they were later than the Empire but not much so; these considerations support the evidence of stratigraphy by indicating a date shortly after the Empire fell. The name 'post-Hittite' has been chosen for the period when the inscription was set up, and the three periods which follow it, similar in culture, are called post-Hittite too. Except for the fact that all four post-Hittite stages are numbered from top to bottom, so that the 'fourth period' is chronologically the first, this terminology recommends itself: it is better than 'late' or 'neo-Hittite' or 'Phrygian.' For the situation is complex. The citizens contemporary with the inscription used pottery which resembled monochrome wares from Phrygia except that it was red or brown rather than grey or black; but such pottery is too widely distributed, as the account of its finds states, for it to associate it with the painted wares of invaders. The same observation applies to the painted wares of Phrygian type which, oddly enough, came into use at Karahöyük much later than on the Anatolian plateau. One author believed that the painted wares alike can be derived from native Anatolian prototypes, due allowance being made for motives introduced from abroad; therein they agree with the verdict given by Betts in *Kleinasiatische Studien*. That the Karahöyük people maintained old traditions is, in any case, proved by their burials, which were in contracted positions under house-floors.

Beneath the post-Hittite remains, there was a stratum belonging to the Hittite Period, and quite orthodox in character. It yielded some remarkable sherds of the uncommon relief ware: one ornamented with a figure, part man, part bull, the other with a libation-pourer.

In conclusion, a work rich in use of the conscientious and thorough way in which the excavations and finds have been described. They are amply illustrated by photographs, drawings, and plans, while the superb standard of photography, combined with the excellence of the half-tones and of the paper, has given us a noteworthy record of some of the most lovely coins ever made. Reference to p. 67 (no. 27a) will show the technique of photography at its highest possible point; and, throughout, the reproductions sparkle with the true liveliness of the original post-metal.

As an essay on coins as works of art the book is intended for those, with little or no prior knowledge of Greek coins, who are ready to look and to think. Like most such books it has difficulties to contend with. How much general information shall be given in the Introduction? Selman's is curiously—haphazardly—arranged: the development of Greek coinage is simplified almost to nothingness, its economic importance as the symbol of unscrupulous and cut-throat competition never mentioned. How far shall the commentary include controversy? For there are no notes to the commentary: what is said is said: and the non-specialist, first interested, and then daily interested in the obscurity of what he reads, cannot possibly realize what is sometimes at stake. Nevertheless, as commentary on works of art it is all beautifully done, and, if the author's choice of a word or a phrase from time to time jars sharply, it is only because he has himself set a standard which is usually so fastidious.

W. LAMB.

Antike Originalarbeiten der Kunstsammlung des Instituts (Archäologisches Institut der Universität Erlangen). By W. GRÜNIGEN. Pp. 96; pl. 32. Nürnberg: Hans Carl, 1948. DM 7 1/2. Erlangen University has a respectable collection of classical antiquities, especially of Greek and Italian pottery, which now includes part of the Preuss collection from Munich. This short descriptive catalogue, like those for Berlin, Tübingen, and Hamburg, is a handy aid for visitors and students working in the museum, and seems generally reliable. A useful innovation is the ascertaining of items which photos are available. An index of provenances would also have been convenient.

R. M. COOK.


A reliable, popular guide to the friezes now at Moscow, with some introductory paragraphs on Pergamon and on the structure of the altar. The booklet is remarkably well illustrated, in half-tone. The photographs show the town and altar site in their actual condition and from models, the architecture of the altar, many groups and individual figures in both the friezes, and some interesting details of the Gigantomachy. A sketch-map of the Aegean is appended, but no plans are included.

A. W. LAWRENCE.


This is, first and foremost, a picture-book—short, but excellently produced and attractively illustrated. Nearly 200 text-figures (illustrating some sixty coins) are included, about half of which show select specimens enlarged up to four—once or twice up to six—diameters; each of the coins is placed near a natural-size photograph of the same coin. The coins have been photographed by the direct method, and not from plaster casts; and the superb standard of photography, combined with the excellence of the half-tones and of the paper, has given us a noteworthy record of some of the most lovely coins ever made. Reference to p. 67 (no. 27a) will show the technique of photography at its highest possible point; and, throughout, the reproductions sparkle with the true liveliness of the original post-metal.

As an essay on coins as works of art the book is intended for those, with little or no prior knowledge of Greek coins, who are ready to look and to think. Like most such books it has difficulties to contend with. How much general information shall be given in the Introduction? Selman's is curiously—haphazardly—arranged: the development of Greek coinage is simplified almost to nothingness, its economic importance as the symbol of unscrupulous and cut-throat competition never mentioned. How far shall the commentary include controversy? For there are no notes to the commentary: what is said is said: and the non-specialist, first interested, and then daily interested in the obscurity of what he reads, cannot possibly realize what is sometimes at stake. Nevertheless, as commentary on works of art it is all beautifully done, and, if the author's choice of a word or a phrase from time to time jars sharply, it is only because he has himself set a standard which is usually so fastidious.
Selman's powers of perception again and again startle with a sharpness—almost a pang—of pleasure. Again and again dolphins 'swimming clockwise against a current of ten letters' (p. 49); the pine-tree, on the wonderful coin of Aetna, that sways slightly under the eagle's weight (p. 56); the departing Selma (p. 59), of the Amphitripus tetradrachm with 'multitude of eyes,' forward lightly by the wreath that rests upon it' (pp. 94 f.), and of the dolphin, on Simon's Syracusan tetradrachm, which 'comes diving out of her hair to meet a second wave,' gracefully sculling from right to left (p. 98), are quite admirable: that the decadrchm of Acrages could not be surpassed (p. 105). The keen-eyed reader will discover a mass of new detail for himself, for example, the curling of the two leaf-tips in Terina's olive wreath (p. 67), the flexible head-band of Amanessos (p. 87), and the hard, gem-like brilliance of the Syracusan gold (p. 93) with its Heracles and lion superbly contrived alike by desperate effort and the narrow circuit of the flan.

The Introduction and Commentary contain points which will certainly be disputed or thought to need further inquiry—in particular, the ingenious reconstruction of Phryggylus' career and movements (the evidence here is perhaps the eetuns are important as is suggested, the place of 'celators' and 'celature' in the Greek world (is it really defensible to assert (p. 9) that 'celebrated artists like Pheidias and Polykleitos acquired their fame, not as sculptors as celators working in gold and ivory'), (pp. 11 f.) the pan-Hellenisation was Athens' origin and in spirit. With regard to this last point, even if it could be proved true of 'celature' it would not be obviously true of other branches of art, and certainly not of sculpture; and Selman's comments on the combination of Athenian and Olympic influence in the famous Naxos tetradrachm (p. 55) suggest uncomfortably that 'to shed all preconceptions about "schools of art" in Greek art' (p. 62) might be to reduce Greek artistic products to a row of beans—curiously yet oddly different.

G. H. V. SUTHERLAND,

DAS KLIMA GRIECHENLANDS.


This book is a very welcome supplement to the same geographer's well-known Das Mittelmeergebiet (as old as 1904, fourth edition 1929). The subject is now Greece alone, which has its special position within the Mediterranean area. It lies eastwards near Asia, and is deeply embedded northwards in Europe, so that, despite a long coastline, it has a more continental climate than Italy. Within Greece there are all sorts of local conditions of wind and weather, and many differences between lowland and highland, east and west, north and south (Athens, for instance, has a more than usually dry and continental aspect). It is only very lately, and now much in print by Greek meteorologists like Aeginitis and Mariódputos, that the various parts of Greece can be really accurately compared and distinguished in this respect; the results are here set forth with all possible details of isotherms and 'Isobraten' and even 'Isohydrogen,' 'Isoeoses,' and the like. The scholar will turn with pleasure especially to those pages where the author alludes to classical matters, as in dealing with winds and sailing conditions (pp. 17, 24). He is neither ashamed to admit that his book, as a work of art, is a long journey, if not a long homeward journey, by foot (p. 26). He is very interesting about the influence of climate on the character of the people, with some reference to the Hellenistic story. On Air, Waters, and Places (pp. 203-19): the reviewer has discussed often his views as the author of one of the most important studies of Ancient Geography, 1948, pp. 106-9). The struggle with the scourge of malaria is very old, being already represented in some of the labours of Hercules (pp. 199-203). Philippson repeats that country, by recent authorities, his original opinion that there has been no great climatic change in the country within historic times (pp. 157-68).

There is a useful bibliography, but no index. The maps, showing the three rainfall, and the sites of observatories, are edited by H. T. Loomis. The book of such lasting value deserved better paper.

J. O. THOMSON.


This is an extremely useful little book which all students of the Greek satyr play will need. It lists with references 205 Greek vases which may be connected with the satyratic drama, and provides a comprehensive survey of the diversity of subjects and episodes from the satyr play, mentioned, subjects of pictures, and museums are added. It sums up Brommer's earlier work and takes full account of Buschor's studies and many scattered references by BezaNotes whose attributions to painters in AV and ARV are quoted throughout.

First a short list of addenda and corrigenda: nos. 5 and 11, add reference to Beazley, PBA, 333, 41 and 50; and no. 8 is now in Sydney, Handbook to the Nicholos Museum, pl. X; no. 92, reference should be ARV 369/97; no. 74 should be Munich 2890, ARV 804/1; no. 98 is now in the British Museum; no. 106 reference should be to ARV 337/35; no. 169 add reference to Haspels, ABL, 117; nos. 172, 173, 179 add reference to Beazley E27, 37 no. 1 and 2; no. 161: two vases are confused under this heading, the Mannheim vase figured here and the former Hope vase (Tillyard 280, Tindall, PP, no. 117), which is now in the Dunnec Public Library and Art Gallery; the Mannheim was, therefore, a satyr vase (Gotthard 280, 91, 15). The vase painter thinking of a satyr play? Only fourteen of these vases show satyrs in the drawers which mark the character of man: three lamps, Naxos masks (nos. 1, 4, 6), but of the fourteen only one 1, 1, 4, 3, 12, 13 possibly is a satyr, the rest are simply pictures of chorus men (to these should be added Boston 03941, ARV 450/4). To use the rest of the material we must adopt some such principle as Brommer's; 'if the Silenus appears with gods and heroes with whom they are not connected by legend, this points to the satyr play.' But we must remember (as Brommer usually does) that: (a) some stories connecting satyrs with gods and heroes go back long before the satyr play, (b) one instance is the Return of Hephaistos, but no. 13 at least must refer to a play and a play earlier than Achaioi 'Hephaistos. The satyrs' attack on Hera (presumably therefore also on Iris and their rescue by Herakles) goes back to about 540 etc. (Oxford 1927, 393; Haepels, ABL, 20, not quoted by B.), and we cannot therefore be certain that nos. 28 and 34 were inspired by a play earlier than Achaioi 'Ir. If Herakles was already connected with satyrs before the satyr play began, the majority of the scenes of Herakles and satyrs probably do not arise from satyr plays, but it still seems possible that nos. 67, 74-76 (the satyr steals Herakles' arms), 78/9, 81/3 (Herakles threatens satyrs), 89 (Satyr dressed as Herakles) are connected by satyr plays, and that the satyr is an invention of the satyr poets. The satyr's appearance suggests that the literary source is not a play (e.g. no. 64). (c) A single satyr in a scene may have some quite other meaning. Thus no. 88, the satyr corresponds to the nymph 'water landscape element; no. 94-6 may be inspired by the scene of the 'Bassarai of Aeschylus but the Bassarai was a tragedy, in which the single watching satyr can have no place; he may signify 'inspired by tragedy' or he may have long been one of the bearers of Orpheus (it is just possible that a Corinthian kyathos from Ithaca (RFA xiii, 21, no. 52) shows Orpheus singing among animals, a satyr, and others); no. 97, perhaps Aeschylus' Neandria, again a tragedy—the satyr is introduced because Dionysus is present; no. 100, the satyr with Hermes are almost personified landscape gods. (d) Satyrs occurred in comedy as well as satyr plays. Five vases may be mentioned here. The Perseus of no. 43 must be a comic satyr if he is a satyr at all but his tail suggests to be a break in the surface and his ear misunderstood in the drawing (JHS lxxv, pl. 1); other interpretations are more likely (see CQ xlii, 18, no. 14). On no. 35 the grotesque head of the satyr suggests comedy rather than satyr play and it is better not to think of Aeschylus' Atalante. On no. 105 a woman leads a children's party, and the tripod cauldron; here it is not necessary to think of comedy; the satyr on the back, who has no connection with drama, has the same button nose and big round eye. Medea rejuvenates an aged satyr. B. suggests Euripides' Pheides but this is most unlikely to be true and we know nothing of Sophocles' Pelias, if it existed. It is
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perhaps worth noting that in Aeschylus' *Trophia* Medea rejuvenated the Nurses of Dionysus with their husbands, who were presumably satyrs. The fat woman who is being tortured by satyrs on no. 116 seems to me more likely to belong to comedy than to tragedy; the couple served on no. 155 also looks to me like comedy. (c) Satyrs are wild, boisterous beings who can do anything and it is amusing to paint them doing things that ordinary humans do not. When mortals and satyrs appear in the palaestra on either side of the same vase (no. 878), this seems to me a more likely explanation than that one side is inspired by Pratinax' *Palaitai* or Aeschylus' *Theoroi* or *Isthmiai*; in this class I should put nos. 59-9-90, 71-78, 723-5, 879-95.

In spite of these reservations we have a considerable gain, since the vases tell us how the Greeks thought of satyrs during the formative and most flourishing periods of the satyr play. They also suggest that there were satyr plays dealing with Perseus (58-42), Theseus (90-103), Pensephone (106), Helios (172), and Aphrodite (21-6). A considerable number of the vases may be connected with plays known to us by name: Aeschylus, *Sphinx* (19, 178-81), *Prometheus* (369-90), *Amphione* (44-54). *Circe* (128), *Argo*? (104). Sophocles, *Amphiaraos* (113-14), *Achilles* (182-3), *Dionysios* (175-7), *Iphigenia* (178-9, 38). *Krisis* (117, unless it is too early), *Pandora* (167-173; 175 is still too doubtful). In a satyr play with Triptolemos possibly the *Iambos* (126). *Europa* (23). *Recluse* (29). Some of these connections or suggestions are more convincing than others. I should like to suggest two more in addition to Aeschylus' *Trophia* (105). On no. 1 a chorus man and other satyrs construct a couch; this might be Aeschylus' *Thesmophoriazousa*; the satyr dressed as the virgin on no. 109 might come from Aeschylus' *Karyki*. Finally, the Pronomos vase (4) gives the actors and chorus of a Herakles play, probably the Hesione story, by a poet Demetrius, who may be the comic poet of that name.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.


*The Que sais-je? series*, intermediate in size of format between the Home University Library and the 'Benn Sixpenny' of the 1930s, is comparable in merit to either of those great enterprises in cheap educational publishing. This volume, however, it must be admitted with regret, is a rather pedestrian little book. It is perhaps not one of the first duties of the writer of a primer to be exciting; yet when the subject is Athens, surely it is a pity if the extraordinary epic and tragic quality of fifth-century history should not grace itself itself. Failing this, one cannot but feel that an opportunity has been missed, and that at best this is not a primer that is going to fire many charges.

To come to details, the chapter entitled *Le Mouvement religieux et intellectuel*, one of three devoted to the decades before the actual struggle deals very conventionally with the Asclepian and pre-Aeschylean drama; there is nothing about other developments in religion, and on the impact of Ionian science on Athens we have only a few cursory remarks in the last chapter. Over forty plays are catalogued and where possible dated (causing one to wonder whether the omission of Euripides' *Ion, Phoenissae, Heraclea* and *Heraclides*, alone among extant plays, is deliberate or not); but judgments on the dramatists are sometimes naive. A play credited with being in good earnest anything that any of his heroes says, and Euripides and his characters in an antique manner, with misgivings; although, as the author gruffly remarks, not all the poet's (or rather, one must insist upon his characters') strivings upon women are applicable to some of his heroes. Erwed Antiphanes is described as 'the chief' of his party in 411, which is a slight overstatement of what Thucydides says; and in the chapter on early fifth-century art five pages are devoted to the 'female statues' and the same number to a celebrated chief of what ancient writers tell us about Myron, Polygnotus, and their contemporaries. There is scarcely a hint of the difference between the types of evidence available to us on these two groups of artists—minor and major—nor a hint of the possible or impossible, as with the minor, in the significance of these different types of evidence, as bearing on the nature and limitations of our knowledge.

I would gladly have praised this book; but modern French scholarship could have given us a better one.

A. R. BURN.


This is the first of a series of selected plays of Euripides which Dr. van Leren has undertaken to edit. The Alkestis, as he writes in his preface, is written in English, with a thirty-six-page introduction, a metrical synopsis, and a short commentary arranged under the text on each page. The editor's chief concern, as he explains in the preface, is with a better understanding of the poet's personality and outlook in the difficult passage 449-51, or in the remark (on 331) that δειδα is 'grammatically not to be linked with προσφέρεται.' What is καθιστα (321)? And on 355 to say that 'ομηρική must only be the proper name of the place?' The remarks are, however, these short notes serve their purpose of helping the moderately competent reader through the text with the minimum of distraction, and it is often an advantage to see the way cut sensibly through a tangled dispute. It is perhaps a pity that, of editions in English, Dr. v. L. should refer only to Hayley rather than to the greatly superior Earle, Hadley, and Jerram; had he been acquainted with these he could not have supposed, for instance, that he was the first to see a reminiscence of *Agam. 416* ff. in Admetus's plan to have a statue of Alcestis.

The introduction and the bulk of the commentary are devoted to the interpretation of the play as a work of literary art. In laying all the stress, in general and in detail, upon Euripides' δειδα Dr. v. L. will have the approval of many readers, but his pleading will not move the unconvinced. He warns us, it is true, against reading modern sentiments into the Greek, but the question is rather one of the whole approach to Greek drama, and to the modern approach to Euripides, who lends himself most easily to this kind of simplification. To assume that the poet's main preoccupation was with the delineation of character, and to interpret every facet of the action, every turn of the dialogue, as deliberately intended to throw light upon the inner nature of the speakers is to disregard a number of other important factors—the needs of the action, the place of rhetoric, with its own code of habits, in Greek drama, the common forms of lyrical sentiment in antiquity (often quite different from our own), the conventions of stichomythia, an occasional tendency to develop a piquant situation for its own sake—among all of which δειδα takes its modest place. Where the search for 'character' by these methods produces a kind of unbalanced traits, the person in question is credited with a subtle and complex δειδα—there is something very elusive about this *Alkestis*—'Her kindness to the servants (796) is taken as evidence of Admetus' temper and the ways of a king with the domestic staff,' so that (825) 'It is surprising that Admetus, who was a model of kindness and piety to Apollo during the latter's period of servitude, seems to be pathetically unkind to his father.' Most of the play, in fact, is turned into an elaborate portrait-study of Admetus, a shallow, insincere extravert, of infantile egotism, insistent on his own sufferings or his own noble feelings, lacking inner refinement, incapable of understanding piety, who כולל the degradation and the harsh and unpleasant to his inferiors. And in order to fit with this picture some of the main incidents of the play
NOTICES OF BOOKS

are turned round and stood on their heads: his hospitality to Heracles is bad manners and unpardonable deceit, deplored by the Chorus in spite of the emphatic ἀγαν (603) and by Heracles in spite of 853 ff. and 1147 ff. (which is mysterious, or to develop Xenophon's misunderstood), while his reluctant consent to shelter the unknown woman brought by Heracles is represented as a final 'unfaithfulness and moral defeat,' foreseen only too well by Alecstis and the Chorus earlier. Dr. v. L. speaks of a certain ambiguous quality in the play predicated by the Earlier inherited the realistic and mythical conceptions which are closely interwoven in the presentation of its characters; its substitute 'story for characters' and I would cordially agree, but the change makes a deal of difference. In denying that the drama is 'satyric' or 'comic' (cf. the Hypothesis) he is surely right.

The 'metrical analysis' does not go beyond the attachment of a separate label to each line, in many cases, such as 'reitiation' for 114, 'glyciconic with dactyl base' for 24, 'laemb. dim. with Doppelsenkungen' for 24, obscuring rather than illuminating the phenomena.

The English, apart from one or two slips, is excellent. For 'Herkakes' p. 7 read 'Death,' and for 'Parmentier' passim, 'Meridi.'

A. M. DALE.


This translation by a scholar who has already published a lexicon and a critical analysis of Herodotus and an edition of the Greek text should naturally be welcomed by the student of Herodotus in English. He began the first draft, he tells us, when he was at school nearly twenty years ago and has submitted it to severa revisions. The text used is the Oxford text of Hude with emendations by the translator and others, of which a list is given at the end of the second volume.

The Introduction contains much interesting matter. Mr. Powell's account of the evolution of the work follows his critical analysis already mentioned (Cambridge Classical Studies IV, 1939). He holds that the fruits of Herodotus' inquiries and the observations made during his travels were embodied in a History of the Persian Empire published c. 448-442 B.C. and consisting of a chronicle of events, historical tales, and ethnographical descriptions of the countries with which the Persians came into contact. In this original version the centre of interest was Persia, but, after Herodotus had taken part in the colonization of Thrace, he enlarged the scope of his work to include the Hellenic West as well as the rest of Asia. The Geography of Anatolia. This process is admirably illustrated by the analysis given on pp. xiv and xv. This revised edition contained no mention of the Peloponnesian War, and it is conceivable that Herodotus may have died of the plague at Athens in 429 B.C. Other topics treated in the Introduction include the language and style of the author, the influence of rhetoric on his work, his religious views, and his achievement as a historian, geographer, and literary artist.

After the Introduction a note on English translations of Herodotus is inserted. Mr. Powell does not distribute bouquets to his predecessors. Mr. G. C. Macaulay's translation, published in 1890, receives most approval.

In his own translation, Mr. Powell tells us, the language is in the main the English of the Authorized Version of the Bible, and he expresses the opinion that this language has 'a certain quaintness and archaisms' which makes an impression on the reader. He has taken from the English of the Authorized Version and from other English sources free use of Attic and the modern Greek. He has added a variety of phrases, with brief notices of persons and places, and three excellent maps.

Edward S. Forster.


The appearance in the Penguin series of this translation of one of the greatest of Greek democratic literature is a very welcome event. The language used by Mr. Warner, like Xenophon's own, is simple, straightforward, and lively. Occasional deviations from correct usage (e.g. Aeolia for Aeolis) will not trouble or mislead those for whom the translation is intended. It is a pity, however, that Mr. Warner has not called a parasang a parasang. Parases are surely as much part of the local colour of the Anabasis as knots are in stories of the sea. It is to be hoped that in any reprints of this translation parasangs will be added to the eleven words such as ephor, hoplite, pelast, that Mr. Warner has left untranslated in his text and explained on p. 13 of his Introduction. His arguments for not having rounded off the dozen by including parasang leave me quite unconvined. One other improvement might be suggested. The sketch map would be more useful if it was larger and consequently clearer and not tucked away as it is between the introduction and the text.

These, however, are very minor matters. For the great majority of readers, who will certainly have no knowledge of Greek, and whose knowledge, if any, of Greek history will be drawn from modern books about Greece, this very handsome record will come as an excellent document that should revive the faith of doubting democrats. The writer is a child of the Athenian democracy who was highly critical of Athens and had a great admiration for totalitarian Sparta. The expedition took place four years after the fall of Abydos. The ten thousand mercenary and mercenary就够men men, largely drawn from cities which had been on the Spartan side in the Peloponnesian War. Yet within their own little community these ten thousand conduct their proceedings by argument and elections. Mr. Warner does well in his Introduction to protest against the debunking of this achievement so common among modern historians.

But however warm our welcome to this translation, it cannot help reminding us how few people there are in this country who can read even this simple story in the original Greek. Even among students in the Arts faculties of our universities they are the rare exception. But Mr. Warner's Persian Expedition may remind us also how easy it would be to change this deplorable state of affairs. For these literally misguided students and for thousands of intelligent young people in the top forms of our schools, ignorant of Greek but reasonably good at Latin, it is a strictly practical proposition to learn a book and the rest of ancient history in Greek. It can be done as a ναρώγω in the course of a few years. Some will not be content to stop there, but even those who do will have gained some idea of the unique language that was the basis of the Greek achievement.

P. N. URE.

Le déchiffrement des inscriptions minoennes. By V. GEORGIEF. Pp. 61. Sofia: University of Sofia, 1949. Professor Georgiev has supplemented his Vorrichtliche Sprachwissenschaft (Studia Linguistica II, 1918, 69 ff.) by a more extensive survey of the Minoan script, and generalisations as to the characters of the language, which he thinks may be Indoeuropean and perhaps contain words common to Greek. On this matter his philological skill is of value. He accepts much from other writers—Sundwall, Peruzzi, Hrozný. Many sign-groups he regards as personal names, others (on commodity tablets) as place-names. On the other hand, he accepts the traditional identification of no fewer than twenty-five names, with brief notices of persons and places, and three excellent maps.

Edward S. Forster.
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we have bilingual texts, or even a few with traces of syntax. We cannot yet speak, as Mr. Georgiev does, of ‘different words of which the meaning is evident’ (p. 41). Among all the commodity tables, what is the Minoan word for a sheep or a wheel? (p. 41)

The present memoir consists of discussions of the Eteocretans, Pelasgians, Kelith, and the spread of the Greek language, from Neolithic times to the Dorian migration, summarising authorities and recent work, but not adding much. John L. Myres.


The present full piece of research, clear, concise, and admirably documented. Miss Christoupoliopoulou examines all references to the Byzantine senate and senators (ἡ σύγγλυτος βολῆ, ἡ σύγγλυτος, σύγγλυτος) in official documents, histories, chronicles, letters and tracts, Lives of the Saints, and, finally, poems, both literary and popular; and summarises her results under the headings ‘Composition of the Senate’, ‘Functions’, ‘Duties’, and ‘Place of Senators in Society, State Services, and Legislation.’

The author’s researches that there was in mediaeval Byzantium an enormous body of persons of senatorial rank, the large majority of whom were ex officio senators, that is, in virtue of other offices or ranks which they held in the bureaucracy or nobility. The number of senatorial places no one has attempted to count, but Pliny the Younger in Attaliota that in the days of Nicephorus III there were ‘thousands’ (ταῦτα εἴλατον) of them must be received with caution; but they must always have been counted in thousands. This body as a whole had no constitutional function; the rank was honorary, distinguished by special insignia, and jealously guarded. On the other hand, from among the leading members of the body, the emperor chose his advisory council, and various ad hoc legal and other commissions. The effect of the senatorial statements and committees seems to have been in each case the emperor: they had no independent power, except as a council of regency. None the less, the advisory council, consisting as it did of the most influential members of the state and, there is reason to think, often composed of members of the imperial family, obviously exercised enormous influence on imperial policy. In its combination of advisory and judicial functions this ‘inner’ senate may be compared to the Privy Council of mediaeval England.

Various theories have been put forward to explain the terminology of senatorial gradation, and the principles on which the councils were chosen. The author’s excellent knowledge of Byzantine terms and phraseology makes her criticism of these theories the more convincing, since she is able to deal effectively with the untenable thesis of Ellisen (p. 61), and to correct errors of Ostrogorsky (p. 68), Bury (p. 77), and Zachariä and Uspensky (p. 99). In fact, there was no certain terminology for the inner councils; the members were merely the πρόοδοι, πρόφυτοι, δρόπιοι τῆς συγκυρίας, or the ἠμαρτάνοι, familiares, of the emperor (add to the author’s exhaustive list of references De Admin. Imp. (ed. Monastir, 51-59)).

Where difficulties are baffling, the author is not afraid to say so. Like the rest of us, she is posed by the Egyptian papyri papyri papyri, the Cretalograph, though she gives all the dates about them with her usual clarity. (May note the frequent simplification of the sparse material.)

She includes (pp. 47-55 and 80-8) list of officials mentioned as holding various offices together with senatorial rank, and as ‘Prodroi’ or ‘Protoprodroi’ of the council. These will be useful to epigraphers also. There is a very full source-index. This is a valuable hand-book, indispensable to all Byzantinists. R. J. H. Jenkins.

Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum: Belgique: Bruxelles, Musées Royaux d’Art et d’Histoire, fascicule iii. By F. Mayence and V. Verhoogen. Pp. c. 200; pl. 55. Brussels: Musées Royaux d’Art et d’Histoire, 1946. (The present volume completes the publication of the Brussels vases, and the authors deserve praise. They give good measure (this is not one of those numerous fascicules of the Corpus in which by free use of large borders a score or so of vases are made to cover the minimum number of plates considered decent). The photographs are nearly all very good, without retouching, or painting off the backgrounds. The work may, as described at the outset, of deliberately falsifying the negatives has been a curse of the Corpus all along, is a disgrace to classical archaeologists, and in spite of protests appears to be ineradicable. The descriptions are careful and detailed, the biographies appropriately concise, and the plates are devoted to all three fascicules, and a preface gives a history of the collection, which records, among other matters, first, that the vases acquired by Brussels from the Campana collection had formed a reserve, second, that the material of the collection was bought by the French government; secondly, that the benefactor de Meester de Ravestein, disappointed at one time by the reception of his overtures in Belgium, thought of presenting his collection to the Museum of Munich, but was dissuaded by his friend Heinrich Brun, who urged him to keep it in his native country, and if the Belgian state was unwilling to receive it, to entrust it to a Belgian university.

The three notes follow: in a publication of such wide range, points must needs present themselves on which there may be more than one opinion.

II D pl. 4 (Belg. pl. 106), 5: also Johansen Aludan fig. 8.

III Ch (Etruscan) pl. 2 (Belg. pl. 111), 1: splashes not grouted.

Ch. (Belg. fig. 8). Pp. 108.

Find a ribbon. G [CGG (Berg) pl. 74] like Brussels R 215.

III G, Boeotian. Pl. 3. 1 seems Attic, cf. BSA 42 pl. 20-1. So does pl. 3, 2, cf. the stemless London A 483, and another, from Kalavryta, in the Vlasto collection. A pl. 3, 5, cf. Oxford 1927, 4532. Pl. 3, 6 cannot be separated from Oxford 1927, 6 (CF. III C pl. 1, 55 and pl. 3, 10), with which it is here compared, and must be Corinthian like it. Pl. 3, 9, Attic? Pl. 4, 4, Attic; pl. 4, 6 too, as well as pl. 4, 7, a very fine class of vase. Pl. 5, 5, 6, and a much more common form, with a hydria in Jena (AM 41 pl. 30, 1).

III He, Attic bf. Pl. 22, 1, Group of London B 76. Pl. 24, 2, cf. KG. pl. 18, 32. Pl. 24, 7, Phylaxis Class, Armington Group. Pl. 24, 6 too. Pl. 25, 5, related to the Acheelois Painter. Pl. 27, 3, funeral — valediction? Pl. 28, 15, a good fragment by the Painter of Munich 1410. His other works are Munich 1410 (CF pl. 41, 2, pl. 42, and pl. 52, 4), Munich 1411 (CF. pl. 41, 3 and pl. 43: wrongly ascribed to the Swing Painter in BSA. 52, pl. 14), Philadelphia 4982 (Mus. Journal 4 p. 148), New York GR 533, and a hydria in Jena (AM 41 pl. 30, 1).

III Ic, Attic rf. Pl. 21, 2: Theseus not Herakles, sword hanging not bow. Pl. 23, 1, with the figure holding spear and shield cf. the Berlin Painter’s Amazon on his panther. Pl. 23, 2, the most convincing fragments not published.

III I d, Attic rf. Pl. 12, 7, Carlsruhe Painter (ARV. p. 510, no. 59). Pl. 17, 2, Painter of London E 356, cf. him (impressed in the inner circles) in the Munich 87, pl. 5, a-L.

III I e, Attic rf. Pl. 4, 1, in the form of a bell-crate rather than a skyphos. Pl. 4, 3, Saint-Valentin class (EV 219).

III a, Attic white. Pl. 5, 7, Quadrade Painter.

III L and N, Attic black. Pl. 3 (Belg. 1938, 4): seems Etruscan or Latin, Torlonia Group, see EV. pp. 253-6. Pl. 3, 21, Tsasmine Class, as it may be called from a hydria in Oxford found at Tsasmine in Cyprus: others: once in the Munich 87, (Exhibitions below the hudded rank?). Sie includes (pp. 47-55 and 80-8) list of officials mentioned as holding various offices together with senatorial rank, and as ‘Prodroi’ or ‘Protoprodroi’ of the council. These will be useful to epigraphers also. There is a very full source-index. This is a valuable hand-book, indispensable to all Byzantinists. R. J. H. Jenkins.
are ambiguous because of their very simplicity: and it is reasonable to think that the poet intended the epithet to be double-edged, a message of blind obedience, but of implicit reproach. The late C. W. Brodribb of The Times (who had read the book under review) tried to convey the same ambiguity in equally simple English:

"Ho! Sir; here lie we in this foreign dust.
Tell Spartæ; hers the word and ours the trust.

The simplest words often conceal the most—not only in Greek; the German 'Der der Mann unter dem Steine' is a modern example of an ancient one. (Did Virgil, one wonders incidentally, mean three out of the five words in 'quam fortí pectore et arma!' to be taken in two senses?)

The illustration from French of phrasal homophony on p. 8 is, unfortunately, printed so as to lose the point of the joke. It should read—'

Gal, amant de la reine, alla, tour magnanime,
Galamment de l'arène à la Tour-Magne à Nîmes.

HENRY BIRKHEAD.


In a special issue within the framework of its quarterly periodical the American School of Classical Studies at Athens commemorates the memory of one of its great men who died in 1945 at the age of sixty-four. While he ranged freely over the field of Greek archaeology, Shear will be remembered above all for his guidance of the excavations at Corinth and the Athenian Agora. It is therefore fitting that not a few of the forty-five contributors to his memorial volume should have written on matters intimately concerned with these two great projects. Miss Margaret Crosby describes the construction whose plan has been recovered in the Agora under the track of the electric railway: she dinches its identification as the precinct of the Altar of the Twelve Gods dedicated by the younger Peisistratos; summarising the evidence she inclines to the belief that the year of the dedication was 522 B.C., that it was the same altar that was later known as the Altar of Pity, and that the front of the original parapet was decorated with reliefs (probably reflected in contemporary vase paintings) in which the cowherd was arranged in thalpids. O. Waagen, a devoted follower of the finds from an Early Helladic III mass interment in a well near Corinth. A number of specialised studies from the Agora offer new material and conclusions: A. W. Parsons' short note on T. Flavius Pantainos who founded a library, Homerising through that of Mr. Stanford's knowledge of other literatures and especially his insight into poetry. Some of its key passages are in Chapter VI 'Elements of Meaning.' Elaborate use of esoteric poetry was foreign to the Hellenic ideal of σωφρός. This was because in classical Greek days the hearer was considered far more by the greater poets than he is to-day. The greater classical poets (Mr. Stanford instances Horace) did not, as the more esoteric poets do, adopt the method of the cut-off retreating corner of an opaque cente of purple patches. The author makes a useful distinction between the ποιητὴς ἄμφος and the ἄμφιος ποιητὴς, the communal poet and the private poet. The former, with whom Mr. Stanford is most concerned, would avoid being obscure, but that deliberately be ambiguous; in writing for a varied audience he would allow for the fact that words have different personal meanings for different persons and groups of persons. Mr. Stanford amply proves his case by the many examples of Greek authors, and readers of the masterly chapter on the 'Agamemnon,' the 'Oedipus Tyrannus' and the 'Bacchae' which will wish that he had extended his very wide field of illustration.

Why, for instance, is Simonides' epitaph on the dead at Thermopylae so famous? 'For its simplicity,' we were told at school when we thought it feeble. But four of the simple words...
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presenting a ‘series of strong lines or sinews’ in the aspect of the roof. Rhys Carpenter finds confirmation of his previous restoration of the figures of the east pediment among the twelve gods of the altar recently discovered at Olynth; his paper, like C. H. Morgan’s lively research on the claim of the Vienna Apoxyomenos to represent Lysippos, should not fail to provoke discussion. Miss Lucy Shaw discusses the several uses of dark stone in Athenian buildings before, by, and after Mnisekles. Oscar Broneer expands his interpretation of Plato’s description of the people of Athens; duplicate cults and the name of the month Metageitnion are convincingly explained by the migration of townsfolk to summer billets in the fields around the Isthmus. Among the specialised studies in Athenian epigraphy, the most impressive are those of W. S. Ferguson, who supplements his work on the Attic argomena by a discussion of the fragmentary decree recording the inauguration of the cult of Bendis, and A. R. Bellinger’s collection of the objective evidence for the dating of New Style silver. E. S. G. Robinson relates the suspension of the silver issues of many of the tributary cities in the mid-fifth century to the Athenian currency control decree, and uses issues and hoards to show that the application of the council’s control to other metal issues is secure and consistent. The preservation of cultural traditions by the old families in Roman Athens is shown to advantage in J. H. Oliver’s sympathetic treatment of two men of letters, Sarapion and Chares.

The fragments of a stone pillar, perhaps from the doorway of an early Mycenaean tomb, with ships roughly scratched on its faces draw special attention to the article in which C. W. Blegen identifies the mound at Draemis near Aulis as the pre-classical site of Hyria, and H. R. W. Smith discusses a new specimen of a small class of early-fifth-century protome figurines, which he considers to be Lebadeian in origin, and the relation of veiled female protomes to classical Aten. Breitenstein (Denk. Nat. Mus.), Pl. 40, no. 331, from Atalante): while among much that is remarkable in David M. Robinson’s publication of the Robinson teaching collection of gems one might single out no. 24, which the owner would like to regard as a portrait of Plato, or failing that Aristotle or another. There is much else that will interest readers in the different branches of classical studies and attract those who care for ancient craftsmanship; it is sufficient to remark that it is written under names ranging in order from Beazley to Wace. The excellence of production and the scarcity of slips and misprints render the book a pleasure to read and a very handy-some memorial.

J. M. Cook.


This is a pleasant little work. The author is an archaeologist, obviously interested especially in the history of art both ancient and modern and far from ill-informed regarding the literary sources for the cult of the Arkadian goat-god. Concerning this he has nothing very new to say, indeed could hardly expand the subject in so small a compass. He does, however, suggest that so fundamental a human need as belief has lasting results: ‘Götter, wenn anders sie wirklich Götter sind, sterben nicht’ (p. 10). He also thinks this development of Pan into a universal deity is something more than the bad pun on θάνατος and παν; he remarks pertinently that in Hellenistic times several minor deities achieved relatively prominent places (p. 6); he instances Hekate and Tyche, but might have made use of what later arrangement of Pan into a universal god is.

However, the chief feature of the work is the discussion, well illustrated and with careful references for the sources of the illustrations, of the representations in art of Pan and a good deal of other material, in connection with what earlier arrangement of Pan into a universal god is. He is an interest construction of a credible figure half-human, half-bestial (he has some remarks, p. 51, on the genius of the Greeks for doing this very thing), then the modifications, such as they were, of this or rather arrangement, and the artists of the Renaissance. A good deal of space is given to the fantastic and rather fascinating works of the Swiss painter Böcklin.

Interesting points are the story of the death of Pan (p. 701); he connects him with dying and rising gods of the well-known type, with her reviews of which some such deities are non-Greek and agricultural and, as the author rightly says (p. 17 sq.), Pan is pure Greek and a god of herdsmen, and the quaint post-classical developments (pp. 70, 71), which connect him with the devil and also with Christ. Of mistakes of fact there seem to be none of the least importance.

H. J. Rose.


Father Festugière, one of the two or three persons now alive best qualified to speak about the Hermetic writings, continues his study of them in this volume, which is one of the series known as Études bibliques, a title which obviously is given a liberal interpretation. His short introduction covers fairly familiar ground, for he is not interpreting minor details of the Corpus Hermeticum itself, but tracing the descent of one idea or another through later myths. It is well known that the treatises fall into two principal and mutually contradictory groups, in one of which the material universe is good, while in the other it is bad. The one is the optimistic, the other the pessimistic. It may (cf. p. 75) take either of two shapes, of which the second is perhaps the more characteristically Hermetic. Either the universe is considered to be probably the work of a wise and beneficent God, or gods (the familiar Argument from Design), or it is itself a divine being, and in that case (p. 142) the universe may, if somewhat loosely (for there seems to be nothing like a cult of the universe, the heavens, or any part thereof, until the third century A.D.), speak of a cosmic religion with a cult, and a Teratotheos.

Hermetism, however, is a system quite lacking in originality. Its treatises are not even original in their form, which derives (I would add ‘so far as we can trace it!’) from those portions of the Platonic dialogues which, like the famous address of Diotima to Sokrates, are a private interview between master and disciple, or a small and select group of disciples; see p. 50 and the whole of Chapter II.

It is therefore instructive to trace the descent of such of its teachings as are of the optimistic kind already mentioned, and this is done in great detail in a series of chapters which cover, of necessity, a good deal of ground already well known to students of the history of philosophy. Their justification is that the material is arranged with a view of tracing this one tendency in a way hardly possible to a superficial review of the whole history; even so, they are perhaps too verbose. It seems therefore unnecessary to analyse them here in detail; one or two differences of opinion on trivial points will be found in a forthcoming notice of the book in CR. The arrangement is well thought out.

Chapter IV, which is quite short, treats of Xenophon’s Memorabilia, and here as elsewhere attention is drawn not only to the resemblances to but the differences from ideas expressed in the Hermetica. Chapter IV treats of the Timaeus and Laws, and the study of the earlier (pre-Aristotelian) period is thus concluded, for the author does not dogmatically say that the Epinomis is not Platonic (pp. 196–218), but rather passes the question over (p. 196, n. 1), although with fairly evident leanings towards the view that it is not Plato’s own, because for his purposes it is enough that it is in accord with the views of the Academy after the master’s death. Aristotle is represented chiefly by his lost work On Philosophy, and the elaborate discussion of his brings to an end the second part of the book.

Chapter IX beginning the third section, with a treatment of the earlier Stoics. With Kleanthes (and Aratos, who gets a fairly minute examination) a sort of cosmic religion may be considered. It is what is properly established.

Part IV bears the general title Le dogmatisme éclectique, and its first chapter (XII) reviews the beginnings of eclecticism, not forgetting one of its most important vehicles, the over-popular manuals of philosophy, the ancestors of the doxographies which we still have. Naturally therefore the author goes on to examine the works of the most
elloquent student of such manuals (though not of them only), Cicero, whose philosophical works are given a long and thorough analysis, filling Chapter XIII, in which the author neither attempts nor feels capable of making Cicero out to have been an original philosopher nor falls into the opposite error of supposing that his long life, spent in grappling with moral and political problems, left him with nothing of his own to contribute. Chapter XIV deals with the expounding of the Delphi, and translating a great part of it from Lorimer’s text, there having been, it appears, no good translation in French before. The last author to be considered is Philon of Alexandria. The omission of several writers, lost or surviving, is deliberate (see pp. xiv, xvi). Some merely say what those analyses had said already; one, Poseidonios, is too imperfectly known for us to be sure what views he had of his own and what he merely repeated after earlier thinkers. The book ends by discussing in three short appendices and a number of addenda several interesting, but minor points.

H. J. Rose.


This book is unassuming in size, but not unimportant. When the full history of the influence of Hesiod, which the author desires, comes to be written, its learned compiler, whoever he may be, will certainly find that Professor Solmsen has decided views of his own, from which one may differ and yet learn more than a little, and strong common sense, in spite of which he occasionally makes apophasic gestures against some ἴσαν ἐπίσταν from the ghost-world of separation when he mentions Homer. The first and perhaps most important chapter in the book is devoted to Hesiod, and treats him from the proper point of view, as an original thinker, whose central idea is (p. 52), the new order introduced by Zeus with Justice for its governing principle. The details are worked out most interestingly, for example, the twofold arrangement of much of the matter, genealogical and cosmological (pp. 58 sqq.) and the early equivalent of logical categories which the former arrangement gives rise to (as p. 80). Perhaps, however, the author’s enthusiasm for his subject takes him a little too far when he speaks (p. 64) of ‘Plato’s debt to Hesiod.’ A certain resemblance between their lines of thought is certainly present and explained by Professor Solmsen, but each of the two men has, in his fashion, to perceive an orderly system in the facts they studied. Those facts, as is well recognised on p. 77, were for Hesiod of two kinds, the data furnished by the canonical writings of Homer, the Theogony and especially Homer, and the inferences affecting daily life. Here and there doubtful interpretations creep in. In poems so loosely constructed as those of Hesiod, the possibility of insertions by a later hand is real, and disputed passages are and probably will always be many. Solmsen accepts the praises of Hekate (p. 51) and rejects, on grounds which seem to me frivolous, the episode of the swallowing of Metis. Now and again he seems to find difficulties which are not there. For instance (p. 28), why should not the Hesperides be children of Nyx, seeing that night and evening are naturally associated ideas? He finds (p. 58) that it is ‘difficult to believe’ that Hesiod should have stated the object of his poem in Hymn to Dionysus, 331, ‘Hymn to Dionysus the Dionysus of all parents of all things, but merely reiterates that he is the ancestor of all gods, i.e. τὸν ἀνθρώπον is masculine. But such flaws are no more than occasional weaknesses in a generally excellent exposition.

Hoping, having dealt, towards the end of the discussion of Hesiod, with that poet’s conception of justice (see especially pp. 92-3), he goes on in a brief chapter (pp. 107-23) to treat of Solon, paying naturally most attention to the moralising in frag. 1 Diehl, but not confining himself to that. The handling of the matter is sound, but not particularly striking; there was not much new to say.

The second chapter (pp. 24-29) he treats of Aeschylus, spending about half the space on the Prometheus. Although he accumulates valuable material, I find his work here comparatively disappointing. There are modern, for instance, interpretations of the Prometheus, that are quite adequate, and do not do more than express general approval. The play had been well enough expounded before; Solmsen follows the soundest views and briefly rejects certain crank sociological theories. To go into minute detail of agreement and disagreement would expand this notice beyond reasonable limits.

H. J. Rose.


This is an excellent source-book for lecturers on and students of Greek religion. The texts, which are taken from good modern critical editions when these are available, are arranged under five main heads, and divided into seven parts: the Eleusinian Mysteries being grouped together, but a list at the beginning of the book gives the date of every text, and when an inscription is cited, its date is given at the head of it. In this way the danger of jumbling together authoritative and unreliable documents of different ages and different weights is avoided. There are no notes save a brief apparatus criticus to each extract; the alternative would have been to provide a commentary such as would swell the book beyond all reasonable limits for a work of this kind. But a few more pages giving more inscriptions extracts, for instance, some information about Hellenistic mysteries, at Andania and elsewhere, would make a very welcome addition. Of really essential literary little material has been omitted.

H. J. Rose.


This is a serious attempt to list and classify all known Greek altars or similar structures, including those of the Mycenaean period. The author believes he has succeeded in being ‘complete, if not exhaustively so in number, certainly as to types’ (p. xvi). For these he furnishes a terminology which archaeologists might do well to examine, as it may save a great deal of trouble in describing such things as the evacuation of a temple or of a house containing a private shrine. An unavoidable result is that most of the book is taken up with dry enumerations, measurements, and the like, which could not be omitted if a clear and accurate idea was to be given of the objects discussed. On such matters as the restoration of lost or partly lost structures, the assignment of a given altar to a particular cult (Olympian or chthonian) and other debatable points, due caution is shown.

One theoretical result, however, is important if correct. The author holds that sacrificial altars, intended for burning the flesh of victims, are comparatively late (pp. vi, 41, 52, 56, 87 sqq.), coming about the time of the Dorian migration. So far he deals with archaeological fact; no one structure capable of being interpreted as an altar is found associated with calcined animal bones or fat-soaked earth or ashes. But when he proceeds to credit the invading Dorians with the introduction, not simply of burning victims on an altar and not, for instance, on a pile of wood on the bare earth, but of animal sacrifice generally, he goes beyond the facts and neglects the strong evidence of Homer that this Dorian custom was familiar to Achaeans also, to say nothing of that indication from the very title of the double sacrifice and the ‘horns of consecration’ in Crete that victims were quite commonly offered to the deities worshipped there. Such considerations, being positive, must outweigh the merely negative fact that no place has yet been found
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where burnt sacrifice was provably offered, save for Cypriote examples (pp. 42 sq.), of neolithic date and belonging to the cult of the dead. The Homeric evidence, however, shows that altars were used for animal sacrifice (e.g. Δ ἄβços, 9) not infrequently mention such an offering without saying that an altar was used (as γ Χρόνια, sqq.). Also, it does not tell us if the altars were permanent structures, in any way comparable to the score or so of types which Yadis lists and analyses. Apollo at Delos would seem to have had a permanent one of some kind (§ 162), but otherwise we are left in doubt.

Use is made (p. 22) of the H. Triadria sarcophagus for Crete. Probably too late for the author to have read it, Nilsson has pointed out (Korykos Myth, 1949, 14) that it represents intrusive Achaian ceremonial and not a native cult at all.

Having made the above exceptions, I think it proper to emphasise that Professor Yadis has written a most valuable work of reference, not to be neglected by anyone who would form a clear idea of what apparatus was in use from Cretan to Hellenistic and Roman times in the Greek area for the worship of Hellenic or pre-Hellenic deities.


This volume, which is No. 18 of the publications of the Institut français d'Athènes, is also the first of a new series, designed to illustrate the continuance of Greek custom and life through the ages, but must therefore be a little suspected of part pris; for despite the high scientific repute of Professor Romaios, he, like every other human being, has his personal equation, and being a Greek, is constantly under the natural and understandable temptation to find a native Greek origin for any old custom he observes in his own country. This detracts a little from his explanations of the customs discussed; the value of the descriptions themselves is of course unaffected, and they alone would make any book worth reading.

The (Assanaria (the shorter form is in local use, or more commonly nestanaria) are a complex of rites celebrated in a group of villages of N.E. Thrace, the centre of the cult being the village of Kosti. The date is May, the first ceremonies taking place on May 2, and others following for some three weeks. The officiants, who of course are not of the official clergy, for the Church has vainly fulminated for centuries against the whole performance as heretical if not heretical, are held in great esteem locally. The three most outstanding feasts are: an ecstatic dance during which icons of SS. Constantine and Helena are carried, a firewalk, attested by most respectable observers, medical and other, to be perfectly genuine, and the killing and eating to as many as possible of the victims, a bull or bulls, whose age must be an odd number of years. The earliest full description dates from 1873, but documentary evidence of the existence of something of the kind takes us well back into the Middle Ages, and an ancient origin seems highly probable.

A general resemblance to Dionysiac orgies is obvious; it cannot, however, be said that the detailed proof of this which Romanos attempts is at all cogent. In particular, he fails to note, what some of his own quotations prove (pp. 111 sqq., citing Strabo V, 2, 9, to which he should add Vergil, A. XI, 785 sqq., with Servius ad loc., and XII, 2, 7) that the only attested cases of fire-walking in classical antiquity are Italic and Etruscan, not Greek.

The rest of the book is on a subject already familiar to British students especially, from Professor Dawkins' classic description of it, JHS 1906, 191 sqq., the rite of the kôzásoros (to give them one of their numerous names; Romanos does if these were ever, more to be monky, more necessary to say more, therefore, that the author collects from several good sources further details of this rite itself and of others like it. When he comes to explain it as a ceremony meant to produce fertility, he is no doubt correct, but he is unnecessarily complicating the text and he falls into an error which is less common now than it once was, that of imagining (p. 173) that because a rite is of a simple, magical kind, involving no appeal to any deity, it must therefore be of great antiquity, 'predeistic' and prehistorical. As a matter of fact, such performances may originate wherever and whenever there is a community living in a desired state of things, and it is not particularly practised for the public good, or survive in one conservative enough to keep up, in earnest or as a traditional piece of fun, the ceremonial of its simpler ancestors, whether they live as long ago as the fourth millennium. Therefore it is rather too much and too uncritical use made of the works of the late Miss Jane Harrison.

H. J. ROSE.


Dr. Rosan's book on Proclus is divided into two main parts. The first, 'Introduction to Proclus' contains a survey of important books and articles on Proclus, a translation, with introduction and notes, of Marinus's 'Life,' and a fairly detailed account of Proclus's own writings. This part of the book will be of great value to all students of ancient philosophy, as it provides a good deal of information, well arranged and clearly presented, which is not easily available elsewhere.

The second part is devoted to a detailed survey of the philosophy of Proclus, to which Dr. Rosan is, as he says himself in his Preface, very sympathetically disposed. This is from a rather artificial distinction (into Ontology, Cosmology, and Theology) and does not correspond to anything in Proclus's thought or the arrangement of his writings and also from a somewhat unhistorical and uncritical approach. Dr. Rosan does not make very much serious attempt to put Proclus in his historical context or to relate his thought to that of his predecessors, and especially to that of Plotinus: the comparison of Proclus and Plotinus (pp. 227-9) certainly does not suggest that Dr. Rosan has a very good understanding of the thought of the latter. He does not realize the difference in the intellectual and spiritual stature of the two men. Nor does he anywhere bring out the ways in which the thought of Proclus influenced later philosophers and theologians. And in his account of Proclus's system he is so anxious to demonstrate the coherence and validity of the philosopher's thought that he occasionally goes so far as to suggest the introduction of further elaborations into what one might have thought was already a sufficiently elaborate structure. But in spite of this Dr. Rosan has done students of Neo-Platonism a great service in providing them with a very much fuller and clearer guide to the labyrinth of the Commentaries and the Platonic Theology (his principal sources). Though for the study of the basic principles of Proclus's philosophy in their historical setting Dodds's Oxford edition of the Elements of Theology remains unsurpassed.

The Greek (or Latin) texts of the most important passages of Proclus referred to in the notes are given in an appendix. There is a full bibliography and adequate indexes.

A. H. ARMSTRONG.


The revision of this standard work has been very thorough, resulting in a considerably larger volume than the first edition of 1927, that is, the volume is in 2 parts, with illustrations in the text, and four plates; this one lacks plates, but has 208 text-figures large and small, the size of page remaining practically the same. But much more important is the completely elaborated structure. But in spite of this the book is the fruits of work with which it has been brought in line, partly on basis of new archaeological discoveries since 1927, but with the author's enlargements and reconsiderations of his own views. To take one example, perhaps especially interesting to British students of the subject, the 'Ritual of the Kyklopai', and Arthur Evans' interpretation of the figures on it originally occupied a considerable part of the last section of the book.
that dealing with the after-life. It is now relegated to a section (pp. 40 sqq.) which treats of 'suspect objects' and the view that it is a forgery supported with weighty arguments (especially p. 50). The discussion of sarcophaghi which H. Triphtha (chap. xiii) has been enlarged to bring in the author's latest explanation of its anomalies, that it is a native Cretan artist's presentation of the cult of a Mycenaean, not a Minoan worthy. The freshness of the information is helped by the insertion at the end of the prefatory part of the work of two pages of addenda for which no room could be found in the text, the references being to works which appeared after the book was in page-proof. These include Yavis' monograph on Greek altar, reviewed above (p. 94).

The main outlines of the book and the most important conclusions remain unchanged, a testimony to their general soundness in the hands of a scholar who can be as critical of his work as he is able to retract what he has published earlier, or to point out where his former views call for modification. Nevertheless, this edition contains so much that is new that it will replace the former one as an indispensable book for all interested in this important branch of the study of ancient religion.

H. J. ROSE.


This thesis is divided into five chapters. The first gives a brief and rather confused account of the importance of Antioch from the Seleucid period to the Arab conquest. The last two are second and third chapters, which treat the provenance, numbers, race, and language of the Antiochenes. The author does not, it is true, add much to our knowledge. He does not make full use of the scanty evidence available; in his analysis he is often offered against them by ancient and modern historians. Of more value are the second and third chapters, which treat the provenance, numbers, race, and language of the Antiochenes. The author does not, it is true, add much to our knowledge. He does not make full use of the scanty evidence available; in his analysis he is often offered against them by ancient and modern historians. The two authors, in their local inscriptions from Antioch, have collected the number of Antiochenes known from literary sources and from inscriptions elsewhere. But he handles his evidence with care and good sense, coming to the conclusion that the terms Hellenic and Syrian have in the Roman period scarcely any racial significance.

A. H. M. JONES.


This is written in Turkish with an English summary of about half the length of the Turkish text. The main finds of Pergae were sarcophagi of the second and third centuries A.D., thirty-five of which were discovered, most of them sculptured and inscribed. The more elaborate are of imported marble, in one case Proconnesian, as is stated in the inscription. All but one are 'garland sarcophagi' of slightly differing types; the remaining one belongs to Rodenwaldt's Pamphylian group, and it is possible to give a fuller list of sarcophagi of this group and to confirm the attribution to a Pamphylian workshop, which exported sarcophagi as far as Italy.

Many of the inscriptions contain a version of the formula protective for a fine ranging from 5,500 to 50,000 denarii to the city or the imperial treasury (τῇ πόλις, τῷ ηπείρου ταύτῳ, τῷ φίλῳ, τῷ κυριάκῳ ταύτῃ) if the heirs should not securely fasten the sarcophagi, or if any unauthorised person should deposit a burial in it. None the less, all the sarcophagi have various inscriptions on them, witness usurpation. As in other inscriptions of Pergae, there are no Anatolian names; of eighty-three names recorded, fifty are Greek, thirty-three Latin. Of the inscriptions, to the memory of an equestrian Roman, is in Latin.

The great glory of Pergae was the temple of Artemis Pergaia, but search for its remains was unsuccessful.

T. J. DUNBARIN.


The plan of publication of the Danish excavations at Hama on the Orontes, of which this is the first part, envisages four volumes, some to be divided into separately published parts. Hama has a very long history, and most periods between the neolithic and the late Byzantine were touched on. But the cemeteries, with which this volume is alone concerned, belong to a limited period, the early Iron Age (c. 1200–720 B.C.). Some 1670 funeral deposits of this period were found, so their presentation in a practical form was intended to offer problems which the author has successfully overcome.

The first interest of the Hellenist will lie in the evidence of intercourse between Syria and the Aegean. In two deposits were found fragments of Cycladic cups with pendant concentric semicircles below the rim (like those found at al Mina, JHS 1940, 3, fig. 1a-4). Others were found on the citadel of Hama, in the stratum which represents the city destroyed by Sargon in 720 B.C. In the same period—eighteenth century, possibly extending back into the ninth—Cypriot vases and fibulas of Cypriot type are also found in fair quantities.

The pottery is for the most part of local Syrian types and origins. But at the beginning of the Iron Age (late seventh century) Dr. Riis observes an appreciable amount of Late Mycenaean or submymecenaen influence in both shapes and decoration. Further signs of Aegean, or in some cases it may be European, influence at this time are the appearance of figures of a 'spearman', of 'slashing swords', of 'wheatsheaves', of amber, and, according to Dr. Riis, of crenation. A useful section examines the early appearances of crenation in Greece and the Near East, and concludes that it was an Eastern custom, introduced at the time of the migrations. It must be observed, however, that the earliest instances of crenation in Anatolia belong to the full Bronze Age (Troy VI, Yasilik Kaya, and in a Boghaz Keui text); the recently discovered traces of purification by fire at Kültepe (First interim Report of the British Institute in Kentikale, 1948-9, p. 20), together with instances of the same rite in Mycenaean burials in the Argolid, may suggest that crenation developed in Anatolia rather than in Greece, from this rite, and spread outward with the use of iron. However, in Syria crenation is intrusive, at Hama as on other sites, and is introduced with iron as a consequence of the migrations at the beginning of the Dark Ages. It is at the same time that crenation is introduced to Athens; and there are other parallels in the burial rite at Hama and in the Kerameikos, in the deposit of iron weapons in men's graves (the swords are of the same type) and in the use of rough stones as grave markers. The submycenaean character of some of the pottery at Hama has been interpreted as the result of the Late Mycenaean expansion to Cyprus and the Syrian coast. But the similarities of burial rite in Early Iron Age Syria and Attica should be due to a common influence from a third area or, perhaps, to related elements in the population of these areas. It may be that the common element is derived, not from the Balkans or Central Europe, but from eastern Anatolia, where the Iron Age began.

The general level of culture at Hama in this period was not high and most of the objects are of a 'utility' nature. The mettalic way in which all classes of objects are presented and discussed is the more laudable, and should make the book very useful for workers in neighbouring fields. But there are goods things; for instance, the fine ivory golet with handle is already known from the northern Palestinian report, and the gilt bronze figurine of a seated god wearing a horned tiara.

T. J. DUNBARIN.


The use of abstract titles of courtesy ('your transparency') of which Ernest Bramah has taught us to consider the Chinese outstanding exponents, has been examined more
NOTICES OF BOOKS

than once in its older flowering in the Byzantine Empire, but never, Dr. Zilliacus states, from the background of purely linguistic history. In this charming and unassuming essay he seeks to fill this gap. He starts by working forward from classical and early Hellenistic Greek in order to discover, in the order of chronology, where the word θραυσμος shows a potential predisposition in the language, which can be regarded as an unheeded or neglected scholarly style. But the case of Latin will prevent our taking 'potential predispositions' too seriously. Zilliacus quotes with approval Marouzeau's dictum 'the history of the Latin language can in a sense be summed up in the conquest of the word θραυσμος.'

The book offers a Muistes tua applied by Horace to Augustus (Ep. II, 1, 238) at a time when there is no question of Greek influence, and a widespread use of abstract forms of address in the fourth century. 'Divinitas vestra venerandum purpuram suam adornare iussit' writes Abbianus to the joint emperors Constans and Constantius in A.D. 340, JEA 1928 p. 320 (Divinitas is missing from Zilliacus' list of abstract titles. I presume its Greek equivalent is θραυσμος). When, however, he reaches the Roman and Byzantine periods, Zilliacus has many thoughtful remarks to make. Mention may be made of his preliminary discussion of Byzantine stylistic in his first chapter, enlarged later in examining the ecclesiastical histories of the fourth century; the use of P. Oxy. 2131 of A.D. 207 τη δε αρχή της μεγαλοποίησης των θεών ... τιμωρυχία μετά των δύο δικοι ... πετωματισμός (it may be added that such a phrase is an essential part of the pro forma in appeals to authority) to show the shortness of the step from the concept of an official's omnipotence to address- ing him as the incarnation of that omnipotence. An analysis of terms used in the fourth century enables Zilliacus to separate in the epistolary manual that goes under the name of Libanius those model letters which are fourth century products from the later acrescence. The book concludes with an index locorum and a list of titles discussed. Incidentally, the Latin letter quoted on p. 55 is to be dated to c. A.D. 320; a tattered duplicate of it and other papers concerning Thoephantes of Hermopolis are in the John Rylands library in Manchester.

E. G. TURNER.


In 1947 a collection of Greek papyri (part already published) which formerly the property of O. Graden- witz was purchased by the Fuad I University in Cairo. Mr. D. S. Crawford expounds this collection in his book. He prints 43 unpublished texts in full, describes or extracts from 290 others and revises those already published. All the texts are documents with the exception of three unimportant Homeric scraps, and one described as 'theological' (magical?). In compiling this catalogue, the editor has perforce had to work his way through the tiny scraps found at the bottom of the barrel in every papyrus collection. It is a task to try the powers and patience of an expert, and Mr. Crawford is a newcomer. It should therefore be said straightforwardly that the attempt is not one. He has laboured to understand the texts, but to believe (often poses a new problem or makes interesting remarks on new terms (e.g. on δοσιακοκλώσω, an object familiar to archaeologists). Nevertheless, the difficulties have not been mastered. The equipment is insufficient to allow any attempt at close dating of the hands concerned: in spite of his sceptical remarks on p. iv, documentary hands can be dated within narrower limits than he allows. His transcriptions do not always agree among themselves (e.g. centurion's name in his no. xxxiv) and there are no photos to serve as a check. It is therefore all the more to be regretted that he has unnecessarily handicapped his readers with an expl. of peculiarities of Greek script; some names are printed without accent, breathings, capital letters or punctuation, though the words are divided; trifling notes on matters of diplomatic and important ones on matters of substance play hide and seek with each other and with such translations as are given; Roman, not Arabic numerals are used for serial numbers; the papyri instead of being arranged throughout either by publication numbers in a list, by order of discovery, or under headings, are dealt with by a mixture of both, making reference a tortuous and verbose business; there is no concordance table of present inventory numbers and places of previous publication, so that it is a tedious investigation to discover whether this edition makes any important revision. All this is redundant and need not be brought to the reviewer of the infuriating vexations of the Petrie Papyri, which after all were published 60 years ago, before Grenfell and Hunt worked out a technique of presentation which has been universally accepted as a sound scientific method.

There are several interesting texts in the collection, but the short compass of this review will permit only one to be singled out. No. XIV is the top portion of a letter of the early third century A.D. addressed to a strategus of the Memphite nome by an ex-epimeletes of Memphis who is also κλαδους (κλαδους τοιου τηναπο διανειχα). The text from I. 5 r: 'Επί Ασιαπολημου Αυθωνομιου Φροντισσατος Ενταγμουντος ενδια (read ενδια, and compare, for instance, with Φροντισσατος ἐνταγμουντος τοιου την αυθα (read -εθα) μεγαλουκειο με και ενδια τοιου την αυθα ενταγμουντος τεθανεί τις λαέρεις κτλ. The editor suggests the possibility that θαυμασχει means 'some sort of stage scenery', and one thinks of the θαυμασχεια of A. W. Wood, The Roman Campagna, 300 A.D. (Dionysos at Athens, Index) in the Delphic theatre lists. But what is a frumentarius doing here? Now θαυμασχεια at this time may equally well be applied to an amphitheatre, and it is in fact tempting to connect this frumentarius with preparations made after Caracalla's proposed tour of the Empire. Dio Cassius 77, 9, 6-7 relates προσεχεια και θαυμασχεια και τετράδρομον παντεχο, οπουνα και ζημωμενα θημα αι και μακροεντομα, μηνα παρ' σοτοι λαερεις. If this view is on the right lines, it might mean some kind of container (for wild beasts? with trap doors?)

The following observations on individual texts are the fruit of a first perusal. No. VI (same correspondents as in P. Oxy. 1069); in l. 4 and 7 ( which are falsly used for ). L. 4 is presumably to be understood as ἥμα το θαυμασχεια ταμείον. L. 6 ἐγγενεται γεωνομος does not mean 'the post left'. No. VII, l. 7: since the papyrus is incomplete, divide of οὔ, restoring e.g. of οὔ[ο]. The suggestion that οὐσ = όσε is phonetically unconvincing. No. XIII, l. 8: και at the beginning of line, if correctly read, points to an omission by the scribe. No. XXIII 19-22: in this tantalising date by Carinus and Numerianus without Carus (the year number not being made out), unless there is a further omission. All is distinguished as imperator and Numerianus as nobilissimus Caesar though both are Augusti.

E. G. TURNER.

Mélanges d’archéologie et d’histoire offerts à Charles Picard à l’occasion de son 65e anni-

The width of M. Picard’s interests is reflected in these volumes presented to him on his sixty-fifth birthday. The articles range in time and subject from ancient Egypt to medieval France, and many of them, perhaps most, have their starting-point in an observation made by the master. As there are 108 articles (and a few others which could not appear in the Mélanges have been printed in Rev. Arch. for 1949). It is impossible to do more here than give a brief note of those which concern Greek studies, passing over those which deal with Egypt or the Near East, Rome or Gaul, or medieval subjects.

Peristories. C. Delvoye contributes an important paper on the origin of the seal-stamp of the Greek mainland. N. Platon writes on M.M.I Bell-Idols, publishing objects from his excavations at Poros near Heraklon. P. Demargne discusses Minoan female dress, beginning from M.M.I. The frontispiece from Mallia. E. Chadaptour publishes a Linear B inscription on a clay roundel, also from Mallia. H. Gallet de Santerre deals.
with the relations of Delos, Crete and the Mainland in the second millennium; he holds that Delos first became an important centre of population in the L.H. I period, from which relations with the Mainland are attested by finds of pottery. From the tomb of a warrior at the entrance to the ancient city walls of Enkomi, which belong, according to the potter found in his excavation there, to the late fourteenth or thirteenth century.

Byzantium. C. H. Emilie Haspels discusses the colossal kriophoros of Thasos. Miss G. M. A. Richter adds epigraphic evidence to her Archaic Attic Gravevases, concerned mainly with the Kerameikos and Boston sphinxes. E. Coche de la Ferrière works on the relief Athens 3131, which points to a Roman origin of the tombs of the Attic black-figured amphora. M. Simon-Besques publishes the head of an archaic Attic marble kouros, now in Amiens.

H. P. L'Orange deals with a head known in a number of copies derived from the fifth century b.c., which, he thinks, represented Pausanias with his beard knotted in Persian fashion. J. Bérard publishes three terracotta heads of the early fifth century, one Sicilian, the other two probably from Medusa, and related to Pythias. R. Lefort of the Ylones works on 'Le galep du Parthénon' (a mixed action, impressionist rather than photographically realistic). J. Pouillon treats reliefs from Thasos figuring a torch race with clubs, perhaps part of the Heraia. G. P. Stevens illustrated the discovery of the Tomb of the Monarch of the Ship of Amphialus. A. W. Lawrence treats generally of cutting points in Hellenic sculpture, à propos of Pliny N.H. xxxiv. 52: 'cessavit deinde artis. P. Lévêque offers an identification of the combattants in the Attic Treasure at Delfti. J. Macé reads on Parthenokles of Athens, a third century sculptor, known from three inscriptions; R. Martin, on a signature of Praxias son of Praxias, of Athens, found at Thasos.

Inscriptions. As well as the artists' signatures just mentioned, other epigraphical articles are those of G. Daux on IG XII, Suppl. (1939), 347, a Thasian inscription relating to the wine trade; F. Sokolowski on the treaty between Delphi and Sikathes (BCH 1939, 189 ff.); A. Plassart, publishing inscriptions from Thebes; M. Launey on an inscription of Ptolemy VI Philotet of Methana (IG IV 354), adding an unpublished inscription from Delos naming the same person (Eirenaeos, not, as is read in IG IV 354, 1, 4, [T] (T) [m] ais).


'Other iconographical' studies are those of W. Déonna on 'les lions tied to the column', tracing the motive from an Oriental origin through Minoan-Mycenaean art to Romanesque times; Anna Roes on 'l'agne psychopomphe de Memnon' in the collection of Mme. M. Guez, Athineon; M. H. Petzet on the collection of Mme. Petzet at Athens, is published by G. P. Okkonen; he identifies the subject as Achilles killing Troados. W. Vollgraff writes on Theocr. xv. 100 f. and the Cypriot Aphrodite; R. Pataki and A. G. E. M. Schefrin on the Cypriot Germaine Cart, Triptolemos on two lamps in the Louvre.

Among the papers dealing with cult are H. Grégoire on Bacchus in bull's form; F. Vian on the Panathenaic peplos in Apolloleus, 493-2 88 (FGH II. B, 1072, F 105); S. Estrem on the Epidaurus at Eleusis. R. Schilling illustrates the Arvæphoria from a passage of Martial (iii. 68.3).

Topography. Many papers already mentioned deal with topographical points, particularly connected with the French School excavations on the Cyclades, Chios, Delos, etc. Other topographical papers are: J. Delorme, on the identification and chronology of the Palaestra at Delos (the Granite Palaestra being dated after the middle of the second century b.c.); G. Amé on Delphi; P. de La Coste-Messire's careful account of the Delphian offering of the Tarentines over the Messapians (cf. Paus. x. 10.6); L. Lerat's 'Krisa' (Krisa prehistorique, Kirha archaïque et classique; analysis of the literary sources, taking the results of French excavations at Delos, Delphi and Thebes). H. van Effenterre discusses fortified strongholds in East Crete, some with gynaietrai on the rocks of ships, archers and short inscriptions. Another Cretan paper is by G. D. Steriopoulos on the threefold division of Crete ascribed by Strabo (C. 476) to Minos; he finds that this corresponds not to anything in Minoan times but to the Hellenistic rivalry of Knossos, Gortyn and Kydonia.

P. M. Duval's paper on Greek and Roman ships does not fit into any of the categories so far established. He illustrates from representations of ships the development in the same general form from Greek to Roman, and the modifications of the general type of the two main periods (in some cases, following Hellenistic models). There are more representations of Roman ships than of Greek of the classical period; one, in the form of a column base, in the Terme Museum, is published by J. Le Gall.

History. P. Cloché offers 'Remarques sur les étapes de l'ambition d'Antigone 1er jusqu'en 316 avant J.C.' J. Treheux deals with the last years of Delos under the amcyctes, offering a table of archaees for the years 396-315. To an earlier period relates F. Chambou's paper on the Antenorids at Cyrène, referring to Pind. Pyth. v. 82 ff. (holds that the Greek colonisation of Cyrène was thought by Pindar and his contemporaries to precede the Trojan War; cf. the early Euekan date); and Y. Béguignon on Apollo's usurpation at Delphi, Ptoon and Thebes, in each place accompanied by Athena Pronaia.

Other papers whose topic is mainly literary (though many of those already mentioned combine literary and archaeological evidence) are by F. Robert, on the origin of the word 'tragedy'; L. Rousel on the stage in the classical Greek theatre (he believes in a wooden stage); H. Jeanmaire on satyrs and Maenads, referring to Plato Lese 843 c.; P. M. Schulz on 'Le jeu du lier, les liens de la nécessité et la fonction d'Hestia', on Rep. vi. 506 ff. and other passages of Plato. J. Bouquet's treatment of Callimachus fr. 197 Pfl. and the throne of the Hermes Colossus is a good example of the papers in which an archaeologist may bring to the interpretation 'the lore of the ancients'.

Medieval Greece. Among the papers on medieval and modern subjects are A. Bon on the capture of Kalamata by the Franks in 1205; J. Longnon also on the Fourth Crusade, in a more general paper called 'Dominated, colonized, and civilisation grecque'; M. Th. Schmitter-Picard on silk-workers. J. Carcopino throws light on the Periplus of Hanno from a Greek portolan of the sixteenth century. T. J. Dunabin finds a survival of the cult of Apollo at the monastery of Panormos in Smyr.

Only half the contents of these two volumes have been enumerated in this already too long and jejune summary. It remains to wish M. Picard many years to enjoy the continuation of his principal researches and to pay him the tribute offered in homage by his friends and pupils may strike from him some of those characteristically enlightening sparks in which his works, the bibliography of which is here printed, have been so rich.

T. J. DUNABIN.
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of the needs of those states in man-power. How did they meet these needs, from what areas, and for what length of time from the various reservoirs? 'Military demography', in fact, is the first problem he tackles. It fills the whole of this book and will spill over into the second, and it is revealed, as he assures us, that this second volume will also contain a prosopography of the foreign elements in the armies, wider than the well-known Ausserbritische Bevölkerung of F. Heichelheim in that it will refer to all the Hellenistic kingdoms, narrower since it will deal only with military personnel. The second volume will then proceed to the second stage: the contacts of these mercenary armies with the cities and the rest of the population of the states in which they were billeted or settled on the land; the attitude adopted towards that standard of living, prestige, and populariety; the institutions such as gymnasia, societies, religious traditions by which armies maintained their individuality, and the clash of cultures which resulted. What he does not intend to do is to examine the military organisation of different states, their recruiting methods and the internal structure of their armed forces; or even inside his chosen field to discuss the civic and national armies (e.g. the Macedonian forces of the Antigonids, or the Egyptian army of the Ptolemies).

The thematic discussed in this volume has not previously been discussed synthetically on so ample a scale. G. T. Griffiths' admirable Mercenaries of the Hellenistic World comprises it in less than 20 pages. Professor de Launey's admirable search for complete collection of the evidence, and his 'researches' are clearly based on an enormous card-index. It is not, however, merely tipped out into his writing. Every fact is weighed for its own sake, and ordered in perspective. Particularly welcome in the collection of evidence is the attention given to the archaeological monuments and their information concerning details of equipment and tactics. It is to be hoped that the second volume (with a generous index) will not long be delayed.

The volume opens with an essay in statistics. The author analyses in turn inscriptions lists of soldiers (the Lilia inscriptions, still alas! unpublished, yield different results from those given by Griffiths), non-chronicler documents containing ethnics, the military colonisation of the Anaisone, the military population of Egypt and the inventories of historians with a certain coherence of results. In all the armies the 'pure Greek element drops brutally about 200 b.c., and practically disappears... the Macedonians held their own better, not through immigration which was certainly interrupted... but through a greater racial vitality and fecundity. The second and first centuries show, at least in Egypt, a great upsurge of Semites.' From the general he then proceeds to the particular and discusses different areas: the Peloponnesian, Central and North West Greece, the Islands, Macedonia, Anatolia, the Balkans, Asia Minor, Gauls, Semites and Iranians, and Africa and the West. Here are considered such questions as: who are the men who emigrated? When and why? What are their special national habits and skills and their individual aims?

One point may perhaps be taken up in the limited space here available. Much of the argument necessarily depends on the acceptance of a theory of the papyri, and the author is well aware that the ground quakes under his tread. He interprets the sale of slaves as used in the later second century as a mark of 'promotion to a superior military rank which conferred on its bearer the ethereal prestige of the benefactor'. The son of Apollonios, who is called 'Pseudo' in 18 b.c. after being simply 'Pseudo' in 112, 110 and 109, that there is a change of the ethereal consequent on military advancement. It may be debated whether this too is not a false trail through the jungle, and whether after all all juridical status, not military rank or organisation, is the basis of these pseudo-economics. In a contract of 76 b.c. to be published in P. Rylands Vol. IV according to two persons 'Pseudo', καθοδ' ευτροφή Προσφέρεται τῆς ἡμέρας, that is, the characteristic as Pseudo τῆς ἡμέρας denoted a judicial fiction, presumably entailing a diminution of rights voluntarily submitted to by debtors. Now, the same formula is almost certainly to be restored in P. Reisch 25, 1, 3 (also the cancellation of a debt), 'Pseudo', ἐνικέωντος [μαχητή] ἔορκα Προσφέρει τῆς ἡμέρας. This person is quoted several times by de Launey (e.g. p. 35 b. 3; 356 n. 2; 357) as Pseudo τῆς ἡμέρας simply, the reference to him as Pseudo being treated as an anachronism possibly glossing over the solution of the problem. Moreover, as the man is also described as βασιλεὺς ἡσυχοῦ (i.e. not a soldier) it is hard to conceive of him earning the title Makedon by military promotion.

E. G. TURNER.


The intelligent layman is not an easy person to write for; he will either be bewildered by technicalities or infuriated by the assumption that he knows nothing. He is however admirably catered for by these two books, which are in the best tradition of German scholarship.

Both authors treat their subject chronologically; which is the only reasonable method for the non-technical reader. And both tend to confine their attention, as well as their plates, to objects in Berlin. This is perhaps a pity as the result is neither a catalogue nor a complete history, and the novice is left in ignorance of much that is unrepresented there. Something, for instance, should have been said of the Daedalic figures (in and around the rich series of terracottas from Sicily, Locri and Tarentum).

Of the two books, that on sculpture is the more factual. Prof. Weickert gives plenty of dates, which are more important as milestones on the way of the expert. The three female figures used to illustrate the development of sculpture during the sixth century are admirably described and illustrated, and the early fourth century is especially well represented. If Dr. Bruns is slightly misleading in his table of objects, he is writing of a subject that seems to invite imprecise thinking, and which has of late been given the attention it deserves. Her study of the methods of firing and decoration could scarcely be bettered, nor could her collection of plates, except for fig. 10, which looks suspiciously like a forgery.

It is a pity that the plates are not equipped with invoice or catalogue numbers and that a short bibliography has not been added. The reader will undoubtedly be tempted to enquire further, and he should be helped as much as possible.

The authors of this series are to be congratulated on producing something scholarly, readable, concise and well illustrated.

R. A. HODGINS.


This small book comprises 69 illustrations—mostly in 2-adamantium enlargements—of ancient coins, with a running commentary, which in effect sketches the history of ancient coinage from its beginnings until the period of Constantine I. The illustrations are taken from first-class specimens, which were all in the Berlin collection and will make many realize what a loss Western scholarship has suffered in the removal (since the War) of that collection from Berlin to a destination at which we can only guess.

Enlarged photographs are, alike for the numismatist and the general reader, aremely good medium for displaying the art of the ancient die-cutter: and since that art was most often manifested in the portrayal of the features of gods or rulers, one is content that the author should have concentrated on it. Nevertheless, the general reader may infer that portrait coins are almost the entire interest of ancient coins as art: whereas, the inclusion of, for instance, one or two Tarentine 'horsemen', or of Roman architectural compositions would have helped to the greater variety and a more complete treatment. As for the text, one has no complaints, except that the name of Agathocles, the Baution king shown in fig. 37, should not be omitted: and that it seems a pity to repeat the 'Traditional' account of the earliest kind of Greek coinage in face of the weighty reasons given for its rejection by Mattingly and Robinson sixteen years ago.

G. K. JENKINS.
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These two little paper-bound books come from the series 'Antike Bronzen' and 'Dien-cam' Berliner Museen' which records in words and picture some of the best things in the pre-war Berlin collections. Simply written and orthodox they are designed for the general reader rather than the specialist; but since it looks like being a long time before the Berlin museums are reconquered and replenished in this dedications tolled, it would be good to have these convenient mementos by them. Criticism of their contents is hardly called for. One slip in Gerda Brun's book is perhaps worth noting: the Minoan praying lad by some, in a short introduction this text is written: 'the metal has not been touched after casting agrees with usual Minoan practice. In Römische Skulpturen, divided into portraits, reliefs and copies, historical reliefs receive less attention than their importance in Roman art deserves; but that is a lack in the collection rather than the author. In general the wealth of the Berlin collections is amply clear from the balance and continuity with which both books have been able to be planned. Pictures and production are remarkably good for Berlin, 1946-47.

D. E. L. HAYNES


For its purpose, the giving of some understanding of Greek philosophy up to and including Aristotle to readers who know no Greek and little about the ancient world, it would be very hard to find a better introduction than Mr. Guthrie's little book in the Home Study series. It is an admirable example of the right sort of elementary book, written by a specialist scholar of high accomplishment who has digested his scholarship well and can write attractively.
The account of the Pre-Socratics in chapters II and III is certainly the best and most sensible short account available in English of these thinkers, who are so particularly difficult to modern readers. The way in which Plato is presented in his historical context is another good feature of the book, and the two chapters on Aristotle are extremely clear and within their narrow limits of space remarkably complete. The introductory chapter on Greek Ways of Thinking should be particularly useful to the readers for whom the book is intended, especially in its discussions of the meaning of the Greek words aris, dikes, and theses (Mr. Guthrie naturally transliterates for his Greekless readers). Perhaps in repeating and expanding Wilamowitz's dictum that theses have primarily a predicative force it would have been well to point out that after all the Greeks did apparently start with a class of very substantial beings with well-defined characteristics which they called theses, even if it is also true that their dialectically impelled wish to annihilate out of everlasting superhuman power; in other words theses was surely a substantive before it was a predicate. Perhaps the division of all philosophers into materialists and teleologists, matter-philosophers and form-philosophers is rather too much of a simplification (though it works quite well for the Pre-Socrates) and would not be very easy to apply to later schools (on which side of the line do the Stoics come, for instance?). Mr. Guthrie's closing remarks (p. 161) suggest that he still holds the view of the decadence of Hellenistic thought which till quite recently was almost universal among classical scholars. There is room for high debate here, and the revaluation of Hellenistic civilization and thought, and still more that of the later Roman Empire, which is now so popularly ought to lead to some interesting and perhaps valuable discussions and comparisons.

A. H. ARMSTRONG


In the present volume, dedicated to Professor B. D. Meritt, who pays a warm tribute to the valuable assistance received from Miss E. H. Jeffery, gives a detailed account, illustrated by 324 photographs and 146 drawings, of 933 inscribed monuments of the sixth and fifth centuries B.C., together with two (nos. 1356, b) of a later date, dedicated on the Athenian Acropolis. It is a sheer delight to handle a work so convenient in format, so admirably printed, adorned with useful indices and with line-drawings of such clarity and skill. And the substance is wholly worthy of the form. The classification is not, as in Friedländer's Epigrammata, metrical, for many of these dedications are prose or epigrammata, so that their metrical nature cannot be determined, but material dedication-loci, low bases, pillar-monuments, stelae, altars and basins. Each section of the catalogue opens with a short introduction, and the invaluable Appendices contain full discussions of: (a) the formulae of the inscriptions, (b) technical aspects of the early Attic dedications (material, direction of writing, stechdorn order, punctuation, spelling, script, etc.), (c) their historical significance, and (d) the thirty sculptors whom they name. The catalogue, drawn up with infinite care and an unrivalled command of the relevant evidence, records the provenance and present location of each item with dimensions and characteristics of the stone, followed by a brief account of the almost overwhelming, bibliography, the text of the inscription and an adequate commentary. The work closes with a full epigraphical index, a table of concordance and a list of inscriptions studied or emended. Experience has taught us against claiming anything for a growing interest, but it is hard to imagine that the present work will ever be superseded. No doubt it will arouse further discussion of some of its contents, and so pave the way for progress in their study and interpretation; but the thoroughness with which the Akropolis has been examined precludes the hope that many additions will be made to the class of documents with which it deals.

The work is not indeed faultless. Errors of accentuation and punctuation are not infrequent, but it would serve no useful purpose to register them here. Many of the restorations accepted or suggested are open to doubt, though the repeated insistence of the author that the texts he offers are uncertain does much to disarm criticism. I confine myself to brief notes on a few points. No. 15. A fresh treatment of this much debated and historically interesting epigram will appear shortly in BSA.—No. 76. While fully agreeing that restorations different from those previously given in are fact possible, I cannot bring myself to regard as even possible, much less probable, the version here presented of the Phylius dedication.—No. 148. Διανοιαςιν τοῦ ἄγωμα as the end of a hexameter seems to me a likely conjecture, a mistaken interpretation of Διανοιαςιν εἰ τῶν ἄγωμα (op. cit. 124) mentioned by R.—No. 167. I doubt the restored phrase τῆς δημοσίου φυσικοῦ, for which I know no parallel.—No. 190. τοῦ κύριος ἀναστήσεις, for τοῦ μένος ἀναστήσεις, is preferred by me. The use of ἄνω on τοὺς, but the index gives ἄνων; either form of the verb is possible, but not so.—No. 202. I cannot accept ἀπὸ τῆς ἀναστήσεως ἵνα ἄνωσεν (ἀναστήσεως) as the end of a hexameter. This perhaps the earliest extant example of the use of χί ντος to represent the fusion of the ξ of ἰξ with the opening σ of the following word (see ΑΡιθ. LXVII. 329 ff.)—No. 218. In 1 4 R. writes τῶν χρησιμονον ἄνω τῆς Χρήσιμος of ιΓ Π. 625; but this is unmetrical (as is also the wording used in 1. 1) and leaves τοὺς unexplained. If τῶν refers to the dedicated statue (cf. nos. 76, 87, 133, 236, 332), χρησιμὸν must agree with the dedicated rather than with the subject, and in any case it should be ἄνωτος, not the aorist, participle.—No. 233. Παράδειγμα ἡς κόμης is unacceptable as the beginning of a hexameter, and I prefer the Παράδειγμα τοῦ στρωμάτος of ΙΓ Π. 674.—No. 382 (cf. p. 529). Surely ἐν τῶι must be ἐν ξοι.—No. 387. τοῦ κυρίου τῶν ἀναστήσεων the Nepos of Kirchhoff; found in Inser. Cret. I. xvi.5.32) or [Ἀνάστασις] (which occurs on a single ostracoon) is proposed; it is curious
that the Athenians had not been suggested in view of the prominence of a "Theophrastus at Athens" just about the time he was known as a "Physicist." This, to which R. assigns the inscription on the ground of its letter-forms (Hist. VIII. 21, Thuc. I. 91; for a later Theophrastus see [Dem.] XLIV. 10). But despite these and other points on which I dissent from the association of Theophrastus, there is no legitimation regarding the work as an epigraphical and artistic masterpiece, for the writing of which Raubitschek was uniquely qualified.

M. N. Tod.


Readers of Professor Farrington's earlier books, and especially of the volume of this present work, will doubtless have a shrewd idea of what to expect from Greek Science 2: Theophrastus to Galen. Professor Farrington will not disappoint them. Compressing more than five centuries of the history of science into a mere 175 pages, he gives us, mutatis mutandis, the mixture as before; and a stimulating tone it unquestionably is.

Professor Farrington has two favourite hobby-horses, both of which he rides whenever he can, and flogs in the present volume. One is the position that the length of texts is the key to the quality of science. First, there is the conviction that science must be useful; or as he himself puts it (p. 17; cf. pp. 56, 165 al.) 'that science ought not only to give logical answers to puzzling questions but also to lead to desired results in practice.' Around the idea of science is the notion that the 'paradigm' of ancient science was due to the 'miscellaneous separation of the logic from the practice of science,' which was itself the result of the universal cleavage of society into freeman and slave (p. 165). This is the twofold message which, with a persistence that would be admirable perhaps if it were not also irritating, he never tires of preaching. And each of these two main contentions lends, of course, a characteristic and pervasive colour to the whole of his work.

It is unfortunately the first of these contentions, for instance, that Professor Farrington, in his admittedly interesting section on Theophrastus, tells us virtually nothing at all about what might well be regarded as his greatest contribution to science, his work in the field of botany. Botany in the hands of Theophrastus was not perhaps calculated, directly at least, to lead to desired results in practice; but it is surely none the less valuable a contribution for that. And in the hands of Dioscorides, who has to rest content with a solitary mention of a footnote, the case is altogether different. It seems to me both surprising and disappointing that, even in so brief a book, there should be so large an omission: surprising, because I should have expected this of which was the 8th book of Theophrastus Historia Plantarum gives us such fascinating details, was especially deserving of Professor Farrington's social sympathy; and disappointing because, to quote only a single example, there is surely little in the whole history of ancient science more interesting and, even on Professor Farrington's own principles, more important than the custom of the ancients, described by Dioscorides in his paragraph on Mandragoras but apparently never resumed at the Renaissance, of administering an anaesthetic before an operation.

Professor Farrington's second hobby-horse, itself palpably the offspring of his political bias, is sire to a strange brood. There is a passage in his writing, a propensity to unwarrantable generalisation, that can hardly fail to rouse the suspicions of the sceptic. Was Vico really, as he is described on p. 11, 'the most profoundly original of all sociologists before Marx?' Maybe he was; but the manner in which the opinion is presented is liable to win for it at least as many opponents as adherents. Again, is it true, as we are told on p. 112, that 'half the best poetry of antiquity is didactic?' There cannot then be much ground for a dictum. There is no need to consider instances of such utterances: they can be found liberally scattered throughout the book. But one final example will serve to show that on occasions Professor Farrington is swept away by the force of his own propaganda. If it is really true, as we are told on p. 17 of the father of Theophrastus, that the fuller's was 'an important profession at these days?' Again it may be so; but in that case it is palpably false to write, as Professor Farrington does on p. 172, that in the sixteenth century 'chemistry too, which in antiquity had lived an underground existence because its practitioners—the fuller's, the dyers, the makers of cosmetics—were outlaws from society, began to assert its claims to be an honoured science.'

Other defects can be found in Professor Farrington's presentation of ideas that are presumably the outcome of the brevity at which he has aimed. There are, for instance, occasional misleading over-simplifications. 'In the Pre-socratic materialist philosophy,' we read on p. 19, 'motion had been regarded as the mode of existence of all things. By the time of Plato, however, had taught the view that matter is essentially inert and that its motion requires explanation.' What then of Empedocles or Anaxagoras who, in answer to Parmenides, had been constrained to introduce, as the initial cause of motion, Love and Strife or Nous? Or again on p. 23: 'All that now concerns us in that (i.e. Aristotle's) theory is that it contains no clear differentiation between animals and plants. Aristotle had not succeeded in defining the difference. That may be true; but is not Aristotle known as a materialist in the sense in which Plato, or as he often gives full references to Professor Farrington's sources, there are occasions when, though they are urgently needed, they are tantalisingly withheld. Whereas, for instance, on p. 41 Cicero's comments on Strato's account of the language of plants are so much less difficult to follow, are accompanied by full references, we are on the preceding page left to guess—unless we happen to know already—what is the anonymous treatise 'in question and who has 'confidently claimed' as Strato's the sentiment in which Professor Farrington quotes. If the whole disproportionately long section on Strato, though little less confident in tone than all the rest, has left at least one reader full of doubts and queries. Some of them might have been more easily resolved with the aid of a few additional references.

I have cited only a few examples to illustrate the peculiar flavour of Professor Farrington's work; many more could be adduced. There is undoubtedly much in the book to which a pedant could, and should, object. Scholarly probing is not always a form of technique, are accompanied by full references, uncharitable attack. At all events his book will provoke discussion—and that in itself is a valuable achievement; while for those who, like myself, find themselves constantly at variance with his outlook, there is an occasional important truth that it would be unjust and reactionary to overlook. Thus, for instance, Professor Farrington is surely right, even if not perhaps as original as he sometimes is, when on p. 118, having summarised Lucretius' sketch of the origin and progress of civilization, which occupies the final half of his book, he comments as follows: 'Many of the principal features of this sketch of human progress have contributed, and are perhaps even still capable of contributing, to the growth of the science of history. We may note the fundamental importance attached to the achievement of the great technical inventions. Much history still remains to be rewritten in the light of this conception.' It is from suggestions such as this that the book derives its value. And yet even be that Professor Farrington, tome himself, as he would no doubt wish, has inaugurated the rewriting, in the light of this conception, of the history of the Graeco-Roman world. But that he has done no more than inaugurate an undertaking is certain. In the final version of such a history a clear distinction must be made between facts on the one hand and creed or conjecture on the other;
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and the facts, which even in such a history must still surely be the pegs from which judgments are suspended, must be allowed, to a greater extent than Professor Farrington is prepared to allow them, to speak for themselves.

J. E. RAVEN.


Mycenae is not only a site of prime importance to the prehistorian; nature and the Mycenaean architect have combined to make it one of the most stirring and impressive sites in Greece, and no one interested in the arts can but be impressed with the thought that it will be left to the future excavator. From the days of Schliemann too Mycenae has been fortunate in the calibre of the archaeologists who have worked there, and of its majority of monuments have been well studied and fully published. This very richness, however, can be a stumbling-block to the student and the non-specialist—the more so that there has been no lack of controversial writing—and Professor Wace's new book, designed, as he states in the Preface, 'as an introduction to Mycenae and its civilisation', will fill a very real need. Those who need no 'introduction' will welcome it; not only the results of the 1939 excavations, here given at greater length than in the first report in JHS LXI, but also a full account of the earlier conclusions mainly those of BSA XXV, in the light of subsequent discoveries and of the author's unceasing researches and reflections on Mycenaean topics.

The book is simple. Five introductory chapters describe the site, topographically and as Pausanias saw it, and the chronological context of Mycenaean culture, analyse the types of Mycenaean tombs, and survey the history of Mycenae from the Early Bronze Age to its gradual decline in the late Hellenistic or Roman epoch. The next seven chapters conduct the reader round the monuments in the order in which a traveller would visit them; the last contains a wide survey of Mycenaean civilisation as a whole, including its less tangible aspects, at its most flourishing period. Finally, two appendices deal in detail with the dates of, respectively, the Treasury of Atreus and the Cyclopean Walls, and a third provides a useful account of the stones and tools employed by Mycenaean stone-workers.

There is also a good index and a select bibliography.

It is only by comparing the descriptive chapters with the original detailed accounts in BSA XXV that one can fully appreciate the success of Professor Wace's work of simplification. It is, indeed, a wonder that he could succeed in generalisation or dogmatic statement. The archaeological facts about each area or monument are presented first, deductions from them take second place; the essential evidence is placed before the reader, and he is left free to accept or reject the author's interpretations and conclusions. These are of course of at least equal value to the student, especially when seeking to understand the scattered ruins of the successive palaces on the citadel, and their possibilities are illustrated by the final chapter, which is concerned with the re-creation of a vanished age. Here, upon a basis of every kind of archaeological material, the author builds up a surprisingly complete picture, not only of the daily life of the Mycenaeans, but of their social and political organisation, their contacts with the wider world, and even their intellectual and scientific attainments.

The comparatively full account of the 1939 excavations is most welcome. One very satisfactory result of the work at that season, and providing a lovely backcloth for the upper courses of the great dromos walls, is the system of buttress walls (admirably illustrated by Mr. Silcock's plans) was found, running round the dome to support the superincumbent mound, taking the lateral thrust of the stone, and providing a brick backing for the deep courses of the great dromos walls. Thick layers of crude brick, made of tough yellow clay, were used to prevent any seepage of water into tomb and dromos. The wonderful preservation of the Treasury of Atreus is an impressive testimony to the efficacy of these precautions.

As briefly reported in JHS LXI (1941), Professor Wace and Professor Marinatos have worked out a new reconstruction of the decorated façade of the Treasury; this too is here discussed at greater length. Though not yet in its final state, the new reconstruction must supersede all earlier attempts.

The remarkable carved group of two sitting women and a boy has been more completely reconstructed in JHS LXI, pl. XIVb was taken. As the new photographs show, the group is meticulously carved on every side, including the bottom, and it is suggested that it once formed the head of a caryatid or stoa.

The House of Columns is the most sumptuous non-palatial Mycenaean house yet excavated, with a central colonnaded court and at least three floors, including the basements. Professor Wace compares it with the House of the Horse in that it is of a certain degree in arrangement, but the latter would certainly fit in very well with some scenes in the Odyssey, especially the slaying of the suitors. The plan is a good deal more complex than that recently put forward by Professor Palmer (Trans. Phil. Soc. 1948), on philological rather than archaeological grounds, for the Homeric House, and certain features which the latter regards as essential, like the ωυγες δαπος, are lacking; but the House of Columns does suggest that it is too early to abandon the idea that Homeric architecture was not that of the Mycenaean period, and that the former was a close connection with Mycenaean originals.

On chapter XIV a few points may, with deference, be raised. P. 105, windows. Sir Arthur Evans has stated (Travels in Crete, II, 1879) that Knossos windows were 'glazed' with some form of parchment, painted red; may we not suppose that this feature, like so many others, was taken over by mainland architects, at least for royal clients? P. 108, ships. Wace's place of Greece and Asia Minor are illustrated by Furmark (Mycenaean Pottery, Analysis and Classification, 355 with fig. 56, mot. 40); G. S. Kirk also briefly discusses the subject in BSA XLIV, p. 113, flint. A rather poor quality flint is common in Ithaca, and would have been available to the Mycenaean world from some source from at least the mid-thirteenth century B.C. P. 114, copper. The suggestion that the prime source of the wealth of Mycenae was perhaps copper mines in the Argolic hills is important and illuminating, and it is to be hoped that it can be investigated at an early date.

The Appendix on the date of the Treasury of Atreus appeared in Antiquity for September, 1940. The 1939 excavations provided overwhelming proof of the general correctness of the conclusions set out in BSA XXV; a huge deposit of LHIII/LHIIIA pottery etc., which for stratigraphical reasons must ante-date the tomb, puts it beyond doubt that the latter was not built before 1350 B.C. It is however hitherto impossible to maintain that the Treasury was assigned to the LHIIIB period, as the dividing line between LHIIIA and LHIIIB; since the most characteristic sherd found under the threshold of the Treasury from a panel-style bowl must not this bring down the laying of the threshold, and so of the completion of the tomb, to after 1300? The author describes the threshold sherds (p. 120) as 'probably mid-fourteenth century', though he accepts (p. 125, n. 4) Furmark's down-dating of the earliest Lion Gate strata to LHIIIB, which helps partly on the presence of similar panel-style bowls. This inconsistency is reflected in the label, 'LHIIIA', of fig. 76b, a panel-style bowl from Lion Gate stratum II. If the Gate itself was as late as 1300, the Treasury— and Professor Wace shows good reason why they should—this consideration will also affect the conclusions of Appendix 2, though not the general argument of that section, in which the author seems to have maintained his case against the criticism of Daniel and others on the other chronological point; it is suggested (p. 76) that the gypsum used at Mycenae, including (p. 136) the material of the two sculptured slabs from the Elgin Collection in the British Museum, was imported from Crete but from Kephallenia. This would be easier if the Mycenaean remains of that island were not all so late; nothing Mycenaean has yet been found there earlier than
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H. WATERHOUSE.


It took nine years from its date of publication to bring this book into the hands of the reviewer, and it took another year for him to be able to finish the thorough examination of it. This is not a work easy to review. As the title indicates, it is based on the assumption that the Greek world was a society of nations, that therefore the relations between State and State were international relations, and that the international life of the Greeks developed in two concentric circles, the Greek and the Barbarian circle. Although the author fully realises that Persia for a long time had an important share in interhellenic politics, he nevertheless draws a strict demarcation line between the two circles. He is interested in the Greek circle alone, and he tries to make this clear throughout the book by adding to the word international the word panhellenic. It seems obvious that a difficult problem is hidden rather than solved. The Greek States as independent nations, Prof. Martin rightly opposes the obsolete idea held by many of his nineteenth-century historians, that the Greeks suffered from ‘particularism’, that Kleinstaaten were presented to them, having no more power than a Dalmatian county. The problem is, as so often, in the political modern terms. The Polis was a State, and as such an independent element in State-to-State relations; but it was no nation, however we may define that elusive expression. Nor is it convincing to see the ethnical division of modern Greeks as analogies to larger groups of modern times, so that ‘une conscience bético-étolienne, étruscienne, arcadienne, correspond to ‘une conscience latine, slave, germanique’. Nation in the modern sense did not exist in Greece, but what there was was possibly deserving that name with Greek people. To some extent, the German distinction between Staatsumwandlung and Kulturumwandlung may help to clarify the position, but even that seems not quite adequate. The unity of a variety of states was far stronger and more influential than unfortunately any ‘Europe’ has been for the last eight hundred years; perhaps the Christian unity of mediaeval Europe provides a better analogy, but that was before the rise of national states. As far as the present book is concerned the author does not realise that most of the forms in which Greek international life was expressed were of a kind not suitable between independent nations, although some of them are to be found in the specific character of the Greek society of states.

The intention of the book, however, was less to define the particular nature of Greek interhellenic relations than to see them as an example of international relations in general. It seems best briefly to indicate the scope of the book. A first section deals with the nature of the Polis, its ‘physical’ and ‘moral’ characteristics; this is little more than an introduction, but it fills 120 pages. The second section, dealing with the Polis in its international life, has five chapters: The Alliances (pp. 121–281), Imperialism (pp. 283–391), Peace Treaties (pp. 393–486), Arbitration (pp. 487–576), and Panhellenic Anarchy (pp. 577–594). A full index analytique follows. It will be manifest from the headings alone that the various chapters overlap continuously. We come repeatedly against the same phenomena, seen from various angles and yet ‘much the same’. This is one reason why the reviewer urgent and claims for the reader a thorough systematic and historical treatment to an extent we do not expect in a work of this kind. While no chronological order is attempted—the Delian League is treated before the Peloponnesian—we meet with frequent parallel narratives: though usually some descriptions of a background of historical events and conditions, they do not contribute anything new and seem superfluous for anybody familiar with Greek history. Prof. Martin is probably so expansive because the book is intended also for general public and classical scholars. But it seems a pity that it is overloaded with too many irrelevant pages and too many repetitions.

There is, of course, a good deal of valuable material and sound reasoning in those 600 pages. We shall mention a number of passages of detail, and naturally controversial questions have mainly been selected. Martin, for instance, strongly opposes the idea of ‘natural frontiers’ which he calls ‘une notion artificielle, inventée par la politique’. This is certainly going too far. Were mountains like Githaeron and Taïgetus not natural boundaries? They could be overcome, but they nevertheless existed. And the sea was a frontier not easily overcome. Nobody (certainly not the present reviewer, who has been singled out by Martin) will maintain that geography explains all, or even most of, the political boundaries. If the Aegean world consisted of hundreds of small City-States, this was largely due to various historical conditions; it is not more difficult to understand than solved. What they were, had the same people settled in a different kind of country.—Prof. Martin well describes different types of Greek States; he realises the impact of the ideas of liberty and autonomy. But did they make it really work? For a Polis to join in wider political groups of structures? Most of them did, though sometimes under pressure. Martin speaks of Greek patriotism as the fervent love for ‘la patrie quasi personificée’, but he seems to forget how often this feeling was marred by the most outrageous expressions of class-hatred and civil strife. Social partisanship frequently ran across Polis frontiers. Martin calls this ‘l’adhesion a un meme credo politique et social’, a formula which again seems too much influenced by a modern concept. It is avoided when he goes so far as to speak of an ethnic and a political ‘Internationale’ in Greece.—In dealing with alliances, Martin realises that they were safeguards of Polis interests and not results of a clearly conceived ideal of federation. Still, is it right to say that all Greek alliances derived from the need for security? Surely, at least some of the alliances such as the Peloponnesian and the Corinthian Leagues came into being as instruments of power politics, bearing expansions to conquer or defend. The whole theory contradicted himself when he calls symmachy and hegemony ‘des notions indissociables’, although he distinguishes between ‘une symmachie egaleitaire’ and ‘une symmachie hierarchique’: there are differences, but in the end “c’est en raison d’institutions internationales, la contribution la plus originale de la Grece classique’ I am glad Martin has
accepted the conception of hegemonial symbiosis; his alternative ‘dualist symbiosis’ is an ambiguous expression which might mean an ordinary bilateral alliance. He distinguishes between a permanent and an intermittent type of alliances; the first were at least three, the Delian and Peloponnesian Leagues respectively. But this distinction refers to the use made of the league by the leading State rather than to a difference of structure. The greater freedom enjoyed by the members of the Peloponnesian League, and the rule that league less permanent than its rival. Was, on the other hand, the Delian League merely the continuation of the alliance of 498? Martin accepts this view; but if he points out that Sparta regarded herself as a member of the anti-Frcean coalition it is not, this proves the contrary, for she did not belong to the Delian League. The earlier coalition was probably never officially dissolved, but the change of hegemony was more than ‘une affaire intérieure de la coalition’. In his treatment of the Delian League, though sound on the whole, Martin makes insufficient use of the epigraphical sources. In his treatment of the Peloponnesian League he keeps to a middle line between Kallistidis’s and Larsen’s views. He well emphasizes the psychological effect of Sparta’s formal respect for the autonomy of her allies, and is equally right in declaring that there was hardly any Peloponnesian solidarity within the league. The Second Athenian League, on the other hand, had a different atmosphere: the league created a different interhellenic atmosphere by a constitution safeguarding the autonomy of the allies and giving to their common voice theoretically as much weight as to the hegemonial power. The absence of any a priori rule as in the case of the culture of the hegemonial symbiosis which had ‘ni sentiment de solidarité fédérale, ni idéal commun, ni volonté collective’. The hegemonial symbiosis had become an instrument of the element dominating 5th and 4th century politics, of City-imperialism. Martin dedicates another long chapter to this, rightly emphasizing the difference between modern and Greek imperialism; the latter, in his view, did not know either annexation or assimilation. They are to some extent replaced by the use of cleruchies and by a number of legal obligations imposed and upheld by force. Martin proposes, not without some justification, to abandon the phrase ‘Athenian empire’, but admits that there is nothing to replace it. More recent experience may have taught us that imperialism can lead to a system of ‘Satellite States’ rather than an empire, and that would perhaps be a more adequate description of Athenian imperialism as well, although it was only in the Peace Treaties that the changes which the form and spirit of such treaties underwent. It is most regrettable that here as elsewhere most of the fourth century is simply left out, and thus he never even mentions the tendency of restoring a permanent koinéis. In saying a few words only about the King’s Peace he makes excuses fearing that his book would become too voluminous. This is a reasonable feeling most wrongly applied. The fourth chapter once more emphasizes the negative aspect of all the Greek efforts mentioned. The attempts made to decide cases of inter-State quarrels by arbitration had, at least before the different atmosphere of the Hellenistic Age, very little effect; with one or two exceptions, they were applied only when there was a chance from the stalemate of a lawsuit could lead to war. The final summing-up, after all this, cannot be anything but gloomy. There was no trace of a real interhellenic organisation in politics. Olympian festivals and Anaphytion did not count. All knowledge was a matter of special interests and the Delian league did not lead to any Greek State putting the idea of collective interest above its own advantage. ‘La solidarité panhellénique n’a existé que dans la conscience d’une élite restreinte et, en somme, impuissante. In his having worked through Martin’s book we are left with a feeling of disappointment; in spite of the length of the treatise something essential is missing. The Greek efforts for peaceful cooperation between the many States were certainly unsuccessful. Otherwise the history of the fourth century would not have ended with Philip and Alexander. But there are more signs than Martin is aware of that the Greeks from Elis and so on were operating against their rival. Martin makes also too little of the effects of the Persian menace, and of the attempts at partial federal unisons. Moreover, Panhellenism was not an invention of some intellectuals such as Gorgias and Isocrates but a fact of all the articles of some of which Martin could not yet know. But tragedy and comedy no less than the policy of Cimon show that Panhellenic thought and feelings were widespread. Pericles more than once tried to disguise his Athenian imperialism in apparently Panhellenic schemes; he would not have done so without believing in at least some response.

VICTOR EIDENBERG.
NOTICES OF BOOKS

From the Collections of the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek


The volume of studies from the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek was planned as an international tribute to Carl Jacobsen on the centenary of his birth, but owing to the German occupation the only contributors to the very large volume, which has recently arrived in the Hellenic Society, are Scandinavian. P. J. Riis publishes seven Etruscan stucco terracotta in the Glyptotek, five female, two male, ranging in date from the late sixth to the early third century B.C. F. Poulsen (28) briefly discusses a number of Attic grave stele on the eastern attica of the early 5th century (Glyptotek no. 134) on which two soldiers, one standing, one crouching await an attack, perhaps of the Persians at Marathon; he illustrates the tactics from Homer and Herodotus. Vagn Hagerup Poulsen (93) has a long study of Phedias and his circle in which he discusses the ascription, chronology, and style of various works attributed to Phedias, Agorakritos, Alkamenes, and Kresilas. This is an important addition to the considerable post-war literature on Phedias and cannot be discussed in detail here; it may however be noted that Poulsen assigns the fragmentary bronze Diadoumenos head in Oxford to the group of classicizing bronzes collected by Rumpf in Critica d'Arte 1939. F. Poulsen (94) points out that a comparison with other early Hellenistic portraits that the Menander head (Ny Carlsberg 249) is Menander and not Virgil: he also publishes two Roman portraits of the 2nd and 3rd century A.D. (172a, 177a), K. Fris Johansen (123) upholds the erotic aspect of the Pompeian painting, Biber H.T. fig. 237), bronze head of negro in the same museum, Egyptian bust and bronze seated Hermes in the Musée Jacquemart-André. M. P. Nilsson (168) argues from various references to Bendis in inscriptions and literature that the importance of the Bendis cult in Athens at different times reflects the political relations between Athens and Thrace (note that Kratinos Thracian Women which refers to Bendis is dated by Schmidt 443 B.C., and by Pieters 442 B.C.). S. Eitrem (189) discusses those and sceptre in Roman art. A. Boethius (202) writes on the horn of Themistocles from Osia; he suggests that there are two stages before this Roman copy—a statue of 2nd B.C. and based on a portrait of the fourth century, for which the Second Athenian Confederacy would furnish a suitable occasion. E. Dyggve (225) publishes a sarcophagus lid in the Glyptotek (777) with an inscription referring to Orestes, Iphigenia, and perverted offerings could be poured into the sarcophagus; he discusses other instances of this kind of ritual device. H. P. L'Orange (247) divides the few certain portraits of Nero into a 'constitutional type' and an 'aposthosis type' and equates them with the earlier and later heads of Nero on coins. The other articles are devoted to Egyptian and modern art.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.

The Excavations at Dura-Europos: Final Report


In this impressive work, Professor Bellinger gives us a definitive account of the fourteen-thousand-odd coins found at Dura, with valuable chapters of interpretation, and copious illustrations.

Of particular interest relating to the Roman period, particularly the large hoards, from which he is able to draw a complex picture of the currency in the eastern Roman Empire, I need say little (since a review is to appear also in JRS), beyond expressing particular admiration for the masterly way in which the results are drawn together in a final chapter 'The Currency of Dura'—clearly an important contribution to the economic history of the ancient world.

It is true that the Sasanian and Parthian periods the material is smaller: there are no large hoards: but although the separate coins found on the site form a comparatively small part of the vast total here catalogued, they are more plentiful than the finds at, for instance, Seleucia, with which it can be contrasted. Bellinger, on the contrary, decorated with Seleucia, Dura was a small place with no mint of its own (except for a short time under Antiochus I) and had to obtain its currency from elsewhere—in fact, as the finds show, almost exclusively from Antioch and other Syrian cities. Not least important is the contrast of the East are basely with the West (or Seleucia and Ecbataniza). Clearly Dura's commercial connexions were almost entirely with Syria. Bellinger remarks (p. 195) that the supply of currency cannot have depended merely on what individuals brought in with them, but must have been catered for by banking arrangements: the large quantities of some particular issues (invariably Antioch-minted), recorded in the catalogue, certainly suggests some form of bulk-supply. It is interesting to observe that, when Dura was in Christian hands, things went on much as before: the Parthian coins themselves found at Dura are few, yet there was still a steady influx from Antioch (when Syria had become a Roman province).

We are not far now from Mesopotamia was more centralised and flexible under the Romans: a remarkable instance is the way in which Sextimius Severus used the mints of the Pontic cities to supplement other sources. Very large numbers of coins were struck in Antioch, each mint, which are, thus, no mere 'local' issues (and one wonders whether, with more evidence as to circulation, this might not be true of many other Greek Imperial 'coins'), but whose sudden and extensive appearance in an unexpected area shows that 'the whole north-eastern limes, of which we know so little, is now a region sufficiently civilised to require Roman coins'.

On several other points of interest. Firstly, the attractive hypothesis (p. 200) that the Parthian conquest of Dura took place in about 113 B.C. This is based on the fact that the latest Seleucid coins present in bulk are those of Antiochus Grypus' first reign at Antioch (120-113 B.C.), and that some of these have a peculiar countermark—only found at Dura, and unlike ordinary Seleucid countermarks—which, it is suggested, may have in fact been used by the Parthians to validate the currency they found in circulation when they took Dura. (A certain resemblance between the countermark in question, no. 4 in Bellinger's table of countermarks, and the design of some Sassanian seal, Survey of Persian Art, 1, p. 805, can hardly be more than fortuitous, I suppose.) We need perhaps not accept the full intricacy of Bellinger's idea. Though there is some possible evidence for the date of the Parthian conquest: the Parthian coins themselves do not help much, for the earliest reign represented by more than a handful of coins is that of Vologases I (102-117), and so it seems likely that the coins under whom, on the theory advanced, Dura will have changed hands, are, as Bellinger notes, entirely missing. May there not, however, also be a possibility that the 'Cox and Box' dynamic struggle between Antiochus Grypus and his brother Cyzicenus might have something to do with this countermarking of Grypus' coins—as is perhaps the case with some of Cyzicenus' coins (in the British Museum) which have a countermark (a palm-branch) struck across the coin's head in rather the same way as a Dura countermark is applied (Bellinger, Plate II, 97 b).

Finally, a point on which I would be prepared to disagree, though it is an incidental detail. On p. 117, under No. 142, Bellinger follows Wroth (rightly, as against some more extreme opinions) in the identification of the group of Parthian tetradrachms to Vologases II: at the same time he explains some numeral letters, which occur on the obverses of the coins, as regnal years. But, contemporaneously with these coins, there is a group of Parvus H (with four similar letters, A, E inclusive, corresponding with only two calendar years, A.D. 77/8 and 78/9); and five numerals, A, E inclusive, occur later in the reign of Vologases II himself, within a single year, A.D. 121/2. Clearly the numerals cannot be regnal years in either of these cases, and are hardly likely
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to be so in the case under discussion. The true explanation of them seems yet to be sought.
G. K. JENKINS.
Apollo Delphinios. By P. P. BOURLISI. pp. 81.
Miss Bourboulis has chosen to investigate the questions which are so called Delphinios, and where the cult and the associated myths originated. Carefully collecting (pp. 9-18) the relevant passages, literary and epigraphical, she finds a twofold myth, one variant being that in the "Homeric Hymn to Delphes", and the other in the "Homeric Hymn to Delphi", which is found mostly in Plutarch and Pausanias. The cult existed in numerous islands, including Crete, several places in Greece proper, and with extensions as far east as the Euxine and as far west as Gaul. She comes to the conclusion, after reviewing and criticizing other theories, that the original home of the god is Attica (p. 47), and that the title means what it seems to mean, 'dolphin-god' (pp. 48 sqq.), the reason for it being that the friendly fish is on occasion thought of as leading mariners to a land where they may settle and do so by divine inspiration (p. 59). This agrees well with the activity of Apollo as a guide to colonists. His festival she considers to be connected with the seasonal opening of navigation (p. 49), and considering that the goddess Exekia is expected where the material is by no means abundant and much of it has to be taken from late authors whose sources of information are no longer extant, the force of her arguments varies, but the general tenor is reasonable and critical and the conclusions not unlikely.
The Greek printers have had difficulties with the English text, but the worst misprints are corrected in an inserted errata-slip.

H. J. ROSE.
A new, full-length monograph by the distinguished author of Vizantiya i Araby and Histoire de l'Empire Byzantin must arouse keen interest in all Byzantinists, and scholars will not be disappointed in this formidable mass of information relating to nine short years of the early sixth century. In his History Vasiliev awarded only a paragraph to Justin I. He now devotes to him 439 pages of text, notes and index. We have here, clearly and logically arranged, every scrap of evidence, in all languages, ancient and modern, that bears on the East Roman Empire between the years A.D. 518 and 527.
The emperor Justin, who reigned during these years, was, unlike Napoleon III, not so much an emperor as an uncle. Throughout his term of power, the hand that guided Byzantine policy, whether religious, foreign or domestic, was that of his nephew and successor Justinian, and Vasiliev has every reason to give the title of the subtitle An Introduction to the Epoch of Justinian the Great. Justin himself was an Illyrian peasant from the region of Skopje, who had risen to command a division of the imperial guard, the Exceditor. Considering that he was illiterate ('incredible' says Vasiliev, p. 83; but why incredible? The author of Przidzadzenie imperatora Vasilija Makedonjanina needs no reminding that Basil I could not write; nor, for the matter of that, could Charlemagne, 'tis Emhardi Vitam eui, cap. 25), and considering that he was an Exceditor, it was a stroke of no common diplomacy that rendered him acceptable to the aristocracy, the Blues and the Scholars; (for the political rivalry of Scholars and Exceditors, see the important article of D'Yakonov, commended by Vasiliev, in Vizantijskij Shornik, Moscow, 1945, p. 198, 'kazhdaja iz grupp . . . staralas provesti na imperatorijskij prestol svoevo kandidatu', and the French summary in Byzantinostudia, X, 1949, p. 86). The question was the restoration of the orthodox doctrine of Chalcedon, and the condemnation of the monophysitism of Anastasius I. From this reform divers advantages accrued, of which the greatest was a reconciliation with the Eastern churches, and the success of Justinian's succeeding plan to recover the West from Arian Goths and Vandals. That orthodoxy could be enforced on the soldiery without protest (pp. 233, 242) shows that the strength of the army did not yet derive primarily from the East, as it did in the time of Maurice and Heraclius. The measures against monophysitism of course meant trouble in the East; but, as Vasiliev clearly shows (pp. 241 ff.), Justinian's policy, at least between the years 520 and 527, was one of conciliation and persuasion. In Egypt, indeed, he had no power to persecute; and, whatever the advantages of reunion with the West, he had no intention of being governed by the pope (pp. 207-12). With wonderful skill he prepared for the great drive westwards that was to come. The grand Germanic coalition of Theodoric dissolved before his eyes, and the great king died a suspicious and cruel tyrant. Vandal and Burgundian kingdoms, so long as resorted to the emperor. It is only in the Balkans that we detect the first symptoms of that collapse which brought down the glorious but ephemeral structure of Justinian.
Meantime, to this preparatory work Justin himself contributed little, and his wife Euphemia, apart from her steady opposition to the ambition of Theodora, even less, though she was always treated with respect in the diplomatic world; (incidentally, the plural form βασίλεια, which puzzles Vasiliev (p. 145), perhaps refers to Justin and Euphemia; cf. Theodora's cups, p. 94, ll. 7, 9, where βασίλεια seems to refer to Valentinian and Placidia).
Vasiliev begins with a learned survey of the sources, Greek, Latin, Syrian, Ethiopic and Inscriptional; but to be said, indeed, it is rather more than complete, since the Russian Letyopisi supply no new material, and some at least of the Greek chronicles listed on p. 14 do not take up the tale till three centuries after Justinian's death, so that they will not include them is perhaps to be justus minus. Circumstances outside Vasiliev's control prevented his consulting Stein's L'histoire du Bas-Empire, II, pp. 219-73, which however only supplements him by some change of emphasis in certain aspects, notably by a more damaging estimate of the character of Theodora.

Vasiliev next deals in order with Justin's rise to power, his domestic, religious and foreign policy, and ends with a valuable chapter on the economic state of the empire at the beginning of the sixth century. These chapters are divided into sub-sections, each of which ends with a summary of its source-material in a foot-note. This arrangement gives the book very great value as a work of reference, a value enhanced by a good index at the end. But the sub-sections are more or less water-tight, and this militates against continuous narrative and leads to much repetition and over-lapping, not only of statement but also of source citation: 66, on p. 91 we read, 'As a matter of course, Theodora was crowned Augusta'; on p. 96, 'Theodora was as a matter of course crowned Augusta'; on p. 98, 'Theodora automatically became Augusta'. The same text from Justinian's Edict XIII is quoted on p. 105, note 59, and p. 130, note 50, the only difference being a typographical error in the latter citation.

The book is one for scholars and researchers, and as such deserves all praise and gratitude. The range and minuteness of its scholarship are quite wonderful. Almost the only entry which appears not quite worthy of the author is the quotation with qualified approval of a silly statement by a Soviet writer about the Slav contribution to the Byzantine Empire (pp. 393, 394), which seems to revive the exploded theory about the connection between the Russian commune and the thematic Steurgemeinde (see Ostrogorsky, Gesch. Byz. Staat., p. 88, note 2).
The book has two minor faults, one of which at least cannot be fairly laid to Vasiliev's charge. First, he has been inadequately assisted in the matter of English. For the fact that a Russian scholar of Vasiliev's eminence should publish his book in English, we can feel nothing but thankfulness; but we have a right to expect that his publisher shall have see that his meaning is clear at a first reading, and this is not everywhere so. I have read the second sentence on p. 43 several times, and still do not know what it means. On p. 78, note 58, the phrase 'coronation of the Patriarch' or 'coronation (of the emperor) by the Patriarch' is 'coronation (of the emperor) by the Patriarch'.
counted more than forty, without any curious search. Most are trivial, but by no means all; e.g., John's for Justin's on p. 13, and circumspetion for I scarcely know what (perhaps, 50).

If I have noted these small flaws in a great work of scholarship, it is in the knowledge that they detract nothing from the solid worth of the book, and in the hope that more readers than I in a second edition, and even the work itself is never likely to be superseded in our time.

R. J. H. JENKINS.


The subject of this study as stated in the introduction is the problem of Oriental and Greek relations from the tenth to the sixth century b.c. 'nel suo complesso.' The author shows an extraordinary width of knowledge, historical, literary and archaeological, in both Oriental and Classical fields. Nevertheless it is clear that he writes first and foremost as a historian. He discusses first the origins of the terms 'Asia' and 'Hellas' and the different stages in their evolution. As to 'Asia' his discussion has now been partly superseded by H. Bosser's detailed study of the Hittite material (H. Bosser, Asia, 1935). Asia was not part of a name of part of Asia, and the Greeks who learnt the name from the Lydians. When they became masters of Asia Minor under Croesus, the term 'Asia' became synonymous with Asia Minor. Finally, when Croesus was swallowed up by that of the Persians, it was extended to describe the entire continent under Persian rule. In his third chapter the author describes the way in which the states of Asia Minor fused into a cultural whole, which together with the greater powers of Assyria and Babylon remained alien to the Greeks, and opposed to them except for the bridge which the Phoenician merchants interposed. This is an over-simplification, because in fact we know little enough about the early Greek cities of Asia Minor and still less about the native states of Phrygia, Caria, Lydia and Lydia; while the recent remarkable discoveries of Bossert and others at Karatepe in Cilicia have shown that a kind of semi-barbaric half-Greek state existed there in the eighth century B.C. with its centre at Adana, and its ports at Tarus and Malatia, ruled by the House of Mopsus, speaking or at least writing Phoenician, yet whose soldiers wore Greek armour. The picture in fact of Oriental Greek relations is more complicated than he would suggest. For not only were such half-Greek states to be taken into account but what is taken for Phoenician influence in Greece is often to be more accurately analysed into partly Phoenician, partly Near Eastern, and as the Mediterranean as the Near East.

In his Chapter IV dealing with Mermnads and Heraclids, he introduces a surprising theory, namely that they were the same, the story of their difference being merely an invention of the Delphic oracle for raison d'etat. He is happier and more convincing forward from the origin of tyrants, where he thinks is wrongly attributed to the Lydians. For one thing the Lydian word for king is not pronym but pothoik, and where pronym occurs in Asia Minor inscriptions, e.g. as applied to the god Men, it means no more than lord, and indeed seems to have been a Greek expression. Again it can hardly have been derived from Lydia as that country provides no true parallel. Here again we must go warily, knowing that little what Lydia was really like. Hanffmann (AJA 1948, 1948) has demonstrated rightly that far as the excavations at Sardis showed, the culture of Lydia was at a low level, and vastly inferior to that of the Greek fringe. Thus it seems not merely did the Greeks learn nothing from Lydia, but it becomes very unlikely that it was from there that (as Mazzarino suggests) they learnt their scientific notions of map making, astronomy and the institution of the calendar. In one point he may well be right, however, in stressing their religious debt. But even this is uncertain. Hrozny followed by M. found new support for the old idea of Wilamowitz that Apollo was an Asiatic god, in a Hittite Hieroglyphic inscription perhaps of the twelfth century B.C. mentioning the god Aplalatam. Unfortunately this is based on a false reading.

In Chapter IV (Phoenician Commerce and Greek Colonies') he rightly dismisses a theory of Milner that the Phrygians closed the Pontus to the Milesians and thereby forced the Greeks to seek contact with the East for their raw materials. This is supported neither by contact, and if the Greeks (Iamani) who came into contact with the Assyrians in the late eighth century were not exclusively Cypriot Greeks, as M. suggests, they were certainly something very similar, namely half-Greeks, such as those illustrated at Karatepe whose frescoes in Greek armour are depicted overcoming an Assyrian. Mazzarino upholds Herodotus' tradition of early Phoenician colonies in Thera, Melos, Thasos and Cythera, perhaps in the connection placing too much emphasis on the Phoenician proto-geometric vase from Abu Hawwam which Heartley claimed to be Thessalian but which Kunze thinks is later and perhaps Cycladic (AM 60/66, p. 227). Nevertheless M.'s general argument, that the Phoenicians blazed a trail step by step along the islands to the west, and that in their advance Crete formed the key point, is gaining in probability as the recent study of Demargne (La Crête Dédale) has shown, provided we remember that North Syrians are also included. In this connection the report (AJA 50, p. 90) of recent excavations at Carthage, revealing levels of the eighth century, is of great importance and the plan announced by the French to investigate the oldest levels of the city is welcomed. The city of Utica by Tyre opened the way to Spain. Here however, M.'s readers should be reminded that the ancient evidence about Tartessus is of the flimsiest, that the reviver believes that Tarshish is not Tartessus but Tarus. (In Tarshish = Tarras, which is Greekized to Tarshash by the Bibles, and by Tarsus, the Phoenician case-endings - is). Add that the Phoenician inscription from Nora in Sardinia which M. uses to prove Nora was from Tartessus has not been recently re-evaluated so as to omit all mention of Tartessus entirely (Dupont-Sommer in Syria xxiv, 1948, p. 990).

Another possibly misleading suggestion may be pointed out (p. 990): that 'an aramaic king' who signed his bars of silver with his name as a proof of their quality thereby took the first steps in inventing the idea of coinage. That this Phoenician inscription was from Nora in Sardinia which M. uses to prove Nora was from Tartessus has not been recently re-evaluated so as to omit all mention of Tartessus entirely (Dupont-Sommer in Syria xxvi, 1948, p. 990).

Another possibly misleading suggestion may be pointed out (p. 990): that 'an aramaic king' who signed his bars of silver with his name as a proof of their quality thereby took the first steps in inventing the idea of coinage. That this Phoenician inscription was from Nora in Sardinia which M. uses to prove Nora was from Tartessus has not been recently re-evaluated so as to omit all mention of Tartessus entirely (Dupont-Sommer in Syria xxvi, 1948, p. 990).
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basis for the reconstructions; if Bulle's notes no longer exist even in students' notebooks or memories, Wising's reconstructions are based on interpretations of particular passages that which they might misrepresent his original reconstruction. Only a few of these are given in Bulle's essay and Möbius' introduction. For instance, in the P.V. it is only from Bulle's introduction that we learn why Prometheus appears and the character of the stage-building: Bulle believes that the platform on which they stand was lowered behind the normal front at the end of the play. We must however accept the reconstructions in the form that they are given to us, and we can only be grateful that we know how a distinguished scholar pictured to himself the scenery of five plays of Aeschylus, three of Sophocles, four of Euripides, and five of Aristophanes. The reconstructions naturally raise many questions. What changes did the rebuilding of the stage buildings in stone (which Bulle dates about 435) bring with them? Apparently none, when we compare the reconstruction of the Agamemnon and the Tragedies. What justification is there for assuming that a pediment surmounted the back wall of the classical stage in Athens, even if this can be proved for the Hellenistic theatre at Segesta? Why is the theatron shown as an elaborate kind of lift? The god surely could walk upstairs with a minimum effect on the chief horizontal arm. Plato speaks of 'raising gods' and Antiphons (191K) of 'raising the mecanes like a finger', which surely implies something much more like our derrick. But the major problem, in which I find myself involved, is to determine just what portion of the stage scenery Bulle is, the problem of changing scenery between plays. Sir Arthur writes: 'it has been calculated that in a twelve-hour day of the festival not more than two hours at most can have been available for intervals between plays'-two hours for four intervals if we assume an ordinary comedy after the tragic tetralogy. The sets reconstructed by Bulle are much too complicated for building and unbuilding in half an hour, and we must suppose that the Greeks were content with scenery much simpler such as painted canvas screens and properties which could be carried on quickly. But these may be much less disagreement about detail, these drawings are always interesting and sometimes, particularly in the pictures of Aristophanes, delightful.

T. B. L. WEBSTER


Dr. Pfeiffer deserves both warm thanks and much praise for this book, which in so many ways does notable service to Callimachean studies. Firstly, he has made a much more thorough selection of the text than O. Schneller selected, not previously overhauled (I. Kapp's work on Hecata prior to 1934) since their publication nearly eighty years ago. Even in bare statistics the result is impressive. Adoption of reasonable categories, ascriptions and fusions, backed by remarkable studies in syntax and word meanings, in syntax, in other categories, elimination, and ninety-three absorptions in papyri, reduce Schneller's unplaced pieces from 490 to 235. Also, from his 490 or more Agesin rigorous pruning leaves only fifty-five survivors. Twenty-eight others, recognized as from other authors, are listed in Conpectus III. (how blind was Schneller to find at his 33?); Callimachus acquires sixty-eight, mainly for Hecata from Suidas; and several more are deemed in various degrees likely to be his. Herein in substance for such a large part of the the very version seems to improve what endures after this weeding. There is room here to mention only some salient points, with selected references given in his pagination. A better authority is followed (Frt. 274, 2, 655, 754). New emendations (530), a few noted as published as such (32, 326, 623), a lacuna left unaltered (393, 669). Encumbrance yields to the quoter's text (70, 630, 659); importations from his text and unknown are rejected (325, 340). Closer attention to metrics and Adriachips affecting details (102, 543) is altered by details (653, 2, 680, 3, 22) or on other grounds (218, 379, 491); and assonance helps in wording (281, 283) or towards location (725). Papyri change some readings in absorbed fraggments (e.g., 1, 34, 73, 3, 191, 11; cf. Lobel at 55, 15;) and are often enlightening. In his familiar way, with I. Kapp on both Schneider's remains and papyri.

To survey the papyrus papers, here excellently presented with the Diegesis attached, brings constant reminders of our great debt to Mr. Lobel. Among other notable improvements, Pfeiffer himself makes many happy textual contributions—e.g., his emendation at 21.3, his supplements of t. 14 and 43. 42 from out-of-the-way reading, the decision of the Diegesis, and in the first instance of the 'sicurus prouinumus' from 260. 64. In a conflict of evidence Costa Benerti is set just before the epilogue of Aetia. Act. II. his order of themes is still unknown; but some future discovery may justify Pfeiffer's placing of Frr. 44—47 by showing the key to 43. 42 to be Rhadamantus' sense about retribution in kind (Arist. Eth. Nic. V. 8 ap. Hom. Fr. 174 Rzach).

On both old and new fragments the commentary's clear Latin text provides a lexicon satura of information, discussion, suggestion, and (Callimachus being as slippery as an eel) warning. To references at 195, 1 add Xen. Anab. VI. 6 § 4. Possibly 191. 92—93 allude to Hippopax's poetic venum' (cf. Aet. 15. 27). Aetia's statement of the 'white figs at mid-day, and then sleep, induces a fever which povi xeho. Elsewhere a few of Pfeiffer's interpretations seem doubtful. At 95 may not Dies' πους φησεινων being mean simply (i.e., shrews) who consider that such should belong to her? Given the note's premises about 203, 24, what shape of supplement can bring in the proposed negative? Since 384. 42 speaks of a foot-race, surely the metaphor from wrestling, δον δοσει, is incredible. Maass's view of 388, 9 seems preferable, and 'i.e. ' sine illa remuneratione' . . . unwaront at 649.

In this volume's production the Clarendon Press has done its best—and how good that is! Miss Afldor is clearly a good ally in proof-reading. Earnest (but not malicious) scrutiny for erata yields only a few in the Latin, and these easily grasped (Daudia for Didia, p. 131 ad fin., is slightly tougher), and a handful in reference-numbers, reported to Pfeiffer for mention in Act. II. post. 3. 1. I need slight changes and additions, Comp. IV. is short over P. oxy. ined. Fr. 91 gets γονος from PSI, not P. Oxy. On Pfeiffer's own part a stout heart must have accompanied erudition and critical skill in performing so long and intricate a task. 'Well run, sir!' M. T. SMILEY


In spite of the many outstanding collections of ancient bronzes all over Europe and America, relatively few scientific catalogues of them have been written within the last thirty years. I suspect one of the reasons is the difficulty of the task, since the often heterogeneous character of the material poses many problems in identification and dating.

Miss Hill has courageously stepped into the arena and written an up-to-date catalogue of the bronzes in the Walters Gallery. The book she has produced is an exceedingly creditable piece of work, full of useful information and unexceptional observations. The arrangement is as follows: A general introduction deals mostly with technical matters, especially the various methods of ancient casting—a difficult subject that modern research and recent discoveries have considerably clarified. Then comes a short, factual history of the Walters bronzes, assembled by Mr. Henry Walters between 1902 and 1931, and bequeathed to the city of Baltimore. This is followed by the catalogue proper, which includes, in the sections allocated for the bronzes, objects of personal adornment, and other decorated bronzes, are to be treated in a subsequent volume. No one will quarrel with the fact that some of the bronzes in the first volume have had a "decorative" usage, and that has been assigned for the second volume. As the author rightly points out, certainty regarding the original intention of an object is often out of the question.
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matter of fact, in many cases one does not greatly care whether a piece was an independent creation or part of a larger whole. The evaluation of the object itself is more important.

The classification within these two larger groups is made according to subject, and this too is perhaps a good idea, for it relieves the author of often arbitrary decisions regarding chronology. What seems a pity, however, is the order in which the objects appear—first, appropriately enough, deities, headed by Zeus, Poseidon, Hermes, Apollo, etc.; then the minor divinities; then human beings, and, farther down the scale, barbarians, priests, grotesques, dwarfs and babies. After that, surprisingly, we start again with deities, but this time with female ones, followed by maenads, women, girls, parts of human beings, animals, and monsters. This segregation of the sexes seems unwarranted. Surely Athena and Aphrodite should come immediately after their own male relatives instead of after dwarfs and babies. The result is that in this general medley the relatively few first-rate pieces have become submerged. For instance, the seventh-century girl, no. 237, the early fifth-century girl, no. 239, and the girl of about 400 B.C., no. 241, which are among the most important statuettes in the collection, have become just so many secondary females, making their appearance with their more modest sisters in the concluding pages and plates of the volume.

One of the many excellent features of the book is the inclusion of forgeries, sometimes as doubtful pieces with an honest question mark, at other times as certainly modern works, grouped at the end of the book (after the animals). The bibliography, with the useful addition of sale catalogues, and the careful index are also most welcome.

The illustrations are not remarkable for their quality, but they are serviceable and generally give an adequate view of every piece (only the Hellenistic base, no. 146, appears twice—an excellent view on the frontispiece in addition to the one on pl. 31). An occasionally different composition of the objects on the plates could have somewhat rectified the confusion caused by the arrangement of the material, by making important pieces stand out more prominently than others. The fine archaic sphinx, no. 279, for instance, is shown in a small, unworthy illustration between two large sphinxes.

A shortcoming of the book, for students at least, is the lack of clarity in the chronology. Most of the pieces in the Walters Collection are Graeco-Roman, or Roman, if you like, since Miss Hill prefers that term. As is now well known, this period was one of wholesale copying and adapting of earlier works, in bronze statuettes no less than in stone sculptures and engraved gems. An assignment to the type that lies behind the Roman work is therefore called for, and, in our present knowledge of styles, one expects such appraisals as, ‘Roman execution after a fifth-century, or a fourth-century, or a Hellenistic type’. Sometimes, of course, it may be doubtful whether a piece is of Roman date or a Greek original, but there should be at least an attempt to determine the period of the underlying type. Miss Hill in most cases contents herself with such assignments as ‘presumably Roman’, ‘appears to be Roman’, ‘probably Roman’, ‘the choice of type makes a Roman date probable’, ‘early Roman’, ‘Neo-classic period’, etc. Even in such obvious cases as the Apollo, no. 37, where the type is rightly recognized as derived from a work of before the middle of the fifth century B.C., the comment is ‘actual date doubtful, probably Roman’; and no. 97, one of the many Roman copies of the Lyssippian Herakles of the Farnese type, is dated Hellenistic, 280–270 B.C.

This defect of a somewhat confused chronology is compensated, however, by the many technical details that Miss Hill gives in her descriptions—regarding casting, chasing, riveting, mounting, etc. Students will learn much from these observations.

I add a few questions and comments, mostly small points: p. xvii. There is another replica of the Periathos head in the Liechtenstein collection.

p. xxv. Wace’s contention that bronze rather than marble sculptures were in favour from the late sixth century B.C. to the period of Praxiteles may be correct to a certain extent, but that great sculptors like Pheidias and Alkamenes worked extensively in marble we learn from Lucian, Zeus Tragodai, 7, where Myron’s and Polykleitos’s bronze is contrasted with Pheidias’s and Alkamenes’s marble.

no. 1. Why should this boy be eclectic because the head is more carefully worked than the body? Why not a Roman copy of a Hellenistic work?

no. 49. The ‘twin’ is now in the Metropolitan Museum. Instead of Dioskouroi could not the two statuettes be boys in Oriental costume?

no. 106. Why should a bust found in the house of Laberius Gallus at Bolsena necessarily represent the owner? There are so many other possibilities.

no. 171. This little kouros seems to me early archaic. First half of the sixth century B.C. rather than middle? I suggest period of Orchomenos—Thera Group, 590–570 B.C.

no. 175 ff. Surely the term kouros should not be used for post archaic youths, its only excuse being that it conveniently differentiates archaic boys from later ones.

no. 183. As Miss Hill rightly recognised, this charming statuette is a variant of the Elgin Athena, which, by the way, has now been acquired by the Metropolitan Museum.

no. 195. The inscription Demetrios on the inside of the left foot could refer either to the owner or to the maker. We may recall that on engraved gems, where also little space is available, names in the genitive are generally signatures.

no. 236. A forgery?

GISELA M. A. RICHTER.
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I.—GENERAL

A
Aberdeen, hydria 695, 28, 30 ff.
Agoge, Spartan, 61
Argive Heraeum, excavations, 4
Athena Syllania, in state-cult of Sparta, 60
Athens: Acropolis, skyphos fragment (ARV 28), 32;
Agora excavations, 2; Stoa of Attalus, excavations,
2; Stoa Poikile, 2; National Museum accessions, 1 ff.
Ayia Paraskevi (Cyprus), excavations, 13

B
Bamboula (Cyprus), excavations, 14
Baths, terracotta, from Old Smyrna, 11
Berlin, amphora (ARV 134 no. 1), 28
Boston, hydria fragment 03.898, 32
Boulogne, neck-amphora (ARV 134 no. 37), 28
Brassön, excavations, 4
Bronzes; Kouros from Argive Heraeum, 4; young
male god from Enkomi, 14; figurine of Hermes, 2;
statuette from Kosmá (Sparta), 1; figurine of
Athena Promachos from Parthenon, 1

C
Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, r.f. volute krater
(ARV 137 no. 99), 23 ff.
Cape Drepanum (Cyprus), excavations, 15
Carthage, inter-relations with Sparta, 64
Chryse, sanctuary and altar of, on Attic r.f. vases, 35 ff.
Clisisthenes, reform of, 60
Coiled wire patterns, on tripod, 17
Coins: from Curium, 14; from Kozáni, 7; from
Thasos, 7
Corinth: excavations, 4; greatest age of, 64; calyx-
krater (ARV 137 no. 88), 26, 33
Cretan origin of Spartan system, 58, 63
Curium (Cyprus), excavations, 14

D
Delos, excavations, 7 f.
Delphi, discoveries at, 5
Delphic oracle, 49, 57 f.
Demiguroge, in Plato, 66, 68 f.
Devil, in Plato, 71

E
Enkomi (Cyprus), excavations, 14
Ephorate, Spartan, 61
Epidauros, excavations, 5
Episkopi (Cyprus), excavations, 14
Erlangen, vase fragments (ARV 131 no. 4), 33
Euripides, Philokettes, 41

F
Famagusta (Cyprus), excavations, 15
Fibulae: beaded, 20; 'boat', 20; 'Bocotian', 20;
compound, 20; hump-backed, 20; 'leech', 20;
safety-pin, 20; stilted, 20; and see Spectacle Fibulae.
Florence, pelike (ARV 28, top no. 2), 26, 30, 32 ff.

G
Gerousia, Carthaginian, 46; Cretan, 46; Spartan,
43 ff., 61

H
Havana, Gumá Collection, hydria, 29 n.
Hoplite tactics, at Sparta, 51 f.
Horses on stands, dating of, 16 ff.; from Ithaca, 21 f.;
and see Syracuse, Taranto.

I
Inscriptions: from Athenian Agora, 4; from Delos,
8; from Delphi, 5; from Fortéta, 9; from Kalývia
Sokhás (marble kerb), 5; from Paros, 7; from
Salonica, 6; from Thasos, 7; from Vérria, 6

K
Kalavassos (Cyprus), excavations, 13 f.
Kalývia Sokhás, excavations, 5
Kantharos, on vases, 25
Kaphzín (Cyprus), excavations, 14
Kastorí, early Christian basilicas, 6
Knossos, excavations, 9
Kozáni, excavations, 7

L
Labyrinth, as vase-pattern, 30
Lamps: from Arkhánes, 9; from Kaphzín, 14
Laxia (Cyprus), excavations, 14
Leipsic, volute-krater (ARV 137 no. 100), 26, 28
Leningrad: hydria (ARV 140 no. 138), 32; pelike
43f, 35, 39; volute-krater 33A, 35 ff.
London, British Museum: Geometric amphora, 21;
bell-krater Ep64, 35 ff.; hydria Ep62, 28, 30ff.;
hydria Ep64, 25; volute-krater Ep68, 23
Lycurgean Reform at Sparta, 42 ff.

M
Madrid, hydria (ARV 140 no. 136), 32
Málía, excavations, 9
Meander patterns, on vases, 20, 30
Medallions, on vases, 19 f.
Megara, greatest age of, 64
Messenian Wars, 50 ff.
Metalwork, clay impressions from Athenian Agora, 4
Mosaics: from Cape Drepanum, 15; from Curium,
14; from Delos, 8; from Smyrna, 12; from Thasos,
7
Munich: amphora, 25; panathenaic (ARV 132 no. 5),
28
Myrtou (Cyprus), excavations, 14

N
Néa Ionia, excavations, 4
New York, hydria (ARV 140 no. 132), 28, 32
Nicosia, Cyprus Museum, Philia type vases, 13
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O
Old Smyrna, excavations, 10 ff.
Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, Protocorinthian aryballos, 22

P
Panormos (Crete), excavations, 9
Paris, Louvre: calyx-krater G342, 35, 39, 41; hydria G176, 30; pastiche G166, 26; stamnos G413, 35, 39, 41; vase G231, 32; vase fragment (ARV 143 no. 184), 28, 33
Pericles Monarchos, 76 ff.
Pernera (Cyprus), excavations, 14
Plato and the ἀρχαιοκτόνοι, 65 ff.

R
Rays, on vases, 16, 19
Rheta, Spartan, 42 ff.
Rome, Villa Giulia, volute-krater, 23 n., 30
Running palmette, on vases, 23 ff.
Running spiral, on vases and tripod, 16 ff.

S
Salonica, excavations, 5 ff.
Samothrace, excavations, 7
Sarcophagi, from Salonica, 5
Sculpture: from Ano Kopanós (bast of young man), 6; from Athens (relief), 1 f.; from Athenian Agora (head), 4; from Delos (head of Hermes), 6; from Koukla (archaic), 14; from Nicosia (medieval), 15; from Vérria (head of woman), 6; from Thasos (head of archaic kore), 7
Side (Pamphylia), excavations, 13
Silver vases, from Kozaní, 7
Sparta: art, 63; evidence for early history, 57 ff.; excavations, 5; Lycurgan Reforms, 42 ff.
Spectacle Fibulae: dating of, 16 ff.; from Artemis Orthia, 17 f.; from Cauchita, 18; from Delphi, 18; from Marmariani, 18; from Thera, 18
Syracuse, horse on stand, 21

T
Tanagra, Battle of, 75 ff.
Taranto: Protocorinthian aryballos, 21; calyx-krater (ARV 850), 35, 39; horse on stand, 21
Terracottas: from Knossos, 9; from Kokkinia (Cyprus), 14
Thasos, excavations, 7
Tripods: dating of, 16 ff.; Ithaca leg 11, 16; Olympia 585, 18; Payx, 17; steatite from Mesogenea, 2

V
Vases: 'prothesis', 21; from Argive Heraeum, 4; from Artemis Orthia (orientalising aryballos), 18; from Athenian Agora, 2, 4; from Enkomi (Mycenae), 14; from Ithaca, 8; from Kalavassos, 14; from Kephaz [?], 14; from Kerameikos (proto-geometric), 21; from Kozaní, 7; from Mália (Minoan), 9; from Marmariani, 18 ff.; from Néa Ioulá, 4; from Old Smyrna, 10 ff.; from Thasos, 7; and see Abercorn, Athens, Berlin, Boston, Boulogne, Cambridge, Corinth, Erlangen, Florence, Havan, Leiptić, Leningrad, London, Madrid, Munich, New York, Nicosia, Oxford, Paris, Rome, Taranto, Vienna
Vase-Painters: Altamura, 35; Berlin, 23 ff.; Douris, 30; Euphrates, 34 n.; Eucharides, 30; Euthymides, 25, 28, 30, 34; Gela, 30; Hermonax, 35, Kiev, 35; Kleophrades, 4, 30; Late Geometric Lion, 16, 21; Leagros Group, 32; Nereus, 28 f.; New York Centaumomachy, 9; Niobid, 10; Onesimos, 28; Pan 30; Phintias, 34; Pioneer Group, 30; Pronomos, 35; Sophilos, 10; Syleus, 30; Triptolemos, 30; Triphiles, 30, 32; Vienna, 28
Vérria (Beroea), excavations, 6
Vienna: bell-krater Inv. 1144, 33 ff.; pelike (ARV 222 no. 58), 28, 30, 32 f.

W
World-Soul, in Plato, 65 ff.
Writing, invention of, 64

Z
Zeus Syllanios, in state-cult of Sparta, 60

II.—INDEX OF GREEK AUTHORS

Assaracus, 186, 59
Alcman, fr. 71, 62
Archilochus, 66, 47
Aristophanes, Wasps 474, 77
Aristotle, 1071b 37, 67; fr. 541, 54; Lokanon Politia fr. 533 (ap. Plut. Lyc. 1), 56; fr. 535 (ap. Clemens Alex. Strom. I. 152), 57 f.; fr. 536 and 537 (ap. Plut. Lyce 5 and 6), 57; fr. 538 (ap. Plut. Lyc. 28), 57; Politia 1269a 41, 56; 1269a 20, 56; 1270a 1, 56; 1270a 20, 56; 1270b 1, 56; 1270b 18, 56; 1271a 13, 56; 1271a 23, 56, 61; 1271a 27, 56; 1271b 20, 55; 1271b 23, 58; 1272a 46; 1272a 3, 56; 1273a 46; 1273b 33, 56; 1273b 34, 61; 1274a 30, 56; 1294a, 55 n.; 1296a 20, 56; 1306b 30, 62; 1313a 25, 56; 1333b 11, 56
Callinus, 9 f., 51 f.
Diodorus, VII 12 (Tyrtaeus IIIa), 47 ff.; XI 50, 47; XI 79, 75; XII 1, 2–3, 76
Eufrides, Medea 384, 48; Arg. 2, 41; Supplilia 349 ff., 77; 493 ff., 77
Hellenicus, 108, 59
Heracleides Ponticus, fr. 3 (2), 50
Herodotus, 1, 53; I 65, 6, 52 ff.; I 65, 1, 54; I 65, 2, 53 f., 62; 165 3, 58; I 66, 1, 53, 55; 167, 1, 53; I 68, 5, 4; I 73, 5, 55; II 142, 53; II 173, 47; III 80–2, 76 f.; IV 145, 59; VI 57, 64; IX 53, 60 n.
Homer, Iliad 797, 51; Odyssey XII 57, 47; XIX 405, 47
Lycurgus, Leor. 107, 59
Mimmermus, in Wyss, Antimach Colophonii Reliquiae (1939) 83 and 88, 52
Pausanias, I 29, 9, 75; IX 29, 4 (fr. of Smyrnaid), 52
Pindar, Pyth. I 62 f., 59
Plato, Laws X, 65 ff.; 896d, 70; 891c, 70; 895c, 71; 896a, 72; 896d, 70 f.; 896e, 71; 898c, 71; Philebus 26c–39d, 69; 65a–66b, 69; Pol. 273b, 68; Sophist 248c, 72; 255e, 68; Theaetetus 176b, 72; Timaeus 30a, 69; 34a, 66 f.; 35a, 67 f.; 36c, 68; 36d, 66; 37c, 67; 38c, 67; 43a, 44a, 67; 46b, 66; 50c, 66; 52d, 65; 59c, 67
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Platonic First Alcibiades 112c, 75
Plutarch, Cimon 15, 75; Cleomenes 10, 61; Lycurgus V, 43; VI, 42 ff.; Pelop. XVII, 43 n., 60; GQ, 17, 64
Proclus, ap. Tim. I p. 402 (Dichl), 73
Sophocles, Philoctetes 1326, 39; Arg. 1, 39 f.
Theocritus, VIII 8, 47

Thucydides, I 18 1, 54 f.; I 20 3, 60 n.; I 79 f., 47; I 84 3, 62; I 103, 76; I 107 2-108 2, 75; II 15 2, 60; II 66 1, 75
Tyrtaeus, I 6-24 (ed. Diclr), 50 ff.; II, 51; IIIa (Diodoros VII 12), 47 ff., 58; IIIb (Plutarch, Lycurgus VI), 42, 44, 46 ff., 58; IV 3, 50 f.; VI-VII, 50; VIII 5, 56; IX, 51
Tzetzes, ap. Lyc. 911, 39 f.

III.—INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

ἀγωρά, 45
ἀκατεία, 70
ἀμαία, 70
ἀμάχη, 65 n.
ἀναξιοθέατα, 51
ἀνάγοραία, 44
ἀνταμείβομαι, 47
ἀνταμείβομαι, 47
ἀνιμίβομαι, 47
ἀπαλλά, 45
ἀποτοπτηρά, 45 n.
ἀρχή, 71 f.
ἀρχή κακίας, 65 ff.
ἀρχή κινήσεως, 66 ff.
ἀφίστασαι, 43 f.

γένειας, 65
γεώργια, 44
δάμω, 44
δύσμεκτον, 67 f.

ἐλαρεύνω, 43
ἐκσείσμονε, 63
ἐκδηλοθέτουμεν, 45
ἐροτήμα, 45 n.
ἐυκλάσις, 51 f.
ἐυδοσία, 535 n., 55 n.
ἐυνομείσθαι, 55

IV.—BOOKS NOTICED

AKARCA (A. ), see MANSEL (A. M.).

BELLINGER (A. R.), The Excavations at Dura-Europos: Final Report VI—The Coins, 102
BENSON (H.), Einführung in die alte Geschichte, 79
BLUMEL (C.), Römische Skulpturen, 97
BOURBOULES (P. P.), Apollo Delphiinos, 103
BROMMER (F.), Satyrschild: Bilder griechischer Vasen, 85
BRUNS (G.), Der grosse Altar von Pergamon, 84
—Antike Terrakotten, 96
—Antike Bronzen, 97
BULLE (H.) and WIRSING (H.), Szencenbilder zum griechischen Theater des 5 Jahrhunderts v. Chr., 104

CHRISTOPHILIOPOULOU (A. A.) 'Η σύγχρονος Τόπος τοῦ βουλαντίου Κράτος, 88
CLOCHE (F.), Le Siècle de Périoctés, 86
CRAWFORD (D. S.) (Ed.), Fund I University Papyri (Publications de la Société Fouad I de Papyrologie, Textes et Documents VIII), 94

DESPRÉS (E.), Pindare et Platon (Philosophie ancienne, I), 79

FARRINGTON (B.), Greek Science, 2: Theophrastus to Galen, 98
FESTUGIÈRE (Le R. P.), La Rélevation d'Hermès Trismégiste. II. Le Dieu cosmique, 90
FIELD (G. C.), The Philosophy of Plato, 78
GEORGIADES (T.), Der griechische Rhythmus : Musik, Reigen, Vers und Sprache, 82
GEORGIEV (V.), Le Déchiffrement des Inscriptions minoennes, 87
GOLDSCHMIDT (V.), La Religion de Platon, 78
GRÉGOIRE (H.), Περιγραφή, Mélanges Henri Grégoire (Annales de l'Institut de Philologie et d' Histoire Orientales et Slaves, IX), 101
GRÜNHAUSEN (W.), Antike Originalarbeiten der Kunstsammlung des Instituts (Archäologisches Institut der Universität Erlangen), 84
GUTHRIE (W. K. C.), The Greek Philosophers from Thales to Aristotle, 97
HADDAD (G.), Aspects of Social Life in Antioch in the Hellenistic-Roman Period, 93
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HERBIG (R.), Pan: der griechische Bocksgott. Versuch einer Monographie, 90
HILL (D. K.), Catalogue of Classical Bronze Sculpture in the Walters Art Gallery, 105
INSTINSKY (H. U.), Alexander der Grosse am Hellespont, 79
JEFFERY (L. H.), see RAUBITSCHKE (A. E.).
KININMONTHI (C.), The Children of Theiss: a Study of Islands and Islanders in the Aegean, 82
KLAFENBACH (G.), see KIRCHNER (J.).
LANGE (K.), Antike Münzen, 96
LAUNEY (M.), Recherches sur les armées Hellénistiques, 95
MANSEL (A. M.) and AKARCA (A.), Excavations and Researches at Perga, 93
MARTIN (V.), La Vie Internationale dans la Grèce des Cités (Publications de l'Institut universitaire de hauteudes internationales, no. 21), 100
MAUYENCE (P.) and VERHOOGEN (V.), Corpus Vasorum Antiquarum: Belgique: Bruxelles, Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire, 88
MAZZARINO (S.), Fra Oriente ed Occidente: Ricerche di Storia greca arcaica, 104
NILSSON (M. P.), The Minoan - Mycenean Religion and its Survivals in GreekReligion. 2nd revised edition,92
NY CARLSBERG GLYPTOTEC. From the Collections of the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, No. III, 102
OZGUÇ (N.), see OZGUÇ (T.).
OZGUÇ (T.), Die Bestattungsbräuche im vorgeschichtlichen Anatolien, 83
OZGUÇ (T.) and OZGÜÇ (N.), Türk Tarih Kurumu Tarifinden Karşıyayık Hafriyatı Raporu, 1947: Ausgrabungen in Karşıyayık, 83
PALLIS (S. A.), Greek Religious Texts, 91
PARIENI (R.), La Macedonia sino ad Alessandro Magno, 81
PHILLIPSON (A.), Das Klima Griechenlands, 85
PICARD (C.), Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire offerts à Charles Picard à l'occasion de son 65e anniversaire (Revue Archéologique XXIX and XXX), 94
POWELL (J. E.), translation), Herodotas, 87
RAUBITSCHKE (A. E.) and JEFFERY (L. H.), Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis: a Catalogue of the Inscriptions of the Sixth and Fifth Centuries B.C., 97
RIUS (P.), Hama: Fouilles et Recherches de la Fondation Carlsberg, 1931-38. II. 3: Les Cimetères à crémation, 93
ROBERT (L.), Hellenica: Recueil d'Épigraphe, de Numismatique et d'Antiquités grecques, VII, 61
ROMAOS (C. A.), Cultes populaires de la Thrace: les Anastéria, la cérémonie du Lundi Pur. Trans. I. Tissandier, 92
ROSÉN (L. J.), The Philosophy of Proclus: the Final Phase of Ancient Thought, 92
SELTMAN (C.), Masterpieces of Greek Coinage, 84
SHEAR (T. L.), Commemorative Studies in Honor of Theodore Leslie Shear (Hesperia, Supplement VIII), 89
SOLMS (F.), Hesiod and Aeschylus (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, vol. XXX), 91
STANFORD (W. B.), Ambiguity in Greek Literature: Studies in Theory and Practice, 89
VAN LENSEPLE, Euripides: Selected Plays, with Introduction, Metrical Synopsis and Commentary. Part I. The Alkestis, 86
VASILIEV (A. A.), Justin the First: an Introduction to the Epoch of Justinian the Great, 103
VERHOOGEN (V.), see MAUYENCE (F.).
WACE (A. J. B.), Mycenae: an Archaeological History and Guide, 99
WEICKERT (C.), Griechische Plastik, 96
WIRING (H.), see BOLLE (H.).
YAVIS (C. G.), Greek Alars, Origins and Typology, 91
ZILLIACUS (H.), Untersuchungen zu den abstrakten Anredenformen und Höflichkeitsformeln im Griechischen (Societas Scientiarum Fennica, Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum XV, 3), 93
a. Old Smyrna. East Greek Orientalizing Oenochoe.
b. Bronze Horse on Tripod, Found in Ithaca.
c. Bronze Horse on Tripod, Found in Ithaca.
d. Protocorinthian Aryballos and Bronze Horse, from Bari, in Taranto Museum.
a. Late Geometric Amphora.
b. Bronze Horse on Stand found at Aetos, Ithaca.
c. Bronze Horse found at Syracuse. (Syracuse Museum.)
d. Early Protocorinthian Arvallos. (Asimolean Museum.)
e. Bronze Horse on Stand found in Ithaca.
Volute-krater in Cambridge.
(Fitzwilliam Museum, on loan from Museum of Ethnology and Archaeology.)

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

Finance.

That the Excess of Expenditure over Income stands at £255, as compared with £1,113 in 1948, calls for a word of explanation: (1) the 1948 accounts contained the expenses of the two volumes 67 and 68; (2) the 1949 accounts, which are circulated with this Report, introduce a new practice with regard to the Journal account; instead of including in the year's expenditure the estimated cost of the unpublished Journal, as has been the practice, we shall in future show the actual expenditure on the current Journal issue. This new practice is conveniently introduced now, as the Journal is being brought up to date by the simultaneous publication this year of volumes 69 and 70; this enables us to spread the cost over the two years 1949 and 1950, and we have therefore included in the 1949 accounts half the cost of these volumes, leaving the balance to be included in the 1950 accounts.

The fact remains that there has been no hope of living within the present income, and we have therefore taken the decision, in agreement with the Roman Society, to recommend the increase in subscription rates for all classes of new members.

Membership figures have been revised as at December 31st, 1949, a plan which relates them more exactly to the year's income. These revised figures represent the strictly paid-up subscriptions, and they show the membership not yet back at the 1939 figure.

1947 948 141 179 404 1,672
1948 965 141 186 390 1,682
1949 revised 975 133 188 384 1,680
Journal exchanges 64

Obituary.


The Joint Standing Committee of the Hellenic and Roman Societies.

An important development of the past year has been the establishment by the two Societies of Joint Control over all the Library functions. The premises at 50 Bedford Square pass into the joint responsibility of the two Societies (expenses being shared equally); the Library and its administration will be jointly controlled (expenses being shared in proportion to membership H.S. 60%, R.S. 40%). Two new Joint Accounts will in future appear in respect of these. The two Councils have appointed Mr. E. G. Turner to be Hon. Librarian for the next triennial period.

The Committee recommended the appointment of Miss J. E. Southan as Librarian in succession to Miss G. R. Levy, who retired at the commencement of the session.

Premises.

The expiry of the lease of the present premises in December created a very difficult situation. A renewal of a long-term lease on modern conditions is clearly beyond the resources of the Society; and although in two years' time the Council have good hopes of being able to arrange suitable accommodation for the Society, the intermediate period had to be provided for. Fortunately, the Duke of Bedford, our landlord, has consented to a short lease, on terms which are generous to the Societies and have enabled us to avoid immediate removal. The end-of-lease dilapidations, for which no provision has yet been made, will have to be met in 1952, and for this emergency the Council is asking members to contribute to a Special Fund.

Journal of Hellenic Studies.

Thanks to the grant from UNESCO we issued last year volumes 67 and 68, and before the end of this year we shall publish the two volumes 69 and 70 in one binding; this will bring the Journal up to date after making up the two years lost through the war. Volume 71, to be pub-
lished in 1951, will be a tribute volume to Professor Sir John Beazley; it is hoped that subscribers who wish to show regard for him will bear the expense of the lavish illustration which we shall produce for this volume.

The future development of the *Journal* is receiving consideration; it is proposed to divide the editorial work by appointing as General Editor Professor A. W. Gomme and as assistant Editor, Mr. G. K. Jenkins, and to widen the scope of the *JHS* by the inclusion of more numerous historical and literary articles, without neglecting the archaeological interests with which it is especially identified.

**Meetings.**

The following communications have been made at Meetings of the Society during the session:

- **November 8th, 1949.** Professor R. J. H. Jenkins on *The Historical Tradition of 9th Century Byzantium*.
- **February 7th, 1950.** Professor A. J. Tounbee on *Greek History as a Key to World History*.
- **May 9th, 1950.** Professor H. D. F. Kitto on *The Gods in Greek Poetry*.
- **June 27th, 1950.** Professor E. R. Dodds (Presidential Address), *The Greek Shamans and the Origins of Puritanism*.

**Provincial Meetings.**

Meetings were arranged in collaboration with local branches of the Classical Association at the following centres: Hull, Southampton, Reading, Bristol and Glasgow, and papers were read by Professor A. W. Gomme, Professor H. D. F. Kitto, Professor L. J. D. Richardson, Professor T. B. L. Webster and Professor C. M. Robertson.

**Administration.**

The following members of Council retire under Rule 19: J. Allan, W. L. Cuttle, B. L. Hallward, Professor H. D. F. Kitto, Professor M. E. L. Mallowan, E. V. C. Plumptre, Professor H. T. Wade-Gery, Professor E. H. Warrington, Professor T. B. L. Webster.

The Council have nominated for election as President of the Society: Professor T. B. L. Webster, and as members of their body for the next three years: R. M. Cook, Miss D. H. F. Gray, G. B. Kerferd, H. C. Oakley, Professor D. L. Page, Professor C. M. Robertson, F. H. Stubbs, G. A. D. Tait, Professor D. Tarrant, and Mrs. A. D. Ure.

E. S. G. Robinson has been re-elected to the Standing Committee for the next triennial period.

The Council thank their Honorary Member, Mr. C. T. Edge, F.C.A., for acting as auditor, and have pleasure in nominating him for re-election.

**The Joint Library.**

The following figures show the work done during the last three sessions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1947-8</th>
<th>1948-9</th>
<th>1949-50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books added</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books borrowed</td>
<td>4,023</td>
<td>4,395</td>
<td>4,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowers</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slides borrowed</td>
<td>6,157</td>
<td>6,118</td>
<td>5,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slides sold</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filmstrips</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filmstrips sold</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Library Committee has been enlarged, and now meets every three months. The present members of the Committee are: Professor R. J. H. Jenkins (Chairman), Mr. E. G. Turner (Honorary Librarian), Miss M. Alford, Professor N. H. Baynes, Professor A. H. M. Jones, Professor W. S. Maguinness, Professor C. M. Robertson, Dr. H. H. Scullard, Professor R. P. Winnington-Ingram.

The new Committee has, as its first task, tackled the problem of filling gaps in sets of foreign periodicals due to the war, and resuming exchanges. As a result, fourteen exchanges have been resumed during the past year, and gaps are slowly being filled, though owing to war-time destruction it is feared that some of them will be permanent.

In response to requests from members, current numbers of all periodicals are now kept together in the main Library.

The Committee intends to devote its attention next to bringing the Library up to date as far as possible. It is impossible to purchase large numbers of foreign books owing to their prohibitive cost, but every effort is being made to get books for review. During the last year, 110 books have been received for review from foreign publishers.

The new Committee on Slides, Photographs and Filmstrips has now begun to meet. The members are Professor C. M. Robertson (Chairman), Mr. B. Ashmore, Dr. J. K. St. Joseph and Dr. J. M. C. Toynbee. The Committee is at present concentrating on the revision and improvement of the sets of lantern slides. It is hoped to revise twenty-four out of the total of forty-six within the next two years.

Additions to the Library during the year include:

**General:** Higet, The Classical Tradition; Hommage à Joseph Bidez et à François Camout; Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire offerts à Charles Picard; Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie, vol.
18, parts 2, 3 and 4, vol. 20, part 1, and Supplementum band 7, A2 parts 1 and 2.

Literature: Aristotle, Prior and Posterior Analytics, ed. Ross; Bacchylides, ed. Snell; Callimachus I, Fragmenta, ed. Pfeiffer; Herodotus, trans. Powell; Organ, An index to Aristotle in English translation; Piwonka, Lucilius und Kallimachos; Solmsen, Heroid and Aeschylus.


History: Bellinger, The end of the Seleucids; Bréhier, Vie et Mort de Byzance and Les Institutions de l’Empire Byzantin; Calderini, Le Fonti per la Storia antica greca e romana; Ehrenberg and Jones, Documents illustrating the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius; Gelzer, Pompeius; Jacoby, Athènes: the local History of the Persian Empire; Ostrogorsky, Geschichte des Byzantinischen Staates (Handbuch der Allerumwissenschaft, XII, i, 2); Taylor, Party Politics in the Age of Caesar; Vogt, Constantin the Great and sein Jahrhundert.

Law: Jörs, Kunkel and Wenger, Römisches Recht, 3rd edition; Seidl, Römisches Privatrecht.


Roman Britain: Bushe-Fox, Fourth Report on the Excavations of the Roman Fort at Richborough, Kent; Charlesworth, The Lost Province; Richmond, The British Section of the Ravenna Cosmography.


Geography: Philippson, Das Klima Griechenlands.

Art: Blümel, Hermes eines Praxiteles; Buschor, Griechische Vasen, Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum, Belgium III, and Spain, Musée Archéologique National, II; Dragendorf and Watzinger, Arretinische Reliefkeramik; Hill, Catalogue of Classical Bronze Sculpture in the Walters Art Gallery; Kähler, Pergamon and Der grosse Fries von Pergamon; From the Collections of the Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek, III; Picard, La Sculpture, III.

Numismatics: Mattingly, Sydenham and Sutherland, The Roman Imperial Coinage, vol. IV; part 3; Sellman, Masterpieces of Greek Coinage; Syllote Nummorum Graecorum, III.


Papyri: Bell and Roberts, Merton Papyri 1; Crawford, Fouad I University Papyri (Textes et Documents VIII).


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

Authors: C. A. Albenque, Dr. H. G. Beyen, A. A. Christophopolou, C. Clairmont, Professor O. Davies, Dr. C. Diehl, R. H. Dolley, V. Georgiev, G. Haddad, Professor C. F. C. Hawkes, W. M. Hugill, M. R. Hull, D. Kanatsoulis, G. B. Kerferd, W. F. J. Knight, N. M. Kontoleon, W. Lepik, M. A. Levi, H. Mattingly, J. A. Maurer, Professor Dr. G. Moravcsik, B. Pace, Professor L. R. Palmer, R. Pariben, Professor L. J. D. Richardson, P. J. Riis, Professor L. Robert, Professor L. J. Rosan, L. Roussel, Dr. A. Rumpf, Dr. R. Strömer, Dr. E. Swoboda, A. Van den Daele, R. Werner, R. Wilde, H. Zilliacus.

Other Donors: Professor N. H. Baynes, Dr. V. L. Ehrenberg, D. Gillie, D. B. Harden, W. R. Lefanu, Professor W. S. Maguinness, E. L. B. Meurig-Davies, Miss M. V. Taylor, Mrs. A. D. Ure.


The two Councils wish to thank Mrs. L. Batley and the Rev. J. H. Hopkinson for gifts to the photographic collection, and Miss S. Benton for valuable help in the Photographic Department.
# The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies

**BALANCE SHEET, DECEMBER 31, 1949.**

<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>2,177 13 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>By Cash in Hand</td>
<td>729 9 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions paid in advance</td>
<td>66 3 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>83 4 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Fund</td>
<td>2,779 12 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Special Deposit Account (Donation from Arch. Inst. of America)</td>
<td>123 15 3</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. Tozer; £500 from the late Mr. G. A. MacMillan; £50 from the late Lady Owen Mackenzie; £50 from the late Sir George Hill; £100 from the Cambridge Classical Society)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>936 8 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal Fund</td>
<td>200 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Petty Cash</td>
<td>821 6 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Compositions—Total at January 1, 1949</td>
<td>2,135 14 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Investments at cost (valued December 31, 1949, £3,796 16s. 5d.)</td>
<td>3,525 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received during the year</td>
<td>15 15 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rates paid in advance</td>
<td>57 4 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,151 9 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Library Premises Capital Account—Amount spent to date</td>
<td>5,584 13 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less carried to Income and Expenditure Account—Deceased Members</td>
<td>78 15 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less Donations received</td>
<td>4,699 11 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Purchases Fund (Donation from Arch. Inst. of America)—Balance at January 1, 1949</td>
<td>35 12 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transferred to Income and Expenditure Account during past years</td>
<td>885 2 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less utilised for Purchases in 1949</td>
<td>35 12 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Now transferred</td>
<td>865 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus at January 1, 1949</td>
<td>299 1 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated Valuation of Stocks of Publications</td>
<td>20 2 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Deficit from Income and Expenditure Account</td>
<td>255 4 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated Valuation of Library</td>
<td>20 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus at December 31, 1949</td>
<td>43 17 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated Valuation of Photographic Department</td>
<td>2,000 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£7,339 19 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£7,339 19 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></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,**

May 5, 1950.

**Cyril T. Edge,**

Chartered Accountant.
The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies

INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1949.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Salaries</td>
<td>1,039</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensions Insurance</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Expenses</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationery</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone and Postage</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry Printing</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating, Lighting, Cleaning and Maintenance of Library Premises</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance (General)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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>British School at Rome</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance from 'Journal of Hellenic Studies' Account</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance from Library Account</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>£2,565</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receipts</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Subscriptions received</td>
<td>1,480</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Tax recovered</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Compositions (Deceased Members),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brought into Revenue</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividends on Investments</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions from the Society for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of Roman Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of 'Ante Oculos'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of 'Artemis Orthia'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Receipts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance from Lantern Slides and Photographs Account</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance from Premises Account</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess of Expenditure over Income</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Receipts</strong></td>
<td><strong>£2,565</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Journal of Hellenic Studies' Account for the Year Ended December 31, 1949

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£ s. d.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£ s. d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Cost of Vol. LXIX—</td>
<td></td>
<td>By Sales, including back Volumes</td>
<td>118 9 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and Paper</td>
<td>395 0 0</td>
<td>&quot; Balance of Grant from UNESCO</td>
<td>128 11 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawings and Engravings</td>
<td>75 0 0</td>
<td>&quot; Balance to Income and Expenditure Account</td>
<td>419 18 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing and Reviews</td>
<td>20 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage and Packing</td>
<td>60 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess Cost of Vols. LXVII and LXVIII over Estimates</td>
<td>550 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>116 19 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1666 19 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lantern Slides and Photographs Account for the Year Ended December 31, 1949

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£ s. d.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£ s. d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Slides for Hire</td>
<td>17 2 3</td>
<td>By Receipts from Sales and Hire</td>
<td>67 2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Balance to Income and Expenditure Account</td>
<td>50 0 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>167 2 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Library Account for the Year Ended December 31, 1949

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£ s. d.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£ s. d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Binding and Sundry Purchases</td>
<td>92 0 2</td>
<td>By Receipts from Sale of Catalogues, Duplicates, etc.</td>
<td>38 0 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Balance to Income and Expenditure Account</td>
<td>53 19 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>192 0 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Premises Account for the Year Ended December 31, 1949

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£ s. d.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£ s. d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Rent</td>
<td>408 8 0</td>
<td>By Rent from the British School at Athens</td>
<td>70 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Rates</td>
<td>225 11 3</td>
<td>&quot; Rent received from Sub-Tenants</td>
<td>631 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Transfer from Balance Sheet—proportion of Expenditure for the year</td>
<td>20 2 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Balance to Income and Expenditure Account</td>
<td>46 18 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1701 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>