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διώρισι τὸν ἀληθὴ χάριν τίνος
πάντων ὑπὲρ σεῦ λευκείψαθεν, εὐχόμεσθι μικρὸν
eἰς ἀιώνα ὁδὴν βίων δικαίων,
ἐσθιὰ δὲ τοῖς πρῶτοις εὐρήκατε πολλὰ προσθείνετε,
σωτῆρ协定 στῆραν νέους ὀπερεότητι,
τοὺς δὲ φιλέλληνας τέρπεν ἢ ἥν χῶς φιλεῖς διδάσκειν.

A.S.F.G.
THUCYDIDES IN BOOK I

Work on Thucydides published in the last thirty years has mostly shown two tendencies, the one, to regard Thucydides as having two successive attitudes towards history; the other to revert to Eduard Meyer’s view that the work as we have it, in all important points of interpretation, at least, was written at one time and that time after the Fall of Athens. I should say at once that I am sceptical about both these views and also—to go rather farther back in the discussion—I would agree with Pohlenz in doubting the far-reaching activity of an “editor” who left the end of the eighth book as we have it. Such unity of outlook as the whole work presents—such unity as Prof. Finley has stressed in his Thucydides—seems to me due, not to the work being written or finally shaped all at one time, but to its being written all by one man who from the first had strong and definite ideas and a clear notion of what he was trying to do. The tendencies which I have mentioned naturally lead to the conclusion that the first book has been, if not written, yet reshaped or largely added to at a later stage in Thucydides’ career and may reflect a change of view about the causes or antecedents of the war. It seems worth while to examine those parts of the book in which these effects would show themselves if they exist, i.e. chiefly in the speeches and the excursus on the Pentekontaetia and its setting.2

The archaeologia proper, chapters 1–19, gives reasons for Thucydides’ expectation that the war would be a great one and more notable than any of its predecessors, judging this from the fact that both sides entered it at the height of their preparedness and that the whole Greek world was on one side or the other or contemplating joining one side or the other (1, 1). The Western Greeks got no further than this contemplation when the war began and it would be natural to suppose that Thucydides wrote these words when he did not yet know that they would go no further. The main argument of the archaeologia seems to show how this height of preparedness and tendency to fall into two camps was reached, and the last sentence of 19 underlines the conclusion.

I would agree with those who have urged that chapters 20 and 21 are a continuation of the archaeologia in the same actual line of thought and the last sentence of 21 makes a transition from the archaeologia to the actual events of the war itself and Thucydides’ treatment of them as described in chapter 22. In this chapter we have, as has been more than once observed, a natural interplay of ideas with chapters 20 and 21, e.g. χαλεπά δύνα παντὶ ἕξις τεκμηρίῳ πιστεύει (20, 1). χαλεπόν τὴν ἀκρίβειαν αὐτὴν τῶν λεγέντων διαστημάτωσα (22, 1); ὁτίωσ ἀπολαίποντος τῶν πολίων ἔτη τῆς ἀλλακής (20, 3). ἐπιτωπών δὲ ἡμικριστο (22, 3); ἐπὶ τὸ προσαγωγότερον τῇ ἀκροάσει ἢ ἀληθέσει (21, 1) ... ἐς μὲν τὴν ἀκράσιν ἵστο τῷ με μυθόδες αὐτῶν ἀτερπέστερον (22, 4); ὀμέτρών τῶν ἔργων σκοπεύει (21, 2) ... ὥσι πᾶ εὐθυγράμτου τῶν γενομένων τὸ σαφές σκοπεύε (22, 4). It is hard to escape the conclusion that it is the same Thucydides in the same mood who has written all these three chapters. By a natural transition he moves from the justification of his method of dealing with earlier history which establishes with sufficient credibility his belief that the war would surpass its predecessors to the justification of a different claim for his treatment of the war itself, including what each side said either on the eve of war or when engaged in it. What Thucydides claims to attain by the methods which he applies to speeches and to τὸ ἔργον τῶν προανθύπον ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ is something for his reader’s study, viz. τῶν γενομένων τὸ σαφές, a study which will be a useful guide in judging the events of the future, for he postulates that human beings will react

---

1 What follows is largely based on a paper read to the Philological Society of Sir John Beazley’s University in 1945. It has gained by some alterations and omissions due to helpful discussion at the time. Account has been taken of later published work, as of earlier, even when no specific reference seemed to be required. The obligations of any student of these questions are too wide and varied to be acknowledged in the space available.

2 The excursus on Cylon, Pausanias, and Themistocles do not effect the main issue; and the narrative of actual operations can be seen in much the same light whatever general view is accepted.

3 All references to Thucydides in which the Book is not mentioned come from Book I.
in the same or similar way to the same or similar situation when it occurs. At whatever precise date Thucydides actually wrote chapter 22 I find it hard to believe that it does not reveal the goal which he set before himself from the start. In view of the difficulties of which Thucydides shows himself aware in that chapter, τὸ σαφὲς must, I think, mean to him the result of a process by which, sparing no pains not merely to discover but to understand what was being done and said, undiverted by partiality, untempted by the seductions of a literary artist, he sets himself to attain—not perfect ἀκρίβεια (for that is impossible) but an approximation to it near enough to justify his claim to its practical utility for those who have the mind to use it as it should be used. The statecraft of the future is to be illuminated not so much perhaps by the general education advocated by the sophists as by study in action of the statecraft of what has become the past. If one could ask Thucydides who were those to whom his work would prove useful, he would, I imagine, reply ‘men of action political and military’, for to the fifth-century Athenian there was hardly any distinction between these activities, and I would imagine that he thought of τὰ μέλλοντα as a series of political and military situations with which a man of action would be concerned. And about all the factors in such situations the future statesmen must be helped to judge by examining τὸ σαφὲς of all the factors in the similar situations of the past.

To take an instance: the emotional and intellectual make-up of a community—especially in those communities in which it directly affected State policy—may be an instructive study for any historian: the emotional and intellectual make-up of Athens and of Sparta, as it was or seemed to be in 432, would surely be to Thucydides a topic to be elucidated if one was to be able to examine τῶν γενομένων τὸ σαφὲς. It was a factor in the calculation of a statesman, and the future statesman must know what it was, or seemed to be, if he is to know if it is a like factor in the situation with which he may be faced. And the more persistent it is, the more relevant it may be. In Book VIII, Thucydides observes that, had the Spartans been τολμητοὶ, they might have achieved great things by following up a victory with an immediate attack on the Piraeus. And then he adds that this was not the only instance in which the Athenians found the Lacedaemonians πάντων δὴ ἕμφασιν ἔφεσαν προσπολεύματα ... διάφοροι γὰρ πλεῖστοι ὁσταὶ τῶν ὑπό τό στόπον, οἱ μὲν ὁξέοι, οἱ δὲ βραδεῖοι, καὶ οἱ μὲν ἐπιχειρηται, οἱ δὲ ἐτόλμηται, ἄλλος τε καὶ ἐν ἀρχῇ ναυτικῆ, πλείστα ὁμολογοῦν. Εἰδέσκεκαν δὲ οἱ Σιρακοῦσαι μάλιστα γὰρ ὀμοιότροποι γενόμενοι ἀρισταὶ καὶ προσπολεύτησιν (96, 5).

To return: the character of communities as they were, or as they were reputed to be, at the time was a factor in any situation in which they were engaged, and a situation that leads to war is one in which this factor would most readily be apparent, and it was, one may suppose, very present to Thucydides’ mind. And it is a priori probable that Thucydides realised in 432 the factors that affected 432. This does not mean that his political judgment might not ripen. It does not mean that he might not revalue some ideas—he may have come to assign more effectiveness to constitutional forms, to study the effect of popular excitement as it presented itself more clearly as the war went on. All this Thucydides might do, but it seems to me that the validity of his definition of his task would not be affected by it.

The speeches in the First Book are parts of a long-drawn crisis: if the future statesman was to judge whether a similar crisis of his own day would issue in war and was to find Thucydides’ history a help to him, he must be given τῶν γενομένων τὸ σαφὲς. To estimate the historicity of the debates at Athens and Sparta we have to reconstruct the situation as Thucydides thought it was. We must realise what were to him τὰ αἰεὶ παρόντα so as to see what were to him τὰ δεόντα περὶ τῶν αἰεὶ παρόντων. Equally we have to remember that (as J. E. Powell has pointed out) the rule stated in I. 22 meant that Thucydides would need to possess some know-

---

4 See H. Gundert, ‘Athen und Sparta in den Reden des Thucydides’, Die Antike, XVI (1940) 98 ff. (written, however, in the belief that at least the great speeches were not composed till after the fall of Athens); H. Herter in Rh. Mus. XCIII (1950) 143.

5 Thus Thucydides’ opinions on Athenian imperialism might develop with time and events, and on this possible development much light has been thrown by J. de Romilly, Thucydide et l’imperialisme athénien.

ledge of τὰ ἀληθῶς λεχθέντα if he was to know how closely he was keeping to their ξύμπασα γνώμη 'to their general line'.

This brings us to chapter 23. The first part of that chapter hardly concerns us at this moment. With the second part of the chapter we reach the introduction to the antecedents of the war which to Thucydides included more than the αἰτία of Corcyra and Potidæa. Of that more will be said presently. It has often been maintained, and it is a view to which I have adhered in print, that the famous sentence—τὴν μὲν γὰρ ἀληθεύσατην πρόφασιν, ἀφαιρέσατην δὲ λόγον, τούτης Ἀθηναίως ἡγοῦμαι μεγάλους γιγαντούς καὶ φόβον παρέχοντος τοῖς Λακεδαίμονισι ἀναγκάσαι ἐκ τὸ πολέμου (23, 6) reflects a later phase in Thucydides' thinking and that, whereas he once found the αἰτία and διαφορά, that is the grievances and disputes, a sufficient source of the war, he later detected a deeper explanation in the growing power of Athens and the fear it inspired in the Lacedaemonians. On further reflection I am now inclined not to assume two distinct phases in Thucydides' thinking about why the war happened. My own vacillations are of no interest to anyone but myself—and we remain entitled, indeed obliged, to make the best judgment we can on the facts known to us about the historical reasons for the outbreak of the war. That is not a matter to be settled by authority, even the authority of Thucydides. But what we are concerned with at the moment is Thucydides' view of the situation from which the war sprang.

On the statement of the αἰτία and the ἀληθεύσατη πρόφασις follows the narrative (24-31) of the events which led to the first debate in the book (32-43).

The speeches which appear as those of the Corcyraeans and Corinthians are doubtless based on a real debate which Thucydides may have heard (and, in any event, could have found out about), a debate which, at the time or soon after, must have seemed relevant to his theme, falling in his category of speeches by those μέλλοντες πολεμήσειν. Granted the Thucydidean style, the omission of details such as the strength of the Corcyraean fleet (which he has already given in 25, 4), the formal arrangement under the leading topics of τὸ δίκαιον and τὸ ἐξορίσην, the thrust and parry of arguments between the two speeches, granted all this, how closely does Thucydides, in these two speeches, keep to ἡ ξύμπασα γνώμη τῶν ἀληθῶς λεχθέντων, and how far does he confine himself to what could and would be said at the time?

In the debate, held in the spring or early summer of 433, the Corcyraeans speak of a general conflict as μέλλον καὶ ὅσον οὖν παρόν (36, 1) and say... τοὺς Λακεδαίμονισις φόβῳ τὸ ύπερέχον πολεμήσειντος καὶ τοὺς Κορινθίους δυναμένους παρεξοῦσας αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐμὸν ἔξωρος ὑπάθεσις (33, 3) to which the Corinthians retort τὸ μέλλον τοῦ πολέμου... ἐν ἀγαπεῖτε κεῖται (42, 2). These contrasted statements are in each case τὰ έξορία περὶ τῶν παρόντων. The apparent anxiety of the Spartans two years before to see the peace preserved in the Greek world (28, 1) does not suggest any general inceptive or desiderative attitude of Sparta towards war. But for the Corcyraeans to say only that Corinth was hostile to Athens and influential with Sparta was a dangerous line, as Athens might have merely deduced that it would then be well to remove Corinthian ill will. Thucydides in the chapter after the debate says it was thought that, in any event, it would come to war with the Peloponnesians (44, 2), which implies that, right or wrong, the Corcyraean view seemed to reflect the situation more accurately, at least to a majority of Athenians at the time. That, later on, many Athenians thought war could be averted by concessions (139, 4) would not be relevant to Athens' general attitude in 433. If we may postulate, for the moment, that Thucydides regarded it as part of τῶν γενομένων τὸ σφέτος and as dictated by his intention to keep, as far as possible, τὴν ξύμπασα γνώμη τῶν ἀληθῶς λεχθέντων, to limit himself to the arguments that belonged to 433, how far does he achieve this? The Corinthians make what seems to be a veiled diplomatic offer (43): Corinth will continue a policy of leaving Athens to deal as she will with her ἄρχη if Athens will leave Corinth free to deal as she will with her odious colony of Corcyra. That argument does not

1 I use this translation to indicate that I am aware that γνώμη, a chameleon word that takes its colour from its setting, may contain a 'willensmoment'. See H. Patzer, Das Problem der Geschichtsschreibung des Thukydides und die thukydideische Frage, 44 ff.

* CAH V, 191 ff.; 480 ff.
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reflect the slogan of the ἔλευθερωσις τῆς Ἕλλαδος. What the Corcyraeans say in 36, 2 about the position of their island between Sicily and Greece reflects something which Thucydides says the Athenians did then in fact take into account. The two possibilities envisaged—the first that the Siceliotes might wish to send a fleet to help the Peloponnesians, the other that the Athenians might wish to send a fleet into Sicilian waters, these possibilities were in fact present. There is no need to suppose that the speech foreshadows either the Athenian expedition of 427 or the greater expedition of 415, any more than the words ἀμαὶ δὲ καὶ τῆς τε Ἰταλίας καὶ Σικελίας καλὸς ἐφαίνετο αὐτοῖς ἢ νήσος ἐν παράπλευροι κείσασα (44, 3). 9

Now let us consider an argument that Thucydides does not make the Corinthians use. Corcyra proved an ineffective and wavering ally of Athens, and after a time relapsed into neutrality. Her government proved not to be really stable: her foreign policy proved not to be trustworthy. In the Phormophorai of Hermippus, written before 424, the poet says of the Corcyraeans 'May Poseidon destroy them in their hollow ships, for they are double-minded' (frag. 63, ll. 10–11). Here is an argument, viz. that the Corcyraeans were not allies worth securing—it is not used. It would be based on considerations not present in 433 B.C.

It must be admitted that if Thucydides' view of his task as being to present τῶν γενομένων τὸ σαφῆς and his endeavour to keep as close as possible to ἡ ἐξήγησις γνώμη τῶν άληθῶν λέγεντων inhibit him from importing arguments that could not be used at the time, then the absence of such arguments is no proof that the speeches were not composed a good deal later than the events with which they are concerned. There are the two possible explanations, the first that Thucydides wrote these speeches quite early and the second that, whenever he wrote them, he avoided the anachronism of afterknowledge of later events, and these do not necessarily exclude each other: they may be complementary. But if we may suppose that Thucydides' purpose from the start was not merely to relate what happened in the field of action—τὰ ἐργά τῶν πραγμάτων, but also to explain how it happened in the light of what could be known at the time—for this too belonged to τῶν γενομένων τὸ σαφῆς—then the burden of proof rests on those who would suppose that he would not think the present could supply the necessary material for interpretation on those lines. And if Edouard Meyer 10 is right in regarding the speeches as the 'Lebensnere' of Thucydides' history, it seems hard to suppose that the historian would be content with preparing a narrative of events without adding, as soon as might be, the element that made his history lebensfähig. I say 'as soon as might be', for there might be good reasons for not reaching the composition of speeches for Bk VII and good reasons for the absence of speeches in the stretch of the history between the closing chapters of Bk IV and the Melian dialogue. Also a speech like the Funeral Speech, which has a timeless quality in the sense that it is not part of a situation, may be placed in a category of its own.

And now to turn to the speeches on the first conference at Sparta in the autumn of 432. 11 Let us look at these speeches in the light of what was known or could reasonably be conjectured in that year by Thucydides or anybody else. First the speech of the Corinthians. They were themselves moved by anger. Athens had stood in their path over Corcyra as she had done nearly a generation earlier over Megara, when she first aroused Corinth's σφόδραν μίσος (103, 4). And to the Corinthians a war did not seem a hopeless venture. They knew the superior skill of Athenian crews, but they dreamt of overcoming that handicap. They had seen an incipient revolt in the Athenian Empire, and if Potidaea was enabled to hold out this might spread. The attitude of Persia was ambiguous: at least it had been suspected by Athens at the time of the Samian revolt (115–6). Athenian influence was growing in North-West Greece and

9 The idea that used to be supported by the decrees about Rhégium and Leontini passed about this time, viz. that a new or more ambitious Athenian conception of western looking policy was concerned in the Athenian alliance with Corcyra lost its support when W. Bauer (Klio, XV (1917) 188 f.) showed that the two decrees were nothing more than the renewal of older treaties in identical form.
10 Forschungen zur alten Geschichte, II, 386.
11 In much of what follows about this debate and that at the second conference I am in agreement with what Professor Gomme has written in the first volume of his Commentary to Thucydides. When I wrote what follows and read it at Oxford Professor Gomme's work was still unpublished, and I had no knowledge of its contents. Conversely, though Professor Gomme later read my paper, it was after his Commentary had been passed for press. Where our conclusions agree, they were arrived at independently (though I am naturally strengthened in my opinion by the agreement) and I have left my arguments as they then stood.
might injure Corinthian trade there and with Sicily. Moved by this anger, these hopes and fears, Corinth was ready to take the risk of war. But they had to fear the possible inertia of the Lacedaemonians. Two years before Sparta had sought to see the peace kept when she gave diplomatic support to an attempt to settle the quarrel between Corinth and Corcyra. There was now at Sparta an activist tendency dominant perhaps among the ephors if these, as τὰ τέλη τῶν Λακεδαιμόνιων, had given promises of intervention to the envoys from Potidaea in the previous winter (58, 1). But the Spartans were not knights errant, and nothing that Athens had done since the Thirty Years Truce directly impinged on Spartan interests. The grievances of Corinth, though real, might well not be enough to sway Sparta to bell so formidable a cat as Athens if she could safely leave it unbellied. What Sparta cared about most was her leadership in mainland Greece, and this Athens under Pericles had accepted in the Thirty Years Truce, and the Spartans were slow to anger at other men’s wrongs. The Megarians and the spokesmen for Aegina too had grievances and urged them. But when the Corinthians’ turn came they had to find more than grievances. They could hint at secession from Spartan leadership and Thucydides makes them do so (71, 4–6). But, with the Spartan-Argive Treaty in force, this threat was not very compelling. What remained was to arouse in the Spartans the fear that their inertia might play into the hands of Athenian initiative and restless greed for power. To make the power of Athens φόβον παρέχει, Athens must be presented as a people that would never be content, born neither to be at peace themselves or let others remain at peace (70). The belief that they were this was also a real factor throughout the whole of the crisis, but it is not irrelevant to this debate. Granted that the formulation of the contrast between Athens and Sparta is Thucydides’ own, with its sharp almost paradoxical phrasing, it does not seem far removed from the line of argument which it would have served the Corinthians’ purpose to pursue. And it seems to contain nothing that was not implicit in the situation as it could be seen and debated in 432.

At the same time this speech, together with those that follow, helps to build up a composite picture of the character of the two chief communities concerned, which would not be irrelevant to the understanding of what was to follow.

Next the Athenian speech. It seems fantastic to suppose that there were no Athenian envoys at Sparta and that no speech was made by one of them. Whether or not Athens invented the ‘other business’ on which they came, so as to discover what was afoot, no one can say (though some do), but Thucydides cannot well have invented an embassy which so many people still alive would know was an invention. The attitude consistently adopted by Athens in 432 was to meet all complaints by a reference to the arbitration clause in the Thirty Years Truce and, having done so, to yield to no demand. That at least was the policy of Pericles.

It is true that many Athenians thought otherwise, but Athenian envoys would not venture beyond what could be certain of approval at home. But so far they could go. Herein would lie the most actual part of their speech, and their insistence on Athens’ services to Greece and justification of her empire, couched in Thucydidean almost paradoxically phrased arguments, would not go beyond their brief. While they do not say how Athens would meet a war—a topic on which they could hardly venture—they are made to point out how a Persian invasion did not cow the spirit of the Athenians or make them helpless (73–4). The speech, intransient as is its tone, does reflect what seems to have been in fact the general spirit of Athens at the moment. It was not of the kind to make Athens appear less dangerous to her neighbours. And if we may assume for the moment that the speech of Archidamus which follows represents the kind of thing he said, it is not irrelevant that he refers to the φρόνημα of Athens (81, 6) which would prevent them from yielding to an invasion and that he refers to their readiness to abide by the arbitration clause (85, 2). Granted that Thucydides may have altered the balance of emphasis, sharpened the dialectic, and stiffened the attitude, there is nothing really improbable in the assumption that there was a general adherence to ἡ ἐξίσωσις γνώμη τῶν άθροίς λέγεταιν.

Schwartz’s observation that the speech seems to intrude between the speech of the

---

12 Das Geschichtswerk des Thukydides, 105.
Corinthians and the speech of Archidamus—much of which is an answer to the speech of the Corinthians—does not mean that Schwartz was simply behaving like a Dionysius of Halicarnassus. It is true that, were the speech not there, no modern would have missed it. And it is impossible to deny that the passage (77, 6) about the unpopularity the Spartans might well incur if, having overthrown the Athenian Empire, they took the place of Athens may point to a date of composition later than the Fall of Athens if—as indeed it seems to be—it is an original element in the speech. But the words καθελόντις ἤμας need not imply knowledge that Athens was overthrown, for it was, at any time in the second half of the fifth century, a necessary preliminary to a Spartan ἀρχή, and the implied reference to Pausanias’ conduct is evidence enough for a probable unpopularity without a knowledge of Lysander’s harms. And it may be doubted if Thucydides would have written the generalisation ἔμεικτα γὰρ τὰ τε κοθ’ ἤμας σοῦτοι νόμῳ τοῖς ἀλλαῖς ἔχει καὶ προσέτι εἰς ἐκαστὸς ἔξιον ὁτε τοῦτοι χρήται ὁδὸν, οἷς ἡ ἄλλῃ Ἔλληνες νομίσι (77, 6) without qualification, had he known of the effect of Brasidas’ personality on the allies of Athens and felt himself free to use his knowledge. It may be added that, in view of Thucydides’ practice elsewhere, too much can be made of the supposed desirability of διασφι θάνατον on the formal side. And even so, it might be contended that as the debate is in two phases—one in the presence of the allies, one after their withdrawal, Thucydides might regard two speeches in each phase as desirable. My standard of what is wholly fictitious may be unduly high: I cannot say that I think the Athenian speech reaches it.

The speech of Archidamus follows. Archidamus, addressing the Spartans alone, does not concern himself to debate the justice of the allies’ complaints. The Athenians have been made to say that they did not come before the Spartans as ἐκαστὸς (73, 1), and the King does not set up to be a δικαστής. He proposes sending to Athens and urging the allies’ grievances and declares it is not νόμον to assume the Athenians’ guilt especially as they are ready to go to arbitration (85, 2). As has often been pointed out, this seems to echo the Athenian speech and had no such speech appeared in the debate it would have been more natural for him to say ‘let us send envoys to make sure of the Athenians’ will to implement the arbitration clause’. It might be urged that Thucydides is here anticipating the belated bad conscience of the Spartans on this point when they had suffered reverses in the war (V, 14, 3). But Archidamus was a man of formal scruples as is seen from his behaviour at Plataea three years later (II, 74, 2). His belief that the Athenians would not be daunted by invasion, once it happens, and the tacit assumption that the Peloponnesians will not be vouchsafed the opportunity to end the war by a more decisive Tanagra, imply Pericles’ control of Athenian strategy. When in 431 Archidamus warns his officers to expect an Athenian sortie (II, 11) he says what any wise general would say.13 The Athenian Empire is regarded as beyond the reach of anything but a fleet. The speech in fact notably fits what a general like Archidamus would think according to the evidence available in 432, as it fits its place in the debate. The defence of Spartan institutions against the strictures of the Corinthians would not seem strange to a Greek and assists the picture Thucydides presents. The remark ‘I fear rather we may bequeath the war to our sons’ (81, 6) fits the drastic phrasing of the speech, and affords no indication of the date of composition. That Archidamus, king and general, made a speech on this occasion may be regarded as practically certain, and the proverbial secrecy of Lacedaemon would not prevent it being known abroad what kind of thing he said. A part of the argument about this belongs to the discussion of the second speech of the Corinthians and the first speech of Pericles, so any conclusion must be provisional: my own provisional conclusion would be that Thucydides has adhered pretty closely to ἡ ἐναι βασιλεία τῶν ἀλποι ἀληθεύτων.

change of ephors the Spartans went more hesitatingly to work does not make his γνώμη less probable. So much for this debate.

The decision of the Lacedaemonian Assembly is given as λευκότατοι οἱ σπουδαί καὶ οἱ Ἀθηναίοι δικείν (87, 2), or, apparently less precisely, τὸς σπουδάς λευκότατοι καὶ πολεμίτες (88). This incidentally means that Sparta can no longer appeal to the arbitration clause in the Thirty Years Truce, though Athens can, as indeed she did with notable dialectical force under the adroit guidance of Pericles. That an acceptable arbitrator could hardly be found is true enough, but it would have suited the temporising policy of Archidamus to explore every avenue, even if every avenue was a cul de sac.

We may pass over, for the moment, the consulting of Apollo and the setting of the excursus on the Pentekontaetia and go at once to the speech of the Corinthians at the second conference, this time of the Peloponnesian League as such. Sparta had given a lead, but it is clear that if a majority of the League members voted against going to war, the League would not be involved. The feverish activity of the Corinthians which Thucydides, no doubt truly, describes suggests that the Corinthians thought an adverse vote possible. When Thucydides contented himself with one speech, that of the Corinthians, he presumably regarded them as exceptionally important, as he regards their grievances as more worth retailing at length than those of the Megarians or Aeginaeants.

The speech of the Corinthians, after referring to the fact that their criticism of Sparta had been met by the decision of the Spartan assembly, goes on to urge that inland states are threatened by Athenian navalism. This notion was not anachronistic in 432, quite apart from the implications of the Megarian Decree. At least the general idea is found in the Pseudo-Xenophonhte Constitution of Athens (II, 3-4), a work which few will put later than the Archidamian war. So far as can be seen, the pressure of Athenian navalism proved not so effective as is suggested in the Corinthian speech or in the Constitution of Athens, and, in so far, this argument is not likely to be an argument later imported by Thucydides.

After what seems to be a parry to a point in the speech of Archidamus, comes the plea that Corinth is not asking for a war à outrance (120, 3). Nothing is imported to reflect either the Corinthian disillusionment with the Peace of Nikias or the mood of the closing stages of the whole 27 years war. Then comes a partial answer to points made in the Archidamus speech about the prospects of the war and the potential resources of the Peloponnesians and an optimistic estimate of their chances (121-2). The notion that in naval matters courage would prevail once a degree of skill was reached is reflected in the speech of the Peloponnesian commanders (II, 87), which does not seem anachronistic. There is a reference to ἐπιστροφον ἐπίς, but a moment when there was in fact a revolt is not a moment at which the reference would be inappropriate. Εὐπτεύομενος, which is also mentioned, was not first thought of at the time of Decelea. Something of the kind was tried again and again by Athens in the Archidamian war. So the speech passes through an αὐξησιά to a peroration, with the slogan of the ἐνισχύσεις τῆς Ἑλλάδος which was undoubtedly being voiced at the time. The whole speech, so it seems to me, is not merely well suited to the occasion in the light of the earlier debate but also reflects what we can suppose to have been in people's minds at the time. The Corinthians speak 'aus der Situation in die Situation hinein'. With these words we may pass to the first speech of Pericles, for Nesselhauf has used these words, truly I think, of that speech so far as the diplomatic situation is concerned. And Pohlenz, in discussing the able dissertation of R. Zahn on this speech, has pointed out that the Periclean strategy is that implicit in the Pseudo-Xenophonhte Constitution of Athens.

14 The notion of a loan from Olympia or Delphi may have made shipwreck of Spartan scruples, but it was not, as has been suggested, something which could only have been advanced by the rationalistic Thucydides. Pericles, who after all did not rule out borrowing Athena's golden robes, is later made to use the slightly opprobrious word νεκρος of this proposed transaction, but after all he is not made to speak impartially.

16 Hermes LXIX (1934), 295.
18 Die erste Periklesrede. Diss. Kiel, 1934. As is well known, this dissertation is strengthened by what it contains from the pen of Professor Jacoby.
The notion of ἔπιτηκευσις belonging to the strategical technique of Pericles’ time, the treatment of military and naval problems in all these speeches does not import the lessons of the Sicilian expedition or of the Decelean—Ionian war. Pericles, like the Corinthians, is made to regard the Athenian supremacy at sea as exposed to one danger, the attraction away of oarsmen or the training of Peloponnesian crews to manoeuvre with Athenian skill (142–3). The naval defeats of Athens at Syracuse, which reduced her fleet to a strength that could be challenged, were due to an improvement of naval construction rather than to acquired skill in handling the ships, and this improvement was effective against an Athenian fleet fighting on the scene of Phormion’s triumph (VII, 34). The revolts of allies are regarded by the Corinthians as a way of reducing Athenian revenues (122, 1) rather than as a factor in operations.

To return to Pericles. His speech may include points made in an earlier debate in which the Megarian Decree was the chief topic, but though Athens had already rejected the Spartan demand, those who hoped to avoid war would not hesitate to revive the topic and urge that concessions should be made. At least Thucydides says that at the final debate some did declare ὅσ' ἐμπότισθαι εἶναι τὸ ψήφισμα εἰρήνης (139, 4), and Pericles would hardly have neglected the topic when speaking πρὸς Ἀθηναίους μετεβολούσιν. In any event, the conflation of two speeches would not violate Thucydidean principles. The manner of the speech reflects an authoritative attitude in Pericles for which the evidence is not confined to Thucydides alone. The speech seems to give what Pericles thought in 432, and there is no good reason to suppose that he did not say what he thought.

A passage which has often been adduced as evidence for the late composition of the speech or part of it, is ch. 144, 1. πολλὰ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα ἔγρα ἐς ἐπικαίρως τὸν περίεσθαι ἵνα ἐκληρή ἀρχὴν τε ἡ ἐπικαίρως ἀκέραιοι μεταβούσιν καὶ κινδύνους αὐθαίρετος μη προστίθησθαι: ἐναλλὰ γὰρ περικλῆς τὸ ὅνειρο τοῖς ἁμῶν ἐμφάνις ἡ τῶν ἐκατόντων διανοίας. It has been argued that these words were written with knowledge of the great Sicilian Expedition. In chapter ii. 65, 7, in the passage in which Pericles is contrasted with his successors, we read ὅ μὲν γὰρ ἐνώπιον τοις ἐκατόντων τούτων ἐρωτευόμενος καὶ ἀρχὴν μὴ ἐπικτικομένους ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ μὴ δὲ τῇ πολεικινδυνεύοντας ἐαρ περίεσθαι. Granted that this part of ii. 65 was written late, there is no reason to doubt the truth of Thucydides’ statement that Pericles did in fact urge this policy and that what we have in 144, 1 and in the latter part of 143, which reflects the notion of ἐνώπιον τοῖς ἐκατόντων τούτων ἐρωτευόμενος, is in fact what Pericles said while he was alive to say it. It did not need the Sicilian Expedition to illuminate the logic of Periclean strategy. At the end of the first section of chapter 144, Thucydides goes on to say καὶ ἐκείνη τοῦτο καὶ ἐν ὅλῳ λόγῳ ἐκείνη τοῖς ἐργαζόμενοι (i.e. when the time for action comes, ἐργα having, as so often in Thucydides, the meaning of military operations) ἐπιλύθησεν. The carrying out of Pericles’ promise is reflected in the last sentence of ii. 13 when Pericles on the very eve of the Peloponnesian invasion not only reviewed the resources of Athens but ἔλεγε δὲ καὶ ἄλλα οἴσπερ εἰς τὴν ἐπικαίρως τοῦ περίεσθαι τοῦ πολέμου. We have then, it seems, in chapter 144, 1, advice which Pericles more than once gave the Athenians, advice which Thucydides is naturally content to put in his mouth once and for all but which he, equally naturally, recalls when, in ii. 65, he contrasts Pericles’ strategy with the adventures of his successors. That Pericles distrusted the judgment of the Athenians when he did not guide it, is not to be doubted: it may, indeed, have been one reason why he was reluctant to see the issue of war postponed by concessions.

It may be granted that as Thucydides looked back over the course of the whole war he saw Pericles as a shrewder judge, a firmer handler of events than his successors, but I cannot myself detect in the First Book signs of a later rewriting ad maiorem Periclis gloriam, but rather the presentation of political and military problems as they in fact presented themselves to any clear-sighted observer at the time.

The military calculations of Archidamus, the Corinthians and Pericles are interlocked, but they seem to be real contemporary calculations which had to be made and had to be stated, which in fact did interlock. The hypothesis that much of the second Corinthian speech was

invented in order to set up Aunt Sallies for Pericles to knock down, appears to approach the unrealistic. It is hard to suppose that Thucydides, who was presumably aware that States seek to avoid wars which they believe they will lose, did not set himself to give his readers a view of what these States did in fact believe, or what their leaders believed and urged on their allies and fellow-citizens. But most communities before they pass from peace to war, granted they have any choice in the matter, need more than the conviction that they are likely to win or that their cause is in itself just, or that the cause of their opponents is in itself other than just. Motives not wholly composed of either conviction come into play, and with these too Thucydides was bound from the start to be concerned.

This leads on to the setting of the excursus on the Pentekontaetia in chapters 89–118.

It is generally assumed that the excursus was written to give the evidence for the ἀληθεστάτη πρόφασις. This assumption needs to be examined more closely. In chapter 88 Thucydides says that the Spartans voted that the Truce was ended and that they must go to war, not so much because they were persuaded by what their allies said as because they feared that the Athenians might become more powerful, observing that most of the Greek world was already under their control. He then continues—οἱ γὰρ Ἀθηναῖοι πρὸ τοῦτο ἠλθοῦν ἐπὶ τὰ πράγματα ἐν σῖς τὶς ἡμέρας (89, 1). The purpose of the excursus is then further given in 97, 2. It is to fill up a gap in his readers’ knowledge and to show how the Athenian ἄρχη was established. The excursus ends with the Thirty Years Truce, followed by an account of the Athenian suppression of the Samian revolt. So far it may be said to explain how the Athenians founded their power and how the Spartans could observe that most of the Greek world was already under Athenian control, but it does not show why the Spartans should fear that the power of Athens would increase to Sparta’s disadvantage. Now the ἀληθεστάτη πρόφασις is not only the greatness or power of Athens but also the fear which it inspired in the Lacedaemonians.29

In 118, 1 when Thucydides has ended the excursus with the reduction of Samos and the submission of Byzantium he proceeds—μετὰ ταύτα δὲ ἱδίῃ γίγνετο οὐ πολιούσι ἄνευ ύπερον τὰ προειρήματα, τὰ τε Κερκυραῖκα καὶ τὰ Ποταμεικα καὶ ὅσα πρόφασις τούτῳ τοῦ πολέμου κατέστη. It is difficult to escape the conclusion that when Thucydides says πρόφασις he is referring back to the ἀληθεστάτη πρόφασις of chapter 23, and, if so, then this is to be found, or at least partly found, in what happened a few years after the events he has described in the excursus. The πρόφασις then includes what Thucydides has been concerned with in the chapters that lie between the end of τὰ Ποταμεικα and the beginning of the excursus. For the πρόφασις is more than what the excursus has described, it is more than the establishment of Athenian power or of the ἄρχη—it is the combination of power and apparent dangerousness which was the truer explanation why Sparta felt bound to go to war.

In saying ‘felt bound to go to war’ I may have given too little force to the word ἀναγγέλλει in ἀναγγέλλει ἐς τὸ πολεμεῖν (cf. also 118, 2). I did so to remind myself that one need not always assign to a word in Thucydides its most trenchant meaning. In his Paideia W. Jaeger pointed out that there is a passage in V, 25, 3 which shows a certain parallelism to the ἀληθεστάτη πρόφασις. Thucydides has said that for 6 years and 10 months the Athenians and Lacedaemonians did not march against each other, but under cover of an unstable truce injured each other and then continues ἐπείτα μέντοι καὶ ἀναγκασθέντες οὐκ ἦσα τὰ μέτα τὰ δέκα ἐτῶν σπονδάς σύν ἐς πολέμου φανερὸν κατέστησαν. But if one examines what happened at that time it can hardly be said that the two States were enforced by an inexorable logic of events, and I would hesitate to suppose that in I, 23, 6 Thucydides need mean that, in his view, the Peloponnesian war was precisely what moderns call ‘inevitable’, a word which often conceals a certain economy of thought. But it may be suggested that Thucydides did intend his account of the debates at Sparta to suggest a kind of addition to his account of the establishment of the

29 It is not difficult to forget that it has this double character. When Dionysius of Halicarnassus (de Thuc. iud. 10) cites 1, 23, 6 with the text of Thucydides before him, he quotes it correctly, but in another work (Ep. II ad Ammæ, 6) this is what he gives us: τὴν μὲν οὖν ἀληθεστάτην αἵτιν.
Athenian Empire that was the source of Athens’ strength, namely reasons for the fear which that strength inspired in Sparta or rather the half reasoning, half emotional and not explicitly declared atmosphere, in which the στίχος precipitated a crisis that ended in war—a part of that atmosphere being precisely the unwillingness of Athenians to behave like Spartans, their τολμηρόν και νεωτέροποία which, however groundlessly, had alarmed the Spartans once before at the time of the Helot revolt (102, 3).

But if the excursus in chapters 89–118 is not the whole of the justification of the ἀληθευτάτη πρόφασις, it seems to imply its existence in the mind of Thucydides. And if one was sure that the excursus was not written until the end of the war, this would certainly suggest that the ἀληθευτάτη πρόφασις may describe something which Thucydides did not realise until about the end of the whole period of 27 years. The passage that matters is, of course, 97, 2. If K. Ziegler is right,22 as I think he is, in urging that this passage originally said simply ἔγραψε δὲ αὐτὰ καὶ τὴν ἐκβολὴν τοῦ λόγου ἐπιστομάθην διὰ τὸ τέλειος τοῦτο ἢ τὸ χρώμαν καὶ ἡ τά πρὸ τῶν Μηδικῶν Ἑλληνικά ἐπιτίθεσαν ἢ αὐτὰ τά Μηδικά. ἀμα δὲ καὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐπιδέσωσιν ἔχει τῆς τῶν 'Ἀθηναίων ἐν οἷς τρόπω κατέστη καὶ τὸν τότε καὶ ἐπεισόδιοι ἐκλίθη τούτων—ἐὰν Ζiegler is right, then the reference to Hellenicus’ work supplies not a terminus post quem for the composition of the whole excursus but a terminus ante quem, which is a very different matter. The excursus is to Thucydides an ἐκβολὴ τοῦ λόγου which needs justifying, and Ziegler23 has urged that the excursus is derived from a work on the history of Greece in which Thucydides had been learning his trade as a historian before ever the war began. But it seems too selectively relevant not to be written, or at least rewritten, for purposes concerned with the causes of the war. But granted that, the excursus itself has, so it seems to me, characteristics which tend to place it early in Thucydides’ career when indeed, I now think, Thucydides was evaluating all the motives that caused the war to break out.

It is common ground that the excursus shows a lack of chronological precision about the intervals between military events. Thucydides may have supposed a chronology in archon years to be misleading, but it remains true that what he has given us rarely shows the spacing of events, and it is hard to escape the conclusion that this was because he could not discover the truth about it. On the other hand he does give indications of the length of certain enterprises: Thasos’ surrender in the third year of the siege, the expedition to Egypt lasts six years. These facts, as W. Kolbe has pointed out,24 might be gathered from the Athenian casualty lists preserved in inscriptions. If for the moment we accept Kolbe’s suggestion that Thucydides turned to this source for information, did these inscriptions also give indications of the intervals between wars by giving the absolute dates of the wars concerned? The only heading that has survived, that of the Erechtheid decree, does not settle the point, for the words τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐν ἔτει τῶν “In [or of] the same year’ may either be, as it were, absolute or may refer back to chronological indications given in another list for what I will call that casualty year. The limits of a casualty year if, as most scholars now agree, Wilamowitz was right in making these the times of the public commemorations25 are not readily to be defined by ordinary Attic chronological formulae. But an indication might be given of the archon under whom the particular commemoration was held, and this would sufficiently define the period to those who know what the ἐν ἔτει meant. If on the other hand no such indication was given, Thucydides could deduce by putting lists together roughly how long wars lasted but not the intervals between them. One day this matter may be cleared up beyond doubt.

Thucydides also knows that there is an interval of about 12 days between two Corinthian defeats in Megara, that the battle of Oenophyta is on the sixty-second day after Tanagra, that the Greeks and Egyptians were besieged for eighteen months before the collapse of the Egyptian expedition, that Samos surrendered in the ninth month of the siege. These details may well be

22 Rh. Mus. LXXVIII (1929) 66, n. 2.  
23 Hermes LXXII (1937) 246 ff., 266.  
24 loc. cit. 62 ff.  
25 Aristoteles und Athen, II, 292.
derived from those who were engaged in these operations. From the same source would probably come information about the numbers of ships, for the size of fleets would be known to those who served on them but are not likely to figure in inscriptions. The first of these sources of information, that of the inscriptions, if in fact Thucydides used it, would be at his disposal either before his exile in the winter of 424/3 or after the Fall of Athens. The second, the recollection of the combatants, would hardly be available more than 40 years or so after the events. Schwartz, who was too honest a scholar to refuse to see difficulties that might beset his conclusions, writes:

‘Daraus, dass er die Pentekontaetia erst nach 404 schrieb, folgt mit nichten, dass er erst damals das Material sammelte. Von etwa 450 an verfügt er ausserdem über seine persönliche Erinnerung; sein historisches Interesse wird auch nicht erst mit 431 begonnen haben.’

It seems most economical of hypothesis to suppose that Thucydides saw reason to find out what he could about the Pentekontaetia and to write the excursus at latest before his exile in 424/3 and probably in connection with the outbreak of the war. The greater detail of the account of the Samian Revolt would be explained by the fact that for this he would have access to the most recent knowledge and it has been suggested that he was drawing on a family tradition. Now this is admittedly hypothetical, but it can fairly be said that the excursus on the Pentekontaetia shows characteristics that are most easily explained by supposing that it was written at a time not far removed from the outbreak of the war. If this is so, then Thucydides may have been conscious at that time that the establishment of the Athenian Empire and the general growth of Athenian power in that period was relevant to the question why the war happened and that he did quite early come to believe that the αἵρεσις—the immediate grievances, were not the whole story.

This does not mean that he ever regarded the αἵρεσις as immaterial, as just ripples on the surface of a tide towards war. The greatness of Athens, the existence and maintenance of the Athenian Empire, did not in themselves violate the Thirty Years Truce, and if Sparta could acquiesce in these in 446 why not do so in 432? To this there was the answer that Athens had crossed the path of Corinth and had aroused in her headstrong hatred. The Megarian Decree had revealed the drastic application of Athenian control of half the Greek world. But there was more than this. The known or supposed Athenian character (and the supposition did Athens little injustice) made the potential danger from Athens greater than the actual. At Sparta there were those who had regretted the compromise of the Thirty Years Truce, who might be goaded to act by a picture of Spartan inertia, those who had perhaps outlived the old σωφροσύνη with its inhibitions. The very mixture of Athenian formal correctness and unyielding refusal to mitigate the use of her power, attested inter alia by the Megarian Decree, had a formidable quality which might either daunt her neighbours into keeping the peace or terrify them into war. And to war, in the end, it came.

This is, so I venture to think, the Thucydidean analysis reached in the light of what he could discern as the outbreak of war was reached. If this is so, then in the First Book we have a view of the antecedents of the war which is all of a piece, and which does not need to be explained by the importation into it of Thucydidean δεύτερων φροντίδων, a view which explains what we find in these parts of the book, written to elucidate, for the benefit of the future man of action, τῶν γενομένων το σοφές.

F. E. Adcock.

DEMETER OF CNIDUS

[PLATES I–XVI]

The headless statue of a seated woman swathed in a himation was first seen at Cnidus by the expedition of the Society of Dilettanti in 1812. 1 Nearly fifty years later C. T. Newton excavated the site—identified by inscriptions as sacred to the chthonic deities—rediscovered the body, and, after shipping it off, found the head also. 2 There is no ground for doubting the identification as Demeter. Brunn interpreted the head with understanding in 1874, and in 1900 A. H. Smith described the statue briefly but carefully: 3 what can be added to this, mainly on the technical side, will be found in Appendix I. Other comment has been desultory, and although the date of the statue has been generally accepted as somewhere in the fourth century B.C., there has been no satisfactory attribution to a sculptor. 4 Doubt has gradually arisen about the substance of which it is made, 5 even about the position of the limbs and the kind of seat on which it rests: 6 and finally, Carpenter, quietly loosing one of his ample stocks of hares, has suggested that it was made in the first century B.C. 7 Clearly, then, it is time to study the whole problem afresh, and to see whether evidence exists for more definite conclusions. That evidence does exist, and most of it has been set down in print before—though by various writers, and piczeemal: my argument is new in its pattern only, not in its components. 8

First, a word on the statue and its setting. The body and drawn up over the head to form a veil though this would have been. The body has had a severe battering, and has split where the marble was weakest; streaks of ochre are almost impossible to find: there is a faint trace of a weak stratum in the middle of the thighs, hardly visible traces of others behind it at intervals along the left edge of the throne, and also a grey streak in the back leg of the throne: but otherwise the block is, to the naked eye, remarkably uniform in structure. Nor is there any need to infer, from the supposed differences of marble and workmanship, that the body is by a different sculptor: it must have been conceived by one man, but the differing states of preservation make it difficult to decide whether it was carved entirely by him. It is perhaps not easy to imagine the creator, if he were present when the statue was assembled, leaving the folds of the himation at the back of the head so inorganically connected with those on the shoulder (pl. IX, b, c). This raises the question whether the statue is, perhaps, a contemporary replica of an original set up somewhere else, presumably in Attica.


1 Ionian Antiquities III 22.
2 Newton’s excavations at Halicarnassus and Cnidus are published in his ‘Discoveries at Halicarnassus, Cnidus, and Branchidae’ (1862–3: vol. i, places, folio: vol. 2, text; cr. octavo), of which ‘Travels and Discoveries in the Levant’ (1865) is a popular abridged account. They are also described in a series of despatches written by Newton on the spot, and addressed to the Foreign Office. These were printed and presented to both Houses of Parliament thus: 1858 ‘Papers respecting the excavations at Budrum.’ 1859 ‘Further Papers respecting the excavations at Budrum and Cnidus.’

The despatches sometimes gave useful information which does not appear in the Discoveries.


4 Most opinions have been vague, and have ranged from Scopas on the one side (E. A. Gardner Sir Gr. Sculptors 191) to Praxiteles on the other (Klein Praxitelis 371). As late as 1938 Sissert (Gr. Plastik 176 n. 131) described the statue as the work of ‘einer Praxiteles’, which is much what Collignon (Hist II 362) said in 1897 (‘contemporain de Praxitèle’) and Waldmann (Gr. Orig. 155) in 1914 (‘Kunstschule: Praxitelisch’). These are sure signs that the sculptor has not yet been correctly identified. See also Ruhland Elsolin, Göttingen 89: Höwly Gr. Plastik 84, and—for those who can enjoy the aesthetic of 1903–Gurdon in Weekly Critical Review Aug. 27th, 1903, 136.

5 Although A. H. Smith (l. c. note 3) rightly described the whole statue as of Parian, and Collignon (Hist 362) merely remarked that the head was ‘sculptée dans un bloc de Paros différent du marbre employé pour le reste de la statue’, this did not satisfy E. Gardner (Handbook 1905) 414, who said that the body was of inferior local marble, or Lawrence (Cl. Sculpt. 265), who degraded it to ‘a local stone of poor quality’. I cannot detect any difference in the kind of marble, which is Parian of very fine grain in both head and body. The block used for the head may be of slightly better quality, but the grain is of the same size, and although the colour seems rather warmer, this is due to an accident of preservation, for the protected parts of the statue, e.g. under the sides of the throne, are equally warm in tone. The colder tone is not confined to the clothing, and thus cannot be the remains of a dark paint, appropriate

6 Papers respecting the excavations at Budrum.

7 So Newton (G. Sculptors 191) to Praxiteles on the other (Klein Praxitelis 371). As late as 1938 Sissert (Gr. Plastik 176 n. 131) described the statue as the work of ‘einer Praxiteles’, which is much what Collignon (Hist II 362) said in 1897 (‘contemporain de Praxitèle’) and Waldmann (Gr. Orig. 155) in 1914 (‘Kunstschule: Praxitelisch’). These are sure signs that the sculptor has not yet been correctly identified. See also Ruhland Elsolin, Göttingen 89: Höwly Gr. Plastik 84, and—for those who can enjoy the aesthetic of 1903–Gurdon in Weekly Critical Review Aug. 27th, 1903, 136.

8 Although A. H. Smith (l. c. note 3) rightly described the whole statue as of Parian, and Collignon (Hist 362) merely remarked that the head was ‘sculptée dans un bloc de Paros différent du marbre employé pour le reste de la statue’, this did not satisfy E. Gardner (Handbook 1905) 414, who said that the body was of inferior local marble, or Lawrence (Cl. Sculpt. 265), who degraded it to ‘a local stone of poor quality’. I cannot detect any difference in the kind of marble, which is Parian of very fine grain in both head and body. The block used for the head may be of slightly better quality, but the grain is of the same size, and although the colour seems rather warmer, this is due to an accident of preservation, for the protected parts of the statue, e.g. under the sides of the throne, are equally warm in tone. The colder tone is not confined to the clothing, and thus cannot be the remains of a dark paint, appropriate

9 The material for this essay was mostly collected in 1909: the substance of it was delivered as a lecture to the Hellenic Society in May 1946.

10 I thank the Trustees of the British Museum for permission to publish pl. I, V, X, xIII, XIV: Mr. C. O. Waterhouse for his patience with a difficult subject; pl. III, IV, VII, VIII, IX, a, x, a-d are his photographs; the remainder are mine. Mr. Waterhouse also drew the text-figures 1-4; and Mr. D. W. Akehurst pl. VIII, d.

11 The hair is also confined by a ribbon, which shows in front of the fold of the himation on the top of the head (pl. IV, r). In Caylus Revue VI pl. XLVI i. a is published an engraving of a veiled marble head at that time (1764) in the possession of M. Peyssonel, consul of Candia, and said to have been found shortly before in Rhodes. Though not a replica it bears in the engraving a remarkable though probably accidental resemblance to the head of Demeter. I cannot discover its present whereabouts. Cf. also Einzelausf. 1190, which looks false.
at her left side, the other is flung over the left shoulder, where it lies in a rich mass of folds (Plate VI, b). Of course there is a chiton too, but it appears only round the ankles, outside the left elbow, on the front of the right upper arm, and above the right breast. The right arm was lowered, but the elbow must have been slightly bent; the left bent at the elbow, with the forearm raised and extended somewhat to the left.

The composition of the lower part of the statue is not clear at first sight, because the breaking away of the knees has given undue emphasis to the transverse folds of the himation between the left knee and the right shin. The feet are not crossed but the left foot is slightly drawn back (the remains of the toes, resting on the footstool, can be clearly seen in Plate I, vertically below the left knee) whilst the right foot is thrust forward over the front edge of the footstool, dragging the chiton with it: a perfectly natural, if slightly restless attitude.

Commentators have remarked the contrast between the calm of the head and the restlessness of the body and drapery. As regards emotion, the remark is just: but of physical movement in the head and neck, Plates II and III show that there is more than commonly supposed.

Nor is this all: it will be noticed that the finish of the hair on the right side of the head, where it waves back from the temple, is more detailed than that on the left (pll. III, IV), and it might be thought that this higher finish was due to the turn of the head on the body, which exposes this side more fully: but further study shows that the edge of the cushion on the left is also treated in more summary fashion than that on the right, and a similar reason cannot here be valid (pl VI). Furthermore, the top of the front throne-leg on the left side was half covered by drapery, whereas that on the right was completely exposed: and the structure of the seat also differs on one side from the other. The inferences that may be drawn from these observations are, first, that the statue is not likely to have been set in one of the niches to which the expedition of Dilettanti and, more tentatively, Newton himself at first assigned it, since both sides alike would have been hidden, the difference in treatment...
ment would have been purposeless, and the asymmetry of the drapery when seen from the front disturbing; second, that the statue may have been set at an angle to the spectator; third, that it may have been grouped with another statue. That the statue was set sideways or three-quarters to the spectator is not impossible, whilst it is extremely probable, since the temenos was a temenos not of Demeter only but of Demeter and Kore, and most of the dedications mention both the goddesses, that it contained a cult-statue of the daughter in addition to one of the mother. Is there any evidence what this statue of Kore was? The answer to that question, given in Appendix II, is that it was of an Attic type well-known about the mid-fourth century B.C., and if the answer is correct it implies an Attic origin for the statue that stood beside it. Instead of relying on this argument, I prefer to assume outright that the statue of Demeter is by an Athenian. This may seem to beg the question—if we are blind to what a thousand grave-reliefs show us of Attic style in the fourth century. It is, moreover, by a sculptor in whom the classical Athenian tradition—that of Pheidias—seems particularly strong. The monumental oval of the face, the broad yet subtle modelling of the forehead, the deep but unostentatious emotional content derive directly from the masterpieces of the fifth century: here is a man who has often walked on the Acropolis, has stood before the Lemnian, and has looked up at the Parthenos. He is a sculptor of great ability, and therefore one whose name is likely to be known to us from literary records: he must have carved other sculptures in Athens and elsewhere: fragments of them may have survived, and if so, may give a clue to his identity.

The most obvious of these fragments is the head of Alexander from the Acropolis (pll. XI, XII), and a comparison both of the general forms and of the details leaves little doubt that, despite the great difference of subject, the same mind and the same hands are at work. In particular, it is not easy to imagine that different artists designed and carved the mouths and put the finishing touches to the lips (pl. XI, c, d). Who, then, was this sculptor? Although one name, that of Leochares, has several times been mentioned in discussions of this portrait of Alexander, the issue has been confused partly because most writers have preferred to pass judgement on and to argue from, not the head of the Acropolis, which is an original, but the Erbach head, which is a Roman copy of it, and partly because the attribution has been supported by stylistic comparison with other Roman copies, of lost works whose identification is often doubtful—a kind of argument that can never be conclusive and is not often convincing, with the result that what is in fact a strong case has not been properly appreciated. Let us approach the problem from a different direction.

What would have been the essential conditions in choosing a sculptor for this commission—a statue of Alexander the Macedonian to be set up on the Acropolis at Athens in the fourth century B.C.? For reasons of external policy it would have been important to employ one of eminence; of internal, an Athenian; and it must have been desirable that this Athenian should not be hostile to the Macedonians. The claims of Leochares, as I see them, are these. He had already made a statue of Isocrates, the ablest advocate of the Macedonian policy that Athens produced. He had worked for Philip just after Chaeronea on the gold-and-ivory

18 For example, two of the three cult-images of about this date which are reproduced in the relief in Athens (Walter, Rel. kl. Akrop. 68, no. 117) were apparently turned at an angle to the spectator, and several of the Attic reliefs of the Eleusinian goddesses (e.g. Kehr AM XVII, 125 ff.) for other ref. see n. 4 p. 13 imply groups of which some of the statues were set thus.

19 The horizontal section is given by Cusack Boston Cat. 65.

20 If, as suggested below, he was also a worker in gold and ivory, he may well have needed to study the Parthenos closely.

21 Casson Acrop. Cat. II 232 no. 1331: to the reff. there given add Suhr, S. parts. of Greek Statues 121 ff., Gebauer Alexanderbaldes (AM 63/4 (1938/9) 101, K.67; Buschier, Hellenist. Bildnis 9; Bieber, Proc. Am. Philosop. Soc. 93, 5 (1949) 380. This head is of course an original. The emphasis is necessary, for opinion has been waverjng, confused, and even perverse. There are two copies, one at Erbach (Stark, Zwei Alexanderköpfe (1897) 12), the other, from Madynus, in Berlin (Blumel Cat. K.203).

22 It is just possible that two originals of similar type, one in marble and one in bronze, were produced by the fourth-century sculptor, and that the Erbach head, which has more meticulous detail in the hair than the head from the Acropolis, is copied from the lost bronze.

23 Amelung long ago observed the identity of style between Demeter and Alexander (Autonia III, 1908, 127 ff.).

24 See, for example, the confused discussion in Suhr op. cit. 121 f.


26 Not later than 338, for it was dedicated by Thanneus, who died in that year, as did Isocrates himself (Plut. Vit. X Orat. loor. 27).
group of the Macedonian royal family—including Alexander and his mother Olympias—in the Philippeion at Olympia. This fact was doubtless widely known in Athens and elsewhere. It is likely that he preserved some record, in the form of studies, if nothing more, of his sitter’s features, especially Alexander’s (for Alexander completed the dedication after Philip’s death, as is proved by the inclusion of Olympias); and that when the question arose of commissioning a sculptor for the statue in Athens, this too was known: tradition is clear that not many artists had direct access to Alexander, and he was apt to be in some remote part of the world when sittings were needed, so the point is important. Leochares was later to work with Lysippus—pre-eminently the sculptor of Alexander’s court—on the bronze group at Delphi of Alexander hunting, which was commissioned by Craterus and, some years after his death in 321, dedicated by his son. It is unlikely, then, that with this sculptor at hand, any other would have been employed for the making of a marble statue of this importance in Athens, his native city. Finally, no less than seven signatures of Leochares have been found in Athens, one not a great distance from the find-spot of the head of Alexander.

Is it possible to determine the most likely date for the dedication? After Chaeronea in 338 Philip sent Alexander to Athens bearing the ashes of the Athenians who had been killed in the battle. The Athenians are thought to have conferred their citizenship on both Philip and Alexander in gratitude, and to have set up a statue of Philip in the agora. Were this certain, then it would be reasonable to argue that they did not at the same time set up one of Alexander on the Acropolis, because a statue on the Acropolis has different implications. Thus 338 and, from historical circumstances, the year or two following, are improbable. Immediately after Alexander’s death the state of feeling in Athens, and, indeed, her political moves, rule out such a dedication: accordingly 323 is a fairly certain lower limit. Within the period 336 to 323 there are several occasions which might have prompted the dedication, but it is not easy to find a decisive factor: 334, after the battle of the Granicus, when Alexander sent three hundred Persian panoplies to Athens; 331, when he released the Athenian prisoners taken in that battle and was awarded a crown by the Athenians. Lastly, there is 324, when he claimed divine honours from the Greeks, and was in fact deified, though grudgingly, by the Athenians; it must be admitted that the Acropolis would be an appropriate place for a statue erected with that purpose: true, there is no external sign of deification, and no diadema, but their absence tells us nothing. Nor can anything certain be inferred from the apparent youth of the subject, although this is a promising line of approach used by Bieber (loc. cit. n. 19 above). Age is difficult to guess in an ideal portrait, and her estimate of only fifteen or sixteen seems too low: if correct, it would fix near 340 the date when the sittings were given and the type created, but it would not necessarily establish that date for the dedication, though increasing the probability that it too was early. In short, 330 remains a convenient central date, but Bieber’s argument tilts the balance to the period before it.

What then of the statue of Demeter? Before attempting to fix its date either in relation to the head of Alexander, or absolutely, it is worth glancing at a problem which has some bearing on both date and authorship, for if these two works represent the style of Leochares, that style should be recognisable among the remains of the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus, where he

---

23 Pust. V 20. 9. Gebauer’s theory (Blümel, Berlin Cat. V 55 293: cf. Buochor, Mauu. u. Alcz. 48.) that the Erbach head may be copied from the chryselephantine statue at Olympia, is not irreconcilable with my own. I suspect that the so-called Alcibades type, identified as Philip by Arndt (Strenu. Helig. 11. Arndt-Br. 497-70), may reproduce the portrait of Philip from this group at Olympia.

24 See Johnson Lysippus 67 (with ref.). Wackhauer (Uber antik. Portraits Alexanders 51) argues that the animals were by Lysippus, the portraits by Leochares.

25 It is customary to assume that Leochares was a native Athenian, but for this there is no direct evidence. Lippold in RE XII 2, 1994, loc. cit. ‘Leochares’, cites one piece of indirect evidence, an inscription of Roman date.

26 Loewy Inscr. Gr. Bildh. 62 no. 80 (‘cast of Propylaea’); the head of Alexander was found ‘near the Erechtheum’ (Klein AE 1900, 1). I regret not having had an opportunity since 1997 of again studying this head at first hand; it is just possible that a fresh examination might give a hint of the kind of body to which it belonged, and thus of the purpose and date of the dedication.

27 This is usually stated as an established fact, e.g. by Geyer in RE XIX 2, s. s. Philippus 2295; but it is no more than an inference from the authorities there cited, among whom only Pausanias (1 ix 2) mentions a statue of Philip, saying that it, and one of Alexander, stood in front of the Odeon, but giving no date for either. I thank Sir Arthur Pickard-Cambridge and Professor A. W. Gomme for help in clearing up this point.
was one of the four chief sculptors. The facts—or rather the alleged facts—are familiar. Pliny’s story, usually accepted, is that the reliefs on the east were by Scopas, those on the north by Bryaxis, those on the south by Timotheus, and those on the west by Leochares. Vitruvius has a rather different and—because less fairy-tale-like in pattern—slightly more plausible account. Pliny’s words have sometimes been taken to imply more than they say, as, for instance, that any piece of sculpture, whether in relief or in the round, found on the north of the building, must be by Bryaxis, any piece on the south by Timotheus, and so on: this is certainly unjustified; but even what they say must not be taken literally. To prove this, only four slabs, from the Amazonomachy, need be examined closely. They alone reflect the style we are seeking, and the very fact that they are supposed to have been found in situ forces us to face the problem with common sense. They are slabs 1013, 1014, 1015, and 1016 (pl. XIII, XIV). They were found by Newton on the eastern side, and therefore if Pliny’s account is to be accepted literally, ought to display the style of Scopas. If the sculptures of Tegea are a criterion of his style, they certainly do not: given that the subject is similar, nothing could be further from the rugged forms and wild expressions of Tegea than these smooth muscles, calm features, and rhythmic poses. But that is by the way. We need only go so far, at present, as to remark that the slabs are not homogeneous, and it thus becomes clear that whatever the statements of Pliny and Vitruvius may imply, they do not mean that four artists took one side each and designed and executed all the relief-work upon it. For slabs 1013, 1014, and 1015 are clearly the design of a single mind (pl. XIII): they may also have been executed by a single pair of hands; but slab 1016 (pl. XIV), which was found with them and seems to belong to the same allegedly eastern series, clearly differs from them in execution. Perhaps more deeply: the horse, for instance, hardly comes from the same stable.

At the least, we are forced to distinguish design from execution, and to assume that each main sculptor had a number of assistants, of unequal ability, working under him. This is but natural, since the physical labour necessary in this amount of carving demands some such system, and sculptors inevitably differ in merit. The design may well have been entirely by the master, even if broadly sketched: he probably supervised the carving, either closely or loosely, and he may have assisted any of his subordinates in the early, intermediate, or final stage: or he may, of course, have done parts entirely himself. This hypothesis, and this only, will permit us to accept the broad truth of the statements by Pliny and Vitruvius; yet will account for the differences of touch within the same general approach, and will explain why some...
figures display the superficial elements of certain styles, without the fire and life which it is reasonable to expect from the greatest sculptors of the fourth century.

To return to slabs 1013, 1014, and 1015 (pl. XIII). They make a balanced composition which runs on from slab to slab, and the figures exhibit the same or similar style throughout. The same artist designed them, either carved or most closely supervised their carving at every stage, and, at a guess, put the finishing touches. This style, if allowance be made for the difference in the size, the kind of subject, and for the possible difference of date, agrees reasonably well with that of the statue of Demeter and the head of Alexander. I have chosen for illustration (pl. XV, XVI) the three female heads that are tolerably well preserved, for comparison with that of Demeter. The male beardless head (pl. XIII, a) is severely weathered, and the bearded heads (pl. XIII, b) naturally cannot be compared in every detail with that of Alexander, but despite this they agree in general remarkably well. However, the resemblance is not in the heads alone: there are the same stocky proportions that we see in Demeter, whilst the drapery, with its bold arrangement but unsensational detail, is characteristic. A particular comparison can be made between the cloak of the Amazon on foot (pl. XIII, c) and the himation of Demeter; the chitons of the mounted Amazons (pl. XIII, a, c), in accordance with the difference of material, show a more careful and detailed treatment and a tender understanding of the subtleties of fine folds: I do not know if this reflects another mind or another facet of the same mind.

There is one more piece of sculpture from the Mausoleum that certainly exhibits a similar style, and to avoid confusing the particular issue by citing others less certain, let us confine ourselves to that. It is the best-preserved fragment from the frieze of chariots, the charioteer no. 1037, found on the western side of the building (pl. XIV, b). On pl. XVI are set the heads of this figure and of Alexander side by side. The face of the charioteer is perhaps a little more rounded, but there is the same stress on the forms of the forehead, the same excitement in the lips and nostrils; nor is it irrelevant to remark the resemblance of the charioteer's down-flowing drapery to that of the Amazon on the right of slab 1015 (pl. XIII, a).

To be brief, we find among the remains of the Mausoleum the style of the sculptor we have been discussing. He ought to be one of the four whose names we know—Scopas, Bryaxis, Timotheus, and Leochares. The criteria for the style of the first three are familiar from the text-books: it would need evidence stronger than any hitherto brought forward to connect with any one of these the style we have isolated, which may thus, on the evidence set out above, be assumed to be that of Leochares.

To resume the question of the relative dates of the several sculptures—Demeter, Alexander, and the friezes of the Mausoleum. The head of Alexander we have put between 336 and 323, with a bias to the earlier part of that period, the friezes of the Mausoleum were carved about 350; and the slabs we have cited do not show to any marked degree that feeling for volume evident in the statue of Demeter, which has been compared in this respect with the copy in the Lateran of a statue of Sophocles probably set up in 330. It seems to me equally close to that of Aeschines (the copy in Naples) the original of which on historical grounds is also not likely to have been earlier than 340–330. 315 is approximately the lowest limit for the career of Leochares, on the assumption that he did not work as a sculptor after the age of seventy. Although I favour a date round 330 for the statue of Demeter, there is nothing to disprove its being ten years or so earlier, even ten years or so—but hardly

---

33 Newton Disc. II 99 (cf. 90). He stresses the fact that the find-spots of most of the marbles have little value in determining their original positions.
34 The eyes and lips of Alexander show a slightly freer, more impressionistic treatment than do those of Demeter, and this, unless it be due to the difference of subject, seems to argue a later date.
35 Buschor, in Mauvue u. Alex. passim, argues for two main periods of work on the Mausoleum, the first from a little before 353 to 351, the second round 333.
36 Sussertott, Gr. Plastik 178 f.
37 Before his banishment in 330 B.C. Lippold (Gr. Porträt. 95: Kopien 210) puts it at the beginning of the third century, "perhaps 480 B.C." This seems too late. Among Panathenaic vases one in London (Sussertott op. cit. pl. 6r) dated 332 B.C., with its multiplicity of small folds, has something in common with the statue of Aeschines (though even more with that of Demeter) but looks earlier; whilst one in the Louvre dated 315 (Sussertott pl. 10r) looks later.
38 For a summary of the evidence for his date see Richter Sculpture and Sculptors 292.
two hundred—later. Instead of trying to fix it within a decade, especially when the evidence does not permit such precision, better perhaps at the moment to be content with bringing Leochares—by repute one of the three great Athenian sculptors of the century, yet of whose style we know up to now nothing certain—a step out of the shadows. 39

APPENDIX I

A. THE STATUE (Figs. 1–4, and plates I–IX).

*Measurements (in centimetres)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Height (with head)</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (without head)</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width (greatest, at level of elbows)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width (greatest, at back of throne)</td>
<td>84·5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth (front to back)</td>
<td>70·4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height of head (from bottom of inset to top of veil)</td>
<td>45·4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height of face (from point of chin to top of forehead at lowest point of hair-parting) (pl. II)</td>
<td>20·5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breadth of face (immediately below ears) (pl. II)</td>
<td>14·5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breadth across eyes (from outer corners, including lids) (pl. II)</td>
<td>10·1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of upper lip (pll. II, and XI, c)</td>
<td>4·8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The head was made separately, with deep rounded inset (pl. IV), of which the maximum breadth, from side to side, is 27·3.

No dowel was used for fixing the head on to the body, but the inset must have been held by stucco, a key being provided by the rough surface of the inset and the more roughly picked surface of the socket into which it fitted: both surfaces were produced by claw-tooling and punching. A flattened but furrowed surface inside the top edge of the socket, at the back and a little to the left (pl. IX, a), corresponding to a flattening on the inset (pl. IV, b, IX, b), must have allowed the stucco to form a thicker layer at this point, which would act as a wedge and prevent the rotation of the inset in the socket. There is no doubt of the correct setting, for there is a horizontal setting-line at the back (pl. IX, b), and the long locks at the sides of the head in front fit their ends on the body (pl. I).

Both arms were made separately.

_L. arm._ In the stump is an oblong dowel-hole, 2·2 long, 0·8 high, with remains of an iron dowel. 1·5 above this is a cluster of four or five drill-holes forming a hollow 1·8 square—probably the remains of the pour-hole for the lead of the dowel. The section of the stump shows that the forearm was raised fairly high, and it seems to have been extended towards the left.

_R. arm._ In the stump there is an oblong dowel-hole 2·4 long, 0·7 high, stained with iron. The forearm was apparently lowered; the hand may have rested beside or on the thigh, or on the arm of the throne.

The use of flat bars for dowelling is noteworthy, and may prove to be a useful criterion of date and even of workshop, when more information has been collected on the piecing together of sculpture. 40

---

39 Richter _op. cit._ 284, ‘we must admit that Leochares still remains a shadowy figure’.
40 Carpenter’s remark in _Memoirs XVIII_ 71, ‘I cannot recall any pertinent instance of an undoubted original so pieced together as early as 300 B.C.’ is baffling, unless the word ‘so’ applies only to the Girl from Anzio. Original statues of the fourth century are not numerous, and few are so complete as to show whether the arms or other parts were made separately. But when a sculptor was making the head separately—and we have a number of fourth-century heads that are so made—there was no law to prevent him dealing similarly with the arms or other projecting parts, if it happened to prove convenient. As early as about 400 B.C., in a statue in Eleusis (Br.-Br. 536), one foot was made separately although the head seems not to have been. If there is one undoubted original of the fourth
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I have suggested elsewhere (BSA XLVI 4) the main reasons for carving head and body from separate blocks of marble—there was less risk of a flaw developing in a vital place at a late stage in the work and, if it did develop, not all the statue was ruined. Additional reasons are that in this way a finer block can be used for the head, and more than one sculptor can work on the statue at the same time, if necessary in different workshops.

B. THE THRONE (see especially figs. 1-4 and plates VI-VIII).

The throne is worth discussing in some detail, since it does not seem to have been thoroughly studied before. The general type is familiar, and the evidence for a complete reconstruction is there. It measured 63.5 cm. high, excluding the back (S-Q, fig. 1); 84.5 cm. wide (F-K, fig. 1); and approximately 53 cm. from front to back (A-B1 fig. 2). This can be checked on the left side, where the length of the cushion (P-Q, fig. 4) 44+ plus the thickness of the back leg, 4.4, plus the conjectured thickness of the front leg, 4.4, totals 52.8.

**Back.** It had a back, the height of which (46-47 cm.) is determined by the top of the pour-hole for the lead of the upper dowel (B, fig. 1) which fixed it to the figure: part of the dowel itself (2.3 wide, 0.7 high) and of the lead filling remain (C, fig. 1, and pl. VII). The back extended the full width of the throne, and was fixed to it by two tongues of iron (about 2.7 wide and about 0.8 thick) which were probably leaded into the lower edge of the back, but inserted without lead into slots (3.3 deep) on the upper edge of the throne itself (G, J, fig. 1). In addition, the back of the throne was fixed by stucco to the back of the figure and to the upper edge of the throne: this is proved by the rough picking of these two surfaces as a key for the stucco (between C and H, and from F to K, fig. 1). What the shape of the back was we have no means of discovering, except that from the details just mentioned it must have been solid along its lower edge and down the middle of the back of the figure—probably therefore completely solid.

**Legs.** The front legs are missing—they were cut almost free of the drapery and the central block along their inner edges (pl. VI), but their form can be inferred without much difficulty from the remains of the back legs (which are incised on the marble where they are not carved in the round) and from analogy, especially the almost contemporary thrones from a tomb in Eretria, and on the Persae vase. Each evidently finished at the top in a pair of evolute spirals resembling an Aeolic capital, from the centre of which sprang a pair of involute spirals (pl. VIII, d, e, g).

**Arm-rails.** That the throne had arm-rails is shown by a slot in the drapery at the left side of the figure (N, fig. 4, and pl. VI, r), where the left rail ran: its lower edge was 11.7 cm. above the upper surface of the seat of the throne. To judge from the slot, these arm-rails must have been let into the back of the throne with their centres 4 cm. in from its outer edges. They

century in existence it is Berlin K.10 (Blümel Cat. III pl. 14; from Athens) which is a head made for in-setting. Then the head of Asklepios from Melos (B.M. Cat. Sculpt. no. 350), the head of Zeus in Boston (Caskey Cat. 59 no. 25), and the female head there no. 47 (26 and 29—like the patchwork B.M. 1301 from the Cydnian temenos itself—have sometimes been thought later than 300 B.C.). In the statue of Dionysus (B.M. Cat. Sculpt. no. 432), of uncertain date but later set up on the monument of Thirayllus (Weber 44 193oth, 58 H.), the head is let into a rounded socket held by a substantial dowel (present hole 8 cm. wide by 5 cm., but this has been enlarged to extract the metal); the pour-channel runs from the front. The left arm, from the shoulder, was also made separately, being fixed into a mortice of which the remains are 15 cm. high by 13 wide. From the Mausoleum there is the colossal statue no. 1000, which, despite contrary opinion (e.g. Buschor Muns. u. Alex. 10), should from the coin-evidence be Mausolus (Hill in Anatolian Studies (Rome) p. 207) and must anyhow be of the fourth century: head and arms were all made separately. There is the rider 1045, the upper part of whose body was made separately; the colossal head 1025; the large head of Apollo 1058 (with its fragment of socketed neck 1061); and the smaller heads 1055 (which is life-size, not colossal as stated by Jongkees JHS LXVIII 37), and 1058; finally 1065 (socket to receive inset head) and the necks numbered in the British Museum as MRC 51 A B and C (made for insertion into sockets in statues, and now broken from their heads). Admittedly some of the sculptures found on the site of the Mausoleum may be later than the original building, but scarcely all these. I exclude the head in Berlin from a relief (Blümel Cat. III K.45), the separately-made parts among the sculptures of the Athenian, and the statue attributed to the Hephaestion (Hesp. XVIII pl. 51-2), as being architectural sculpture; and I omit all archaic examples of the practice.

41 As in that shown on the relief in Berlin (Blümel Cat. III K.106 pl. 81), or in the statue in Leningrad (Waldaeher 98, cit. 112 pl. XV (our pl. VIII, r)). It is possible that the back of the throne was gable-shaped or rounded at the top, and not horizontal; there is a faint groove on the back of the left shoulder of the statue which may indicate its slope: this is not a convincing explanation, but I am at this loss to account for the groove on any other hypothesis.

42 AM XXVI 355, pl. XIV; FR pl. 88.

43 If it was fitted exactly into the slot.
must also have been supported at their front ends: where were the supports attached to the throne? The evidence of reliefs and vase-paintings for similar thrones show that they were normally set in the centre of the crowning members of the front legs. On the left front leg of our throne this crowning member was covered by drapery except towards its left side (pl. I). It is broken away at this point, but the front edge of the cushion, which partly survives (P, fig. 4, and pl. VI, b), establishes the position of the back face of the leg against which the cushion rested. The cushion itself measures 44 cm. from front to back (P-Q, fig. 4). On the top of the front left corner of the cushion is an oval cutting into the cushion itself (O, fig. 4), its longer axis (originally about 5 cm. long) running from back to front; it is broken away on the outside, and in front. Its shorter axis must have been about 4 cm. in diameter, and on its floor, in the centre of its short axis and 3-5 cm. from its back wall, is the trace of a slender iron dowel. An arm-rail running parallel with the left edge of the throne, and having its inner face and lower edge bedded in the slot of the drapery (N, fig. 4), would pass over the cutting. This precludes the possibility of the cutting having been made for the purpose of holding the butt-end of an attribute grasped in the statue’s left hand, and we can assume that it held the support for the lost arm-rail. The central axis of an arm-rail 4-5 cm. wide would pass exactly over the slender dowel: we can assume then that this was in fact the width of the rail. Now among the remains found by Newton in the temenos there was a ram’s head of Parian marble (pl. VIII, a-c): it is able work, in style evidently not later than the fourth century B.C., and it is clearly the terminal ornament of a square shaft, the shape of which it is just beginning to take at the back: this square had a side of 4-4 cm., and the measurement is so close to that postulated above for the left arm-rail that it is reasonable to assume that the ram’s head is actually the end of it or of its companion. The ram’s left horn is rather less carefully finished than its right; this would indicate that the right side was to be in fuller view, and therefore that this was the right arm of the throne. The head is also asymmetrical, its left cheek and eye being in front of its right and the front of its left horn as much as 7 mm. in front of the right, a substantial difference in a head only 9 cm. long (pl. VIII, a). The asymmetry is, in fact, so strong as to suggest that an actual three-quarter view was intended, which in turn would imply that the statue to which it belonged was also to be seen in a three-quarter view, thus confirming what has already been deduced from other evidence (see above, p. 14 f). To return to the arm-rail—we are given its height, and also its approximate length (53 cm. over all), for beneath the throat of the animal there is a lightly tooted hollow as if to accommodate something below: this must have been the top of the support, in front of which the ram’s head terminal commonly starts. The material of the support was probably of marble, since it was fixed with an iron pin and there are no traces of discolouration by bronze. What was its form? It can hardly have been a little column or similar member, for this would naturally be fixed exactly in the centre of the throne-leg itself and not impinge, in rather unhappy fashion, on the cushion. Moreover, the cutting in which it was set is not circular. Now a seated sphinx is the commonest support for an arm-rail, and the cutting would be of the appropriate shape to accommodate it. But the lower edge of the arm-rail (provided that the slot in the drapery gives the exact level of the lower edge) would have been only 4 cm. above the floor of the cutting, leaving what seems insufficient room for a seated sphinx of the scale demanded by the size of the arm-rail in particular

44 See Richter Anc. Furnit. 13 ff.
45 B.M. Cat. Sculpt. II no. 1306. Total length 10 cm.: of head only, 9 cm.

For rams in general see Richter Animals 27, and for late archaic and early classical rams Jacobsthal Mel. Rel. 135.
The features which distinguish our ram’s head from those made earlier, for instance the clay ram’s-head cups of Lotades and his followers (Beazley ARV 451-3) are the differentiation between bone and flesh (which involves deeper and more detailed modelling), increased feeling for the elasticity of the skin, and greater interest in the surroundings of the eye, the shape of the eye-ball and the way it lies in and projects from its socket. But it is sometimes not easy to determine date and style in a subject where Nature has already done so much for the sculptor, whatever his period: some comparisons are possible with fourth-century coins of Salamis in Cyprus, as Mr. E. S. G. Robinson has shown me, and with bracelet-ends, e.g. that in the Ashmolean Museum, from a fourth-century tomb in the Crimea (THS V (1884) 68 pl. XLVII—misleading), but I have found nothing conclusive. One relief almost contemporary with Demeter should be cited, that of Demetrius and Pamphile (Conze pl. XL, Diepolder Att. Orch. 53 pl. 51), but it is disappointing: the ram’s head is far less vigorous than ours and it lacks the bold aquiline nose (said to be more pronounced in the male animal (Sandars Beast Book 208)).
DEmETER OF CNIDUS

Fig. 2. — (Fig. VI, a.)
A-B, 14 1/2; B-C, 7 2/4; C-F, 4 1/2.

Note.—None of these measurements can be considered accurate to within two millimetres, since the edges of the marble are weathered; whilst those under Fig. 3 are conjectural, being inferred from the order, now broken at their front ends, into which the panels fitted.

Fig. 3. — Sure Panel (conjectural, not to scale, and angles exaggerated).
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Right side:

Fig. 4. — (Fig. VI, b.)
Q-W    Q-Y
T-U    T-Y
L-W    L-Y

A-W    A-X
A-Y    B-X
B-Y    C-X
C-Y    D-X
D-Y    D

Fig. 4.—(Of Pl. VI, b.)
and by the throne in general. Nevertheless, a seated sphinx does seem the most likely form of support: alternatively—if animal at all—it might have been a recumbent animal. Pl. VIII, f, from a statue in Leningrad, shows what the general appearance of the arms and their supports probably was.

Seat and side-rails. The sides of the throne are carved in such a way as to imitate a wooden throne (pl. VI). In the wooden prototype the front legs were joined to the back legs by two rails on each side: the upper, broader, one also forms the seat (B, Br, fig. 2: P, Q, fig. 4); the lower, narrower, is simply a strut (F, G, H, fig. 2: U, W, V, fig. 4). Below the rails, the marble has been tooled away into a concave surface by a honecombng process: 47 this surface has a claw-tooled finish, in which some of the deeper drill-marks still appear, not having been obliterated by the subsequent claw-tooling: these concave surfaces would have been in partial shadow, originally more than now, since panels set in below the top rails have fallen away (D, E, J, H, fig. 2: R, S, V, Y, fig. 4). This solid central block (on each side of which the footstool, originally about 10 cm. high, by 29 cm. from front to back, and 46 from side to side, is shown as a low relief) corresponds to nothing in the wooden prototype, but is necessary here to support the main weight of the statue: it is hollowed behind to lighten the total weight (below L, M, N, fig. 1). 48 Although the inset panels were not identical, each was held in the same way, keystone-fashion, for the edges of the frame in which they rested converge downwards: they also diverge outwards, in order to permit the insertion of the panel (fig. 3). What were the panels? On the analogy of other thrones (e.g. pl. VIII, g) 49 I assume that they were ornamented with designs in relief or painting, and that they were made separately in order that this small and delicate work might be more easily executed. The panel on the left included part of the upper rail of the throne (below R–S, fig. 4): this panel would thus have a frame at the top, though this frame presumably ran flush with the rail forming the seat; the lower frame continued the line of the narrow rail which is now cut short 7-3 from its junction with the back (V, fig. 4): the panel on the right would have had a frame at the bottom only. The measurements of the rails and the approximate measurements of the missing panels are given beneath figs. 2, 3, and 4. This differing structure of the throne on the two sides seems to imply that the two sides were not equally visible. Another possible but unlikely explanation of the difference is that the panel on the left was the second to be carved, and that the provision of a frame at the top was a safeguard—learnt from experience with the first panel—against the breaking away of the delicate upper edge.

Tilt of back legs and seat. The ancient lower bed of the statue remains, and when this is set on a horizontal flat surface the back legs of the throne have a tilt backwards of about two degrees out of the vertical: the missing back of the throne had a corresponding tilt, and so has the surface of the statue to which the back was attached (between B and H, fig. 1).

In addition, the side-rails are not set at right angles to the back legs, but run upwards from them towards the front at a slope of about two degrees from the horizontal: this is more clearly seen on the right side where the rail is not only better preserved, but also seems more accurately reproduced—additional evidence that greater care was taken with the right side of the statue. The result is that the seat of the throne has a total slope downward towards the back of four degrees out of the horizontal: this must have been a feature of the actual wooden throne, devised for comfort. The dimensions of the front legs may thus not have been identical with

46 Roman copy of a statue of Cybele of the fifth century B.C. (Waldhauer Ant. Skulp. Ermit. III 20 no. 248). Arm-rails with sphinx-support and ram's-head finial, especially in reliefs and on vases, are too common to enumerate. For a sphinx-support projecting backwards over the cushion of the throne see Walter Rel. ik. Akrop. 60 no. 104; and for a low arm-rail id. 87 no. 182. The general arrangement is usually the same, though the projection of the ram's-head may vary; for an abnormal arrangement see the rough archaic statue in Leningrad (Waldhauer op. cit. I no. 9 pl. VII).
47 This process consisted in drilling a number of holes with a large drill straight down into the block and then breaking away the walls between them. I previously thought that the hollows visible were the remains of punch-bars, but Mr. J. Brennan, whose help on various technical points I gratefully acknowledge, has convinced me that they are drill-holes.
48 As in the statue of Dionysus no. 432 in the British Museum: for its association with the monument of Thrasyllus see Walter AA 1928 33 ff.
49 See pl. VIII, g, and Richter Anc. Furnit. 20. Two archaic panels from Sardis in the British Museum (Pryce Cat. Sculpt. I 1 (1928) B. 269-70) may have come from reproductions of furniture, but neither is identical in form with the panels missing here.
those of the back: nor is it possible to ascertain whether they were vertical, which seems likely on general grounds and from the traces on the statue where they were broken away, or whether they shared the backward tilt of the back legs. The footstool is level. 50

C. Further Technical Details.

The statue is face-bedded, but whether the block lay on its face or its back in the quarry cannot now be determined. The present lower bed of the block is produced by drilling (see note 47, p. 24), followed by claw-tooling. The surface at the back has been similarly produced, and probably also the original surface at the top of the block (almost all removed by the subsequent carving), for there are remains of large drill-holes round the back edge of the socket for the neck that cannot be otherwise explained. In general the sculptor is sparing in his use of the punch for this purpose: he reserves it for finer work and for making a key for stucco.

The back having been reduced to a level, finely claw-chiselled surface, the sculptor divided it in half with a fine vertical guide-line, part of which still survives (between H and M, fig. 1), and then approximately in half the other way by two parallel horizontal lines which run the whole width of the throne: they are 7 mm. apart and the upper is 4 mm. below the top edge of the throne (F to K, fig. 1). There are also traces of other vertical guide-lines below the breaks under G and J (fig. 1). In addition to punches of various sizes which it is not possible to measure, the kinds of tool used and their approximate sizes were:

(a) **Drill.** A drill 1 cm. in diameter especially for the heavy drilling work under the seat of the throne at the sides. A drill about 6 mm. and another about 3 mm. in diameter, freely used in the drapery. A drill 4 mm. in diameter for the hair and one slightly smaller—3·5—3 mm., for the nostrils.

(b) **Claw-chisels.** An 8-pronged claw-chisel 2·8 cm. wide, used for the bottom bed. A 6-pronged claw-chisel 2 cm. wide, used especially at the back, and under the sides of the throne.

(c) **Flat chisels.** A flat chisel 1 cm. wide used for cutting out the back legs towards the bottom (O, P, fig. 1; L, fig. 2; X, fig. 4): the process was begun and abandoned: the flat chisel may have been used partly because it was less violent than a punch, but the character of the work is different from anything else on the statue, making one wonder if the cutting was done for some practical purpose such as the insertion of wooden poles for easier handling. Flat chiselling also appears on the surface of the drapery, but it is not possible to measure the size of the tools used.

(d) **Rounded chisels.** Used on the surface of the drapery: size cannot be ascertained.

(e) **Rasp.** Especially clear on the drapery outside right thigh and on left shoulder.

APPENDIX II

The Lost Statue of Kore.

The evidence for the statue of Kore is as follows. Not many terracottas of fourth-century type were found in the temenos, and among them are certainly two, probably three and possibly four (the last two are fragmentary) 51 which reproduce a statue of Kore known to us not only

---

50 It was Mr. J. Brennan who observed that the seat was not level. He points out that there is similar tilting in some of the archaic statues from Branchidae e.g. that of Chares in the British Museum (Pryce Cat. I 110; B. 278: pl. XIII). Both front and back legs of the throne of Aitakes J.M. XXXI. 151 have a strong tilt backwards. Possibly the tilt was sometimes produced by the insertion of an extra member under the front legs: in the marble throne from Eretria cited in n. 42 above and illustrated on pl. VIII, d, the lowest members are of a different colour (perhaps intended to represent metal): the back legs, unfortunately, were not shown.

from Roman copies but from contemporary votive reliefs. I illustrate (pl. X, d) one of these terracottas which is itself probably of fourth-century date but which, after the manner of terracottas, simplifies the design and softens the forms. More important is the terracotta illustrated on pl. IX, d, again probably of fourth-century date, of the same technique—with a small circular safety-vent at the back—and the same clay, but strongly sculptural both in design and in execution; it is mould-made, but has been thoroughly retouched by the maker after removal from the mould and before firing, so that it possesses the sharpness and crisp detail of a carving in marble; it is in fact that rare thing in terracotta—a direct, careful copy of a particular statue. And if it is the copy of a particular statue, what more likely, since we know from other evidence that it is Kore, than that it reproduces the cult-statue of the sanctuary in which it was dedicated? Moreover, the general feeling for form—and, where close comparison with a seated figure, namely the upper part of the body, is alone possible, the detail resembles so closely the marble statue of Demeter that this can hardly be due to chance (pl. IX, a, d).

Another find made in the temenos appears at first sight to corroborate the evidence of the terracottas, although its testimony is in fact equivocal. It is a marble statuette of Kore (pl. X, e) apparently of the fourth century B.C. which in general design resembles the two terracottas cited above; but the feet are close together; the himation, which reaches the ankles, wraps the figure very closely without giving much expression to the forms of the body beneath, and is drawn up over the back of the high polos on the head: the face is smiling. It might be thought simply an archaising version of the same type. But the problem is not so simple as this, for an archaising version of the type—not identical, it is true, with this marble statuette, but similar—is known from Roman copies, and this can hardly be a coincidence. There must, one would think, be some connection between the two archaistic versions: but what is it? Was there an archaistic original of the fourth century, on which both are based?

The problem cannot be solved without reference to the earlier history of the normal, non-archaistic type. This seems to have originated early in the second quarter of the fourth century B.C. when this fashion of wearing the dress was common, and the original statue, in which the himation reached the ankles, may have been set up in Eleusis: it is reproduced on Attic votive-reliefs of the time. But the type seems to have been remodelled at least once later in the century: in the modified type—among other differences—the himation does not reach the ankles; this modified type is best seen in the relief from Mondragone. I suspect that the hypothetical statue of Kore in the temenos at Cnidus was a further modification, which gave the body greater volume within the drapery: this feeling for volume is as notable a feature of the terracotta from Cnidus (pl. IX, d) as it is of the statue of Demeter herself. Here too are the beginnings of those studied contrasts between drapery which is tightly stretched though often richly folded, and that which is gently draped or hanging free, contrasts which were to be fully exploited by sculptors of the next two centuries.

To return to the archaistic marble statuette from Cnidus. It seems that there was carved, early in the fourth century B.C., a statue clothed in a fashion of dress that was coming to be associated with Kore, and that this was given a slightly archaic form, or at least one less free than would be normal for the period, in order that it might serve, with companion figures, as an architectural support: a high headdress, in the shape of a kalathos, assisted the transition to the architectural member above. This was an attempt,
parallel with that of the Korai of the Erechtheum, but in more traditional vein, to revive or perpetuate the old convention of which the most familiar examples are the Korai of the Siphnian and Cnidian treasures at Delphi. These figures would not have represented the goddess herself but—by a familiar process—her ministrant assimilated to her. The maker of the Cnidian statuette knew of these figures and produced a free version of one of them, whilst the makers of the Roman statues produced a faithful copy: the Cnidian marble statuette would thus be not, like the terracottas, copied from the fourth-century statue of Kore set up in the temenos at Cnidos, but derived from a predecessor of that statue. Alternatively, it may be that the sculptor, with the fourth-century Cnidian statue as his model, gave his statuette an archaic touch and a head-dress which resembled those of the archaic figures elsewhere with which he was familiar. But where were they? Eleusis would seem to be the obvious place: there is, however, a faint possibility that the archaic as well as the fourth-century original was at Cnidos itself. The evidence is this. The archaic statues of the Vatican and the Villa Albani mentioned above were found near Rome in an elaborate building on the Appian Way, and this may well have been the ‘Triopian’ shrine dedicated by Herodes Atticus.88 Why Triopian? Because it was inspired by the sanctuary of Demeter on the Triopian promontory, in other words the sanctuary of Demeter at Cnidos. It was natural to seek to identify this Triopian sanctuary with the temenos in which the statue of the British Museum was found, but, as Newton himself was the first to point out, in his excavations nothing earlier than the fourth century came to light.89 Of course, it is conceivable that somewhere in the temenos were the remains of an earlier shrine he did not reach, or that the Triopian sanctuary was nearby.

One further point calls for discussion. What was the type of head borne by the statue of Kore which by hypothesis was grouped with the statue of Demeter at Cnidos? The general appearance of the head of the earliest version of this type of Kore is known from the votive reliefs and from the statue in Vienna.60 It had the hair drawn up on the top of the head. A small marble head with the hair done in this way, but looking later in type than the Vienna Kore,61 was found in the temenos of Demeter at Cnidos: it seems to be of the third century b.c. and may have belonged to a votive statue which reflected the cult-image (pl. X, a, b). On the other hand each of the two terracottas cited above has traces of a long lock on the front of each shoulder, and these locks do not appear on either the earliest votive reliefs depicting the type or on that from Mondragone,57 where Kore unfortunately—like all the figures on this relief—lacks a head. The possibility must thus be borne in mind that the Cnidian type differed from its prototypes in the head, that it had long locks on the shoulders and that it may even also have been veiled. In this connection an unpublished bronze coin of Cnidos should be mentioned: from the fabric it seems to be of about 100 A.D. (pl. X, c). One side bears a veiled female head wearing a stephane, and in front, faint but certain, are two ears of corn.62 This is

88 RM IX 134 ff.
89 Disc. 423 ff. Mr. John Cook’s current research into the topography of Cnidos will, I believe, illuminate this problem, and may fix the date of the temenos.
60 See notes 34 and 61.
61 B.M. Cat. Sculpt. II no. 1315. Parian marble. Ht. 22 cm.
62 The date at the end of the fourth century proposed by Sussrodt (Gr. Plastik 194) for the Vienna type is surely too late. I agree with Waldhauser (Ant. Sculpt. Ermit. III 38) that it is very early (though perhaps not the earliest) in the series. Even the latest version on the Mantinean basis preserves the same general arrangement of the hair. A case has been made out by Arndt (Festhch. Oeikerke 96: cf. also Kothland and Löw, ß. c. n. 4 p. 13) for a head in Munich being the original head of Kore from the statue which stood beside Demeter at Cnidos; there is evidence that it may actually have been found at Cnidos. Though recognising the high quality of this head I cannot see that it is of the same style as Demeter; there is no evidence that it came from the temenos. Rizzo (Prasit. 92 pl. 138) gives Ossia as its provenience (the first publications—for which see Furtw. Beschr. (1900) 92—describe it as of unknown provenience, bought in Naples) and says that it is of the same type as the ‘maiden from Herakleaneum’, which it certainly resembles but does not seem to reproduce exactly.
63 The head has the appearance of being on a seated figure. The reverse bears a Victory to r., r. hand outstretched and a palm-branch in her l.: incr. ΚΝΩ ΑΠΟΛΟΔΩΡ. Not in B.M.C. Corpus, but cf. the series p. 96 nos. 90–2.
64 Some of the copies of a type of Kore related to the types we are discussing (though none of them identical with the Cnidian terracotta pl. IX, d) seem to have had the head veiled. Examples are Einleinauf. 357, 2294 (head restored but end of veil left), id. 2905, and Waldhauser Ermitage III no. 279 (where there is doubt whether the head belongs). A similar type, so far as can be seen from what remains of the relief, was used on one of the columns of the later Ariadneion at Ephesus (B.M. Cat. Sculpt. II no. 1211) and also seems to have been veiled. There is no evidence that it was Kore.
Demeter or Kore, then. Does it, like many Imperial bronze coins of Cnidus, reproduce the head of a statue, and, if so, what statue? These questions cannot be answered with certainty. It can hardly be the statue of Demeter now in the British Museum, which has no stephane. It might be that of Kore which, on my hypothesis, stood by her. It might be that of a statue in another sanctuary, and if so presumably the famous Triopian. Or, finally, it might be the head of an Empress deified.

Before leaving the subject, mention must be made of the grey marble basis found by Newton in the temenos and believed by him to belong to one of the earliest dedications there. It is inscribed to Kore and Demeter, in that order, and this seems to indicate that if it supported a statue (and despite suggestions to the contrary I think it did, for the cutting on the top is of a suitable shape), the statue should have been one of Kore. The only doubt is whether the cutting would be large enough to receive the base of a statue over life-size. If it was not over life-size it could hardly have had a direct connection with the statue of Demeter, which is. This question, too, must remain open.

Bernard Ashmole.

---

63 Newton Disc. pl. LXXXIX no. 15; Gr. Inscr. in B.M. no. 813.
STOUT AND SLENDER IN THE LATE ARCHAIC PERIOD

[Plates XVII-XIX]

In his work Potter and Painter in Ancient Athens Sir John Beazley proposes a more detailed study of the shapes of vases in order to obtain a better knowledge of the relations between potters and painters. By this article, written in honour of his sixty-sixth birthday, I hope to contribute to the discussion of the problem.1

It is well known that the development of Greek vase-shapes follows a regular course, from heavy and plump forms to slender and more elegant ones. The illustrations in Richter and Milne, Shapes and Names of Athenian Vases, will confirm this opinion, and Miss G. Richter maintained it lately in her Attic Red-figured Vases 1946, 18. The chronology of vases of the fourth century B.C. depends mainly upon this development (Buschor, FR III, 152; Schefold, Untersuchungen zu den Kirtischer Vasen, passim), R. Zahn calls it a rule (FR III, 204), and W. Technau used this rule as a firm starting-point when dealing with the chronology of the works of Exekias.2

Old rules tend to lose their efficacy if they are not periodically endowed with new vigour, and thus enabled to keep their activity throughout the next stage of development. In the field of Attic vase-shapes one of the most decisive renewals of this kind took place about 510 B.C. at the time of the fall of the tyranny and the institution of the Kleisthenic democracy. A new impetus revealed itself not only in the invention of new shapes, such as the stamnos, the pelike, and the kalpis (Beazley, ABS 24), but also in the modification of long-established forms.3

The essential features of the new style have been made clear by Buschor (FR III, 125; Griechische Vasen 141) and Langlotz (Frühgriechische Bildhauerschulen 18 ff.). The vases become more full-bodied, with a more coherent outline. Langlotz pointed out that this phenomenon is not merely a reaction or retrogression, but serves as a starting point for further development.

It is not possible here to discuss all the problems of the new style of about 510 B.C., for such a discussion would have to include sculpture as well as vases. In the following pages I shall deal only with certain groups of vases which will show some typical stages of the development.

Amphorae

The amphora with flanged handles and a foot in two degrees (type A) is one of the most refined shapes of the late archaic period. It would be easy to make an arbitrary selection of amphorae from different workshops, taking early and late specimens, and so to produce a series beginning with very stout vases and ending with slender ones, which would illustrate the rule of development mentioned above. Where possible, however, it is a sounder method to trace the development of a shape as reflected in the work of a single potter, and the series of amphorae by Andokides is excellent for this purpose.

1 Thanks are due to the Trustees of the British Museum, of the Louvre, the Museum für antike Kleinkunst in Munich, and the Martin von Wagner Museum in Würzburg for their kind permission to publish vases of their respective collections. I am also very much indebted for information and invaluable help to P. Corbett, who kindly revised the manuscript, to B. Ashmole, P. Devambez, H. Diepolder, S. Heinemann, K. Lullies, and E. Scrinai.

2 The chronology of Exekias is far from being certain. Among the amphorae Faina 78 is early, judging by the great breadth of body (compare London B 1971 CV 3, III Hs, pl. 38, 1), and by the handle, which is a prototype of the usual form. Faina 77 and the great amphora in the Vatican are more slender, though still ample in outline (the published photographs of the latter are misleading). Faina 187 has a foot similar to those of the two preceding amphorae, but is perceptibly more slender and leads on to late works such as Louvre F 206. This may be contemporary with the Andokidean amphora London B 193.

Distorted photographs are always misleading in comparing the shapes of vases. Usable pictures are obtained if: (a) the lens is on the same level as the greatest diameter of the vase (as suggested by E. Homann-Weideking), and (b) the distance measures six times the largest dimension (height or width).

3 Compare the tall krater by Exekias (Hesp. VI, 1937, 468 and 471, figs. 1–2; AJA XLIII, 1939, pl. 26a) with the broader Euphorionian version (Berlin 2160; Blünel, Sport der Hellenen, 77).
Andokides


8. Orvieto, Faina 64. A, Herakles and the Amazons. B, Dionysos. ARV 2, 4: Andokides painter. Mouth, foot, and one handle are missing. Corolla Curtius pl. 44 gives a good reproduction of the shape.


The amphorae of Andokides are characterised by their refined proportions and by a technical perfection which concentrates on essentials, not on petty detail. There is a tendency to stress the individual parts; the neck is well distinguished from the body; so is the foot, with its pronounced fillet and sloping outline; so also are the slim handles, which stand well out from the shoulder; the foot keeps its tenseness throughout the whole development despite some changes in its shape. The small lip is sharply cut and has a sloping under-side.

The three earlier signed amphorae show that for a time Andokides concentrated on making the feet of his vases more and more compact. He began to reduce the thickness of the disc-like upper member, which looks as if it were pressed down into the underlying torus. Then he obtained a still more coherent outline by introducing a sloping profile for the disc. From the shape of its foot the unsigned amphora London B 193 clearly belongs to this group, and the Munich amphora continues the development of the series. Both must be of Andokides' own make. The Munich amphora shows the last stage of the development; the two parts of its foot are separated only by a small furrow.

The amphora in Bologna might almost be a twin of the Munich amphora if the foot were not surprisingly different. Its two components are sharply contrasted, and the thickness of the disc, which rises high above the torus, has no parallel on Andokides' earlier works. This is no argument against the attribution, for the signed amphora in Madrid has the same foot. The foot of the Kerberos-amphora in the Louvre has this characteristic though less markedly, whilst its body is nearest in shape to the body of the Madrid amphora. The amphora in Orvieto cannot be far off, if the attribution of this fragmentary piece is right.

With the exception of the three latest vases the series of amphorae made by Andokides conforms, in change of shape, with the tendencies indicated above. The potter gradually reduced the volume and the broad appearance of his vases. First he pulled up the shoulder, then he diminished the diameter of the vase, and tightened the outline, thus increasing its tension. This is the usual development, which has been called a rule. It is worth noting that among the works of Andokides the end of this development is marked already by the two vases in Munich and Bologna, the latter being particularly slender.₅

₅ Furtwängler describes the vase as perfectly preserved. There is a large hole in the interior of the foot, round, and carefully pierced through. This is no rarity; other vases with similar holes are listed below, and there are certainly many more examples. The diameter of the holes varies from 1 to 4 cm.: Amphora by Lydos, Berlin F 1685; Timagora-hydria Louvre F 98 (the hole less carefully made); an amphora in Cassel: A, chariot. B, battle (the hole has been closed inside by a large round bronze plaque, outside by a small irregular plaque, fastened by a rivet); amphora Würzburg 284 (the hole also closed); hydriae Berlin F 1901 and F 1907 (the hole of the latter closed by a modern.—scrap of burnt clay); neck-amphora Berlin F 8190; amphora Berlin F 2160; Sisyphos krater Munich 2268. As far as the proveniences are known these vases come from Italian tombs. They may have been used for libations at the burial, and restored immediately afterwards in order to keep the food for the deceased.

₆ Other workshops, too, produced amphorae of a similar slender shape: Northwick Park (ARV 3, 15: Andokides painter); Würzburg 267 (ARV 5, 5: manner of the Andokides painter); Würzburg 280; Vatican (Albizzi 345); Orvieto, Museo Civico 578; Market (Coll. Hirsch, 1921, pl. 5, no. 143. ABS 42: Antinemos painter); Munich 1412 (Beazley, JHS LIV (1934) 91: painter of the Würzburg neck-amphora 162. GV 1, pl. 41, 4, pl. 44 and 47, 2).
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No further refinement was possible unless it could spring from a new starting-point. Now the latest amphorae of Andokides, the Kerberos-amphora in the Louvre, the amphora in Orvieto, and the signed amphora in Madrid, clearly show a new style. It is true that Andokides kept his preference for tall and elegant forms, yet in his latest works the volume of body and neck is increased, the silhouette fills out and becomes more rounded, and the whole vase looks firmer and more substantial. The ratio between the upper part and the remainder of the vase is quite new, the neck being shorter and broader, and joining the shoulder in a subtle curve. The angular outline of the earlier vases has been replaced by a system of related curves which implies new possibilities.

This sudden change is surprising after the steady development of the preceding vases. It is only to be explained if Andokides’ activity reached down right into the epoch of the renewal of shapes about 510 B.C. Here, with the amphorae of Euthymides, of Phintias, and of the early Kleophrades painter, sturdy forms with stout necks and rounded contours predominate. Here, too, the foot in two very distinct degrees, as used by Andokides for his late amphorae, is extremely common. The style of the figures on the Madrid amphora supports this dating of the late works of Andokides. Moreover, the two amphorae in Munich and Bologna go with the series of slender amphorae (cf. n. 5), several of which must be dated by the drawing to the years around and after 510.

The start of Andokides’ activity is represented by the amphora Louvre G 1, which is dated by its style (Langlotz Zeitbestimmung, 20 f.) and shape to the decade 530–520. The amphora in Berlin cannot be much later. After an interval, there follow the amphorae in London, the Louvre, Munich, and Bologna, the latter probably having been made about 510 B.C. Finally, the three latest amphorae find a place early in the last decade.

Whether Andokides kept his leading position among his colleagues in the Kerameikos or not, is difficult to say. In any case in the early Leagros-period there was another generation at work giving a new aspect to the old forms, and strongly influencing the development of shapes.

*

It would be interesting to know which potter was responsible for the renewal of shapes about 510. Unfortunately the signatures cease, and it is difficult to identify the works of individual potters among unsigned vases. Only one group of potters stands out fairly clearly, the Eukleio-group, named after the two chief painters associated with them—Euthymides and the Kleophrades painter.

The Eukleio-group

A

Louvre G 44. A, warrior mounting chariot. B, woman putting a wreath upon the head of a youth. ARV 25, 2 : Euthymides.


London E 255. A, struggle for the Tripod. B, warrior leaving home. ARV 28 below, 2 : Dikaios painter. Fig. 3.


B

Louvre G 42. A, rape of Leto. B, athletes. ARV 22, 1 : Phintias. Pl. XVII, c and fig. 4.

C

Munich 2307. A, Hector arming. B, komos. ARV 24, 1 : Euthymides. A, Schnizler, Griechische Vazen pl. 50. Fig. 5.

---

8 We must go back to the Exekias-amphora in the Vatican to find a similar foot.

9 Cf. Buschor, Vasenmalerei 152.


11 The question whether Menon has to be named here uncertain, and cannot be decided without a thorough knowledge of the big amphora in Philadelphia.

12 For the knowledge of the following vases I owe much to discussion with Prof. Diepolder.

13 The two b.f. amphorae of the Dikaios painter in Bologna and Agrigento (ARV 29, 8 and 9) do not belong to the Eukleio-group.
D

The most remarkable differences which help to separate the individual potters of the Eukleio-group appear in the shape of the foot. Potter A seems to be influenced by Andokides. The feet of his amphorae, like those made by Andokides, show a strong tension acting against the weight of the body. Another link is given by the variety of foot seen on Louvre G 44 and Munich 2309, where disc and torus fit closely together as in the penultimate phase of Ando-
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Fig. 10—Munich 1720.

Fig. 11—London B314.

Fig. 12—Munich 1700.
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Fig. 13—Munich 1486A.

Fig. 14—London B226.

Fig. 15—Munich 1486.

Fig. 16—Würzburg 204.

Fig. 17—Munich 1531.

Fig. 18—London B220.

Fig. 19—Louvre N1020.

Fig. 20—Munich 1541.

kides' work. Afterwards Potter A preferred a distinct division of the foot into two, at the same time increasing the overall height of his amphorae.

The beginning of this stage of development is marked by the Phintias-amphora of Potter B; its foot, stiff and clumsy in outline, has no parallel within the Eukleio-group.

Potter C may easily be distinguished from the remainder by the shape of the large and widely spread foot of the amphorae, which he divides into two sharply contrasted parts, the disc with a high vertical profile, and the torus swelling out beneath it like an inflated tyre. This shape, already familiar from the amphorae of Andokides in Bologna and Madrid, is very common in the last decade of the sixth century.

Potter D, to judge from the feet of his amphorae, must have been a companion or pupil of Potter A. The great difference is that Potter A increased the diameter of the foot when increasing the total height in order to give his vases greater stability, while the tall amphorae of Potter D stand on a remarkably small foot. In spite of this peculiarity the general aspect of his amphorae is harmonious, thanks to the finished proportions of the body.

Although each of these potters has his own recognisable traits, it is better to treat all four as a group, for the following reasons. In the first place it proves impossible to separate the four potters by the shape of the lip; they all produce the same sharp outline, with a sloping under-side, a narrow bevel at the edge of the mouth, and a slight curve on the inside where neck VOL. LXXI.
and rim join. Variants of the usual shape (fig. 3) as shown in figs. 5 and 6 occur with several potters of the group. Furthermore, there are no differences in the shape or attachment of the handles. They are broad and double-curved, and are gradually brought nearer to the neck and body of the vase. Finally, the several stages of development in the shape of body and neck are so uniform within the Eukleo-group that they must have been reached by close co-operation between the four potters.

The beginning of this development is indeed surprising. Amongst a great many amphorae of the refined and slender type represented by the vases of Andokides in Munich and Bologna there suddenly appear new vigorous forms, full of vitality. Those who like to explain the proportions of Greek vases mathematically could speak of a reversion to an earlier formula when comparing the amphora by Phintias with the earliest Andokidean (pl. XVII, a and c). The basic proportions of the two vases are almost identical, the ratio of diameter to height being two to three, but the shape and the importance of the various parts of the vase have greatly changed. The body is increased in volume by the widening of the lower part and of the shoulder. Consequently the neck is made broad and heavy, and this requires a larger mouth and a correspondingly large foot. At the same time the handles are made stronger and more compact.

So far the changes are clearly visible and measurable, but the shape undergoes other modifications which, though less tangible, are no less decisive for the general look of the vase and endow its outline with a coherence which it retains during the succeeding phases of its development. These modifications cannot be put into words; the best way to appreciate their subtlety is to try to correlate the concavity of the vase’s neck and mouth with the convexity of its body. One finds a far closer correspondence on a vase of the Eukleo-group than on any amphora of the preceding decade.

In its turn this new version of the amphora underwent changes, and within the Eukleo-group a definite sequence of development can be perceived. The first change affected the lower body, which on the Phintias-amphora and the earliest works of Potter A had a comparatively full curve. In the next stage its profile straightened out, so that the vase appeared lighter in build and sat more easily upon its base. Potters A and B emphasised this effect by raising the centre of gravity to the level of the shoulder. This stage of development is represented by the amphorae London E 255 and Munich 2307, the amphora by the Kleophrades painter in the Vatican, and by Munich 1416.

The amphorae London E 254, B 199, and Würzburg 597 illustrate the next step. Compared with their predecessors they are more slender, especially in the shoulder, and also in the neck. The whole vase is higher, and looks more elegant and dainty, but less vigorous and less solid. To correct this fault the subsequent amphorae were made a little more full-bodied and were given a more regularly rounded outline, with a steeper shoulder, and more thickset neck. Potter D, especially, succeeded in giving his amphorae in Ferrara and Munich a harmonious balance of vigour and elegance. The latest works of Potters A and C show the same tendencies, the amphora with Thorykion less distinctly than the Palaestra-amphora in the Louvre. This, the last degree of development reached by the potters of the Eukleo-group, was also the nearest to perfection.

Later amphorae like that of the Kleophrades painter in Würzburg, or the great amphora of the Berlin painter (Berlin F 2160) reveal the spirit of a new epoch which does not concern us here.

The development of the Eukleo-group more or less covers the last decade of the sixth century. Examined as a whole it shows the same principle as the development of the amphorae of Andokides: from stout to slender and from heaviness to elegance. There is a minor differ-

---

13 The lip of amphorae of the Eukleo-group shows strongly the influence of Andokides. The handles, on the contrary, are of quite a different make.

14 The painters thus gained a panel of considerable height.

---

15 At the very beginning of the development the right proportions were not yet established.

16 Würzburg 508; the whole upper part and the handles are modern (Beazley, *Der Kleophradesmaler* 23).
ence; the slightly increased volume of the latest amphorae of Andokides is due to the influence of the new style of the last decade, while the same feature in the Eukleoe-group represents a last refinement of the group's own canons.

So far our investigation has established two points; it confirms the generally accepted 'rule' of development, and also shows that the rhythm of development was that, not of the wave, but of the pulse.

The question arises whether our amphorae are representative of the development of their time. If so, then other vase-shapes ought to show the same tendencies. A short survey of the hydriae and the neck-amphorae reveals not only the parallelism of the general development, but also individual differences from potter to potter, and from one shape to the next.

**Hydriae**

The hydria reproduced on Pl. XVII, 1 is a good example of the usual proportions of hydriae in the decade 520–510 B.C. It belongs to a series of vases which were most probably made by Andokides.17

2. Louvre F 289. Athena mounting chariot. On the shoulder, fight. ARV 6, 12: manner of the Andokides painter. Both side-handles are alien and belong to a much later hydria.

The methods used to date the slender amphorae by Andokides may also be applied to the latest of these four hydriae; its proportions are very near those of certain extremely slender hydriae which are typical of the last decade of the sixth century;18 it cannot be much earlier, and may belong to the years immediately before 510. Links between the Andokidean hydriae and their predecessors are harder to find; they have nothing in common with the ovoid hydriae of the Swinger (cf. Louvre F 47, CV 6, III He, pl. 66, 3 and 5) and there is a puzzling gap between the round-bodied Timagora-hydriae (CV Louvre 6, III He, pl. 63, 1–4; 5–6, and pl. 64, 1–3) and Würzburg 304, which, though broad in the shoulder, has a much straighter outline. For the present, however, it is enough to know that Würzburg 304 approximates to the early rounded shape and therefore must be at the head of the Andokidean series. Thus, in the period before 510 the development of the hydriae is seen to resemble that of the contemporary Andokidean amphorae, running from sturdy forms to elegant ones. Where the activities of other potters of the time can be traced, their hydriae show a similar progression.

* * *

In the years about 510 the new system of proportions which we observed in the amphora was also adopted for the hydria. This is made evident by the works of the three following potters.

Two of them are very near each other, the Ring-foot potter, and the potter of the Hypsis-hydria.

**The Ring-foot Potter**


**The Potter of the Hypsis Hydria**

1. Munich 2423. Amazons. On the shoulder, chariot, and jockeys. ARV 90, middle 1: Hypsis. Fig. 9.
3. London B 355. Women at the fountain. On the shoulder, two chariots. CV 6, III He pl. 90, 3 and 93, 1.

---

17 I hope to discuss the question in another article.
18 This is evident not only from the figures, but also from details of shape, e.g. the foot (Munich 1694, Beazley, JHS XLVII (1927) 88 no. 56: Antimenes painter); foot and back handle (London B 343, CV 6, III He pl. 94, 3 and 95, 5—by the same potter Louvre F 290, Beazley, JHS LIV (1934) 95; Painter of Munich 1703. Id., JHS XLVII (1927) 86 n. 54. Lower part of the body and fillet modern; the foot from a skyphos; the mouth (Frankfurt, Beazley, ABS 42: Antimenes painter).
The hydriai of the Ring-foot potter and of the potter of the Hypsis hydria differ in the shape of the foot; with the first, the foot is fairly horizontal and stands upon a small ring which is visible only from below; with the second, it has no ring, and is more tense and elegant. There are other small differences in mouth and handles, but these are far outweighed by the features common to both groups of hydriai. The body is massive and capacious; its lower part is stout, while from the shoulder upward the vase is built on a larger scale. The curve of mouth and neck corresponds in a very marked manner with the curve of the body (cf. the amphorae of the Eukleio-group) and serves to connect the two portions of the vase particularly closely.

The straight side handles of earlier hydriai had to be adapted to the new form and were tilted upwards in a slight curve. At the same time the back handle was put nearer to the mouth and raised above the lip, which emphasized its practical and aesthetic importance.

The Potter of the Heavy Hydriai


In addition to the innovations described above, the potter of the heavy hydriai introduced two more: the mouth of his vases lacks the hollow on the under side and runs evenly through from the neck to the lip; and the back handle, which was formerly round or oval in section has a marked ridge. In general the heavy hydriai are very capacious, and the details show a predilection for thick and massive forms. The more delicate problems of balanced rhythm and related outlines were not much appreciated by our potter.

Lea-Hydriai

The vases of the potter of the heavy hydriai were succeeded by the very numerous family of the Lea-hydriai (the name alludes to the fact that most of these hydriai are to be found in Beazley’s list of the Leagros Group). Nearly all of them are of slender and elegant shape and represent an advanced stage of development compared with the hydriai of the three preceding potters.

Instead of a long list it may suffice to mention the following two representative examples:


The two hydriai vary in one small detail: the profile of the lip of the first hydria is tilted slightly forward (cf. the similar lip of the heavy hydria, *fig. 10*), whereas the profile of the second is tilted back. It may be that the second variation is the later one, the forms of foot and mouth being refined, and the shape of the lip being nearly identical with the lip of a hydria of the early fifth century (London E 163, *ART* 194, 17). But this remains a mere guess until the problem of the individual style of each potter within the Lea workshops finds its solution.

The development of hydriai from stout to slender shapes in the last decade of the sixth century is illustrated in its extremes by contrasting the heavy hydriai with the Lea-hydriai. Intermediate stages may be found in the works of the following potter:

The Club-foot Potter

1. Munich 1700. Death of Troilos. On the shoulder, the walls of Troy. Beazley, *ABS* 44 no. 20: Leagros group. Fig. 12.
The comparison of figs. 10 and 12 shows clearly that the Club-foot potter imitated the shape of lip found on the heavy hydriae. The shape of the foot, however, is his own, the disc being slightly conical, and ending with a zone which hangs down not unlike clumsily bent toes. The Club-foot potter was not of the first rank, and it is rather difficult to decide whether the changes of detail are due to a definite development, or are merely accidental. On the other hand, the development of the structure of the whole vase followed the general line from broad to slender.

It is noteworthy that only very few examples among the mass of hydriae of the late sixth century are comparable to the latest amphorae of the Eukleio-group. There is a strong preponderance of slender and pointed forms throughout, and about 500 there is hardly any revival of the principles valid in the years around 510. Matters changed only at the beginning of the fifth century, when the type of hydria came in which was preferred by the Berlin painter (ARV 139–140, 126 ff.). With this special shape we are not dealing here.

**NECK-AMPHORAE**

This paper would be incomplete without an account of the development of the neck-amphora. The b.f. neck-amphora of ordinary shape was made in the same workshops as the b.f. hydria, and the relationship of the two shapes often leads to the use of the same kind of soil for both. Yet their development was not identical.

In the years before 510 the divergences were unimportant. Stout and broad shapes were gradually replaced by fine and slender ones, as is shown by the neck-amphorae of Exkias, of Andokides, of one of the potters for whom the Antimenes painter worked, and others. Instead of repeating myself I prefer to illustrate two common types of neck-amphora of the penultimate decade of the sixth century.


The vase in Munich shows the usual proportions of neck-amphorae in this period. The body is egg-shaped, the shoulder sloping, and the lower part of the body is a little rounded. The superstructure is rather large; it consists of a cylindrical neck, a broad mouth, and handles which stand out like ears. Neck-amphorae of this kind show clearly that they are composed section by section.

The various parts of the neck-amphora in London are better proportioned and more closely connected with each other. The tight outline of the vase, the narrow shoulder, and the lower part of the body, which has only a faint curve, give a striking impression of tension and elegance. The whole appearance is very slender.

The next stage of development, showing the new style of about 510 B.C., may be illustrated by the following neck-amphora:

Munich 1486. (J.315). On the shoulder between eyes A and B, Herakles and the Lion. _Pl. XIX, e, and fig. 15._

The body of the vase immediately below the shoulder is rounded and widened, its lower part is short and stout. Neck and mouth unfold in a soft curve which is repeated by the tightly fitting handles. The harmonious and swinging lines of the outline stress the connection of the upper part of the vase with the body. No doubt the same principles of design were current here as in contemporary amphorae and hydriae. Yet neck-amphorae of this transformed shape

---

19 Curiously enough the bad potter who made the hydria for the Nikoxenos painter in London (E 160, _ARV_ 148, 16) was one of the few potters of hydriae who were interested in this difficult problem.
are not very common; most of them are more tapered at the shoulder and in the lower part of the body, so that they look smaller.

Lea-neck-amphorae

7. Würzburg 204. A and B, palaesta. Beazley, *ABS* 46 no. 11: Acheloos painter. Langlotz pl. 43. *Fig. 16.*

This series of neck-amphorae, made by the same group of potters as the Lea-hydriae, begins with a shape whose outline may be compared with a hanging triangle. Then follow some more slender examples with a narrower shoulder, and at the end there is a vase with a curiously puffed-up body—a type quite frequent among late b.f. neck-amphorae.

We find it also among the vases of another old friend:

The Club-foot Potter


The first of these vases is approximately contemporary with the slender variety of the Lea neck-amphorae, whereas the two last find their place among the more full-bodied late b.f. neck-amphorae. There were potters who gave their vases a still more rounded outline in order to make them more substantial. The Nikokenos painter was associated with one of them (cf. London B 238, *ARV* 149, 34; and Munich 1527, *ARV* 149, 31). Chronologically the 'round' neck-amphorae go with the latest works of the Lea-workshop and the Club-foot potter.

The main line of development, however, by-passed the 'round' shape, and ended with a peculiar shape which we meet in the latest neck-amphorae of the next potter.

The Canoe Potter


The Canoe potter's name is derived from the special shape of foot which he employed. It consists of a disc, concave on the upper face, and bent gently upwards at its edge: in section it slightly resembles the silhouette of the bow or stern of a canoe.

The series of neck-amphorae by the Canoe potter illustrates all but the first stage of the development in the years around 500 B.C. At the beginning stands a pointed shape with a broad shoulder (*pl. XIX, d*), followed by a more slender form which is less strongly articulated. About 500 there are both varieties of the more full-bodied type—the slightly puffed-up shape, and the 'round' shape (*pl. XIX, c*).

More important, however, as representative of the common taste, are the remainder. Some of them may be contemporary with those just mentioned, others must be later. The body of these vases is a lengthened oval; neck, mouth, and foot are generally small (*pl. XIX, f*).
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The outlines are not always so regular as in the illustration. Quite often the lowest part of the body is a little more convex, giving a definite air of slackness to the silhouette.

With this type of vase the history of b.f. neck-amphorae ends. A few stragglers are shown to be contemporary with the large r.f. hydriae (see above, p. 37) by their tall and elliptical shape (cf. Athens 560), and a very small number can be assigned to about the seventies of the fifth century by certain peculiarities of shape (cf. Berlin F 1873 with Dresden 307, ARV 347, 30: Orchard painter).

* * *

Thus a detailed study of amphorae, hydriae, and neck-amphorae shows that their development is very much the same in spite of individual differences.

In any case the years about 510 B.C. were decisive in the evolution of shape.

Before 510 angular forms are prevalent. The single parts of a vase were treated as separate elements of the whole, loosely connected with each other. The method is especially easy to recognise in the handles, which stand away from the neck and the mouth. The general trend of development clearly ran from broad and stout forms to thin and elegant ones.

About 510 the situation changed. One must of course remember that there were potters who continued to make light and slender shapes. But the leading group of potters revived the old forms whilst introducing some important new principles.

An outstanding feature is the new consistency of the whole shape obtained by well-balanced proportions and the use of correlated curves. Good potters knew how to give their work an enhanced quality in this way. Others were more or less contented with superficial modifications such as the new form of handles whose subtle curve closely follows the line of the neck and mouth. Concurrently there was an increase of weight and breadth, shown in broad shoulders, powerful necks and strong feet.

These principles were not applied equally to all shapes and by all potters. It might happen that a potter was interested in one principle, and neglected another. But in the last decade of the sixth century there was a common trend in the work of all potters, away from full-bodied shapes toward lighter and more refined ones, just as in the years before 510.

There is a further, more general conclusion to be drawn from the present study; that this rule of development, from stout to slender, retained its validity under changing conditions, and that such changes mark in fact the vital rhythm of an unbroken and consecutive evolution.

HANSJÖRG BLOESCH.
ATTIC BLACK-FIGURED PELIKAI

[PLATES XX—XXII]

In the summer of 1949 the Metropolitan Museum of Art acquired an Attic black-figured pelike which is published here for the first time (figs. 1—3, pl. XX). It was bought from a New York dealer, and nothing is known of its provenance. The vase is 33.3 cm. high and unbroken; its surface, however, was chipped and flaked in places (cf. figs. 1 and 2), blemishes that have since been removed by the restorer at the museum. The potting of the pelike is normal—torus mouth, spreading foot, segmental handles—and the ornamentation—palmettes lying on their sides above the panels—occurs on other pelikai. One feature, however, is unusual: the lip is reserved and two broadish black stripes run around the inside of the neck (fig. 3). A graffito appears on the underside of the foot: AA.

The obverse of the pelike depicts a dramatic moment in the capture of Silenos. The two hunters sent out by Midas crouch in ambush near the fountain in the garden of the king. They wear white petasi, short chitons, and chlamydes wrapped around their left arms in the manner of big-game hunters and shield-less warriors. Each of them carries two spears; in addition, the one on the rock has a sword in a scabbard suspended from a double baldric. There was a tradition that Midas had mixed wine into the water of the fountain to lure and capture Silenos: the New York pelike shows how the ruse is about to succeed. Here Silenos approaches, sniffing the familiar odour of the wine and dancing with joy. As yet he hasn't drunk and one fears he will be cheated out of his anticipated pleasure, for the hunters will presently close in, overpower him, and bring him before the king. The vase-painters usually show the moment immediately after the capture, the bringing-in of the prisoner, and his presentation before the king. The ambush proper is represented on only three other vases. On a Laconian kylix in the Villa Giulia, not much earlier than our pelike, Silenos on all fours makes for a fountain building drawn in the standardised Laconian fashion, while his captors in Phrygian garb stoop over and catch him. On an Attic b.f. lekythos in London the fountain is a low structure, and a hunter is strategically placed on top of it, rope ready to handcuff his quarry. The scene is laid in a foreign country, as symbolised by the palm-trees, but there is nothing foreign, as has been maintained by some, about the dress of the hunter or the two seated figures that frame the scene. Such unconcerned onlookers are common in archaic vase-painting, especially on certain b.f. lekythoi, and are not necessarily related to the scene. Here, however, the painter has made a compromise: he has inscribed the figure on the left Mides and has thus drawn at least one of the seated extras into the context of the story. In later red-figure Silenos approaches the fountain armed with an amphora when he is trapped. It has been suggested that in these scenes Silenos is drunk and that the amphora is to be blamed for his condition, but I think the amphora is empty and was meant to be filled at the fountain. Silenos' gestures, in that case, might be interpreted as stemming from joyful anticipation. On the b.f. cup signed by Ergotimos Silenos is certainly drunk, but the wine-skin which Oreios has

1 Acc. no. 49.11.1. Purchased with income from the Rogers Fund. I gratefully acknowledge my indebtedness to friends and colleagues who have helped in various ways: to Professor Sir John D. Beazley for putting his notes on b.f. pelikai at my disposal: to Miss M. J. Milne for advice on questions of mythology, and to Dr. G. H. Chase, Professor P. Devambez, Miss D. K. Hill, Mrs. S. P. Karouzou, Dr. N. M. Kontaleon, Miss L. Talcott, Professor H. Thompson, and Professor E. Vanderpool for letting me study or publish vases under their care. A paper on the subject of this article was read at the annual meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America in Baltimore on December 30, 1948.

2 The principal restoration is in the right leg of the older boxer on the reverse. In all other instances the modern black follows the silhouette of the original design which was discernible through the discoloration of the clay.

3 The subject has been treated by Brommer in Ad 1941, 36 ff. and, more recently, by Beazley in Hesperia Supplement VIII (1949) 4—7.

4 Cf. Xenophon, Anabasis i, ii, 13; Pausanias i, 4—5.


6 Ad 1941, 41—42, figs. 3—5.

7 Ad 1941, 49, fig. 10.

8 Ad 1941, 37—38, fig. 1.
taken away from him is still full and need not have been the cause. Perhaps Silenos had drunk first from the fountain, as he is about to do on the New York pelike, and then filled his wine-skin before he was apprehended.

For the sequel to the capture of Silenos, one has, of course, to keep in mind the story of King Midas as it was known to the Greeks of the classical period and forget for the moment the version popularised by Ovid. In the earlier story Silenos is not found drunk by some peasants, having strayed from the company of Dionysos, but Midas himself was bent on capturing Silenos. The king, however, does not desire the ransom of turning all he touches into gold, but craves to hear the wisdom of Silenos. It is in this way that he first learns the pessimistic view expressed by the captive: 'It is best for everybody not to be born at all, next

FIG. 1.

FIG. 2.

best for those who have been born to die as soon as possible.' The painter of the New York pelike had little opportunity of anticipating this sequel with its note of resignation. In portraying the ambush alone, he rather concentrated on the tense moment preceding the capture and its inherent humour for the spectator: Silenos eager and unsuspecting, the hunters alert and confident. Everything in this picture is very much alive. The rock on which one of the hunters perches and the shady fruit tree in the middle are drawn with more care than vase-painters ordinarily bestow on nature. Even the lion's head of the fountain spout appears to be a living member of the cast and plays its part in the composition.

At least as original, and certainly as humorous, is the reverse of the New York pelike (fig. 2, pl. XX, b). Here two pupilists practise to the accompaniment of the flutes. Of the two boxers, one is a stocky boy with windswept hair and strong physique, while his companion on the right is a mature man with pronounced paunch and exaggerated biceps. This is a superb parody of the attitudes struck by athletes, and the inscription HΩ ΡΑΙΣ ΚΑΛΟΣ] ΝΑΙ+1

9 Metamorphoses XI, 85 ff.
12 Details of rock and fountain are indicated with added white, now partly faded, and with incised lines.
truly the boy is beautiful) becomes a somewhat backhanded compliment when applied to this boy with his ungainly profile.

The humour of both obverse and reverse brings to mind at once the great humourist among the black-figured painters of the Leagros period, the Acheleos Painter, whose work was first assembled by Beazley in his *Attic Black-Figure: a Sketch*. A stylistic analysis bears out the attribution of the New York pelike to his hand. Apart from the spirit of the composition itself, his style can be detected readily enough in the profiles of heads and necks, in the incised anatomical markings, and even in the ornaments. The new pelike is a careful painting, and should rank with the painter's best works, such as his name piece and the pelike in London. The subjects on the New York pelike are treated with a delightful originality and add much to our appreciation of the artist's personality.

ii

The pelike is one of the last shapes to make its appearance in the repertory of Attic pottery. Like the psykter, the stamnos, the kalpis, and the bell-krater it is a shape first introduced in the last quarter of the sixth century b.c., the period of early red-figure. There is no black-figured pelike that antedates with certainty the earliest red-figured vases of that shape. Some b.f. pelikai have been put together by Pfuhl, others were added by Mingazzini and Johnson. The following list owes much to Sir John D. Beazley, who drew my attention to nos. 9, 10, 14, 33, 50, 53, 55, 57, 63–66 and supplemented my notes on some of the others. The attributions mentioned are all his. For the sake of convenient reference the pelikai are grouped according to the ornamental frames of the panels.

Lotus above, net-pattern on sides, maecander below


Lotus above, maecander below


Lotus above, net-pattern below


Lotus above, net-pattern on sides


Lotus above


---

13 P. 46, appendix VII.
14 Gerhard, *ECC* pl. 15, 16, 1–2.
15 *ABC* pl. 15.
16 *AJA* XLVII (1943) 395.
ATTIC BLACK-FIGURED PELIKAI


22. London B 190. CVA pl. 44, 4. A and B, between Panathenaic columns, Apollo (A) running after Herakles (B), who has stolen the tripod. Ht. 29-2 cm.


Net-pattern above and on sides


Net-pattern above


Palmettes above, net-pattern on sides


Palmettes above


45. Vatican 413. Albizati, Vasi antichi dipinti del Vaticano, pl. 61. A and B, sale of oil.


47. Bologna VF 47. A and B, the punishment of Sisyphos. Ht. 32-5 cm.

Maenader above


Ivy above, net-pattern on sides

Ivy above
52. Boston 76.53. A and B, woman seated between two oxen. Ht. 23.3 cm. Pl. XXI, d.
52 bis. Mykonos, fr. A, two komasts. B, the like?

Myrtle above, net-pattern on sides

Net-pattern (obverse) and ivy (reverse) above

Net-pattern (obverse) and palmettes (reverse) above
55. Florence. \textit{NS} 1934, 423, figs. 78 a-b. A, citharoide between two judges. B, chariot, half-seen, satyr and maenad. Ht. 28.5 cm.

Maeander (obverse) and ivy (reverse) above
57. London 64.10.7.270. \textit{CVA} pl. 44, 2. A, reclining Dionysos (half-seen) and satyr. B, seated Dionysos and satyr. Group of the Rhodes pelike. Ht. 25.2 cm.

No ornamental frame

Frame not recorded or incompletely preserved

In shape the pelike is a derivative of the amphora, and like the latter was used for oil and wine.\footnote{18} It is in fact a squat or truncated amphora of type C\footnote{19} and merely appears more bulging and sagging since its greatest width is so close to the foot. With the amphora it also shares the confining panel of the figure decoration which starts at the level of the upper juncture of the handles and extends well below the middle of the vase. Save for one notable exception, the pelike no. 23 in the list, black-figured pelikai have no rays at the junction of base and body. The mouth, again with one exception (no. 19), is torus-shaped and was not meant to be covered by a lid.\footnote{20} The handles are segmental in section; one or two of the later examples, however, develop a central rib. The foot is either echinoid or spreading. In height the vases range from

\footnote{18} As shown by the oil and wine vending scenes on the pelikai nos. 19, 20, 21, 45. Cf. Haspels, ABL pp. 129-130.
\footnote{19} Richter and Milne, \textit{Shapes and Names of Athenian Vases}, figs. 9-10. The foot of the amphora fig. 9 is alien and has since been replaced.
\footnote{20} Lidded pelikai occur occasionally in the fifth century and have been put together by Beazley in his \textit{Etruscan Vase-Painting}, 178. To his list may be added a pair of black pelikai from the Agora, P 14152 and 14153. The lids are now missing.
six to sixteen inches. From this scale two major groups emerge: the bigger pelike which averages fourteen inches and the smaller one which measures about ten inches. As a rule, the tall pelikai are fairly early, and the small ones are apt to be late.

The subsidiary ornamentation never became standardised, and no fewer than sixteen different combinations of half a dozen ornamental patterns are employed on the black-figure pelikai listed above. These patterns consist of the lotus chain, palmettes, the net-pattern, maeander, ivy, and myrtle, and frame the panels either above, above and on the sides, or on all four sides. In black-figure panels need not be offset from the black body of the vase by an ornamental border, and four of our pelikai (nos. 60–62 bis) do, indeed, without it. The panels of black-figure amphorae are ordinarily surmounted by a decorative band, most commonly the familiar palmette-lotus festoon and the chain of lotus buds. With the introduction of red-figure, however, this system is modified. In the new technique panels have to be set off rather strongly from the black body of the vase, and the top frame alone no longer suffices: the panel requires a border on its sides and even below. The Andokides Painter keeps the black-figured palmette-lotus festoon above the panels, but adds a narrow border, usually the net-pattern, for the sides. Euthymides and his followers go one step further and place an ornamental band under the panel, and for the first time the pictures are framed on all four sides. The same group of artists were also among the first to displace the traditional palmette-lotus festoon above the panel with more or less elaborate palmettes. The innovations are at once taken up by the black-figured artists of the time, and borders on the sides and under the panel begin to make their appearance on b.f. amphorae of type A.

The ornamentation of b.f. pelikai is influenced by this development of the panel-frame in the last quarter of the sixth century B.C. Only the pelike in Amsterdam, no. 1 in the list, is framed on all sides, an abundance understandable in this artist, the Nikoxenos Painter, whose major work was done in the red-figured technique. This pelike is framed above by a chain of hanging lotus-buds which is by far the most popular pattern and is found, always as the upper border of the panel, on almost a third of all the pelikai that have been examined (nos. 1–23). The lateral frames on the Amsterdam pelike consist of the net-pattern in its early, undebased form: the knots are still clearly connected and have not as yet deteriorated into rows of disjointed dots. A lateral frame occurs on seventeen pelikai (nos. 1, 6–13, 24–28, 37, 49, 53, 55 bis) and is always the net-pattern. The same ornament and its derivative, the dot-pattern,
have been employed on twenty pelikai as the upper border (nos. 24–36 quater, 54–55 bis) and, less frequently, below the panel (nos. 3–5). On the Amsterdam pelike the border below the panel is formed by a maeander, common in this position on r.f. pelikai, but rare on the b.f. vases of that shape: it occurs in this position on only one other pelike (pl. XXI, b, no. 2) which Beazley has put close to the Acheilos Painter. It is tempting at first to account for the different treatment of the ornamental frames by attributing these varying combinations to the several vase-painters whose style is recognisable. Only one of them, however, the Eucharides Painter, is at all consistent in his use of ornamental borders (nos. 6–8, 10); the Nikoxenos Painter does not conform, nor does the Acheilos Painter. On his pelike in London (no. 13) both panels are framed above by a chain of lotus-buds, but on the obverse the delightful group of a satyr lifting a maenad is set between two bands of palmettes so broad as to become part of the panel proper and not its mere frame. The new pelike in New York (no. 40) displays similar palmettes lying on their sides above the pictures, and it is on pelikai like this and the others which use palmettes to advantage (nos. 37–42) that one can best gauge the influence exercised by the pioneer group in early Attic red-figure.

Most of the pelikai with lotus-chain or palmettes above the panel belong to the early phase of the shape, datable within the Leagros period. The earliest of them all is perhaps the pelike in Baltimore (no. 15) with its echinos foot and gentle profile, and the band of substantial lotus-buds above the panel (pl. XXI, a). In the later development of the shape other patterns begin to predominate. The maeander now comes into its own as an upper border (44–48 bis, 56–59), probably again under the influence of red-figure. In fact the Hearst pelike (no. 46, pl. XXI c,) looks very much as if it was painted by a man who was best in red-figure. After the turn of the century, with red-figure firmly established, black-figured pelikai are on their way out. They become small, uninspired vases, and are poorly drawn. Of this late phase the pelike in Boston (no. 52, pl. XXI, d) is a fair example. If one compares the outlines of the vase with some of the profiles of earlier pelikai (pl. XXI, a–b) one is struck at once by the general deterioration of the shape, how exaggerated the contrast between the convex and the concave has become and how the diminished height makes mouth and foot seem unduly large.

Black-figured pelikai were produced for perhaps forty years: in red-figure the same shape was employed for almost two hundred years. Popular throughout the fifth century, the pelike seems to have reached its greatest fame at the very end of Attic vase-painting, in the Kertch period, when it seems to outnumber all the other shapes. From Attica the shape spread to the fabrics of Southern Italy, where its development can be traced for at least another hundred years. The same shape is also found in Roman glass, and can be said to have survived in one material or another even to this day.

Nothing has been said so far of the neck-pelike, a special shape, in which the neck of the vase is set off from the body. There are only six examples in Attic Black-figure.22

2. Brunswick P 1. CV A pl. 9, 1–2. A, Dionysos and maenad; B, woman and man.

22 For the Eretrian b.f. neck-pelike, Vienna 136, cf. Amyx, AJA XLV 65, fig. 3.
ATTIC BLACK-FIGURED PELIKAI

The Tarquinia vase, no. 1, is earlier than any of the other vases in the list and its inclusion among neck-pelikai may be debated. The pictures are not set in panels, but separated from one another by an elaborate palmette and lotus configuration under each handle. The mouth is in two degrees and the small lid, now on the vase, need not be the cover originally intended for the vase. There are rays above the foot and a reserved band between the figure frieze and the rays. The palmette-lotus festoon on the neck recalls the pattern used as upper border on some early panel amphorae. This neck-pelike, if one may call the vase by that name, is rather melon-shaped: the Brunswick vase, no. 2, is more pear-shaped but retains the rays above the foot and a palmette-lotus festoon on the neck not unlike the ornament on contemporary canonical neck-amphorae. The pictures, however, are set off in panels. I have no note on no. 3, the neck-pelike in London. The remaining three, nos. 4–6, go together. The neck is decorated on each vase with three alternating palmettes in the manner of b.f. Nolan amphorae. The pictures are in panels, bounded above by tongues and on the sides by simple lines, or, as in no. 5, by net-patterns. Nos. 4 and 5 have a reserved band midway between the panel and the foot, like no. 1 and the pelikai nos. 15 and 16 in the list on page 43. In shape, these three neck-pelikai are very slender.

Among contemporary red-figured vases, neck-pelikai are equally rare. There are two by Euphronios, one divided between the University of Chicago and the Villa Giulia,24 the other, a recent find, in the Villa Giulia.25 A third red-figured neck-pelike is in Ferrara and is in shape very close to the b.f. neck-pelikai nos. 4–6.26 It is by the Berlin Painter. A fourth neck-pelike, attributed to Myson, is in Catania.26 The two neck-pelikai by Euphronios are earlier than any red-figured pelike and at least not later than the earliest black-figured pelikai or neck-pelikai. It is perhaps not altogether impossible that the pioneering potters in their search for new shapes developed first a neck-pelike until their experiments convinced them that the gently sloping shoulders of their new shape did not actually warrant a neck that was built separately and attached with a clearly defined joint. The Euphronian neck-pelike needs in fact only slight modification to be transformed into a canonical pelike. Indirect proof of this transition from neck-pelike to pelike is perhaps furnished by the r.f. pelike which portrays the first swallow, formerly attributed to Euphronios.27 At first glance one would take the vase for a neck-pelike with its rich palmette decoration above the panel, until one discovers that the neck of the vase is set off from the body only by a reserved line in the painted decoration and not by a ridge in the pot itself. This may be the earliest pelike in which neck and body merge in a continuous curve, and perhaps the painter, accustomed as he may have been to neck-pelikai, did not want to give up the neck patterns, even though the new shape was no longer in need of one.

The Metropolitan Museum of Art.  

DIETRICH VON BOTHMER.

25 Beazley, ARV p. 17, no. 10.  
26 Beazley, ARV p. 176, no. 84.  
27 Beazley, ARV p. 17, no. 9; Paralipomena p. 390.

Addendum. The following pelike should be included as no. 51 bis in the list on page 44:  

51 bis. Havana, El Conde de Lagunillas. A and B, komos (near-replicas of the obverse of 51: by the same hand).
PORTRAET DER TETRARCHENZEIT

[Plates XXIII-XXIV]

Das grossartige Portraet, das auf Taf. XXIII-XXIV und in den Abb. 1-3 erscheint, befindet sich in Privatbesitz. Ich habe dem Eigentümer, fuer die Liebenswürdigkeit, mit der er das wertvolle Kunstwerk fuer diese Festschrift zur Verübung gestellt hat, herzlich zu danken.

Der lebensgrossen Kopf ist mit dem Halse 0,175 m. hoch. Das Gesicht vom Ende des Kinns bis zum Ansatz der Haare misst 0,185 m. Der kleinchristallinische Marmor ist griechisch, wahrscheinlich pentelisch.

Auf den ersten Blick wird jeder das Bildnis als spaatantik, aber vorkonstantinisch erkennen. Es ist in der Tat das bedeutendste Werk der Tetrarchenzeit, das wir besitzen, und wird uns viel Neues lehren.

Vielleicht kennen wir seinen Helden schon aus einem anderen Werk. Denn seine Aehnlichkeit mit dem von L’Orange, der um die Geschichte des spaatroemischen Portraets die groessten Verdienste hat, entdeckten und wiederholt behandelten ubernelbensgrossen Kopf des Togatus in der Villa Doria in Rom ¹ (Abb. 4) ist so gross, dass sie ernsthaft geprüft werden muss.


Das Portraet Doria hat L’Orange als Diocletian (284-305) bestimmt. Diese Deutung war nicht ganz sicher. Die schlechten Muenzbilder der Zeit, ² der einzige sichere Anhalt fuer

¹ Rom. Mitt. 44, 1929, 180 ff.; Studien zur Geschichte des spatantikten Portraets 30, 103, 115—Die Statue Doria vor der Ueberarbeitung Not. sc. 1941, 228, Abb. 6 und
² Rom. Mitt. 55, 1938, 39 Abb. 3; Rom. Mitt. 1829, 190 Abb. 1; Studien 101 f.
derbe Arbeit, und auf seine Portraetverwandtschaft mit dem Bildnis-Doria sollte man sich nicht berufen. Wir halten also die Ikonographie des Diocletian bisher nicht fuer so gut bekannt, wie sie Fuhrmann⁶ erscheint.

Das aendert sich nun mit dem neuen Marmorkopf. Die ueberlebensgrosse Statue Doria kann nur eine regierende Persoenlichkeit darstellen. Wenn wir diese nun zum zweitenmal in einem so hervorragenden Portraet finden, so ist der Schluss zu versuchen, dass wir in beiden Portraets wirklich den grossen Neuordner des Reichs vor uns haben.

Aber wie ganz anders erscheint er in dem neuen Fund, der aus Rom stammt. Der Kopf Doria liegt ganz innerhalb der am Ende des III. Jahrhunderts zur konstantinischen Kunst fuchrenden Entwicklung, die schon oft aufgezeigt worden ist.⁷ Ihre Phaenomene sind folgende:

---

⁵ Arch. Anz. 1941, 733.
⁶ Arch. Anz. 1941, 733.
Verzicht auf die Mannigfaltigkeit der organischen naturlichen Einzelform. Die Unter-
ordnung und Vereinfachung dieser in einem neuen System von Flächen und Linien. Nicht
mehr eine plastische Gleichwertigkeit der einzelnen Bestandteile des Gesichts, sondern eine
Konzentration der Ausdrucksformen in gewissen Teilen der Erscheinung, vor allem im Auge,
mit Vernachlässigung anderer. Schliesslich eine neue Konstruktion des Körperrlichen in
kubischen Einheiten einer neuen geschlossenen Grossflächigkeit mit moglichst geringer
Bewegung der Einzelflächen. Eine neue vordergründige Massivitaet des fastbar koerper-
lichen. Ein neues optisches Fernbild abstrakter Ruhe.

Der Prozess der Stilentwicklung der Plastik des III. Jahrhunderts n. Chr. hat sehr ver-
schiedene Tendenzen und Episoden, die wir hier nicht schildern konnen. Es kommt uns
hier nur auf die Haupt- und Schlussresultate an.

Im neuen Portraet nun ist das entscheidende Neue eine plastische Lebendigkeit der
naturlichen Einzelform, die in dem ganzen bisher bekannten Bereich der Tetrarchen kunst
keine Parallele hat. Beginnen wir mit den Augen, so kann der verschiedene Verlauf der
Braun mit der hochehergezogenen rechten und der flacheren linken nur dem physiognomischen
Spiel des Modells abgesehen sein, in dem sich misstrauischer Unwillen ausdrückt. Am Kopf
Doria sind die Augen in einem festen System elliptischer Linien festgelegt, in dem auch das
Weiche erstarrt. Dort aber gibt es ein feines Gefuehl fuer die Schwellungen des Orbital-
muskels uber dem oberen Augenlid und fuer die zarten Schatten der Falten des schwindenden
Fetts unter dem unteren. Nachher ist der Knochenbau des Gesichts wunderbar durch das
Durchscheinen der Wangenknochen ausgedrueckt. Auch die Kinnlade scheinen durch.
Aber die zarten Flaecheuerebergaenge, in denen die weiche Haut der Wangen bis zum Munde
geschildert ist, lassen sich in Worten nicht nachmalen. Das bildhauerische Bravourstueck ist
der Mund und seine Umgebung. Wie er gegen die Wangen abgegrenzt ist, muss man an den
Profilansichten des Kopfes verfolgen. An den beiden Seiten laeuft die auf-und abschwellende
Faltenfurche verschieden. Aber in der Ansicht nach links kommt wieder ein dem Modell
abgehessener Zug zu Wort, der kleine Hautfalottenknoten neben dem linken Mundwinkel.
Und wie der Mund selber spricht. Wohl mit vielen Zahnzucken ist er mit dem Eigensinn
des Alters zusammengekniffen, sitzt etwas schief und ist nach vorne geschoben in einer zur
Gewohnheit gewordenen geizig unwilligen Resignation. Durch die vorgeschobene Unter-
lippe erneuert jede Omea aehnliche Wellenlinie, die unterhalb der Wangenknochen von einer
Backe zur anderen schwingt. Es ergeben sich so in der bildhauerschen Anlage des von vorne
betrachteten Gesichts ein vorderer Reliefzusammenhang, der durch Wangenknochen, Backen-
muskeln und Mund bestimmt ist, und ein hinterer, der zu den Kinnlade und nach ihnen zu den
Hautwulsten des fetten Halses fuhrt. Auch dies gehoert zur Wirklichkeitsnahe des Portraets: Es sitzt nicht streng frontal mit betonter vertikaler Mittelachse auf seinem Halse
wie der Kopf Doria und nachher die feierlichen Porträts Konstantins und seiner Nachfolger,
sondern mit einer leisen Wendung nach links und in den Nacken, so dass jene Haltsalten
entstehen, die Gesichtsache schraeg liegt, und die untere Gesichtsseite im Verhaelt zur
oberen vorgeschoben ist. Auch diese Haltung kann nur durch das Modell bestimmt sein.

Wie leer, oder sagen wir besser, wie abstrakt theoretisch erscheint neben diesem lebens-
vollen Bildle der Kopf Doria, der doch die gleiche Altersstufe schildert, also mit jenem annae-
hernd gleichzeitig sein muss. Wie erlaebt sich der krase Unterschied?

Ich glaube, wir muessen, um beiden Bildern gerecht zu werden, zuerst eines bedenken.
Der neue Diokletian ist offenbar ein originales Portraet mit allen Merkmalen eines Werkes aus
erster Hand. Das Portraet Doria aber gehoert zu der Gattung repraesentativer Portraets
zweiter oder dritter Hand, die als Kopien unsere Musen fuellen, unser Urteil bestimmen und
trueben. Koennten wir römische Portraetgeschichte nur nach Originalen, wie sie der neue
Diokletian und mancher andere neue Fund8 darstellen, schreiben, so wuerde sie anders
aussehen.

8 Siehe dazu L. Curtius, Symposis, Festgabe fuer Alfred Konstantinportraet des Medaillons der Eberjagd des Weber 9—Welche ein Unterschied zwischen dem Konstantinbogens (L’Orange, Studien Abb. 120—122,


L’Orange und von Gerkan, Der spartanische Bildschmuck des Konstantinbogens Taf. 43) mit seiner weichen lebendigen Modellierung im Vergleich mit den hieratischen Portraets der Standbilder. Welche Bereicherung hat die Gallienuszeit durch die zwei vorzueglichen Original-
Charakterisierung der Individualität durch den scharf geschnittenen Umriss und die linear-plastische Fixierung des Mienenspiels. In zahlreichen anderen Beispielen des republikanischen Porträts war die Aufgabe der Künstler aber freilich denkbar, dass ein grosser Bildhauer der Tetarchenzeit von sich aus in eigener Kraft sich zu solchem Verbum der natürlichen Form im Gegensatz zum Stil seiner Zeit durchgerungen hat. Aber geschichtliche Betrachtung besteht in der Verknüpfung der Erscheinungen. Es bleibt uns also keine andere Folgerung übrig: Der neue Diokletian ist in bewusster Anlehnung an das republikanische Porträt geschaffen, das seinem Schoepfer in Rom ja in einer Fülle von Monumenten zugaenglich war.

In einem ganz anderen Zusammenhang aber steht der Kopf als Ganzes und in dem oberen Teil des Gesichts.


9 Zuletzt L'Orange, Apotheosis in ancient portraiture 75 ff.
10 Puenfundzwanzig Jahre toemisch-germanische Kommission 17 ff.


interessante Ausnahmen ubeergehe ich hier. Aber es ist mir immer merkwürdig erschien,
dass die Kaiser Antonius Pius, Marc Aurel, ja sogar noch Septimius Severus, die
doch schon wahrhaft sorgenvolle Zeiten zu tragen hatten, mit glatten Stirnen auftreten. 
Das war offenbar klassizistisches Programm.

Das andert sich zum ersten Mal mit dem frieher schon herangezogenen Porträt des 
Caracalla. Und zwar sind hier die Falten der stark durchmodellierten Stirn nicht Falten 
als die obere, sondern des Affekts. Der aufsteigende Argwohn des misstrauischen Willens-
menschen runzelt die Stirne im Zorn.

Die ederne Haut, wie wir sie nennen, bestimmt zum ersten Mal das Porträt des Trajanus 
Decius im Kapitolinischen Museum, British Catal., Sala dei imp. No. 70, Taf. 59; 
Antike 2, 1926, Taf. 6; L'Orange, Studien Abb. 2. Ein dreifaches Neues wird hier sichtbar. 
Die Stirnfelden sind nicht wie im Porträt der Republik ein aeusseres objektives Merkmal der 
Physiognomie, das den ubrigen Teilen des Bildes gleichwertig ist, sondern sie sind einer der 
Hauptbestandteile der Schilderung. Daher liegen sie nicht mehr als blosse eingezeichnete 
Linien auf der Oberfläche, deren Helligkeit bestehen bleibt, sondern in der Uebertreibung der 
tief eingebragenen Furchen dominieren die Schatten und zerreißen die Fläche.

Zweitens. Dieses Mienenspiel vollzieht sich nicht mehr auf der Buehne einer leicht 
beweglichen Haut, sondern diese ist eigentuehmlich dick, lederen geworden, schwer beweglich 
und leistet einen gewissen Widerstand.

Drittens. Dieser Widerstand eben wird dargestellt. Und zwar nicht wie in dem Bild 
als manheimer Ansicht, sondern als ein dauernder Ausdruck des Kampfes des 
Individuums um seine Behauptung, als Ausdruck seiner Lebensangst. Die faltigen sorgen-
vollen Gesichter der Republik behalten immer ihre 'klassische' souveraene Ruhe. Im Decius-
porträt aber ist die innere Unsicherheit und Unruhe dargestellt nicht in einer einmaligen 
Erregung, sondern als Proces, der dieses Gesicht nie mehr verlassen wird. Dieser Proces 
eben zeigt sich in der flackernden Gegensätzlichkeit zwischen den tiefen Schatten und den hellen 
Lichtern des Gesichts, die Guido von Kaschnitz impressionistisch nennt (Antike a.a.O. 44). 
Blieb man sich der tiefen Unterschiede zwischen antikem und modernem Porträt bewusst, 
dann kam man diesen Hilfsausdruck zur Verstandlichmachung des Stilwandels gelten lassen.

Wir ueberspringen mehrere Zwischenglieder, um die besondere Stellung, die der neue 
'Diokletian' in diesem Stilwandel einnimmt, noch scharfer zu bestimmen. Er liegt nahe 
genau auf der Linie, wo die Darstellung des 'Proces', wie wir sie nannten, aufhört und die 
eine Aeternisierung des Portraits beginnt. Der Diokletian Doria gehoert in seiner harten 
Unbeweglichkeit schon der 'Aeternisierung' 11 an. Aber er bewahrt noch aus der vorherge-
henden Epoche die Stirnfelder der Lederhaut, die in anderen Werken der Tetrarchie, wie an 
den Porphyristatuen der Markuskirche in Venedig, L'Orange, Studien Abb. 32, 34, an der 
Porphyrgruppe im Vatikan, L'Orange Abb. 33, 34, an dem 'Maximinus Daza' in Kairo, 
L'Orange Abb. 42, an dem Porträt in Kopenhagen Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek No. 25, L'Orange 
Abb. 66, ein unverkennbares Charakteristikum des Stils sind. Die Stirnfelder der Lederhaut 
leben auch noch lange weiter. Aber wenn man das Kolossalportrait Konstantin des Grossen 
und den kolossalen Bronzekopf im Konservatorienpalast No. 87, den Rumpf, Roem. Mitt. 
1927, 248 als Constantius II, bestimmt hat, in den Abbildungen bei L'Orange 163, 164 
betrachtet, dann findet man sie verschwunden. Zu der neuen Monumentalisierung des 
Kaiserportraits gehoert entweder eine glatte Stirn, oder diese wird hinter dem herabgelassenen 
Vorhang der Stirnlocken wie ebenso am Bronzekoloss in Barletta, Lehmann-Hartleben-Kluge, 
Grossbronzen III. Taf. 18, Antike Denkm. III Taf. 21 versteckt. Der Kaiser lebt jenseits des 
zeithalt-menschlichen seelischen Konflikts. An ihm wird kein Proces mehr, der diesen 
darstellt, geschildert.

Unser Diokletian aber stellt noch diesen Proces des Ringens der Persoenlichkeit mit 
sich und der Welt dar. Er befindet sich mitten in ihm. Das ist das Ergreifende dieses

11 Der Ausdruck 'Aeternisierung' frieher einmal angewandt auf das Caesarporträt, Roem. Mitt. 47, 1942.

Dazu Schweitzer, Bildnis Kunst 110.
PORTRAET DER TETRARCHENZEIT

Portraets. Dem eigensinnigen Mann, dessen sich verhaertende Alterszüge mit der naturalistischen Eindringlichkeit des republikanischen Stils geschildert sind, hat der Lebenskampf so viele Falten in die Lederhaut der Stirne eingegraben, dass sie sich nie mehr gelaufen werden. Sie verhaengen die Stirne wie eine dauernde Girlande. Und die plastisch herausragenden Augenbrauen, die zu der 'rauen' Oberflaeche hochoeren, sind wie ein Kelch des Leidens.

Aber impressionistische Kunst wie die des Dectus ist das nicht mehr. Statt jener fluktuerenden Gegensatze von Licht und Schatten im Gesicht, hat die Linie eine neue Macht gewonnen, die tiefen Schatten dort sind aufgehellt, der seelische Prozess spielt sich ganz im Lichten ab.

Und nun spielt das Auge eine ganz neue Rolle. Dort lag es tief. Hier liegt es ganz vorne. Dort spach es aengstlich in die Zukunft, was sie noch Schreckliches bringen mag. Hier weicht es der Gegenwart, ja ueberhaupt dem Beschauer aus und blickt nach oben.


12 Funfundzwanzig Jahre 42 ff.
erscheint zur Bestätigung dieser Behauptung am Archigallus im Gegensatz zum Zeitstil des flachen gepickten rauhen Haares eine Wiedergabe des Haares in kleinen präzis gearbeiteten kurzen Locken, die es ein paar Jahrhunderte lang nicht mehr gegeben hat, und die nur von

![Fig. 5.](image)
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Für den seelischen Gehalt aber des Diokletianporträts, für den in ihm dargestellten 'Prozess' gibt es die großartigste Parallele auf einem anderen diokletianischen Denkmal, nämlich auf dem Relief des von einem römischen Soldaten begleiteten Gefangenen auf dem Sockel eines Triumphbogens im Boboligarten in Florenz. Kaehler hat es in seiner aus-


LE PEINTRE D'ALTAMURA AU MUSÉE DE LYON

PLATES XXV-XXVII

Le Musée des Beaux-Arts de Lyon possède deux vases dus au Peintre d'Altamura, les Nos. 18 et 37 de la liste des Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters. En souvenir de la visite faite à Lyon en 1947, par Sir John Beazley, je voudrais publier ici ces documents en les accompagnant de quelques brèves observations.

**Cratère en calice.** Haut. : 0 m. 258. N° d'entrée : E 120 (acheté à Rollin et Feuardent en 1882 ; payé 800 fr.). — *ARV*, p. 413/18 (Pl. XXV, XXVI et fig. 1).

Vase reconstitué de plusieurs morceaux ; quelques repêts peu importants. Lignes noires en relief ; points et lignes brun clair, en particulier sur le chiton de Déméter. Rouge mat presque entièrement effacé pour représenter le bouquet d'épis de Triptolème, ainsi que les flammes de la torche de Déméter et de celle que la ménade tient de la main droite ; la torche qu’elle tient de la main gauche et la torche de Coré ne semblent pas avoir de flammes.

Intérieur et dessous des anses réservés. A l’intérieur du vase, vernis noir sauf une ligne réservée correspondant au ressaut placé à l’extérieur entre la guirlande de lierre et la zone à figures.

Autour de l'orifice, guirlande de lierre. Sur la face A, départ de Triptolème : le héros, couronné de myrte, est assis sur un trône roulant ailé ; il tient de la main gauche un sceptre et un bouquet d'épis ; de la droite il tend une phiale à Déméter. La déesse, vêtue d'un long chiton et portant sur les épaules une draperie retombante, tient d'une main une oenochoë, de l'autre une torche. Derrière Triptolème Coré, vêtue d'un chiton et d'un himation, porte aussi d'une main une oenochoë, de l'autre une torche. Sur la face B, satyre poursuivant une ménade : la ménade, vêtue d'un long chiton à repli et d'une peau de bête tachetée, tient une torche de chaque main ; le satyre porte un thyrse de la main droite et sur le bras gauche une peau de bête tachetée. Sur les côtés, au dessus des anses, ornement formé de palmettes et de rinceaux. Au dessous de la zone à figures, rangée d’oves. Au haut et autour du pied, un filet et deux bandes réservées.

**Stamnos.** Haut. : 0 m. 375. N° d'entrée : E 382 (acheté à Feuardent en 1897). — *ARV*, p. 414/37 (Pl. XXV, XXVII et fig. 2).

Quelques repêts peu importants. Noir tournant au brun sur la face A ; quelques lignes noires en relief sur la face B, en particulier pour les cordes des lyres ; brun clair pour les tresses des chevelures. Rouge mat très effacé pour les bandelettes offertes par les Nikés et la bandelette qui entoure la tête de la Niké de droite.

Intérieur et dessous des anses réservés. A l’intérieur du vase, vernis noir.

Autour de la lèvre, suite d’oves. Sur l’épaule, autour de l’attache du col, suite de petites languettes. Sur la face A, citharède couronné de myrte, portant une longue tunique à large bordure noire, monté sur une petite estrade et jouant de la cithare : il tient la cithare de la main gauche et le plectre de la main droite ; une longue écharpe pend de l’instrument. De part et d’autre, Niké ailée, vêtue du chiton et de l’himation, s’avancant en tenant une bandelette. Sur la face B, homme barbu, vêtu d’un himation et tenant un aulos, donnant ses instructions à quatre jeunes gens drapés qui portent chacun une lyre. De chaque côté des anses, protubérance saillante ; sur les côtés, au dessus et au dessous des anses, ornement formé de palmettes et de rinceaux. Au dessous de la zone à figures, méandre interrompu de place en place par un carré contenant un X. A la jonction de la parie et du pied et autour du pied, deux filets et une bande réservée.

Le premier de ces vases illustre des scènes mythologiques, le second, malgré les figures de Niké, des scènes de la vie réelle. Ils représentent donc les deux sources d’inspiration de l’imagerie céramique.

I

Sur le cratère la face principale évoque le départ de Triptolème. L’œuvre du Peintre d’Altamura, telle qu’elle est reconstituée par Beazley, compte cinq exemples de ce sujet (Nos. 1, 10, 11, 17, 18), celle du Peintre des Niobides en compte huit (Nos. 15, 22, 27, 28, 32, 43, 48, 65) ; ces nombres montrent la faveur dont jouit, chez ces deux artistes à peu près contemporains, le jeune prince éleusinien. J’ai essayé de retracer ailleurs l’évolution du thème de la mission.

---

de Triptolème en montrant comment, dans le second quart du VIe siècle, l'aspect mystique de la mission tendit progressivement à l'emporter sur son aspect agraire et 'culturel'. Ici Triptolème porte bien, associé au sceptre, un bouquet d'épis, mais l'attention est principalement appelée sur le geste de la phiale tendue, que va emplir Déméter. C'est au rite de l'absorption du kykéon, rite qui constituait sans doute l'essentiel de l'initiation préalable, que s'est avant tout intéressé l'imager.

Le revers du cratère est occupé par une scène plus simple : un satyre poursuivant une ménade. Ce sujet se retrouve également à plusieurs reprises dans l'œuvre du Peintre d'Altamura. Sur un cratère de Vienne la ménade, qui tient aussi une torche de chaque main, se retournait dans sa course avec le même mouvement, et la draperie se gonflait de la même manière, mais c'est un moment ultérieur de la poursuite qui est fixé, celui où le satyre a saisi la ménade par le bras et, agenouillé, essaie de la retenir. En revanche, le nu du satyre offre beaucoup de ressemblance dans les deux cratères de Vienne et de Lyon ; le grand dentelé, le contour de la cage thoracique, une des intersections aponevrotiques travers de l'abdomen sont notés avec une égale précision : on remarquera aussi l'affinité qu'offrent respectivement les têtes aussi bien des deux ménades que des deux satyres, surtout si on compare au satyre de Lyon non seulement le satyre représenté sur le revers du cratère de Vienne mais aussi le satyre musicien de sa face principale. D'ailleurs, l'analogue des deux vases ne se limite pas au dessin de certaines figures : elle s'étend à la conception d'ensemble ; sur tous deux la face principale présente un épisode mythologique à trois personnages (retour d'Héphaistos sur le vase de Vienne), le revers le même thème de la poursuite de la ménade avec deux personnages. C'est encore la même ordonnance que nous retrouvons sur le cratère en calice Gallatin.

La ménade et le satyre portent chacun une peau de panthère, accessoire qui appartient à l'accoutrement habituel du cortège dionysiaque, mais n'en ajoute pas moins à la scène une note pittoresque. La même dépouille tachetée de gros points noirs serrés est attribuée au Dionysos et la ménade de l'oenoché de Bologne, ainsi qu'à la ménade de l'amphore de Philadelphie.

La décoration du cratère de Lyon est complétée par des motifs végétaux autour de l'embouchure et sur les côtés, motifs dont les vases contemporains nous offrent aussi des exemples. La même guirlande de lierre se retrouve autour du col de l'amphore de Ménulas et d'Hélène et

---

4 CVA, Fogg Museum and Gallatin coll., pl. 56/2 ; ARV, p. 413/14.
5 Pellegrini, Vasi Felsini, p. 171 ; ARV, p. 415/51.
7 CVA, British Museum 3, pl. 6/2 (E 263) ; ARV, p. 416 (atelier du Peintre d'Altamura).
de plusieurs stamnôs d’Hermonax; mais, alors que, sur ces vases, la tige principale porte des feuilles de part et d’autre, elle n’en porte que d’un côté sur le cratère de Lyon, et les petites tiges intermédiaires n’y ont elles-mêmes ni feuilles ni baies; le motif est simplifié pour mieux s’adapter à la bande étroite qu’il est chargé d’orner. Quant au décor de palmettes placé au-dessus des anses, décor dont une caractéristique est d’être porté par une tige implantée entre les deux attaches de l’anse (fig. 1), des variantes nous en sont connues, dès la fin du style sévère, par le cratère Tyskiewicz du Musée de Boston. Dans l’oeuvre du Peintre d’Altamura ou de son groupe on en rapprochera particulièrement un autre cratère de Boston attribué au Peintre de Froehner; mais, sur le vase de Lyon, l’ornement est plus simple que sur ceux de Boston et ne comporte que deux, au lieu de trois ou quatre palmettes.

II

Les deux faces du stamnos sont consacrées à des scènes musicales. Sur la face A le citharède se tient debout sur la petite estrade en usage dans les compétitions de ce genre; la grande cithare, d’où pend la draperie destinée à envelopper les cordes, est appuyée contre son épaule, et il projette le plectre d’un geste vigoureux, comme s’il venait de conclure son morceau par un accord sonore. A cet accord final les deux Nikês répondent en se précipitant vers lui, soulevées d’enthousiasme, et en lui apportant les bandelettes du triomphateur. De ce couronnement du citharède l’oeuvre du Peintre d’Altamura nous offre au moins deux autres exemples: sur le col d’un cratère à volutes de Ferrare il se voit à peu près parallèle, la principale différence étant que le citharède n’est pas exhausté sur une estrade. Sur un cratère en calice de Leningrad le citharède, qui est un homme âgé, présente son instrument de face et à fin de jouer; en outre, des deux Nikês, qui accourent toujours de part et d’autre, l’une tient la bandelette, tandis qu’à aux mains de l’autre elle est remplacée par des phialae.

La forme donnée à la représentation: couronnement du citharède par deux Nikês, est probablement inspirée des convenances décoratives, désir de donner plus d’ampleur à la scène et goût des arrangements symétriques; elle n’est d’ailleurs pas particulière au Peintre d’Altamura: nous la retrouverons, par exemple, sur deux vases de Florence.

Le vêtement du citharède est caractéristique. Il ne se décomposera pas en deux pièces, comme on en a l’impression au premier abord; c’est une longue tunique, formée par une pièce d’étoffe dont les bords, marqués par une large bande noire, sont cousus sur les côtés en laissant une ouverture dans le haut pour donner passage aux bras. Ce costume est porté, sur le cratère à volutes de Ferrare, non seulement par le citharède du col mais encore par l’aûlêta du revers, avec cette variante que, dans le vêtement de l’aûlêta, les petits cercles sont remplacés par des losanges (il est impossible, d’après la reproduction, d’apprécier comment est orné le vêtement du citharède du col). Sur une oenochoé de Bologne, représentant l’armement de Dionysos et due, elle aussi, au Peintre d’Altamura, la ménade de gauche porte un habillement du même genre, complété par une peau de panthère. D’autres imagiers de la même période ont donné à leurs musiciens des costumes de forme analogue, mais comportant des façons différentes d’aménager le passage des bras, jusqu’à en faire, comme sur le cratère de Pandora au British Museum, une véritable manche longue. Nous avons affaire, dans ces divers cas, à

9 Jacobsthal, Ornamente, pl. 62; ARV, p. 18/5.
10 Jacobsthal, Ornamente, pl. 61 b; ARV, p. 47/2.
11 Aurigemma, Museo di Spina (1ère éd.), p. 151; ARV, p. 412/2.
12 C.-R. de Saint-Pétersbourg, atlas, 1875, pl. 5, fig. 4-5; ARV, p. 412/13.
13 Cratère à colonnettes attribué au Peintre de Leningrad: CV4/2, pl. 36/5 et 44/1; ARV, p. 174/26, et stamnos attribué au groupe de Polygnotos: CV4/2, pl. 48/6 et 56/3; ARV, p. 695/5.
14 Museo di Spina (2ème éd.), p. 133.
UNE SORTE DE COSTUME PROFESSIONNEL ADMETTANT DIVERSES VARIÉTÉS, MAIS DONC LA BANDE NOIRE VERTICALE RESTE UN ÉLÉMENT ESSENTIEL, UNE TENUE CORRESPONDANT À PEU PRÈS AU FRAC ACTUEL. LE PORT N'EN ÉTAIT CERTAINEMENT PAS OBLIGATOIRE, DU MOINS EN DEHORS DES CIRCONSTANCES OFFICIELLES, mais les musiciens aimeraient sans doute le revêtir non seulement pour paraître dans les compétitions publiques, mais encore pour exercer quotidiennement leur métier, lorsqu'ils dirigeaient un chœur de danse ou rythmaient les exercices athlétiques des jeunes gens. Plus anciennement, au VIème siècle, c'est la longue tunique blanche qui était portée dans les mêmes circonstances.

Le revers du stamnos illustre une répétition préparatoire à une exécution solennelle. Au milieu le maître, un homme adulte, paraît donner des explications à quatre jeunes gens ; de ceux-ci trois viennent de jouer ou sont sur le point d'attaquer leur morceau ; le quatrième se repose en écoutant. Le maître tient un aulos au moyen duquel il doit sans doute donner le ton et diriger sa petite troupe. Les cinq personnages, drapés dans leur himation, portent la tunique courte : c'est qu'il s'agit simplement d'exercices. Aussi les jeunes gens ont-ils pris des lyres, instrument plus maniable que la cithare, réservée pour la séance publique.

L'imagerie céramique a représenté à plusieurs reprises le thème de la leçon de musique, mais ce ne sont pas ici des enfants et nous ne sommes pas à l'école. Nous avons affaire à une séance d'entraînement dans laquelle les musiciens se préparent à une exécution d'ensemble. Les jeunes gens suivent attentivement les observations du maître et celui-ci, cessant de les guider avec l'aulos, leur fait sans doute étudier un passage dont, de la main comme de la voix, il rectifie ou nuance l'exécution. L'image n'est donc pas banale ; en nous montrant une répétition de musique d'ensemble, elle nous présente un aspect peu connu de la vie athénienne.

A ma connaissance l'image qui s'en rapproche le plus est celle d'une coupe de Bologne, appartenant à la même période, sur laquelle se voient des musiciennes, jouant les unes de l'aulos, les autres de la lyre ou du barbitos. A l'extérieur, sur l'une des faces, se trouve réuni un orchestre dont la composition est semblable à celle de l'orchestre du stamnos de Lyon : quatre femmes ont la lyre ou le barbitos, une l'aulos, et cette dernière paraît incontestablement diriger les autres. Une main tenant l'aulos, l'autre levée, elle donne des directives à ses...
compagnes, s’adressant à l’une d’elles avec une particulière vivacité. Nous avons là la contre-partie féminine de la scène de notre stamnos.

Comme pour le cratère, la paroi est occupée autour de l’anse par un ornement formé de palmettes (fig. 2). Un arrangement très voisin se retrouve sur le stamnos de Boston attribué à un artiste tout proche du Peintre d’Altamura, le Peintre de Blenheim.23 De part et d’autre des anses une protubérance allongée, placée dans l’axe du vase, rappelle certaines dispositions de la technique métallique. Ces mêmes demi-rouleaux en saillie se voient sur le stamnos du Peintre de Blenheim, et on les retrouve également, par exemple, sur des poteries de type semblable de Smiros et d’Hermonax.24

Les deux vases de Lyon sont de bons représentants de la manière du Peintre d’Altamura. L’art de ce peintre est un peu solennel, empreint, comme celui du Peintre des Niobides, d’une gravité exceptionnelle. Mais cet aspect austère, cette sévérité sont compensés par l’originalité et le soin avec lesquels sont élaborés et exécutés ses tableaux. Sur le cratère la scène du revers est banale, mais le départ de Triptolème appartient à cette imagerie religieuse qui transforme le caractère du thème en accentuant le rôle mystique du jeune héros. Sur le stamnos l’introduction de figures allégoriques dans une scène de la vie quotidienne d’une part, de l’autre le choix d’un épisode très spécial du travail musical relèvent l’attractif de sujets, en eux-mêmes assez communs. Comme le Peintre des Niobides, le Peintre d’Altamura s’intéresse au contenu des scènes qu’il illustre, tâche d’en faire ressortir la valeur poétique, en donne une interprétation à lui. Nous nous en rendons compte ailleurs par ses représentations de thèmes dionysiaques: le cratère en cloche et le cratère à volutes de Ferrare avec Zeus et le petit Dionysos,25 le cratère de Léninograd ou l’oenochoé de Bologne avec l’armement de Dionysos26 nous offrent des sujets rares, de conception personnelle. Sans être des créations du même ordre, les vases de Lyon n’en apportent pas moins un complément notable à notre connaissance du Peintre d’Altamura.27

Lyon, Décembre 1949.

CHARLES DUGAS.

23 Jacobsthal, Oramente, pl. 99 a; ARV, p. 417/4. Rapprocher aussi les stamnai du Peintre de l’enochoé de Yale: Jacobsthal, Oramente, pl. 98 a et 98 b; ARV, p. 329/7 et 328/1. L’ensemble du motif y est ordonné suivant le même principe.

24 Smiros: Jacobsthal, Oramente, pl. 92 a et 92 b; ARV, p. 20/3 et 20/1; Hermonax: Hoppin, Red-fig. Handbook, II, p. 21 et 25; ARV, p. 317/5 et 317/1.

25 Museo di Spina (tête éd.), p. 147 et 149; ARV, p. 414/b2; Museo di Spina (tête éd.), p. 151; ARV, p. 412/2.
26 C.R. de Saint-Pétersbourg, atlas, 1867, pl. 4-3; ARV, p. 413/12; — Vasi Felsinei, p. 171; ARV, p. 415/1.
27 Je remercie vivement M. le Professeur Jullian, conservateur du Musée des Beaux-Arts, d’avoir bien voulu mettre à ma disposition les photographies qui accompagnent cet article.
HUMFRY PAYNE'S DRAWINGS OF CORINTHIAN VASES

[PLATES XXVIII–XXX]

With Humfry Payne's photographs, now in the British School at Athens, are preserved a number of his drawings. Many of these are unpublished. A selection of them may form a useful supplement to those included in Nekrokorinthia and Protokorinthische Vasaenmalerei, and a suitable tribute to offer to Payne's friend and master. I am grateful to Mrs. Leonard Russell and to the Managing Committee of the British School at Athens for permission to publish these drawings.1

The notes on the vases are brief, because the drawings speak for themselves. I have added a few notes on the painters of some of the vases, and in doing so have drawn extensively on Payne's writings and notes, both published and unpublished. Most of the vases illustrated belong to the middle and third quarter of the seventh century, but I have added a few figures from later vases because of their human interest.

PLATE XXVIII, a. Aegina F 51a, from the harbour temple (so-called Temple of Aphrodite) at Aegina. Welter, *Aigina*, 37, fig. 35, top r. Conical oinochoe fr. Lion l. There was another frieze above. Very fine; pale green clay.2 MPC II; towards 650.

PLATE XXVIII, b. Aegina F 104, from the harbour temple. Conical oinochoe fr. Lion l.; in front, hind leg of another animal. MPC II.

These two fragments are by a painter a good deal of whose work can be put together. The nucleus is given in an unpublished note of Payne's:

1. Aryballos, London 94. 7–18. 2, from Eretria: VS, pl. 27. 2; NC, pl. 3. 1; PV, pl. 19. 2.
2. Aryballos, Boston 99. 511: Fairbanks, pl. 41, no. 399: VS, pl. 26. 4; PV, pl. 19. 4 and 6; Lane, Greek *Pottery*, pl. 23 b.
3. Aryballos, Berlin (chimaera).

1 and 2 were associated by Johansen, 3, 6–8 and one of 4–5 added by Payne (for the attribution of 6 see NC, ix). The oinochoe from Perachora provides the link between the Aegina fragments and the published aryballoi. The lion on 5 resembles those on the Perachora vase, particularly in its spotted muzzle, heart-shaped ear,3 and hairy legs. The aryballoi are later, less vigorous, more sophisticated. I have not seen the Berlin aryballos, which Payne calls late.

Lions and sphinxes are the painter's main stand-bys (the two kotyle fr. from Perachora, like 1, have confronted sphinxes). The lions are the more instructive. The double line on the cheek of the lions on 4 and 5 recurs on the lion of the Macmillan Vase (NC, pl. 1. 7 and fig. 73; PV, pl. 22. 5). For the characteristic palmette-snout on 1 and 4 see NC, 18, n. 2;4 it recurs on a fragment of olpe or oinochoe in Aegina (F 49; Welter, *Aigina*, 37, fig. 35, centre), and either this or 4 is mentioned by Payne in that note; cf. also the panthers on the Corfu pediment (Rodewald, *Korkyra II*, pl. 22–4) and the lion from Siphnos (*EA* 1937, 599 ff., figs. 1–2; Richter, *Archaic Greek Art*, fig. 62).

1 I am also indebted to the Director of the British School for help in the selection of the drawings, to Mr. G. H. Dealey and Dr. R. J. Hopper for photographs of some of the drawings, and to Mr. H. N. Newton, photographer to the Ashmolean Museum, for others; and to Messrs. I. Papadimitriou, J. L. Casky, the Trustees of the British Museum, P. Devambez, L. Bernabo-Brea for permission to publish the vases in Aegina, Corinth, London, Paris, and Syracuse.

2 I am further indebted to Dr. W. Kraiker for information about the Aegina sherds, which he will shortly publish, and for valuable discussion.

3 Details of fabric from Payne's notes.

4 Cf. E. Akurgal, *Späthethische Bildkunst* I, 39 ff. On p. 42 and n. 14 Akurgal points out that the form of ear on nos. 1 and 2 is a new, assyrianising feature not found at Corinth before these vases. Cf. ibid., 77.

5 Not known on Greek lions before this period; see Kunze, *Kretische Bronzereifiguren*, 186 ff. For Anatolian forerunners see Akurgal, op. cit., 54.
Kraiker has suggested to me that the fragment from Aegina just mentioned and another illustrated on the same photograph by Welter are the work of the same painter, comparing particularly the fine hairs on mane, tail, and legs of lions. These carry with them a number of other vases:

9. Oinochoe or olpe fr., Aegina F 49 +: Welter, *Aigina*, 37, fig. 35, bottom r. and centre (the smaller fragment joins the bottom right of the larger; the join has been made in Aegina Museum since the photograph published by Welter was taken).


Perhaps also


The grounds for the association of 10–14 will be made clear in the publication of the Perachora vases, that of 9 and 10 with 4 by Kraiker. The fourteen vases cover a considerable period of time, but the development of the painter's personality is not easy to follow, because he has a simple and a more elaborate style which are in use at the same time. The links in the chain seem, however, to hold when tested, though the whole body of the work here put together does not show a single coherent style. The latest is the splendid vase in Aegina (9) with priest leading a bull to sacrifice. This should be Late Protocorinthian, for it has many points of comparison with the vases of the Chigi group, and also introduces a stylisation for the eye-socket not otherwise found before the Transitional period. It has little in common with the much drier late aryballoi. 10 and 11, which go closely together and precede 9, are close to the Painter of Boston 397 (see M. Robertson, *BSA* XLIII, 58) and especially to his kotyle in Ithaca (*BSA* cit., pl. 14 and p. 17, fig. 8, no. 32) and aryballos from the Argive Heraeum (*AH* II, pl. 65, 3; *NC*, pl. 4, 6 and p. 10, fig. 5). The relation of the Painter of Boston 397 to the polychrome style has been established by Robertson.

If the comparisons just suggested are valid, we have here a younger associate of this painter who worked in black-figure, outline, and polychrome techniques. That he was a forward-looking artist is shown by the number of stylisations first seen in his work which become common only in the succeeding generation. His finest work is the jug in Aegina with a scene of sacrifice, whose association by Kraiker with the other Aegina fragments is the hinge by which the two groups of his work hang together. He may be called the Sacrifice Painter after this vase.

PLATE XXVIII, a. Aegina F 142, from the harbour temple. Conical oinochoe fr. Stag r. MPC II; towards 650. A fragment in Amsterdam (inv. 2082) is from the same vase; I illustrate it in Fig. 1, by the kindness of the Assistant Director of the Allard Pierson Museum.


PLATE XXVIII, e. Aegina G 31, from the harbour temple. Olpe or oinochoe fr. Boar r., panther l. Rather fine fabric; unpublished; pale ochre clay. TR.

---

8 Kraiker tells me of another fragment showing a naked boy and part of the altar.

9 See p. 68. Polychrome technique of the priest, and of a male figure on an unpublished fragment of 10, in the same paint as used for male flesh on the Chigi vase; lions on 9 comparable with those on the Chigi vase and on *NC*, no. 41 (*PV*, pl. 26, 2).

7 See *NC*, 29, no. 2, where Payne says that it is not known in the Protocorinthian period. It is made popular by the Sphinx Painter and the Palermo Painter.

5 Found in Aegina in a *pòros* near the temple of Aphrodite.

9 Details of fabric from Payne's notes.
HUMFRY PAYNE'S DRAWINGS OF CORINTHIAN VASES

PLATE XXVIII, f. Aegina. Oinochoe (?) fr. Boar l. For the 'collar' cf. the lions Pl. XXIX, f; NC, no. 41, pl. 8, 7 = PV, pl. 26, 2; and NC, 29, n. 2. MPC II: towards 650. Probably the same hand as an oinochoe and a kotelje from Perachora, both with large figures of animals (lions, bulls, boar) in very fine style.

PLATE XXVIII, g. Aegina F 113, from the harbour temple. Pyxis lid fr. Lion and sphinx r. MPC II.

Perhaps by the same hand as the pyxis lid, Aegina F 48 and Athens, NC, 273, no. 53, fig. 117; AM 1897, 324, figs. 39 a and b; and a kotelje-pyxis from Perachora, with a similar stylisation of the wrinkles round the lion's mouth. Cf. also the lion of Menekrates and the lion's head spout from Samos (Buschor, Altsamische Standbilder, figs. 213, 216–217; Richter, Archaic Greek Art, fig. 61). For the rendering of the lion's mane in separate locks cf. the earlier lion on the fragment from the Argive Heraeum, AH II, pl. 64, 3; NC, pl. 4, 5; conical oinochoe from Ithaca, JHS 1938, pl. 19; and the Chigi vase (with different stylisations). Cf. also the Crowe corselet (Olympia IV, pl. 49).

PLATE XXVIII, h. Fig. 2. London A 1006, from Camirus. Oinochoe. NC, 271, no. 35. LPC-TR. (Fig. 2 by the kindness of the Keeper of the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities, British Museum.)

This is, as Payne says, not among the best of Corinthian vases, but deserves attention for many reasons. First, the composition: there is an elaborately balanced avoidance of symmetry, the single frieze reading: lion r., bull l., lion l., panther r., goat r., goat l., panther r., bull l. The facing goats are the pivot of the composition, flanked by panthers, but one of the panthers turns its back on its goat; the bull facing it is answered on the other side by the group of two lions about a bull. This is the sort of composition favoured by the Sacrifice Painter, in his published aryballos (1 and 2 in the list on p. 63; for the avoidance of symmetry see NC, 90) and, more elaborately, in the two conical oinochoai from Perachora (5 and 11). This vase is not otherwise like the drawing of the Sacrifice Painter. It is associated, by the red and yellow tongues and scales and the red and yellow lines below the figure zone, with a group of oinochoai and opai put together by Payne (on NC, no. 32; see p. 69), but the drawing is not like the other members of this group either. The style is odd; the owl-eyed panther here illustrated has no close parallels known to me, the lion with a tuft of hair over his eye is also unusual.

PLATE XXIX, a. Corinth 14, 3, 5. Alabastron fr. This is the fragment mentioned by Payne, NC, 94–5, 269, and said to be in the style of the Macmillan aryballos. It may well be the Macmillan Painter—I take Johansen's nos. 50, 52, 55, and perhaps, as Greifenhagen suggests, the aryballos Bonn, inv. 1669, from Gela, AA 1936, 345–6, fig. 4, to be his work; the features of the archer and the long legs are like men on the Macmillan Vase and on VS pl. 32 and 34, 2. For the charge of a lion's head cf. the Louvre aryballos, VS pl. 35, 1 (perhaps by the Painter of Boston 397, as Robertson's comparisons suggest, rather than the Macmillan Painter; the features are more archaic than on any of the Macmillan Painter's vases). The bird on the shield of the man on the right resembles a pigeon rather than a bird of prey as on the Macmillan Vase, the Berlin aryballos VS pl. 32, and the aryballos VS, pl. 33, 34, 2, 35–1, but this can hardly be. For the archer in a hoplite battle cf. the aryballos from Perachora, BSA XLIII, 93, fig. 7, and VS, pl. 33. The archer's lion's skin might suggest, at first thought, Herakles, but this is unlikely, for the seventh-century Herakles does not otherwise wear the lion's skin, introduced into literature in the sixth century by Stesichorus or Piseander of Camirus, into vase-painting about the same time.

10 For the close relation of this to Protopotinian art cf. Sylvia Benton, BSA XL, 78.
11 For felines with vertically set eyes see BSA XLV, 194; none of the other instances is like this.
12 The tuft recalls the lion with the wart on his nose on the earliest Lydian coins (see E. G. Robinson, inf., p. 159 f.). I can find no closer parallel.
13 BSA XLIII, 98.
14 But not impossible; the hare on the shield of a falling warrior on the aryballos in Berlin, VS, pl. 32, is not a courageous animal. Cf. H. L. Lorimer, BSA XLIII, 85.
15 Athens, 510 f.; see Furtwängler, Roscher I, 2145; Bowra, Greek Lyric Poetry, 113; P. Zancani Montuori, "Vito di Eracle nell'arte arcaica", Rend. Linc. 1947, 211 ff.; Rumpf, Chalkidische Vasen, 143 f. On the Cypriot Herakles with lion's skin and club, see R. Dussaud, Syria XXV, 1946–8, 205 ff.; on the related question of the replacement of bow or sword by club as Herakles' usual weapon see P. Amandry, Mon. Piot XL, 40.
weapon the club, not the bow. Moreover the archer Herakles would not be in place in a battle piece, unless the story were that of the East Pediment at Aegina, and this story is rarely illustrated; Herakles as an archer appears commonly in more familiar stories, and particularly in the adventure with the centaurs on Mt. Pholoe. Further, other heroes wear animal skins; an example not far distant in time is Hippobatus on the Early Corinthian aryballos Athens 341, NC, pl. 13, p. 95, fig. 29 C. As in other vases of the Macmillan Painter and his associates, it is uncertain whether the painter put names to the figures in his mind. The presence of the archer, whose role had been reduced by the adoption of the hoplite phalanx to that of a humble skirmisher, makes it reasonably certain that, whether the heroes can be named or not, there is an epic flavour about the picture.

Plate XXIX, b. Aegina F 29, from harbour temple. Olpe fr. NC, 272, no. 40, given by Payne to the Chigi Painter. IPC. See below pp. 67 ff.

Plate XXIX, c. Louvre E 612 bis. Aryballos. NC, 304, no. 806. E-MC.

Plate XXIX, d. Delphi. Hydra fr. NC, 328, no. 1450; FD V, 157, fig. 653. Hermes; but hardly leading the way, as Payne suggests, unless he is walking l. and looking back over his shoulder, for he has his back to the l. edge of the panel. The legs in c of the illustration in FD, walking l., with the letters EF as part of the name, seem to belong to the l. edge of the panel on the other side.

By the Painter of the Brussels psykter NC, no. 1439 (Payne). LC; towards 550.

Plate XXIX, e. Palermo, from Selinus. Column-krater fr. NC, 318, no. 1194; MA XXXII, pl. 86, 7, whence Mon. Piot XL, 36, fig. 13. Herakles and the Hydra. For the subject see P. Amandry, Mon. Piot XL, 23 ff.; add to his list of Corinthian representations the krater fr. Bonn, from Naucratis, AA 1936, 361-2, fig. 16; kotyle fr., Athens, from Perachora. NC.

---

16 No example earlier than the cup by Epiktetos, ARE, 48, no. 39, is known to me.
17 See von Massow, AM 1916, 101 ff.; Luce AJA 1924, 296 ff.; Payne, NC, 129 f.; Buschor, AJA 1934, 128 ff.; for other early Centauramachies, some of which may illustrate the Phoibe story, see P. Demargne, BCH 1929, 117 ff.; C. Dugas, REG 1943, 5 ff. To the list of early representations in NC, 129, may be added four Corinthian vases: a fragmentary MPC II pyxis lid from Perachora, a TR alabastron in Florence, an EG aryballos in London, published in BMQ, 1935, pl. 34, and the EC column-krater Corinth VII, 1, pl. 38-9; and an Argive relief pithos, AH II, pl. 69, 1-3 (cf. Buschor, loc. cit.); and an Attic krater from Vasi, AA 1939, 287-8, fig. 1. Sixth century representations: Cretan clay reliefs in Oxford and Paris, Knoblauch, Studien zur archaisch-griechischen Tonbildnerei, 190, nos. 30-33.
18 See H. L. Lorimer, BSA XLII, 94 ff.
PLATE XXIX, f. Syracuse. Dinos fr. Scales; stag or goat l., stag l., lion r. NC, 273, no. 52 A. The drawing recalls at many points the oinochoe from Knossos, NC, no. 42; the bearing of the animals and the delicacy of the drawing are similar, but there are enough differences of detail to show that the vases are not by the same hand. But the Syracuse fr. is related to the Chigi Group, with which it shares some stylisations which become common only at a later period; see NC, 18, n. 2, on the lion’s side-whiskers, and the dots on the muzzle indicating whiskers; and note also that the incisions on the hindquarters and ribs are fuller than is common at this period, and the patches of red on the ribs are not otherwise known so early as this (see NC, 49, n. 1; 47, n. 1).19 LPC.

PLATE XXX, a. Berlin 3205, from Thebes. Conical oinochoe. NC, 272, no. 38. TR.
PLATE XXX, c. Corinth. Kotyle fr. Lion r., bull (?) l. NC, 279, no. 190. By the Perachora Painter, painter of a number of fragmentary kotylai and other vases from Perachora, ascribed to him by J. K. Brock and R. J. Hopper. TR.

PLATE XXX, b, d-h. Florence 3722 and 3725. Olpai. NC, 278, nos. 169 and 170. TR. No. g comes from 3722, e and f from 3725; I am not sure from which of the pair the other animals come.

These are worth illustrating because, though not the best of Transitional drawing, they are typical of a large class into which fall many painters of respectable ability. The starting point is given by a manuscript note of Payne’s on Florence 3725: ‘looks like painter of Syracuse b.b.o.’ (NC, no. 149). With the latter may be grouped (Achradina Painter, after the cemetery at Syracuse in which 1 was found):

1. B.b. oinochoe, Syracuse, from Syracuse: NS 1925, pl. 10; NC, no. 149, pl. 13. 3.
2. Oinochoe, Vatican 66: Albizzai, pl. 4; NC, no. 130, pl. 13. 4.
4. Pyxis lid, Corinth.

The first two are associated by Payne (NC, 277). The lion of 3 is like those on the Florence vases, though not from the same hand. 4 is near to 3.

These are poor relations of the Sphinx Painter: compare the sphinxes on NC, pl. 13. 3 with those on pl. 12. 2 and 6 (especially the former, which I believe to be early work of the Sphinx Painter; see BSA XLV, 194, n. 3); the lions on the Florence vases are more distantly related to the Sphinx Painter, but there is some likeness particularly in the way in which the incisions on flank and hindquarters are pulled forward by the movement of the beast. The lion on Pl. XXX, g has a clear descendant on Louvre E 436, NC, no. 763, pl. 25. 6; this stands in the same relation to the late work of the Sphinx Painter (compare NC, pl. 25. 6 with pl. 25. 2) as ours to his early and middle work.

It may be in place to add a note on the Chigi Painter, a propos of his Aegina fragment Pl. XXIX, b. Any light on the Chigi vase should be welcome, even if its main service is to see brush away some cobwebs. Payne’s dating of the Chigi vase soon after 650 has been a stumbling-block to many who cannot understand how such fine work should be earlier than many rather archaic-looking Corinthian vases.20 On another side, there are those who would like to dissociate it from Corinth and assign it to Aegina or somewhere in Italy because the inscriptions are not in the Corinthian alphabet (though these people have expressed themselves more often verbally than in print).21 Consideration of the development of Corinthian vase-painting should anchor it firmly in time and place. This should perhaps no longer be necessary, as the arguments are set out in Necrocorinthia, 95 ff.; but they can now be reinforced by the discoveries of the last twenty years.

---

19 But cf. the aryballos Louvre E 429, PF pl. 14. 1; FS, pl. 26. 1. This may be later than Payne allows, in dating it to the beginning of the second black-figure style. The panther looks more developed than is likely at this period, and has a descendant on the LPC oinochoe in London, NC, no. 32, pl. 10. 7-8 (cf. n. 35).
21 Miss L. H. Jeffery has expressed the opinion that the Chigi Painter might have learnt his letters at Troezon or Calauria.
The relation of the Chigi vase to earlier Corinthian vases, the development of the polychrome style from tentative beginnings in the first quarter of the seventh century to its climax in the Chigi vase, need not be repeated. The history of the polychrome style is fuller now than when *Necrocorinthia* was written, largely from Payne's own finds at Perachora, but is in no important point changed. But, as Payne says, 'the tradition which it represents was not destined to survive'; and it might be argued that the painter of the Chigi vase was an emigrant from Corinith, perhaps to Cumae or Etruria. The proof that he was as Corinthian as his predecessors the Macmillan Painter, Painter of the Berlin Centauromachy, and Painter of Boston 397 lies in the other vases of the Chigi Group.

The olpe is a new shape at Corinth in the Late Protocorinthian period. To the ten examples of this period listed in *Necrocorinthia* nine are added by Hopper; there are a few unimportant fragments from Perachora, and seven others are known to me, mainly from Payne's notes and photographs. Of these twenty-six, most belong to the Chigi group: for convenience I repeat a list of the vases of this group (1–2 and a–f, i, m, Payne; h–k, n–o, Robertson).

**Painter**

1. Olpe, Villa Giulia, from Veii: *NC*, no. 39; *PV*, pl. 27–9; Buschor, *Gr. Vasen* (1940), 31, fig. 37; detail, Lane, *Greek Pottery*, pl. 24 B.
2. Olpe fr., Aegina F 29: *NC*, no. 49; Pt. XXX, b.

**Group**

a. Olpe fr., Athens, from Argive Heraeum: *AH II*, pl. 64, 2; *NC*, no. 41, pl. 8, 7, 10; *PV*, pl. 26, 2, 3.

b. Olpe, Herakleion, from Knossos: *BSA* XXIX, pl. 25; *NC*, no. 42, pl. 6, 1–6; *PV*, pl. 32, 3, 7.

c. Olpe, Vatican 80, *NC*, no. 43; Albizziati, pl. 6; *PS*, 103, fig. 59.

d. Olpe, Berlin 1138, from Tarquinii, *NC*, no. 44.

e. Olpe, Rome, Villa Giulia: *NC*, no. 45; Mingazzini, *Vasi Castellani*, no. 338, pl. 21, 1, 10, 8.

f. Olpe, Rome, Villa Giulia: *NC*, no. 46; Mingazzini, *op. cit.*, no. 339, pl. 21, 3.

g. Olpe, Syracuse, from Syracuse grave 160: *NS* 1895, 124, fig. 6 (similar to f).

h. Olpe fr., London, from Al Mina, *JHS* 1940, pl. 4 k, m.

i. Olpe fr., London, from Al Mina, *JHS* 1940, pl. 4 l.


k. Olpe, Rome, Villa Giulia, from Veii: *NS* 1930, pl. 2 a and p. 58, fig. 9; *AA* 1930, 321, fig. 7, 1.

l. Olpe (or oinochoe) fr., Corinth: 'thighs of a man in Chigi technique; rosette on trunk; buff flesh';

m. Oinochoe fr., Ithaca, Aegina, *BSA* XLIII, 39, fig. 26, no. 146.

n. Oinochoe fr., Ithaca, Aegina, *BSA* XLIII, 39, fig. 26, no. 147.

See also the dinos in Syracuse, *NC*, no. 52 A, Pt. XXIX, 6 and p. 67 above.

The vases of the group are knitted together; b, c, k, as pointed out by Payne and Robertson, are associated by the white dots on the scales (cf. also Robertson's remarks on n and o); 1 is associated with c by the dots at the bottom of the panel; the technique of the griffon painted in white under the handle of 1 is used also on a and on the Chigi vase; d is, as Johansen pointed out, very like c except in the white dots. These similarities in technique indicate that the group is a close one, a workshop group, the work perhaps of one painter and an associate or associates. The Chigi vase might, taken by itself, be the work of a brilliant artist who had migrated to Italy. The proveniences of the vases of the group—Etruria, Corinth, Aegina, Argive Heraeum, Ithaca, Crete, Syria—compel us to reject this Italian hypothesis.

The remaining LPC olpai are varied. One is a late work by one of the best painters of the preceding period, the Hound Painter; another the work of one of the most prolific g and m above.

Other TR olpai not mentioned by Hopper:

Leiden, Brants, pl. XII, 8.

Aegina F 159 (near Sphinx Painter).

New York 96. 18. 38 (late TR; Sphinx Painter).

New York 96. 18. 41.

*Description from Payne's notes.*

22 See *NC* lx, 342.

23 *Corinth* VII, i, pl. 20–1, no. 142.
painters of the period, the Head-in-air Painter\textsuperscript{39}; the very fine fragments at Corinth\textsuperscript{31} are the work of a distinctive painter whose hand will no doubt be recognised elsewhere\textsuperscript{32}; others belong to a fairly large group of oinochoai and olpai in which several hands may be distinguished. This may be called the Group of Vatican 69 and is a workshop group in touch with the Chigi Group.\textsuperscript{33}

The great popularity of the olpe in the Transitional period\textsuperscript{34} shows that the potters of the Chigi Group and the Group of Vatican 69 were not out of the main line of development at Corinth, but found many followers, among whom are the men whose olpai the Sphinx Painter and the Painter of Vatican 73 decorated. There is not much direct connection between these popular painters and the Chigi Painter, but they took over a good many stylisations which he or his associates were the first to use.\textsuperscript{35} And at one point at least the relation is closer; the sphinxes of the Painter of Vatican 73 bear an obvious relationship to those of the olpe from Knossos, \textit{NC}, no. 42; cf. \textit{NC}, pl. 8, 5 with pl. 11, 1.\textsuperscript{36}

The selection of vases of the middle and third quarter of the seventh century offered here is almost a random choice. But it may serve to illustrate two points. The first is the close connection of Corinthian vase-painters of this time; there appear to have been a small number of workshops producing figured vases, which interacted on one another, and the fine style of the Chigi Vase is deeply embedded in the ordinary black-figure style of this and the preceding period. Secondly, many of the features which distinguish the Corinthian from the Proto-corinthian style are seen to derive from the Chigi Group and farther back, from the Sacrifice Painter. In particular, the Assyriasing details which Payne was the first to distinguish\textsuperscript{37} carry back behind the Chigi vase and the Macmillan Painter's aryballos in Berlin (\textit{VS}, pl. 32) to the Sacrifice Painter and other associates of the second black-figure style.

**Addendum**

Since this paper was written, Kraiker's publication of the vases in Aegina has appeared. I have not modified what I have said, as study of his work would require; but add here the references to his book:

Pl. XXVIII, a and b: Kraiker, \textit{Aigina}, pl. 27, 341.
Pl. XXVIII, c: Kraiker, \textit{Aigina}, pl. 28, 349.
Pl. XXVIII, d: Kraiker, \textit{Aigina}, pl. 35, 474.
Pl. XXVIII, e: Kraiker, \textit{Aigina}, pl. 31, 494.
Pl. XXIX, f: Kraiker, \textit{Aigina}, pl. 28, 349.

\textsuperscript{30} See M. Robertson, \textit{BSA} XLIII, 45.
\textsuperscript{31} Corinth VII, i, pl. 30, no. 218.
\textsuperscript{32} Perhaps by the same hand, a fr. of an olpe (?), Syracuse, from the Athenaion of Syracuse, MA XXV, 555-4, fig. 139.
\textsuperscript{33} Bottom centre.
\textsuperscript{34} To this group belong:
\textit{NC}, nos. 31, 47 and 48; no. 32 (perhaps by the same hand, the pyxis lid, Syracuse, \textit{NC}, no. 52 B); \textit{BSA} XLIV, pl. 17-19, from Siphnos; \textit{NC}, no. 33, and the oinochoe from Corinth, \textit{Corinth VII}, i, pl. 25, 186, associated by Weinberg; and the TR vases \textit{NC} nos. 156, 157, the Amsterdam fr., \textit{CVA} Schaarwerd II, pl. 7, 3-4, and perhaps, as Kahler suggests, Athens, Kerameikos, AA 1933, 278, fig. 12. An oinochoe from Perachora belongs to this group, and goes with \textit{NC}, no. 32. Other Perachora vases of different shapes are related to the group, but less closely. Cf. also above p. 65, on Ps. XXVIII, 5, \textit{NC}, no. 25.
\textsuperscript{35} The ancestor of the group is, I suspect, the painter of the aryballos Louvre E 429, \textit{VS}, pl. 26, 1; \textit{PV}, pl. 14, 1 (see n. 19). Its descendants are many; as well as the TR olpai already mentioned, grouped round Oxford 1879, 100 (\textit{NC}, no. 156), the Painter of Vatican 73 is, as Payne points out, derived from the Group of Vatican 69; the Sphinx Painter also, the other main painter of oinochoai and olpai at this period, is related, though less closely (of \textit{NC}, no. 157, Payne says in a manuscript note 'near Sphinx Painter, but earlier'). Another group of TR olpai, the Group of Vatican 78 (see Beazley in Beale and Magi, \textit{Raccolta Guglielmi}, I, 9, on pl. 1, 2) uses Chigi technique. Most TR olpai are thus descended from one or other of the main group of LPC olpai.
\textsuperscript{36} \textit{NC}, 277 ff.; \textit{BSA} XLIV, 241 ff.; see also nn. 24, 33, and \textit{BSA} XLIII, 45 ff. nos. 221-4 (Ithaca).
\textsuperscript{37} See \textit{NC} 16, 29, n. 2; for the 'Corinthian' rendering of the eye-socket see above p. 64.
\textsuperscript{38} Cf. \textit{NC}, 29, n. 1.
FOUR PASSAGES IN THUCYDIDES

There are four passages in Thucydides (two of them from the same chapter) which have certain features in common: they are all of them explicitly comments by the author himself, they are all demonstrably late, that is, written a good deal later than the events to which they are immediately related (three of them certainly, the other probably, after 404 B.C., and the last named at least not long before the end of the war), and they all show, to a greater or smaller degree, a discrepancy with the narrative of those events. They are ii 65.7, ii 65.11, iv 81.2–3, and vi 15.4.\(^1\) The discrepancies are such that they compel, in my view, the conclusion that they were written at times different from the related narratives; this leads us to the problem of the composition of the History, a problem which has given rise to a mass of controversy, most of it barren to the last degree, but which cannot on that account be ignored. Mme de Romilly in her recent book has adequately defined the problem and described the controversy,\(^2\) and as well contributed most to its understanding; as she says, it is not so much a question of when passages were written, as when they were thought.\(^3\) But I have not seen it observed that these four passages form a group, by reason of their common features; and, because of these features, two of which are certain and the third (the discrepancy with the related narrative), as I hope to show, demonstrable, they should form a somewhat surer foundation for any theory about the composition of Thucydides’ work. If the discrepancy be there, then, since the comments are late, the narrative must be early, relatively early. All four passages, it may be noted in passing, have this also in common, that they are comment on the effect of prominent individuals on the course of the war (Perikles, Brasidas, Alkibiades); and all are anticipatory in the sense that, where they now stand in the History, they point forward to future events.

Three of these passages (the two from ii 65 and vi 15.4) also suggest a discussion of a very different kind of problem: whom, if any one, did Thucydides regard as Perikles’ political heir? No one, of course, inherited his unique combination of character and intellect; but who, according to Thucydides, endeavoured to follow most closely his imperial and military policy? This problem I discuss after the other.

A. Composition

1. (ii 65.6–10). ‘Perikles’ foresight, in relation to the war, was seen even more clearly after his death. His view was that they would win if they would but keep quiet,\(^4\) look after the navy, and not try to add to their empire during the war and thereby risk the safety of the state. οἱ δὲ ταῦτα τις πάντα ἐστὶν τοῦ Ἑλλήνων ἐπίστασον καὶ ἄλλα ἐξω τοῦ πολέμου δικοῦντα εἶναι κατὰ τὸν στόχον τῆς διάκης καὶ τῆς καρδίας τῶν σωτηρίων ἐποίησις, καὶ τοῖς τοῦ Ἑλλήνων ἐποίησις καὶ ὁ πολέμῳ μελετᾶται τοῦ τῶν πολέμων βλαβης καθάρσεως. The reason was that he alone, by the authority which he wielded through his singular qualities of character and intellect, was able to guide his fellow-countrymen along a path of consistent policy; his successors were more on a level with each other in degree of influence with the masses, and in consequence vote-catching measures, dictated by shortsighted personal ambitions, took the place of a consistent policy.\(^5\)

\(^1\) For iv 108.4, which is closely linked with iv 81.2–3, see below, p. 73. The date to which vi 15.4 refers has in fact been disputed: see below, p. 74, n. 10.


\(^3\) Pp. 166–7.

\(^4\) οὐκ ἔσται τις ἐποίησις, τις τοῦτον ἐποίησις, τίς τοῦτον ἐποίησις, τίς τοῦτον ἐποίησις, τίς τοῦτον ἐποίησις, τίς τοῦτον ἐποίησις, τίς τοῦτον ἐποίησις.

\(^5\) The implication, or one implication, is that in spite of the shortcomings of Kleon, Nikias, Alkibiades, and the rest, it would at least have been better for Athens if any one of them had been influential enough to dominate policy for a length of time. Kleon was not a wise man, but his continued leadership might have been an improvement on alternating policies of Kleon and Nikias.
FOUR PASSAGES IN THUCYDIDES

Επροσαφενις is a sweeping statement, and it is a pity that Thucydidès was not more precise; except the Sicilian expedition mentioned in § 11, he does not further define what subsequent action was so contrary to Perikles' policy or foreign to the purposes of the war. Arnold cites the sending of a squadron to Crete in 429 (ii 85.5-6: which was doubtless a blunder, and a characteristic one, but a trifle, without serious consequences), the expeditions to Sicily in 426, which wasted Athenian energies and helped to unite the Sikeliotis against them (but could not be described as disastrous); 'the iniquitous attack on Melos' (which was, strictly speaking, made in peace-time, and was at least in accord with Perikles' policy of dominating the sea—I suspect that Arnold's moral indignation at other countries' imperialism came into play here), and perhaps the campaign of Delion and the despatch of νῆς ἄργυρολογίω (ii 69, iii 19: this last I am sure is not in the picture; Arnold confuses failures with principles). Most editors of Thucydidès are content to follow this; most historians think mainly of the great expedition of 415-3. I would myself add, 'certainly Delion, and probably also Demosthenes' campaigns in Akarnania (though this is consistent with the policy of 431 B.C.—ii 90) and Aitolia, and Alkibiades in the Peloponnesse in 418'; for these look like examples of fighting that brought loss to the state in failure and gain to the individual in success. All these together are, however, far from justifying the wholesale condemnation of Perikles' successors: most of the major campaigns of the Archidamian war were strictly in accord with his policy—Phormion's successful battles, the war against Mytilene, the refusal to send more help to gallant Plataia (this is often misunderstood: if Athens could not risk her hoplite force in defence of her own land, how could she risk it in an inevitably vain attempt to rescue Plataia?), the intervention in Keryra, Pylos and Kythera, and the Epidauros and Amphipolis campaigns. I feel sure that the historians are right who say that Thucydidès has here the Sicilian expedition of 415-3, and perhaps the Mantinea campaign too, most in mind.

But Arnold's instinct was sound: Thucydidès ought to have been thinking of the Archidamian war. For it is the calamitous consequences of Perikles' death which he is describing; Perikles was 65 or more when he died, and could not have been expected to guide Athenian policy for longer than the Archidamian war in fact lasted. By and large, in spite of Aitolia and Delion, his strategy continued to prevail (his strategy, whatever Athens suffered by the loss of his commanding moral force); and by and large, in spite of defeats and misfortunes, Athens won that defensive war—her empire was nearly intact, and her enemies were weaker and much more divided among themselves than they had been ten years earlier. Thucydidès has, after 404, telescoped the events of the war; the Sicilian expedition and the subsequent fighting loomed then so large, and the former was so obviously and so grandly a departure from Perikles' policy (he would have agreed with Nikias in this at least, that Amphipolis should first be recovered), that the length and scope of the Archidamian war is almost forgotten.

But he has not done this in the narrative of the events of that war; they are given their proper weight, told in their appropriate detail. There is a discrepancy between ii 65.6-10 and the narrative of the events to which they should refer; the comment or summing-up, and the narrative were not thought at the same time, nor written. And since the former is late, after 404, it is reasonable to suppose that the narrative is relatively early, though not necessarily left unchanged.}

* E.g., such comments as iv 12.3 may have been inserted later. I do not forget either that if 65.7 repeats the advice attributed to Perikles in i 141.1, and that Perikles (in my view) certainly gave that advice, nearly 30 years before this comment was written. I am not here attempting the whole problem of the composition of the History; but I may draw attention to this also—the contrast between the cautious, almost Nikian tone of 65.7 and the magniloquence and adventurous spirit of the last words given to Perikles, 63-64: 'action and yet more action, and we gain a glorious name even if we fail'. I do not, that is, feel that we can be content to say with Mme de Romilly, p. 130-1: l'élêoge (ii 65.5-12) et le discours (ii 60-64) forment un tout parfaitement cohérent; l'élêoge est la conclusion normale du discours, et le discours lui même se présente, comme nous l'avons vu, sous la forme d'un tout parfaitement cohérent. I am not clear what Mme de Romilly means when she says (p. 275): 'quand, à propos de l'issue de la guerre, il oppose Périclès à ses successeurs, ce n'est pas sur son attitude en matière de politique extérieure qu'il insiste, mais uniquement sur ses rapports avec le peuple'; which seems to ignore the sentence ισόν ἀλλήλους τις... ἐπὶ μετανόησιν. She adds in a footnote: 'd'une façon générale, de même que la sagesse grecque repose essentiellement sur l'opposition de la raison aux passions, l'action du bon chef dans une démocratie est considérée comme avant tout négative et modératrice.' But cc. 63-64, and the Epitaphios, should cause a considerable modification of this: so indeed should οἱ σωλήναι τῶν ἐπιταφίων, to which we may add Phormion's words, ii 89 and 90.
2. (ii 65.11). ἐξ ὧν ἄλλα τε πολλά ... ἡμαρτήθη καὶ ὅ ἐγεῖ Σικελίαν πλοῦς, ὅς οὐ τοσοῦτον γυνώμης ἀμάρτημα ἤν πρὸς οὓς ἐπῆφαν, ὅσον οἱ ἐκπέμποντες οὐ τὰ πρῶταφερα τοῖς οὐχομένοις ἐπιτιγνύσκοντες, ἄλλα κατὰ τῶν ἱστιῶν διαβολάς περὶ τῆς τοῦ δήμου προσωστίας τά τε ἐν τῷ στρατοπεδίῳ ἀμβλύτερα ἐπιτίθενται καὶ τὰ πέρι τὴν πόλιν πρῶτον ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ἐπαράχθησαν. Again we wish that Thucydides had been more precise about ἄλλα πολλά; but here the main interest is in his judgement about the military chances of the expedition. The judgement is interesting, partly because it is hardly consistent with the opening words of book vi (ἅπαξ ἔστω τίνα τοῦ μεγάλου τῆς νίκης καὶ τῶν ἐνοικούσων τοῦ πλῆθους, κ.τ.λ.)—at least the two sentences were not written at the same time; for it was this multitude, οἱ πολλοὶ, who voted the adequate forces for the expedition—though it recalls vi 31.6, καὶ ὁ στόλος οὐχ ἔσον τόλμη τε θάμβει καὶ ὄμοιοι λαμπρότητι περιβόητος ἐγένετο ὁ στρατός πρὸς οὓς ἐπῆφαν ὑπερβολὴ. But the main interest is this, that Thucydides believed that the expedition might well have succeeded, and we, as we read his narrative, cannot but agree with him, but not for the reasons which he gives in ii 65.11; they are not borne out by his narrative. The ἰστία διαβολάζω will include the successful efforts of his political rivals to get rid of Alkibiades, as narrated in their place (vi 29, 53, 60—61); but no reader of books vi and vii alone would suppose that this was decisive of the fate of the expedition. Like his fellow-countrymen in general, at least from time to time, Alkibiades in 415 thought nothing impossible for him; but he was to win his way by personal charm, so he preferred to waste the time and resources of the great armada by a display. That Thucydides himself could not have thought much of his strategy in 415 is shown by his remark in viii 86.4 (411 B.C.), καὶ δικαίως Ἀλκιβιαδὸς πρῶτον τότε καὶ οὖν ἔδωκεν πώς πολέμησοι (we must read πρῶτον with B and not πρῶτος of the remaining MSS.), when Alkibiades had learnt by his experiences in Sparta and in Persia that there was a limit to the usefulness of personal charm. Doubtless also there was danger of dissatisfaction and disunity among the troops when he was recalled (vi 61.5); but Thucydides' narrative does not suggest that it was serious, that τὰ ἐν τῷ στρατοπεδίῳ ἀμβλύτερα ἐγένετο. And of the second and equally important argument here used, that the politicians at home did not support the army in Sicily (with supplies or reinforcements, or both), there is no trace in the narrative. On the contrary, the original expedition was splendidly adequate to its object; and when the unfortunate Nikias unexpectedly asked for large reinforcements—made necessary mainly by his own weakness in command—the Athenians at home do everything, or almost everything, possible to meet his wishes (vii 16—17, 42.2).

This is not to say that Thucydides' judgement in ii 65.11 contradicts his narrative in vi—vii (it may only supplement it), still less that it is wrong; only that judgement and narrative were not written at the same time, in the same breath as it were, both in the mind of the writer all the time. The judgement is late; and the narrative presumably earlier.

3. (iv 81.3). 'Brasidas by his vigorous campaign in the north at once won many cities, which gave Sparta some bargaining power in the event of peace negotiations; and besides, by his upright and moderate conduct, caused many of the allies of Athens at a later date, after the Syracusan expedition, to turn towards Sparta. πρῶτος γὰρ ἔξελθοι καὶ δόξας εἶναι κατὰ πάντα ἄγαθος ἐλπίδα ἐγκατέλιπε βέβαιον ὡς καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι τοιοῦτοι εἶσον.' First, a word about the proper translation of this sentence. We must, in my opinion, take πρῶτος with ἔξελθοι only, not with ἔξελθοι καὶ δόξας ... ἄγαθος, as some editors prefer ('the first Spartan who made a good reputation abroad'). It is the only translation which is logical: it was because 'the first Spartan seen abroad' was Brasidas, so admirable a man, that men thought that all others would be like him; had he been the third or fourth, and the only good one among them, he would have raised no such hopes. πρῶτος is paralleled by τὸ πρῶτον Λακεδαιμονίων ὀργῶντων, 108.6.'

7 There is a difficulty here. The phrase should mean, 'Sparta was in a state of excitement, or enthusiasm, or eagerness', ὑπελθὼν being a vigorous word, and in this sense not common in prose. The statement would be remarkable enough in any event, of a people not prone to excite-ment (i 84.3, 85.1), and is now immediately contradicted by § 7, which tells us that, from various motives, Sparta was not at all enthusiastic for Brasidas to proceed further. (We cannot, with Classen, take ἐξελθὼν to mean, 'it was to be expected that they would find Sparta enthusiastic', an
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Yet the statement, thus interpreted, is not true and not consistent with Thucyrides' narrative. ‘Aliter quondam Pausanias’ (i 130), says Stahl in his note here; but, what is much more significant, aliter, only three years before, Alkidas (not to mention Knemos and Menedaios); especially iii 32.2, Σαμών... πρέσβεις ἔλεγον οὐ καλῶς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἐλευθεροῦν αὐτὸν. (Cf. iv 108.2, Βρασίδας... πανταχοῦ ἐξῆλθον ὡσ ἐλευθεροῦσα τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἐκτείνοντες.) Brasidas really was the third or fourth Spartan seen abroad. But he was the first to be seen by the cities of Thrace; and it was from there that his reputation spread. It is extremely interesting that Alkidas was forgotten both by Thucyrides and by the Greeks of Asia Minor; but this passage was written late in the war, or after its close, and Thucydes has telescoped the course of events; not unnaturally, for the influence of Brasidas' character and achievements was so great that the conduct of his predecessors became unimportant by comparison; and forgotten, and even that of some of his successors ignored, by the cities who were to be liberated by Sparta.  

C. 108 of the same book nearly repeats the thought of c. 81; but its analysis is rather more difficult, for §§ 1–3 and 5–7 fit in easily with the current narrative (except perhaps τὸ πρῶτον ὄργανον in § 6), and only § 4 is demonstrably late (ἀνεφεύρετο μὲν τῆς Ἀθηναίων δυνάμεως ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ὅση ὑπερήφανη, which must refer to the Ionian war); though, if our doubts had not been aroused by other passages, we should not at once believe that § 4 was later inserted. It is like iv 12.3: if the narrative there is comparatively early, that is, composed not long after the events—say, not later than 418 or 417—the comment, ἐπὶ πολλὸν γὰρ ἐποίη αὐτῷ τῆς δόξης ἐν τῷ τότε τοῖς μὲν ἡμερώτατοι μάλιστα ἐνοί, κ.τ.λ., was probably inserted later: which we should not immediately suspect. Besides, 108.2–6 is comment in its natural place, after the narrative of two signal instances of Brasidas' skill as a diplomatist (ἐφολκά καὶ οὐ τὰ διὰ λέγοντος: ‘he was a good speaker, for a Spartan’) and of his personal πράξεις and μεταβολῆς; whereas 81.2–3 is wholly anticipatory, and in this respect also like much of ii 65.5–13 and vi 15.4. This shows that the problem of the composition of the History is not a simple one; I am far from thinking that it is, and I am not attempting to solve it here, only pointing to a neglected piece of evidence. I may add, though, that in i 77.6, the passage in the speech of the Athenians at Sparta which is so generally pointed at as a prophecy after the event (the Spartan empire after 404), the last sentence, ἀλλὰ γὰρ τά τε καθ’ οἱς αὐτοῦ νόμιμα τοῖς ἄλλοις ἔχει καὶ προσέτι εἰς ἐκατότητα ἡμείων ὕπτει τούτων χρήσται 009' οἱ ἡ ἀληθῆ Ἑλλάδος νοεῖται, was proved singularly untrue by Brasidas; and so must have been written before 424’?  

4. (vi 15.3–4). ‘Alkibiades' extravagances were more than his resources could cope with; ὅπερ καθεξής ὑπὲρ ἱκανόν τῆς Ἀθηναίων τόλμην οὐχ ἠκόμα. For the majority of Athenians, frightened both of his licentious and lawless private life and of the ambitions which inspired his every public action, thought of him as aiming at tyranny, and declared war on him, καὶ ἡμοὶ κράτιστα διαδόσας τῶν πολεμίων, ἰδίᾳ ἐκείνοι τοῖς εἰπτεροείμαιναι αὐτοῦ ὀθεδεδνείτο, ... οἰς ἄλλοις ἐπιτείματος οὐ δια μακροῦ ἐξημνήν τὴν τόλμην.’  

There is much the same relationship between this passage and later ones (vi 53, 60–61) as there is between iv 81 and 108: that is, the description of Alkibiades and his position among his fellow citizens, is divided between the two passages, and in the first nothing has yet been related by Thucydides to justify such phrases as τῆς ἐκ τοῦ ἐκστατοῦ σώμα παρανομίας ἐκ τῆς διάταξαν καὶ περιενόμενα ἐπιθεμοῦσά, whereas the second comes after the accusations in connexion with the mutilation of the hermai and the mysteries.  

(expectation shown to be disappointed in § 7.) What we want is Ἀλκιβιάδων, Λακεδαιμονίων, 'their first experience of Lacedaemonians in a state of enthusiasm'; for this might well be said of Brasidas and his men. In 413, after the Athenian defeat in Sicily, Sparta is described as confident (ἐφθαρμένοι), even optimistic (ἀνατρικόμενοι); but it is the subject cities of Athens, Ionians and islanders and what not, who were ready καὶ παρὰ δύο ὀνόματα ἐφιστασαί διὰ τὸ δραγιτέρτις κρίσις τὰ πράγματα (viii 2.2–4: note that καθεξής παντὶ πρώτῳ ἐποίησε ἡμεῖς, said of the same cities in iv 108.6, is closely paralleled in viii 2.2).  

8 Ullrich points out in a different context, that writers of the first half of the fourth century (Lysias and others) tend to forget the Archidamian war altogether, so great was the impression made by the 'Dekeleian' and 'Ionian' wars: Beltrage (1846), 9–13. We are not in such danger; for we did not live through the terrible last years, and we have Thucydides' narrative and Aristophanes to prevent it.  

9 So iv 74.4, on the constitution of Megara, with de Romilly's note, p. 163, n. 3, and her general conclusion about bk. iv, p. 165.
There is not here the same degree or kind of discrepancy as in the other passages I have discussed, and what there is to say has partly already been said in the discussion of ii 65.11. The ‘war’ between Alkibiades and Athens, which was ultimately due to their well-justified suspicions of his general conduct and ultimate aims, and which was no small factor in the final defeat of Athens, began indeed in 415, but after the ‘peace’ of 411 only reached its decisive phase in 407; and it is this phase to which Thucydides is here referring in the words καθελευ ὑστερον and οὐ διὰ μοιρεπος ἐσφάλη τὴν πολέμον. To judge from Thucydides’ own narrative, though Alkibiades played a big part in the decision to send the expedition against Sicily and in arousing the enthusiasm at its prospects which prevailed in all classes at Athens, neither his appointment as one of the three strategoi nor his recall was decisive of its outcome. Doubtless he would have proved a better commander than Nikias; since Nikias came so near to success, he might have achieved it (though the capture of Syracuse might have proved in the end no more fruitful in the way Athenians wished, than the capture of Athens by Xerxes had proved to be for Persia—cf. Nikias’ argument, vi 11.1); had he failed, he would certainly have done something with his forces, though perhaps he would equally have lacked the moral courage to lead them back to Athens (he might have tried to found a colony in Sardinia or Spain). But this is not present to our mind as we read books vi and vii, while Thucydides, writing after 404, has again telescoped events, and can say of Alkibiades κρατισσα διεβάη τα του πολέμου, which is true enough of his actions between his return in 411 and his second exile (again self-imposed) in 407, but which has no relevance to his conduct of affairs in 415 which is the immediate context. vi 15.3–4 (from ὥστερ καὶ καθελευ ὑστερον) was ‘thought’ at a different time from the general narrative of the Sicilian expedition.

There is a fifth passage, ii 8.4–5 (the enthusiasm for Sparta and the hostility to Athens shown by Greece generally in 431, including the subject allies of Athens), which bears a resemblance to these four; for it is not confirmed, especially the account of the feelings of the subject allies is not confirmed, by the narrative of the Archidamian war. On the contrary, in Chalkidike even the successful revolt of some states did not lead to a general secession, and even Brasidas did not find Akanthos, Amphipolis, or Torone enthusiastic, and the immediate hopes after the capture of Amphipolis (iv 108.3) were not fulfilled. But the resemblance is not close: the passage is not demonstrably late, and it may mean that an early enthusiasm was soon dissipated—that is, that the passage was written very early and was left as it stood. And a discussion of it would inevitably involve a discussion of the quite different problem of the composition of the first twenty chapters of book ii (e.g., did Thucydides at one time intend to treat the invasion of Attica, or the attack on Oinoe, as the first act of the war—12.3.19.1—and the Theban attack on Platea as one of the ἀνίκητα καὶ διαφόρα), with which I am not here directly concerned.

B. PERIKLES’ POLITICAL HEIRS

In connexion especially with the first two of the above passages I wish to discuss, very briefly, the question: who, in Thucydides’ view, if anyone, is to be regarded as the heir of Perikles’ strategic and imperial policy? I would make one or two things clear to begin with. First, that I am trying only to elucidate Thucydides’ own views; for Müller-Strübing, for example, in claiming that Kleon alone could be regarded as Perikles’ political heir, was correcting Thucydides. (I may leave untouched the question whether the speeches in the History are more or less close records of arguments actually used or are the historian’s own free compositions; for in the former case the arguments are selected by Thucydides to illustrate what he thought to be the truth, in the latter they presumably state it.) Secondly, we must

---

10 Schwartz, Geschichtswerk. 332–3, thought that the historian meant the disaster in Sicily. He was answered in part by Schadewaldt, Geschichtsreihung. 12–14, and altogether by Wilamowitz quoted by Schadewaldt at the end of his book.

11 It is perhaps worth noting that the spontaneous secession of so many allies from Athens, after 413, is not considered in ii 65.11 as an important factor in the Athenian defeat.

12 This section was written before I had seen Ehrenberg’s interesting article on polybribagynne in J.H.S. lxvi, with which it has obvious points of contact.
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distinguish between what Thucydidis regarded as policy in line with that of Perikles (after Perikles’ death) and what he approved of; for West, in championing the claims of Nikias, and Mme de Romilly, as it seems to me, confuse what may be two different things.14 Thirdly, we must distinguish between Perikles’ war-time strategy, in the strict sense, and his imperial aims.

For Perikles, according to Thucydidis, combined two markedly contrasted qualities: on the one hand, great (some have thought excessive) caution as a military commander and general prudence as a political leader (μετρίος ἔξηγετο, ii 65.5), and on the other an adventurous, almost a romantic spirit in his imperial aims.15 It is customary to assert that not only did Thucydidis write the epitaphios and Perikles’ last speech after 404, but that he wrote them with express reference to the final defeat, as a defence of Perikles to his despairing and incredulous fellow citizens. But of which Perikles—the prudent strategist, as in ii 65, or the adventurous imperialist? Many labours, πόνοι, were the lot of our fathers who won the empire; and we must not relax (ii 36.2, 62.3, 63.1). Honour is our reward; we have already won imperishable glory (41.4, 43.3–4, 63.1, 64.3). Everything human must perish, and our empire will one day end; but our name is immortal; and we need no Homer to sing our praises, our deeds speak for themselves.’ That is the touch of romance: ‘our activities, as citizens of Athens, are their own reward, are worth while in themselves;’ as also in μόνοι οὐ τοῦ ἐμφύλωνα μᾶλλον λογισμὸν ή τῆς ἐλευθερίας τῷ πιστῷ άδεως τινα ὄρμενον (40.5, just after, in another context, he has greatly praised λογισμόν). Daring, τολμὴ, is the spirit which informs this activity (40.3, 41.4, 43.1, 62.5); other writers give us something of it too—

Κήρυξ. ή πάσιν οὖν σ’ ἐξουσίας ἐξαρκείη παττὴρ; Θησεύς. δίσοι γ’ ὑφρατάτα χρηστά δ’ οὐ κολάζομεν. K. πράσσειν σὺ πόλλα ἐκών ἢ τε στὶ πόλις. Θ. τοιχάρ πολυνόσα πολλά πόλλ’ εὐδαιμονεῖ.

(Eur. Suppl. 574–7: πόλλ’ εὐδαιμονεῖ εἰσπράσσεται. This was long ago remarked by Murray, Athenian Drama, iii, Euripides, pp. xxviii–xxxi); and Thucydidis tells us how the rivals of Athens regarded it (i 70). Does all this belong to the spirit of 404? Can it only have been written in the shadow of Aigospotamoi and the rule of the Thirty? Those who believe that the whole of the History was written after 404, more or less continuously, explain such phrases as Ποιεῖται, οἱ υἱοί υἱόν τοῦ λόβου τῆς Παλλήνης (i 56.2: they did not after 430–29, ii 70) and τὴν ἡγέσιν . . . ήν νόμισμα τ’ ὅρμων τοῦ Ἀθηναίων ὑπῆρκο. (ii 23.3: they ceased to be subject to Athens in 412–1, viii 60.1), as Patzer did, by arguing that it was Thucydidis’ ‘habit (itself the result of his intensity of mind) to confine himself rather strictly to what he is describing at the moment’:16 an unsatisfactory argument because as often he breaks his rule (κρήνη γαρ οὖν ἥσαν αὐτόθι, ii 48.2: ἐπὶ πολλῷ γὰρ ἐποίη, κ.τ.λ., iv 12.3; Αλυσίνθην, οἱ τότε Ἀλυσίων ἔχον, vii 57.2; cf. ii 31.3, μέχρι οὐ Νίσσας ἐδέων ὑπ’ Ἀθηναίων, which looks forward seven years to iv 66–69, and iv 74.4, the lasting effects of the revolution in Megara). But if it is true, it was only by a miracle of self-projection into the spirit of the past, the lost spirit of 431 B.C., of ‘confining himself strictly to what he was describing at the moment’, that Thucydidis could have composed, soon after 404, the speeches of Perikles. That is to say, we have in any event, in these speeches, the thought of the past, if Thucydidis is reliving it, only modified by the fact that a man of 60, not of 30, is writing it; and Finley’s

14 A. B. West, Class. Phil. xix (1924), 124–146, 201–228; de Romilly, pp. 156–6, 173, 180, al.
15 So de Romilly, pp. 124–5; but my thoughts run in a different direction. She writes: ‘εὐπέρας ἀθεναίης, πέλεκυν τὸν ἀκροατήρα νυκτὸς, κ.τ.λ., iv 12.3; Αλυσίνθην, οἱ τότε Ἀλυσίων ἔχον, vii 57.2; cf. ii 33.1, μέχρι οὐ Νίσσας ἐδέων ὑπ’ Ἀθηναίων, which looks forward seven years to iv 66–69, and iv 74.4, the lasting effects of the revolution in Megara). But if it is true, it was only by a miracle of self-projection into the spirit of the past, the lost spirit of 431 B.C., of ‘confining himself strictly to what he was describing at the moment’, that Thucydidis could have composed, soon after 404, the speeches of Perikles. That is to say, we have in any event, in these speeches, the thought of the past, if Thucydidis is reliving it, only modified by the fact that a man of 60, not of 30, is writing it; and Finley’s

argument from the unity of Thucydides' thought to the unity of his composition would disappear.\textsuperscript{17}

To return: let us take Perikles' war strategy first. I have already argued that Thucydides' words in ii 65.7, ταύτα τε πάντα ἕτοι τοινύν ἐπροσαγε, show a compression of the facts which in the result is misleading, or would be, if we had not Thucydides' own narrative to correct it; but we can go further. None of the campaigns (of the Archidamian war) which might with some truth be described as contrary to Perikles' strategy, Sicily, Aitolia, and Delion, is connected with Kleon by Thucydides. Indeed, if we were to adopt the canons used by many scholars (conspicuously by West), by which we tell the politics of a strategos by the campaign in which he commands or by his fellow-strategos and the nature of a campaign by the politics of the strategoi (for circular arguments are easy and frequent\textsuperscript{18}), and if we accept every word in Aristophanes, we might say that Kleon was opposed to them all: for Laches (see \textit{The Wasps}) was in command of the first, Demosthenes (see \textit{The Knights}) of the second, Demosthenes and Hippokrates (Perikles' nephew, for what that is worth, which is not much) of the third and most decidedly un-Periklean of the three campaigns; and Demosthenes has been thought to have been friendly with Thucydides and may have been a connexion by marriage (there was a Θεουκύδης Ἀλκισθένεις Ἀριστοδάσσος active between 340 and 320). Kleon is not said to have had anything to do with any of them; and it is at least implied that Demosthenes and Hippokrates took the initiative in the Delion campaign (iv 76.2).

On the positive side Kleon was connected with the war with Mytilene (‘keeping the allies in hand’), Pylos (ἡν ἦν τὴν χώραν ἤμων περὶ θοεῖν, ἡμέρας ἦν τὴν ἐκείνην πλευσογέμενη, i 143.4; and ii 25–26, 30), the rejection of the peace offer in 425, Thrace in 422–1 (eminently Periklean, and later approved by Nikias, vi 10.5, though he had done nothing to forward it in deed). The only thing here that might be thought to be un-Periklean in its strategy (and has therefore been positively asserted to be so) is the rejection of the peace offer; with it we join the description of Kleon wanting the war to go on in 422 because in war he could better cloak his misdeeds (v 16.1).\textsuperscript{19} Yet we would do well to recall i 127.3 of Perikles, ἠνοικίσατο τὸν τοίχον τῆς Ἀκαδήμευς, καὶ οὐκ εἰς ὑπεικίαν, ἀλλὰ ἐς τὸν τόλμην ὄρμα τοῦ Ἀθηναίου; and was not this same charge that Thucydides makes against Kleon made against Perikles, in this very year, 421, in Aristophanes’ \textit{Peace}? Kleon is in good company. Nor does Thucydides in ii 65 mention the refusal of peace in 425 amongst the errors committed after Perikles’ death.\textsuperscript{20} The most that adherents of Perikles could say about Kleon’s policy was that it was principally by his insistence that the Athenians in 425 τοῦ πλείους ὄργυντο (iv 21.2–3, 41.4); for when Athenians were stretching out their hands for more, they were likely to forget Perikles’ advice not to attempt to get the more in war-time. Yet his territorial demands (Pegai, Nisaia, Troizen, and Achaia) did not go beyond what Athens had controlled before 445. It was Perikles who had said, in one of his boldest flights, πάσαν μὲν ἑλάττωσεν καὶ γιὰ τὸν ἔσχατον τὴν ἡμισαρά τὸν κατανεκάςαντο γενόντα, πανταχοῦ δὲ μενήσατο πολλές τε καὶ ἄγαθῶν ἡδία κατοικισάςαντο, and, though on a special occasion and with an apology for the boon, ἡγὼ δὲ ἀποφαίνω δύο μερῶν τῶν ἕκρησιν

\textsuperscript{17} Finley, \textit{Thucydides}, p. 78, says: ‘Would an historian writing, for instance, of Napoleon and Napoleonic France in 1800 at the time of Marengo have seen in the subject exactly what he saw in 1815, after Waterloo?’ Similarly, could Thucydides, after the Peace of Nicias in 421, have written in such a way of the strength and weakness of Athens that what he wrote then would have tallied exactly with what he wrote seventeen years later? The answer gives the basic grounds for believing in the unity of the \textit{History}. I would prefer to put it this way: would any Frenchman, in the shadow of 1815, have written of the glory of France in 1800 as Thucydides writes of Athens in 431? And the parallel is not exact: for, for France, the greatness of the revolutionary idea and the military glory belong to the previous 25 years; whereas in the case of Athens most of the glory, political and military, belongs to the period before 431, not to the war itself.

\textsuperscript{18} Nikostratos is a good instance: all take him to have been a ‘moderate’, an associate of Nikias, a man of peace, and in consequence an enemy to Kleon, because of his conduct in Kerkyra (iii 75–8), his being a colleague of Nikias at Kythera and in Thrace (iv 53, 129–30), and his signing the armistice of 423 (iv 119.2). What then was he doing at Mantinea in 418—the campaign which more than anything else broke the treaty of 421 and destroyed whatever hope of peace there was? He was a man of conspicuous intellecjuice and humanity, as well as daring and skillful in command; he was therefore quite unlike Kleon. But that does not tell us what his politics were.

\textsuperscript{19} It is perhaps worth noting what West, p. 215, adds to Thucydides: ‘so long as Kleon was in power the war was likely to go on with ever broadening aims (v 16).’

\textsuperscript{20} Dr. Otto Luschay of Berlin has pointed out to me that we should write καὶ ἄγαθῶν, not κατανεκάςαντο.
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φανερών, γάρ καὶ ἀλάστης, τοῦ ἐτέρου ὑμᾶς παντὸς κυριωτάτους ὄντας, ἐφ’ ὅσον τε ὑπὸ νέμεσθε καὶ ἢν ἔτι πλέον βούλησθε—καὶ οὐ τσαρ ὁμοίος ἀλλ’ ὑπονόμεις; (21.4, 62.2). Well might he 'fear our own mistakes more than the plans of the enemy'; it was taxing the people's patience to the utmost to tell them of their power and daring and at the same time warn them not to use these assets to the utmost in the war. He was playing with fire already when he advised (as he presumably did, but we are not told) the alliance with Kerkyra, the island on the way to Italy and Sicily, in 433.

But when it is said that Pericles would have accepted the Spartan offer of peace in 425, it is commonly because Thucydides admired him and disliked Kleon; therefore he, Thucydides, 'disapproved' of all that Kleon did, and so Pericles would have disapproved too. I doubt the conclusion, as I doubt the line of argument. Thucydides himself perhaps means to criticise Kleon's terms when he says of Troizen, Nisaia, etc., & οὐ πολέμως ἔλεον, κ.π.λ. (only had the Peloponnesians captured in peace, cf. iv 81.2); but the Spartan offer was an empty one: they had been badly defeated and were in a corner; they ask for peace; and all they have to offer is a promise of friendship. The speech which Thucydides records, or puts in their mouth, is, like that of the Corinthians at the conference of the Peloponnesian League in 432, one of which all the hopes were belied in the event. As Classen points out, the Spartan threat that they will καὶ παρά γνώμην καυδονεύειν (19.4) and will have eternal hatred for Athens if she now refuses the proffered friendship, came to nothing (cf. iv 41.3-4, 108.7, 117, v 15). Their promise that their friendship will be especially sincere and durable was proved wrong by the events which followed the peace of 421; for the argument that the ineffectiveness of that peace was as much the fault of Athens as of Sparta (but still more, of Sparta's allies) does nothing to strengthen the case of a prophecy.

The rest of the Greek world was even less likely in 425 than in 421 (after four more years of war) to 'give Athens the highest honours' and to accept a kind of private arrangement between her and Sparta which had been agreed mainly in order to save Spartan pride or Spartan lives (cf. iv 22.3, 41.3). Mme de Romilly (p. 154) has drawn attention to Nikias' words of warning in 415: χρῆ δὲ μὴ πρός τὰς τύχας τῶν ἐναντίων ἐποίησθαι, ἄλλα τὰς διανοίας κρατήσατον ἄρεσθαι, μήδε Λακεδαιμονίως ἄλλο τι ἡγήσασθαι ἢ διὰ τὸ σχολήν σκοπεῖν ὅτῳ τρόπῳ ἐτὶ καὶ νῦν, ἣν δύνασθαι, σφάλλατες ἡμῖν τὸ σφέτερον ἀπεφέρεσθε εὖ θησαυρίζεται, δόξα καὶ περὶ πλείουν καὶ διὰ πλείουν δὸξαν ἀφετερίζεται (vi 11.6; he adds, 'Sparta is again ἄτροπα καὶ ὀλίγορεφας ἐπικουρεύεται'), and compares particularly the Spartans' words in this speech of 425, οὐ̂ν πρὸ σχολήν ποῦ παρακερεσθεις μετρίως κατατιθήμενης (20.2); and she concludes that, since Thucydides 'approves' of Nikias' opposition to the Sicilian expedition, he 'approves' equally of the Spartan offer of peace ten years earlier. But if, even after her rehabilitation at Mantinea, Sparta was still anxious to wipe out the disgrace of the peace of 421, which itself was agreed to after the brilliant success of Brasidas (not to mention the success of her allies at Delion), how much greater would have been her desire to expunge the memory of a peace in 425, after six years of a war begun with so many hopes, such high-sounding promises, such goodwill from the greater part of the Greek world, and marked by such a series of miserable failures and but one success, the inglorious victory over Plataia. For, alas, it is not true that 'negotiated' treaties, as such, have proved more lasting than 'dictated' ones; and the Spartan offer on this occasion, militarily speaking worth nothing to Athens (except in the moral effect of its having been made at all), demanded not only a generosity of feeling and a far-sightedness on the part of Athens which they had no reason to expect, but an even greater generosity, ἀλλ’ ὑπονόμεις, on their own, to accept the Athenian gesture and forget their own disgrace (19.3-4); and, as well, a quite unlikely humility or, if you will, good sense from the rest of Greece, not only the neglected Corinthians and the proud Boeotians, but the disaffected subjects of Athens who had been promised liberation. That we, wisely reflecting long after the event, can say justly, what a pity a lasting peace was not then made, is no more than to say, what a pity the Peloponnesian war

---

22 See my Commentary, I, 418-19.
ever broke out; and that the Athenians in 421, the Athenians not of The Knights but of The Peace, regretted their lost opportunity, is but a proof of the irony of history. They had refused an empty and, almost certainly, a vain offer; they had obeyed the good military maxim to follow up a victory, to press the enemy hard, and it had turned out wrong: οὐδὲν δέχεται γὰρ τὰς ἔμφορος τῶν πραγμάτων οὐχ ἤσσον ἀμαθὸς χωρῆσαι ἡ καὶ τὰς διανοίας τοῦ ἀνδρόμου. And this was largely due to their own διάνοια, their ἀφοσία, their thoughtless ambition and their submission, in other fields than that of war-strategy, to such a leader as Kleon.

The only part of Kleon’s policy which was un-Periklean, certainly, but even so by implication rather than explicitly, was its cruelty and brutality— it was he, the most violent of the citizens, who advocated the total destruction of Mytilene; later, that of Skione (which, as men get used to atrocities, passes without comment). Yet even here he tried to base himself on Periklean principles, that to yield is merely to betray weakness (i 140.5); and the policy was continued after his death at Melos. Nor are we told that Nikias protested.23 Later, the treatment of Hestiaia under Perikles’ leadership, though rather more humane and better caused, was bracketed with that of the other cities as examples of Athenian cruelty (Xen. Hell. ii 2.3).

Kleon then followed the main lines of strategy laid down by Perikles; and, without understanding him, was his conscious follower (ἐγὼ μὲν οὐν ὁ αὐτὸς εἰμι, τυραννίδα ἔχετε τὴν ἄρχην), and ἐκ τοῦ ἀκανθίου ἀνδραγαθίζεσθαι, iii 38.1, 37.2, 40.4, compared with ii 61.2, 63.2—3.24 He borrows his mantle, and was as forceful a speaker, knowing how to tell the truth (on occasion) to his fellow-countrymen and equally ready to lead rather than be led by them. What was wrong with him was that he had a vulgar mind, acute in a second-rate manner, without intelligence or humanity; as Thucydides makes clear no less than Aristophanes. It was not his policy that was dangerous—for one thing policy might change; it was his character, which would not change. In such hands any policy would go wrong.

Of that other side of Perikles which Thucydides shows us, his imaginative and adventurous imperialism, Kleon had no understanding; but Alkibiades had. His speech in advocacy of the expedition to Sicily has much in it of Perikles, just twisted out of shape, as Kleon’s version had been Perikles debased. Even his self-praise at the beginning has something in it to recall Perikles (ii 60.5), but he bases it on such trifles as a victory and extravagant display at Olympia (note τιμή... καὶ δύναμις, and the future fame, vi 16.2, 5): but more striking are such sentences as οἱ γὰρ πατέρες ἠμῶν τοὺς αὐτῶς ποτόνος οὐστέρον ὧν φαίην πολέμιον ἤπολεῖτον αὐτὰς ἢμισί πλην καὶ προσφέρον τὸν Μήδουν ἔχθρον ἐγγύτερον τὴν ἄρχην ἐκτράπατο τόπον ὡστε καὶ ἡ περίουσια τοῦ ναυτικοῦ ἀγαπῆς, καὶ ὡστέρα καὶ οἱ πατέρες... ἐκ τάδε ἤσσον αὐτά (17.7, 18.6)—so close to Perikles’ spirit, so opposed to his practical strategy! τὴν τε ἄρχην αὐτῶς ἐκτράπατο τόπον καὶ τὴν ἀνά γε δὴ οὖν ἠράκας, παρατηρήσαμεν τοὺς φοβόμενοι τοῖς αἰεί ἡ παράβασις ἡ ἐλπίς ἐπικαλούμενοι, ἐπεὶ εἰ γε ἡνδυσάμενοι πάντες (Perikles’ practical advice) ἡ φυλοκροίαν οἶος χρέος βοήθησα, βραχνὸν διὰ τὸ προσκόποιμοι αὐτήν περὶ αὐτῆς ἢ ταύτης μᾶλλον κινδυνεύσαμεν (18.2)—just as ii 40.4—5 (καὶ μόνοι οὐ τοῦ ἐμφερούντος μᾶλλον λογιστῆς τὸν ἐλευθερίας τὸ πιστὸ ἄδεως τινα ὠφελοῦμεν) and 62.3. καὶ οὐκ ἤστιν ἡμῖν ταυεύσασθαι ἢ ὡστὶ οὐκρουμένῃ ἄρχειν, ἀλλὰ ἀνάγκη, ἐπειδῆ ἂν τάδε καθέσθη τοῖς μὲν ἐπιθεωρεῖν, κ.τ.λ. (18.3), and his scorn for Nikias’ τῶν λόγων ἀπαγορευσθήσει (τὴν τάξιν, ἢν οὐν ἡσύχαζε— the practical advice again—τρίφθαι τὸν αὐτὴν περὶ αὐτῆς ὡστέρα καὶ ἄλλο τι: 18.6—7) recall the famous passage in Perikles’ last speech beginning ἢ οὖν ἐκτητήρει ἢ οὐκ ἠλευθερώθην, καὶ τὸν τάξιν (vi 18.7) with τάξιν ἐν τῇ τόλμῃ οἱ τοιούτῳ ἐτέρωσι πειστεύσαντες καὶ εἰ τοι οὖν οὖν αὐτῶν

23 οἱ σφόντοι τῶν ἄνδρώτων at Athens must soon after 421 have realised that not much had been gained by their being quit of Kleon.

24 Mme de Rouilly, pp. 143—5, doubts this intentional connexion in language between Perikles’ and Kleon’s speeches; and suggests that ἀδραγαθία may have been a catch-phrase in party politics in Athens. Perhaps; but it is Thucydides we are discussing, and it is no catch-phrase in him, whether he is selecting from phrases Perikles and Kleon used, or attributing his own words to them (see the other instances of his use of it: ii 42.3, iii 57.1 and 64.4, v 101). The echo to my mind is unmistakable.
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I am right in thus making Kleon and Alkibiades the principal heirs to Perikles' policy, and in their different ways the destroyers of their inheritance, where does Nikias come in? whom, from his love of ἡσυχία, and his opposition to Kleon and to the Syracusan expedition (μὴ μετεώρω τῇ πόλει ἄξιον κυνικοῦν καὶ ἄρχῃς ἄλλης ὀργεῖσαι πρὶν ἢ ἔχοι μεθ' ἰδίας ἀρχῆς, vi. 15.5—and Thucydidet did not agree with him that, from the purely military point of view, it was wrongly conceived), so many have regarded as Perikles' political heir? Where else than among the ἄπραγμοι whose ideas are rejected with such fine scorn in ii 63.2—3? Who else could be so admirably described as ἐν τῷ παρώντι δεδικήτω ἀπραγμοσύνην ἄνθρωπον σφέτειας? Perikles is not there describing a political party, least of all the small and at that time obscure group of extreme oligarchs, who were not notable either for ἀπραγμοσύνη or for ἁπάθεια; he would not have said of them, τὸ ἀπραγμον ὑπὸ σφέτεια, κ.τ.λ.; he did not mean men who may have wanted peace with Sparta for their own political ends, but those who by their characters were ever inclined to 'appeasement', for its own sake, who would jump at any opportunity, good or bad, that is (if you will) in 425 and 421 or in 430, to make peace. τὸ ἀπραγμον is not an easy word to translate, and the danger of introducing merely topical and temporary thoughts of the present is there; but we may translate this sentence not inaccurately, 'the luxury of pacifist ideas is only possible where there are also men ready to defend the state by action; and they are of no value in an empire, only in a subject state, to be safe and a slave.'

I do not mean that Nikias was theoretically a pacifist; he was too loyal a citizen of Athens, for one thing, and too weak a character. He was one of those who are borne by the tide. I imagine a man who, whatever his own instincts or fears, voted for war, with Perikles and the vast majority, in the winter of 432–1; but, I suppose also, for reopening negotiations with Sparta in 430—though not, surely, for putting Perikles on trial: he was too generous and too honest. His nervousness, when he saw not only the physical but the moral ruin around him in the pentile, may well have persuaded him that it would be best to give up some of the empire at least (Aigina? Poteidaia?, and a little more—i 140.3) for the sake of peace. He was a respectable and much respected man; Thucydidet liked him, as we all do, as all Athens did—too well; he was loyal to his city and its constitution, none more so. But he only understood Perikles' strategic policy because it was, in the main, negative, as near τῇ ἡσυχαίης as circumstances allowed; and he had no understanding of that adventurous and daring spirit which alone had built the empire and alone would make its continuance possible, and which, for Perikles, was sufficient in itself, for it brought glory to Athens and her citizens. What a difference between his own desire τῷ μέλλοντι χρόνῳ καταλαίπειν ὄνομα ὡς οὔθεν σφήλας τὴν πόλιν (v. 16.1), and Perikles' claim for Athens, γνώτε δὲ ὄνομα μεγίστου σιτίου ἔχουσαν ἐν πάσιν ἑαυτῶν, and between his νομίζων ἐκ τοῦ ἀκυδόντου τούτῳ ἐξελεύοντος and Perikles' ἀσφαλός δουλεύειν.

We tend to confuse two, or rather three things: Thucydidet's likes and dislikes of persons (Perikles, Nikias, Kleon, and Alkibiades) and his approval or disapproval of their policies, from time to time, which do not necessarily coincide; and further his opinion of Perikles and his opinion of Perikles' successors. He can hardly have disapproved of Kleon's policy in attempting to recover Amphipolis; but that did not make him like the man any the better. His dislike of Kleon in 425 does not mean that he approved Nikias' actions in that year. He admired Perikles; but it does not follow that because he gives to Nikias, in the debate on Sicily, a wiser speech than to Alkibiades, he did not recognise the latter as Perikles' true heir. It is not unknown for rich heirs to be different from their fathers who founded the estate. It is indeed one of the morals to be drawn from Thucydidet's History 'by future generations so long as human nature remains much the same': Perikles was a great man; but observe what may happen—for his inheritance fell into the hands of Kleon and Alkibiades; and Nikias was not only ineffective.
when opposing unscrupulous men, but also did not understand what Perikles’ aims had been. We must keep in mind one thing more: Thucydides thought Perikles’ war strategy sound; but we do not know that he ‘approved’ of Perikles’ conception of empire or his ideal democracy; later in life at least, he praised the constitution of the Five Thousand which was so different from the democracy and the σωφροσύνη of Chios which was the opposite of Athenian daring, indeed very near to τὸ ἁρρατὸς δουλεύειν. We only know that he understood them, as he understood also Spartan merits and defects; and understanding is what we ask for in a historian.

A. W. Gomme.
NOTES ON NOSES

‘There’s character in noses’... ‘More than in any other feature’, said Lady
Dunstan. ... ‘It should be prayed for in families’.

Diana of the Crossways ch. xxx

WHEN we first began to read Homer we learnt with surprise that Zeus nodded with his
eyebrows, and the expressiveness of the ancient eyebrow has been noted and, as I think,
exaggerated by modern scholars. Ancient noses have, so far as I am aware, received less
attention. The modern Englishman turns up his nose in contempt or disgust, and he produces
with it the sniff and snort which denote similar emotions; otherwise it plays a somewhat
passive part in our lives. We follow or are led by it; fail to see what is underneath it; poke
it into things and pay through it; have it pulled, or bitten off; cut it off to spite our faces, or
keep it to the grindstone; and we put our fingers to it—one, if we are sententious, to enjoin
attention; more, if we have not been nicely brought up, in derisive contempt; but by itself
it reacts little to our moods. The ancient nose was more responsive. Ironists wore the Attic
or Socratic nose. Contempt, in Greek more specifically associated with the nostrils
(μυκροσμός), derision, and disgust, were naturally at home there, but so were anger,
distress, and terror. Mustard mounts to the nose of an angry Frenchman and Italian, and
an Englishman, though he does not think of his nose in that connexion, may be conscious of a
slight dilation of the nostril when he loses his temper, and according to Darwin the same
effect may be produced by terror, but the evidence suggests that violent emotions produced in
ancient noses sensations stronger than in ours and sometimes foreign to them.

Besides its value as an index of mood, and for the superstitious as a source of ominous
sneezes, the nose is usually the most conspicuous feature in the face, and for that reason, if not
also for the others, naturally attracted the attention of physiognomers. I have heard tell that a
distinguished librarian whose library housed also a collection of coins was once found cucking
the youthful assistant to whose charge they were committed, and enquiring how often it would
be necessary for him to say that those with straight noses were Greek and those with hooky
Roman; and it was perhaps on some such general principle that Caesar was called by Falstaff
the hook-nosed fellow of Rome. But this rule, though no doubt serviceable to those
taking their first steps in numismatics, is useless to a serious student of noses. Caesar’s,
to judge from his profile on coins, showed little trace of aquilineity; and although the straightness
of finding noses was remarked also in antiquity, and Leonardo might have had difficulty in
finding in ancient Athens the ten types of profile and twelve types of frontal nose which he

1 Cf. C.R. 58.38.
2 As Dante Inf. 25.44 acciocché il duca stesse attento, mi post il dito sul mento al naso, but this gesture is more familiar
in modern Italy than in modern England.
4 A.P. 11.15.8 quem noui motus subdolae iritatione ducere, sanes.
5 See Headlam on Hadri 6.37. In view of the ample
evidence both Greek and Roman the absence of any
mention of the nose in Seneca’s elaborate description of the
physical effects of anger (Dial. 7.14.1) is somewhat surprising.
6 Od. 24.318 (Odysseus affected by Laertes’s distress) ὁμικρινός ὁ τὸν ἔρωτα μανῆς προεικτός. A scholiast explains
that ἐπειδὴ δεσμός προσεικτοταῖς τοῖς βαθύσσουσιν τις, but the lover
malreated by Eros, who says at Anacreont 29.7 κραδιὰ
καὶ ἀφίτων κινδυνεύειν, seems nearer death than tears.
7 Petron. 62.5. mihi anima in noso esse; stabam tanquam mortuam.
8 Cf. [Arist.] Physiocn. 1.65.4 οὐκ ἐν μυκροσμοῖς ὑποστασίως, ἀδικωσίως. I cite this and other Physiognomonic treatises
by volume, page, and line in R. Foerster Scriptores Physiognomoni, and refer to that collection hereafter as S.P.
The pseudo-Aristotelian treatise is held to be a combination of two Peripatetic works and to date perhaps from the 3rd
cent. B.C. (Foerster S.P. 1. xvii, Ross Aristotle 2. Ueberweg-
Prachter Gesch. d. Philosophie ii 1. 359). If so, it is by
several centuries the earliest of the Physiognomica.
9 Expression of the Emotions, 1904, p. 309.
10 See on this subject W. A. Oldfather in Class. Stud.
presented to E. Coppi, 268.
11 2 Henry IV iv. 3.
12 See Bernoulli Röm. Ikon. 1. Munat. 3. Caesar is
nowhere credited with a hooky nose in antiquity, but I do
not know what passed for his likeness in Elizabethan times.
For aquiline noses in Italy see Marx on Lucil, 942.
13 Adamantius, S.P. 1.386.5
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distinguished in Italy.\textsuperscript{14} not all Greeks conformed to the type which commended itself to their sculptors. "Η σού όσοι ποιήτε πρός τούς καλούς; said Socrates in a famous passage,\textsuperscript{15} ὁ μὲν, ὁτι σμικροί, ἐπίθεται ἐπανειλήματα ὑπ' ὑμῶν, τούτῳ τῷ γραμματίκου βασιλικον φατε ἐλίτω, τού μὲν δὲ διὰ μέσου τούτου ἐμμετρώτατα ἔχειν, καὶ in the crowd painted by Apelles in the Asclepius at Cos a representative of one, if not both of, of these extremes was conspicuous.\textsuperscript{16} Snub noses were not admired,\textsuperscript{17} and the most famous ancient specimen, Socrates', though its owner maintained that, the function of a nose being to smell, his was ideal,\textsuperscript{18} no doubt contributed to the unfavourable diagnosis pronounced upon him by the physiognomist Zopyrus;\textsuperscript{19} for the professors of that science most commonly interpret such noses as indicative of salacity.\textsuperscript{20} Whether physiognomists attributed to the snub-nosed the character of satyrs, or satyrs are depicted as snub-nosed because they are salacious, I will not attempt to determine, but the pseudo-Aristotelian treatise, which, in the matter of noses, bases itself on animal analogies, found in such features a resemblance to deer.

The science of physiognomics however, being based, I suppose, on little solid foundation, left its professors latitude to dogmatise, and they are far from unanimous on noses. Thus Hippocrates, who disputes with Pythagoras the title of father of the science,\textsuperscript{21} and counted a knowledge of it essential to all physicians,\textsuperscript{22} pronounced ὅκοσι πυρροὶ ἀνικτοί, ἀφθαλοί συμκροί, πυρροὶ ἀκόσι πυρρὸν συμικροί, ἀφθαλοί μεγάλοι, ἔθθελαι, and again μεγάλη κεφαλή, ἀφθαλοί μελανία καὶ μεγάλοι, ἄναι ραχεία καὶ σαμικροί, ἐπικελίαι,\textsuperscript{23} but his successors agree in regarding both παχύτης and συμβόλη of the nose as evidence of defects of character, though not always of the same defects. A thick nose is said to indicate idleness,\textsuperscript{24} or stupidity,\textsuperscript{25} or cowardice,\textsuperscript{26} while a snub, commonly, as has been noted, held to be a sign of sexuality, may betray general depravity,\textsuperscript{27} or mark the bragart and liar.\textsuperscript{28} In the converse type however, the aquiline, they agree (except for a refinement to be mentioned later) with the young men in the \textit{Republic} in seeing ὅ ασικανω και τὸ βασιλικόν, and they ascribe to the hook-nosed such admirable qualities as μεγαλομύλον, μεγαλόνων, magnanimitas,\textsuperscript{29} and also, consistent with these but less admirable, μελανία.\textsuperscript{30} Of the intermediate types, perhaps because in Greece at any rate they were the norm, they have less to say, but, disregarding trifles, I note in the professedly Aristotelian \textit{Secretum secretorum}, S.P. 2.203.10, si nasus tenus est, eius possessus agilis est, Amamiota, 1.376.2, θύτης ρίνον γλώσσης ἀκράτειας και νυμφομαέρει. Pseudo-Polemon, I.429.5, ὅ τιν ῥίνον ἐειδέω ἐἐντεύροι, and in an anonymous Byzantine physiognomist, 2.227.17, βίσ ἐξεκάθαρτο ἀπλόυ καὶ υζεκες σημείου.\textsuperscript{30}

The \textit{Physiognomicon} of Antisthenes, cited by Athenaeus (14.656 F.), has perished, and so has Aristotle's treatise on the subject except in so far as it may be represented by or in the pseudonymous treatise, and unfortunately our other authorities are late. But if the last-quoted opinion goes back to earlier times it would explain why in the \textit{Captivi} that exemplary

\textsuperscript{14} Notebooks, ed. MacCurdy, 2.23b. Leonardo's interest in this subject is made only too plain in his drawings: see Popham Drawings of L. da V. pl. 133 ff.
\textsuperscript{15} Plat. Rep. 5.474 b; cf. Arist. Pol. 1.909 b 23.
\textsuperscript{16} Hdas 4.67 καὶ γραφικοί συμμετέχουν καὶ ἀπάνων, καὶ ἀνάμειδος, (I.e. or correction ἀνάμειδος).
\textsuperscript{17} See, e.g., Ar. Eust. 617, 705, 940, Plat. Theat. 1.34 c, Theocr. 3.6, 11-13.
\textsuperscript{18} Xen. Symp. 5.6.
\textsuperscript{19} Cic. de fato 10 stupides esse Socrates dixit et fortasse quid ungula concava non habebit: obstrueas aetas partes et obstruat eae dicebat; addidit etiam mulierum, Schol. Pers. 4.24, cum ad Socratem sententis est et libidinosus est: Cic. Tusc. 4.480, Alex. Aphr. de Fato 6. Zopyrus's judgment of Socrates's collaborators would have been endorsed by later physiognomists: [Arist.] Physiogn. 1.62.12 or 8 λιμένις τούτῳ κατακρούσα λατοφωνία, ἀκολούθως, S.P. 1.523-3.415.2.
\textsuperscript{20} S.P. 1.96.19, 379.5, 499.6, 2.143.3, 209.17. Lavater (Physiognomy, London 1866, p. 50) though an open nostril a token of 'sensibility which may easily degenerate into sensuality':
\textsuperscript{21} Porph. Vit. Pyth. 3.13, Fell. 1.9.2; Gal. 4.798.
\textsuperscript{22} Gal. 19.530.
\textsuperscript{23} Epit. 2.5.1, 6.1 (5.128, 132 Littre).
\textsuperscript{24} S.P. 1.64.19.
\textsuperscript{25} ib. 66.2.; cf. 2.132.24.
\textsuperscript{26} ib. 1.429.1.
\textsuperscript{27} ib. 2.227.16 βίσ συμ τού πειραγόν και ψωκλον και τοιφάλων ἐἐντεύροι.
\textsuperscript{28} ib. 2.204.3 si nasus natus est, in medio ad similem inclinare, gloriosum et mendax est.
\textsuperscript{29} ib. 1.66.9, 379.4; 2.71.4.
\textsuperscript{30} ib. 2.227.16. Since snub noses were condemned and aquiline regarded with comparative favour, it may be asked why Συμ- is a common, and Γραμ- a very rare, element in proper names. Greek names however were bestowed in the cradle, and nearly all babies are snub-nosed, a fact for which a serious reason was given in antiquity (Arist. Prob. 695 b 15) and a facetious by Rabelais (1.40), from whom Sterne (Tristram Shandy 3.38) borrowed it without acknowledgment. Roman cognomina such as Nasica and Naso, like Συμ-, the by-name of Antiochus VIII., were acquired by adults, but to the genuine names Γραμ- and Γραμ- may be added 'Παπίας, Παίδες, 'Παῖον, and 'Ποῦχον (Bechtel Hist. Personennamen 480).
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young man Phileocrates should have a nasus acutus. Another misfortune that has befallen the student of noses is that Pollux in his long account of theatrical masks should be so reticent about them. It is plain that the masks, which prevented their wearers from exhibiting any play of emotions, were primarily intended to indicate their characters, and, in Comedy at any rate, exaggerated to grotesqueness the features which served that end. It is also plain from the many representations of masks and actors that much importance attached to their noses. In Tragedy Pollux tells us only that the white-haired servant called διφθέρας (presumably a rustic) had μακρὰς τροχὲς, whatever that may be. In the New Comedy he says that the ἀγριώτης and the οὐκουρόν γράφιον were σμοι, and that the παράπτωστον θεραπαινίδιον ἦν ὅπλατος, but in the first at least of these a defect of feature rather than of character is probably implied. Further, the ἱμερῶν πρεσβύτης, κόλας, and παράπτωστοι were ἔπιτρυπτοι. These last form a seemingly incongruous group, which may, however, be resolved physiognomically with the aid of [Arist.] Physiogn. 1.66.6: οὶ δὲ τὴν ἱμάν μακρὰν λεπτὴν ἔχοντες ὀρνιθόβους: οἱ ἔπιτρυπτοι ἀπὸ τοῦ μετόπου εὐθὺς ἱμερῷμα τοιχάκης ἀνωφελταί τῶν κόρωνας. οὶ δὲ γραυτὴν ἔχοντες καὶ τοῦ μετόπου διηρθρομενήν μεγαλύφυγον ἀνωφελτάται τῶν ἀστών, and it seems reasonable to suppose that the popular physiognomies of the day, if not also the learned, which no doubt embraced and extended them, are reflected in the masks, which should be considered by those interested in the subject.

Of the artists, who may have influenced, or have been influenced by, the mask-makers, I remark only that painters and sculptors were much freer than the mask-makers to portray without exaggeration both character and emotion; and that if Xenophon may be believed, Parrhasius and the sculptor Cleiton, in conversation with Socrates, admitted that it was their duty to portray them. But on this subject I shall know much more if the scholar to whom this number of the J.H.S. is dedicated will write us a paper on expressionism in Greek art.

The reason or excuse which I have made my own nose into these dark places, and to follow it this brief distance, is a passage which puzzles editors of Theocritus—Id. 12.23 ἤγοι δὲ σε τὸν καλὸν σινέαν/ψεύδαρα ρινὸς ύπερθεν ἄραρης σάκκον ἄναρφον. Ψευδαρά (οἱ ψευδαρά) according to the scholia are pimples, which take their name from the vice or fault which they indicate, just as at [Alex. Aphr.] Prob. 4.58 they are for the same reason white marks on the toe-nails. The scholia disagree whether the pimples are on or over the nose, and ρινὸς ύπερθεν is ambiguous. The phrase however recurs at Id. 22.104, and as there it plainly means on the forehead, I assume it to do so here. On ἄραρα the scholia have nothing to say, and the attempts of modern scholars to explain or emend what Meineke called ineptum nasi epitheton are unconvincent. It seems to me however to a physiognomer the adjective might be by no means inept. None of them uses ἄραρα of a nose, but a slender nose is plainly the opposite of a

31 Plaut. Cap. 647 macisento ore, naso acuto, contorpe albo-oculit necris; i subjugus alicquanto, cristus, cincinatus. Philo- crates might therefore be thought to have worn the mask of the ἀγριώτης κοίμος of Poll. 4.140. The latter however was ύπερθέρας τὸ χρώμα.

32 In a very different connexion τὸς δὲ μέγας had been enumerated among the symptoms of mortal illness by Hippocrates (Prog. 2: 2.114 Littre.), and so also Lucr. 6.1109, Cels. 2.6—'I knew there was but one way; for his nose was as sharp as a pen, as the hostess says of the dying Falstaff in Henry V. Galen (1.178, 18 B. 28) emphases the point that unnatural sharpness alone is relevant in this connexion.

33 4.133

34 Two were sometimes represented in a mask, one on each side of the face: see Quint. 11.3.74, Bieber Hist. of the Gk and Rom. Theater. 182.

35 Dieterich Pilczell 3: Die verschiedenen Hauptformen der Nase sind fur die Gestaltung der komischen Masken fast die Hauptsache.

36 On the characteristics of the άγριωτης see Ribbeck in Abh. Sachs. Ges. 10.1. The conventional boar is likely to have been, like the bluff countryman in Eur. Or. 918, μορφή τῶν ἀγριώτων, and a stub nose would contribute (n. 17 above). Cf. Theocr. 3.8, 20.6; also Chaucer’s miller of Trumpington (Ree’s Tale 14): Round was his face, and canse was his nose.

37 Many reproductions of masks and actors will be found in M. Bieber Denkmaler zum Theaterwesen and History of the Gk and Rom. Theater, but attempts (the most recent: by T. B. L. Webster in Rylands Libr. Bull. 32.97) to identify those described by Pollux and to assign them to characters in extant comedies do not seem very conclusive. In view of the distinction drawn in pseudo-Aristotel above, I remark that in most of the male masks nose and forehead are separated by a marked depression, which is usually emphasized in the old men by the contraction of their brows in a frown or scowl.

The chorus in the Clouds, according to the scholiast (on 344), wore masks with big noses. Cyrano de Bergerac (not an unprejudiced witness) claimed that un grand nez est un gentleman, un homme affable, bon, courtois, spirituel, Liberal, courageous; but those of the Clouds were no doubt intended, as the scholiast says, to be merely γολος καὶ διάσημος, as long noses plainly are at Luc. Men. Con. 35, 469.11, and in many grotesque figurines.

38 Xen. Mem. 3.10. On Polygnotus at θηραρθος see Arist. Pol. 1340 a 37, Poet. 1442 a 5, 1450 a 27.
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thick and snub, and might imply the sort of qualities ascribed in the passages quoted above to noses called ὀξῖν and ἱερὰς or ὠξεῖς—that is to say talkativeness or honesty. Either would make a suitable point—'If I praise you I may be a bore or indiscreet, but I shall at least be truthful', or 'My features show me to be an honest man, and if I praise you no crop of pimples will belie them'. The latter is the more satisfactory, and I like to think that it is what Theocritus meant. Honesty obliges me to add that the passages quoted are many centuries younger than Theocritus, but if anyone is disposed on that ground to dismiss the suggestion out of hand, σιμός σεσηρώς, contorta et uituperanti nare; 38 I think he should first reflect that, as will be plain from these notes, Greeks in general and physiognomers in particular had been nose-conscious since the fifth century B.C. at least, that masks in the theatre must have made the public attentive to physiognomy, 39 that the loreretailed in these books may be much older than the retailer, and that in view of the prejudice against nasal σιμός and παχύς a slim nose is likely to be a sign of grace, if not of the particular grace mentioned. I add as some slight confirmation that according to Galen ὁς μὲν ἡ ἄλεξ ὀξιὰ ἦ γραμμῷ, οὗτοι ξηροῖς σιμίσθ' ὀξεῖς, ύγροί, 40 and that in the treatise in which he relates the κράσις of the body to τὰ τῆς σωμάτου ἡπειρεῖν he connects ἔξωρρησις with συνέσεις and ύγρότης with ὄνοια. 41 But this is a region into which I will venture no further.

A. S. F. Gow.

---

38 A.P. 5.178, Apul. Met. 7.9.2.
39 Theocr. Ἐπ. 11, an epitaph for the physiognomer Eusthenes, whether by Theocritus or not, seems Hellenistic and evidence for the continued existence of professional physiognomers.
40 1.698.
41 4.781, 785.
THE DATE OF THE EPSHEIAN FOUNDATION-DEPOSIT

[Plates XXXI-XXXVI]

Nearly fifty years have passed since Hogarth wrote, and it would be useful and pleasing to comment afresh on the votive offerings from the Artemision, this treasure of gold and silver, of ivory and amber, with a touch of the gynaikonitis and the East. My purpose is narrower: a study of the objects from the Basis, and narrower still, their chronological implications for the date of the coins found with them. These coins are the only ones from the excavation found in what might be called a closed context. They can in principle be later than their latest co-finds; they can be earlier than the earliest, but it is reasonable to assume that they are contemporary with the majority of the objects associated with them.

A few objects were found outside the Basis under stratigraphical conditions which make their inferior limit of time almost as certain as that of the objects from the Basis, and many pieces from outside resemble Basis types so closely that they can with certainty be dated to the same period (Hogarth p. 235): I think it, however, prudent and safe to leave these, where possible, on one side and to keep to the specimens from the Basis.¹

The objects from the Basis are almost all of them of the seventh century B.C., a very few are later, and one piece only is possibly of the eighth century, pl. 4, 34.² It is silver, gold-plated, most probably detached from a hilt (Hogarth p. 114). The description gives no clear idea of technique and purpose: it is too small for a hilt.³ The decoration consists of engraved zigzags and compass-drawn wheels: these are no indication of an early date, as they still occur as border-decoration of the chiton of an acroterion figure from the Acropolis,⁴ but the whole somehow recalls those aimless designs on Late Geometric bronze sheets from Argos (Waldstein pls. 103, 104).

I begin with objects for which a general attribution to the seventh century, but no more exact date can be established.

The majority of the Ephesian fibulae, gold, electrum, silver, and bronze, belong to Blinkenberg's class XII, of which more than half of the total come from Asia Minor (Blinkenberg loc. cit. 206). This is a very large class, very long-lived and with many varieties. For the gold and electrum fibulae from the Basis pl. 5, 3 and 4 (Marshall pl. 10, 1038) (Blinken-

¹ These pages are intended to be a supplement to the article here on pp. 156 ff. They reflect Ephesian dialogues with Stanley Robinson, horae ferales in Christ Church in the war years and after. Bernard Ashmole repeatedly looked with me at originals and casts of Ephesian objects in his Department, and we discussed the problems. The photographs of the ivory statuettes, Pls. XXXIV, f, g, h, and XXXV, a, b, d, are his. Frank Savery kindly read and improved my manuscript. Mrs. Ellen Ettinger, née Rathenau, oblige me and other students of the subject with a concordance of plates and text in Hogarth's book: copies of this useful instrument are in the Ashmolean Museum and in the Greek and Roman Department of the British Museum. Dr. Azis Ogan most kindly contributed the photographs Pl. XXXV, c, and XXXVI, d and f.

² I refer to the plates and text of British Museum Excavations at Ephesus without the title of the book and mostly without the name of Hogarth. Catalogue of Jewellery in the British Museum, Greek, Etruscan, and Roman, is quoted by the name of the writer, Marshall.

³ Bronze objects earlier than the seventh century from outside the Basis are the following: the pin pl. 18, 22, insufficiently illustrated and not described; it looks strangely primitival. The pin pl. 16, 44, access to be Late Geometric. The fibulae pl. 17, 12, and 13, have been classified by Blinkenberg Fibules grecques et orientales (p. 62 II, 2 f.; pl. 64, II, 4 f) as 'submycénien'—which would have consequences for the history of the Ephesian cult, yet this group comprises heterogeneous types: Blinkenberg himself (p. 209) says that Ephesian fibulae such as that pl. 5, 1 (p. 209 fig. 229, group XIII, b)—which are obviously of the seventh century—are related to his sub-Mycenaean group II: the two bronze fibulae pl. 17, 12, 13, are of no doubt coarse versions of archaic electrum pieces of the type pl. 5, 1, and thus of no interest for the early history of the sanctuary. The bronze bird pl. 19, 8, looks Late Geometric: its closest analogy is a bronze bird from the Athenian Acropolis, de Ridder p. 85 fig. 55: the bronze birds from Olympia to which Hogarth and de Ridder refer are different in style and purpose.

These Ephesian bronze objects, like the sub-Geometric bronze fibulae pl. 17, 3, 14, 21-5 (Blinkenberg loc. cit. p. 86, III 11 g; p. 101, IV, 11 n; p. 98, IV, 10 c) are votive offerings of people from the islands or from mainland Greece. To the fibulae enumerated by Blinkenberg those from Kato Phana, Chios, B 54 XXXV pl. 31 should be added.

⁴ Hogarth's suggestion (pp. 111, 114 and 197) that the electrum-plated silver ornaments pl. 4, 5, 7, 17, 8, 15; 8, 19, are the caps of dagger-hilts, and the ivory (or bone?) tubes pl. 41, 1, 4, mountings of sword-handles is unfounded. The electrum pin pl. 7-38, is not a miniature sword (see my p. 86 n. 5). The glass handle-hoops pl. 45, 34, 35, are too small for having been pommels of daggers (Hogarth p. 209).

⁵ Payne and Young pl. 13, 3 and 5; Schrader Marmorbildnisse text pp. 321 and 322, figs. 369 and 372.
berg 224, XII, 14 f.; 226, XII, 13 d) Blinksen refers to fibulae from Gordium, but the tumuli in which they appear cover not only the seventh century but at least the first half of the sixth as well so that they are of little help for dating related pieces from the Ephesian basis.

The same is true of gold, electrum, and silver pins (of the last none were found in the Basis). Their forms are peculiar to Ephesus, and similarities to Dorian ones, which are more or less dateable, are slight. ‘Pear’ or ‘bud’ heads (pl. 5, 8, 11, 22, 28) occur in the Peloponnese, but they differ in details and cover too long a period to provide precise dates for the Ephesian ones.⁵

Fourteen ivory (or bone) two-disc brooches were found in the Basis, pl. 32. 1–9 (p. 187). Very similar pieces come from other sanctuaries and a few from tombs: the former are not stratified, and the latter lack telling co-finds.⁶

Ivory and bone pins are more numerous than in other sanctuaries.⁷ Nearly all types are represented in the Basis (pl. 33, 1–14, 21–2, 30, 33 and many of the pins on pl. 34). Pomegranate and poppy pins and ‘pear’ or ‘bud’ heads have plentiful analogies in bronze, gold, and silver elsewhere, but differ from them in essential features.

Next, objects for which a date in the first half of the seventh century can be established. The electrum roundel with a griffin, pl. 8. 3; Marshall no. 904, p. 68 fig. 10, impressed on the front cover of Hogarth’s book, here Pl. XXXI, a. Three specimens were found in the Basis, one fragmentary: here an analogy may be seen to three plaques with the man-eating lions, Pl. XXXI, b.

Hogarth (p. 110) called the griffin a lion and suggested that he was ‘snapping at a butterfly or bee, which is conventionally represented high up in the field on the right’. The insect is in fact only one of those filling ornaments which cover all the background as well. The right answer to Hogarth was given by Martial Epigr. 12, 61

In tauros Libyci ruunt leones
Non sunt papilionibus molesti.

Hogarth felt himself vaguely reminded of ‘Hittite’ art in Cappadocia or of mid-European art. It is indeed a strange piece, difficult to place in the arts of the seventh century. The griffin has the curves of Orientalising animals of the earlier century: lions on Protoattic vases of the second quarter might be compared. The field round the griffin is covered with filling ornament, cross-hatched configurations, and what might have been intended to represent cable patterns. This recalls Ephesian electrum coins, pl. 1. 19–27, on which coils stand against a background of ‘basketry work’—to use this convenient but misleading term, misleading, because these cross-hatched squares do not render basketry or woven patterns but are abstract ornaments, found in the repertoire of Geometric and Post-Geometric styles in Italy and the North: they had their great vogue in Cletic art in the British Isles.⁸ I do not remember to have seen such a treatment of background in Greek metal work. Notwithstanding the abstract origin of the design it may be asked if the die-sinker took his inspiration from a κυνηγόω Λύδιως.⁹

---

⁵ Very close to the Ephesian type comes the pin Perachora pl. 76. 8 (p. 175). The electrum pin pl. 5. 36, not from the Basis but from the West Area, is a miniature copy of sub-Geometric Poloposian ones such as that from Argos, Waldstein pl. 137, no. 345, or that from the sanctuary of Artemis Orthia B 33. 13, 110 fig. 1, k; a woman from Argos or Sparta, terræ armae, had her—or her mother’s or grandmother’s—pepos-pin copied by an Ephesian goldsmith, wore it with her Ionian dress, and dedicated it to Artemis: the copy of course defies dating.

⁶ Blinksen pp. 262 ff. gave a list, which could be enlarged. He still dated the fibulae from the Ephesian Basis and from the sanctuary of Artemis Orthia before 700 B.C. This is ruled out by the cable patterns and by other considerations. At Olynthus, tomb 516, a bone disc brooch, Olynthus X, 101 no. 939, similar to pl. 20 no. 339, was accompanied by a Corinthian aryballos, similar to the one figured in Olynthus V pl. 44. 3. This would date the burial to the second quarter of the sixth century, but provide only a terminus ante quern for the brooch.

⁷ Two ivory pins in Cambridge said to come from Ephesus, RA 31 1930 pl. 6, one with a cross-hatched bud, the other with a hand as head, might be Roman: compare Cleopatra, de Delia, XVIII pl. 85, and possibly Waldstein The Argive Heraeum II pl. 140. 61, 62, 64.

⁸ Jacobsthal Early Celtic Art 74; Sir Cyril Fox Antiquities Journal XXVII (1948), 123 ff.

⁹ Inventory of the Samian Heraeum, Michel 332; Bechtel SGDI 5702; Rousse Greek Votive Offerings 404; Buschor Beiträge zur Geschichte der griechischen Textilkunst 44.
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The griffin relief is not Ephesian. The likeness of the griffin to Protoattic lions, to which I have pointed, is perhaps more than a general resemblance of contemporary works. Is the tondo Attic? An Attic bronze relief of pure Protoattic style has been found outside Athens at Dodona, Ἡπειρωτικαὶ Ἑρωνικαὶ pl. 19, α, 2: it is decorated with plants identical with those on the Analetos hydria jfd I (1887) pl. 3; Kübler, Altattische Malerei p. 39, 10.10

On the Ephesian relief the whole ground is densely covered with fillings; on Geometric and Early Orientalising vases as a rule the filling ornaments keep clear of the contours of figures: vases on which they touch or almost touch them are not entirely missing. I am thinking of Protoattic vases such as the fragmentary krater with the Sphinxes, BSA XXXV, pl. 51, c; Kübler, loc. cit. fig. 21.11 Of the filling ornaments on the relief the guilloches recur on Protoattic vases from the Analetos hydria onwards; for the cross-hatchings they offer no analogy. Nevertheless it seems to me easier to translate the tondo into the style of Protoattic vases than to look out for analogies in Hittite or central European arts.

Three specimens of an electrum relief, pl. 3, 10 more nearly complete than pl. 8, 4, here Pl. XXXI, b, and that in the British Museum, Marshall no. 908, p. 69 fig. 13. Did they all three decorate the same object, perhaps a wooden casket or were they sewn on a textile?

The plaques have a border of bosses on all four sides, and there is above the figure panel a band with what looks like three two-leaved plants with a bud in the axil of the leaves (preserved in the first specimen). Two anthropomorphic lions and between them a figure are represented. The near hind legs tread on the ground, the off hind legs appear higher up, obviously resting on a support, which, however, is not represented here: in other groups of this kind it is a rock, a pedestal, a flower or the like.12 The near forelegs touch the figure's breast, the far ones its knees. The heads are very large. There is a blob on the shoulder, and another on the haunches, an abbreviation of elaborate patterns, often marking these spots in Oriental and Orientalising lions. The figure, drawn in profile, stands to the right; the feet remain in the air, at some distance above the far hind paws of the lions. The right arm touches the raised forepaw of the right-hand lion. The figure is nude, male rather than female. Quite apart from its sex, this miserable dwarf is not, as has been suggested by Hogarth (pp. 110; 326, III) and accepted by other writers, the Mistress of the Beasts but the victim of the lions. This story was popular in eighth- and seventh-century Greece: (a) Attic Late Geometric gold bands.13 On these as on the Cretan shield Kunze loc. cit. no. 6, pls. 10-20; Beilage 1, the victim is helmeted. (b) Late Geometric Attic kantharos in Copenhagen,14 Pl. XXXI, c: the man's head is in the mouth of one of the lions, the buttocks in that of the other. (c) Bronze fibula Berlin, Hampe Frühe griechische Sagenbilder in Boeotien pl. 11 no. 58, Pl. XXXI, d, beginning of seventh century. The composition is similar to that of the Ephesian electrum plaques, but an advanced phase of the story is shown: only head and chest of the man remain, the rest is in the bellies of the lions.15

These three plaques and the relief in the British Museum, Marshall no. 907, p. 69 fig. 12 (Ephesus pl. 3, 6 and 8, 9), range very low among Ephesian gold work and have a strange, provincial look. Bad works are difficult to date: origin in the second quarter of the seventh century seems likely.

10 John Cook BSA XXXV, 205 'about 700'; Kübler loc. cit. 10 '790-790'.
11 John Cook loc. cit. 675; Kübler, p. 12, dates the vase a little earlier.
12 Omitting the well-known Mycenaean examples I mention a few of the seventh and sixth centuries. Most of the lions turn their heads back, and there are other differences of posture. Amphora, Thera II, 213 fig. 420. In Iovis, Artemis Orthia pl. 111. Corinthian bronze mirror, Payne Necrocinthia 227 fig. 102, B. Bronze plaques from shields, AM XLI (1916) pl. 4 (Noicaitaro); Perachora pl. 50, 1, 2 (p. 148). Gold pectoral, Filow Die archaische Nekropole von Trebenissche p. 14 fig. 10 (pl. 2, 2); p. 16 fig. 12 (pl. 4). Electrum coin of uncertain Ionic mint, Hill Guide to the principal coins of the Greeks pl. 1, 13. Clay relief, Waldstein The Argia Heraeum II, 38 fig. 42 (not Mycenaean but sixth century B.C.). Middle Corinthian column crater, Louvre E 628, Payne Necrocinthia no. 1169: the lions tread on a bema, as if performing in a circus. Bronze plaque, de Riedter Catalogue des bronzes trouves sur l'Acropole d'Athènes 49 fig. 14, Tile, Sardis 10, 1 pl. 5.
13 Kunze Kretische Bronzerei 265; Reichel Das griechische Goldrelief 55, which should be read with Kunze's review Gymnion XXI (1949) 5-6.
14 CVA Copenhagen 2, III H pl. 73 (= Dænemark 74), 5 b, and clearer in the drawing 42 XLIII (1885) pl. 8, 2, whence Furtwangler Kleine Schriften II, pl. 24, 2.
15 In Early Celtic Art 32 ff. and 37 I have said something on other representations of the story.
Pottery

Three sherds, p. 220 figs. 46, 47 (whence Lambrino Les vases archaïques d'Histria 344 fig. 341, 9, 48, 16 belong to a class of vases termed Samian-Ephesian by Technau AM LIV (1929) 22: there on Beilage 11, 12, and 13 Samian pottery showing the same or similar motives is illustrated. 17 Other sherds of such style found at Ephesus outside the Basis are pp. 228 fig. 54; 229 fig. 56 (Lambrino loc. cit. 341 fig. 10). The date of these vases is about the middle of the seventh century B.C. 18 The large vases of which the sherds formed part were no votive offerings: the fragments obviously slipped into the Basis with the filling earth (Gjerstad Liverpool Annals 1937, p. 30). Besides these sherds there are from the Basis three small, plain jars, mentioned on p. 234, but not described or illustrated. As such cheap articles have otherwise not been found in the deposit, the presence of the jars would be best explained if they had not themselves been dedicated but had served as the containers for the offerings proper, coins or gold ornaments, or perhaps ointments or perfume.

Scarabs

I here append eight scarabs, found in the filling earth of the Basis, pp. 204-5, fig. 43, 1-4 and 6-9, which are generally assigned to the 26th dynasty, 660-25. 19

The following ornaments can, with more or less precision, be assigned to various phases of the second half of the seventh century.

Gold Lion Fibula

Pls. 2; 4. 35; Blinkenberg loc. cit. 279, XVI, 17 a, here Pl. XXXI, e. The fibula measures in length 2.5 cm. It is closed on the reverse by a flat, half-circular plate, on which pin and pin-catch are fastened. The structural parts are hidden; the bow and the area within are covered with ornament: the same tendency is at work in the Ephesian ivory brooch of unique type, pl. 32. 12. The bow ends on either side in a lion's head. This feature recurs in a bronze fibula from the Caucasus, Kalitsinski, Recueil Konakov pl. 7. 21, whence Sundwall Die älteren italischen Fibeln 23 fig. 13, d. Sundwall noticed the Anatolian character of the pin-catch: the fibula is in fact more likely an import from Asia Minor than of Caucausan origin. The only other Greek fibula with an animal head at either end of the bow is the seventh-century piece with snakes' heads from Pherae, Blinkenberg loc. cit. 126 fig. 157. Two fibulae show a lion's head at one end of the bow only, Blinkenberg 226 fig. 259, from Pherae, and 224, fig. 257, from Dodona, the former of the sixth century, the latter probably of the fifth.

The arc of the bow is set with upright 'barley-corns' and four-petalled flowers alternately: there are from the Artemision other gold ornaments, decorated in the same taste. The large flower in the middle has six leaves, which have the shape of a double lancet: three are plain, three are foliaged. In the centre of the flower is a matrix for inlay. The foliated leaves have three Ionian analogies: the first is in the gold quatrefoils from Delphi BCH LXIII (1939) pl. 34 (p. 103 no. 49), here Pl. XXXI, f: here the leaves are more like palmettes with a long kernel. The second is a gold diadem with rosette-leaves of this form from Kelermes, AA XX

16 The fragment fig. 48, with no indication of provenience on p. 220, is no doubt the third of the 'three fragments of painted pottery from the Basis', enumerated on p. 234.
17 Of the two hands which decorate the fragment of the bowl, fig. 47, the bottom one occurs in various styles of the seventh century (Johansen Les vases répétités 117-6); it is found in the Samian-Ephesian group, AM loc. cit. pl. 11, 1 and pl. 12, 3-8 (Rumpf JdI LVIII (1933) 70, III, a, 4 and 5). The upper band is formed by serpentine with fillings. A roughly contemporary example occurs on a bronze shield from Idalion, Perrot 3, fig. 636, whence AJA 54 1950, 294 fig. 2. Sixth century: Late-Clazomenian Northampton vase (Beazley PBSR XI (1920) pls. 1, 9, 4; the pattern, Endt Jonsche Vasenmalerei pl. 2. 16). More floral, on the Droop cup JHS LII (1932) 69 fig. 11: the cup might have been painted in the second quarter of the sixth century; the Northampton vase is dated by Beazley to 540 B.C.
18 Rumpf JdI LVIII (1933), 65.
19 P. 207, and Pieper, quoted by Gjerstad op. cit. 30.
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(1905) 59 fig. 4: Ebert Realexikon 13 pl. 27 A, b: there is the same alternation of plain and foliate leaves. The third is found on a fragment of a Vroulia cup, JHS XLI (1924) 189 fig. 13. I shall presently mention another motive occurring on these cups and in Ephesian jewellery.

The lion heads belong to a group of Greek seventh-century lions characterised by a flower-like pattern of wrinkles on the nose. The clearest examples are the bronze gargoyles with a frog from Samos.20 Pl. XXXII, a, and the ‘Menekrates’ lion from Korfu.21 Rodenwaldt dates the latter to the last decade of the seventh century, and thereabouts the Ephesian lion fibula, the finest ornament from the Artemisium, a marvel of μικροτεχνία, might have its place. This and related formulae for the nose-wrinkles of lions follow Oriental models22 but all render nature: Pl. XXXII, b shows two three-months-old lion cubs in the Chessington Zoo.23

The lion heads forming the terminals of two gold foil tubes from the Basis, pls. 7. 29; 9. 1, are described by Hogarth (p. 114) as similar to the fibula lions: the photographs are not good enough to check this. The purpose of the little tubes is not clear; Hogarth thought of pin-heads, hilts, or miniature sceptres: none of these are likely.

CUP SPIRALS AND LOZENGES

Of Ephesian ornamental motives one offers itself for treatment here: it was a favourite pattern of Ephesian jewellers, it is, within certain limits, dateable, and sheds light on the connexion of the art of the seventh-century Greece with Minoan art and the Near East. The ornament is a configuration of cup spirals turning their backs to the centre; another version, at Ephesus less frequent, is a lozenge with scrolls or ‘macander hooks’ at the corners. At Ephesus the cup spirals and the lozenges are divided clearly from one another, but often enough a specimen cannot with certainty be assigned to either version. It is probable that from the beginning the two versions existed side by side, often fusing.

The objects on which these ornaments appear are most of them gold or electrum; they were found in the Basis and elsewhere in the sanctuary.24 Pl. XXXIII, a, b, c, e (Marshall 827; Hogarth pls. 4. 31; 8. 25. 27) give examples of the cup-spiral design, Pl. XXXIII, d (pl. 10. 16) of the lozenge pattern. Pl. XXXIII, c and e are plaques with repoussé decoration, the others have a cut-out contour. The pieces of the first group, as nail-holes in some show, were mounted on wood or leather; those of the second group sewn in textiles; pl. 4. 26, and pl. 4. 31, my Pl. XXXIII, b, are brooches: the reverse is illustrated on pl. 10, 34.

In ivory there are two roundels, pl. 38. 12 and pl. 40. 11, with cup spirals, reminiscent of the gold roundel, Pl. XXXIII, e.

The ivory seal, pl. 27. 3, a, b (Barnett, JHS LXVIII (1948), pl. 6. d), a work of the first half of the seventh century, not from the Basis, also belongs here. In the roundel three wiry cup spirals are inscribed, and in each of the three resulting compartments a seated griffin is seen.25

In the Appendix (pp. 93–5) I give a list of these ornaments, which illustrates their chronology and regional distribution. Both types are centred on the islands; examples from mainland Greece are scarce: the gold band from Delphi is an import from Ionia. Other imported

---

21 Rodenwaldt Korfu II. 177 ff. figs. 154–155.
22 Relief from Khosarabad, Louvre, Enc. Photogr. I. 304, 305; stone head of a lion from Sippur (Abu Habbah) in the British Museum, fig. 2 on p. 160 below: both are of the later seventh century, b.c. See also Rodenwaldt loc. cit. 143 ff.; Emkem Akurgal Spätmykenische Bildkunst 52 ff., 56, 57, 72.
23 From a photograph by Raymond S. Kleboe, by permission of Picture Post.
24 Besides the pieces illustrated here there are the following others:

---

Cup spiral plaques, pls. 8. 8 (Marshall pl. 9. 880), 12. 23, 24. 26, 28. 29; pl. 10. 39.
Cup spirals in openwork, pl. 9. 33–6, 38, 41–8 (Marshall pl. 9. 840).
Engraved on the thron of the hawk-priestess, p. 156 fig. 30.
25 Cecil Smith (p. 169 no. 39) says that the griffins with wide-open jaw look back over their shoulder: in fact they are looking straight on, and what Smith took for an open jaw is an sigrette.
pieces with such ornaments only reflect Ionian models. For textiles and ivories it should be remembered that weavers and ivory-carvers came over and were the agents of Ionic designs.

None of the Greek examples are earlier than 700 B.C., and a few only are later than 600 B.C. Of these the latest are on two nesiotic korai from the Akropolis of the close of the sixth century, one being a dress pattern, the other on an earring: textile patterns are long-lived, and the earring might have been a family piece.

The Ephesian lozenges with 'maeander hooks' have their analogies on Rhodian and Parian vases of the first quarter of the seventh century, the cup spirals on vases of the later part of the century: thus the first would be among the earlier, the second among the later objects from the Basis. 26

Sam Wide, AM XXII (1897), 233 ff., was the first to deal with these ornaments, and in Early Celtic Art pl. 268, 186-212 (pp. 63-4; 74-5), I illustrated their history from Mycenae to the Celts. Wide sought the origin of the Greek patterns in Mycenaean art, where, however, they are not very frequent. We both of us disregarded the fact that the ornament was popular in the arts of the Near East in the second millennium and the first four centuries of the first. The Cretan-Mycenaean ornaments and the Greek archaic ones both reflect Oriental prototypes. It may be asked if there was continuity between the two phases in the West, or whether there were two separate waves, carrying these motives and other artistic goods westwards: I for one believe in the second alternative.

Finally one more gold ornament from the Basis for which Greek analogies of the seventh century can be found, the narrow strip, pl. 9, 50, hardly a diadem, as Hogarth (p. 199) was inclined to believe. It is decorated with a row of unconnected pretzels. The Cretan gold strips from Thera, AM XXVIII (1903), pl. 5, 13, 14, p. 228 (Reichel Das griechische Goldrelief 56 nos. 46, a, b; Kunze, Gnomon 1949, 9), to which Hogarth refers, bear only a general resemblance: they show continuous cables, not single closed pretzels. The Ephesian ornament has analogies in painted pottery of the very early seventh century from Knossos (BSA XXIX pls. 20, 1; 23, 2; p. 279 fig. 34, no. 54 (and related 43); BSA XXXI, 76 fig. 17). The Ephesian gold strip might be as early as the Cretan vases, but it might equally well be later: the motive, in a more ornate form, still appears on the Fikellura oinochoe in the British Museum A 693, BSA XXXIV, pl. 16, a (p. 37).

26 I have on p. 89 quoted the Ephesian ivory rounded pl. 38, 12—not from the Basis—because of the cup spirals on its obverse, but not mentioned the coarsely engraved decoration of the reverse, pl. 38, 10, an alternation of lotus flowers and buds: the flowers with five leaves are the type common in Milesian-Rhodian pottery of the late seventh century; the buds have ovaries, characteristic of roses, frequent on Chalcidian vases (Jacobsthal Oramente griechischer Vasen 163). I do not know earlier examples and am at a loss to date the rounded.

FIGURINES OF THE EARLY SIXTH CENTURY B.C.

There are from the Basis four tiny electrum statuettes of women in sphyrelaton technique, measuring in height between 1.5 and 3 cm., pl. 4, 4, here Pl. XXXIII, 8, 13, 14, 15. The first, in the British Museum, was well described by Marshall p. 80, 1040 ‘a shell, stamped with the figure of a woman, in two halves, one for the front, the other for the back. They were originally joined by being folded over one another’. There was a core: that of pl. 4, 15 is silver (Hogarth). The pieces pl. 4, 13, 14, were, as traces show, fixed on a pin: if they were dress-pins, they would be the only examples of this type from archaic Greece. Hogarth took the other figurines for pendants, but this is doubtful. The women are commonly said to be Artemis, which is incapable of proof. The statuette in the British Museum, like the hawk-priestess, holds a jug in her right hand and a patera in her left.

These four electrum figurines, closely related to one another, are in all probability the works of Ephesian jewellers. The heavy, gloomy faces with big noses recall that of the Sphinx on three gold reliefs from the Basis, pl. 8, 2 (Marshall no. 905, p. 69 fig. 11), here Pl. XXXIII, 1, which, as Kunze (loc. cit. 259) saw, are of the first half of the seventh century, and of the ivory
statuette, pl. 24, 5, here Pl. XXXIII, h, i,\textsuperscript{27} and there is perhaps still a family-likeliness in the slightly later bronze statuette, pl. 14, a woman with a large aquiline nose, the portrait of an aged head-priestess rather than Artemis.\textsuperscript{28} The chitons of nos. 4, 13, 15 show folds; no. 14 wants them but need not for that reason be earlier than the others.\textsuperscript{29} Langlotz in Schrader Marmorbildwerke p. 11 pointed out that drapery-folds are an innovation of the sixth century, and on p. 33 n. 15 cited examples, the first of them being the just-quoted bronze statuette, which he took for Samian, as already Hogarth had done.

Of larger size are the electrum shells of heads or busts pl. 4, 1, 2, here Pl. XXXIII, k, l, and pl. 4, 6. The first recalls the ivory head Sardis XIII, 1 pl. 8 (whence HIS LXVIII (1948) 23 fig. 20) and is Lydian or mixo-Lydian. There is also something un-Greek in nos. 2 and 6.\textsuperscript{30}

Next, a fragment of an ivory 'hawk-priestess', pl. 25, 1, here Pl. XXXIV, b: preserved are the hawk and the top piece of the pole.\textsuperscript{31} This is the only ivory sculpture and the only hawk-priestess from the Basis; the others, the complete statuette, pl. 21, 6 and pl. 22, here Pl. XXXIV, f, g, h, and those of which only hawks and fragments or traces of poles survive (pl. 25, 6 and possibly others on the same plate)\textsuperscript{32} were found in the West Area of temple A.

There are many hawks from the Artemesium, gold, solid and spherylaton, silver, bronze, ivory, terracotta, and faience.\textsuperscript{33} A few of the hawks are in low relief or flat, gold or silver, pendants or fibulae: they show the birds with wings spread. Compare them with the ivory eagle fibulae of the first quarter of the seventh century, Orthia pl. 134, and with the eagle on the contemporary Protocorinthian aryballos in Boston, Johansen Les vases sicyonii pl. 22, 2; Payne Protokorinthische Vasenmalerei pl. 11, 1–5. The majority of the birds are wrought in the round,\textsuperscript{34} and devised for profile view.

Some of the hawks (pl. 6, 62, here Pl. XXXIV, d; pl. 15, 16; pl. 25, 3) grip a round perch: thus would the artists see the sacred birds of Artemis in the aviary of the temple. That the hawks wore jewellery may be concluded from the beads round the neck of the gold hawk, pl. 4, 23, and the silver hawk, pl. 11, 5; the bronze hawk in the British Museum, pl. 15, 16—badly corroded but a much better work than the illustration would suggest—also wore a necklace. Is the woman with the two birds, pl. 24, 8, here Pl. XXXVI, d, e, a neokoros, a novice entrusted with the care of the sacred hawks?\textsuperscript{35} Did the maidens at the feast of the goddess go in procession, carrying on their heads a pole with a hawk perched on it? Athenian women in the Panathenaic procession did not carry owls on poles or hold owls at their waist.

Cecil Smith has added examples of hawks on poles or columns from Asia Minor and Egypt, which, however, are not very helpful. More pertinent is the image of the Potnia Theron with an eagle on her head in the bronze hydria from Graechwil (Bloesch Antike Kunst in Schweizer Privatbesitz pl. 3–5; pp. 22 ff.; 148 ff.), a Greek work from South Italy, a little earlier than the Ephesian hawk-priestesses. Another analogy worth mentioning is the

\textsuperscript{27} See p. 93.

\textsuperscript{28} Miss Richter Archais Greek Art fig. 70 (where the caption should read Istanbul instead of London); Matz Geschichte der griechischen Kunst I pl. 70, a (pp. 162 and 516 n. 140); Ria Bertens IX (1949) pl. 19, 3 (p. 86); Rumpf Griechische und römische Kunst 18. The very carefully executed facsimile in the British Museum shows traces of gilding: it is at present not possible to check this in Istanbul.

\textsuperscript{29} The chitons of the ivory statuettes, Pl. XXXVI, d–e, f, made at a time when drapery-folds were current, are now foldless but it is likely that the folds were painted on.

\textsuperscript{30} Kunze loc. cit. 259 noticed the un-Greek character of no. 6.

\textsuperscript{31} On p. 161 no. 12 Cecil Smith classifies it under ivories but says that the material of this and of the similar bird, pl. 25, 6 (p. 161 no. 13) appears to be wood. Hogarth in the list of wooden objects (p. 217) has omitted both, and the hawk, pl. 25, 1, is not in his list of the contents of the Basis (pp. 233–34, nos. 7 and 13).

\textsuperscript{32} Cecil Smith (p. 172) thinks it possible that the ivory statuette of the spinning woman, pl. 24, 1 (here Pl. XXXV, a, b), carried a hawk-topped pole, fitted into a hole sunk in the crown of her head. This is unlikely, if my interpretation of the maidens with hawks is correct.

\textsuperscript{33} Hogarth, p. 342, index s.v. ‘hawks’. Stanley Robinson draws my attention to a bronze hawk (sixth century?) from the Artemesium at Cyrene, Africa Italiana IV (1931), 106 no. 2, figs. 22, 22a.

\textsuperscript{34} Hawks displayed. Flat: pl. 4, 16; pl. 7, 19, 20; Marshall pl. 9, 1041, whence Pl. XXXIV, a. In relief: pl. 4, 21–4, 27, 28; pl. 7, 27, 28; pl. 11, 10 (silver).

\textsuperscript{35} Hawks in profile. Only pl. 11, 9 (silver) is a cut-out silhouette: the others are in the round: Gold, pl. 4, 36; pl. 6, 62 (Marshall 1042), here Pl. XXXIV, d, both from the Basis. Silver pl. 11, 1–6, 8. Bronze, pl. 15, 14–6. Terracotta, pp. 200, 201, figs. 39, 40. Faience, pls. 43 and 44, several. On the ivory hawks see above in the text.

\textsuperscript{36} Picard, Ephebe et Claron 490 ‘deux éperons enrouleurs de bandelettes et tenus sur chacune de ses mains : les bandelettes are in fact the crossed tips of the wings, for which the gold hawk, pl. 4, 36 (p. 96), gives an analogy.'
Luristan bronze figure, Godard, *Les bronzes du Luristan* pl. 56, 205, 205 bis: a man, carrying on his head a short profiled pole, which is topped by a displayed bird-hawk or eagle. Identical birds on similar stems form the head of Luristan bronze pins, Godard loc. cit. pl. 33, 125, Ashmolean Museum; Sydney, Nicholson Museum, Trendall Handbook 112, fig. 15, a; pins of another type with such a bird are *Bulletin Bruxelles* 1932, 102 fig. 28, and New York Metropolitan Museum 131592/53 g. It is difficult to say whether the likeness between the bird-carrying Ephesian women and the Luristan man is more than one of motive.

What is the date of the statuette of which the hawk from the Basis formed part? The woman—if she were preserved—would answer this question, the bird does not. These hawks are of various types: some, such as that of the hawk-priestess, Pl. XXXIV, a, or the gold hawk, Pl. XXXIV, d, are slender and sit erect; others are sturdy; that from the Basis, Pl. XXXIV, b, stands between them. The build of the birds is no chronological criterion. Only the bronze hawk on a hare, pl. 15, 14, can by its style be assigned to the second half of the sixth century; of the others only those which are preserved with the women who carry them, the pair of the statuette, Pl. XXXIV, d and e, and the hawk of the hawk-priestess. These statuettes, as I shall point out presently, are works of the second quarter of the sixth century. This is no reason for dating the hawk-priestess from the Basis as late as this, and to upset the well-established chronology of the contents of the Foundation Deposit. The hawk from the Basis just proves that ivory statuettes of maidens with hawks were dedicated to Artemis already in the seventh century or in the early sixth.

The hawk-priestess from the Basis, of which the hawk alone survives, calls for some remarks on the other Ephesian ivory figurines: none of them comes from the Basis, but it will appear that their study sheds light on finds from the Basis, which are the subject proper of my paper.

First, the hawk-priestess, Pl. XXXIV, f, g, h.

No marble statue expresses the East Greek ideal of a kore more clearly than this ivory statuette, only just over 4 in. high. Modesty and composure are virtues seen in the korai from the Athenian Acropolis, but the vitality and naivété on this face have not their like in Athens. Such might have been the looks of the maidens dear to Sappho; and one might feel oneself reminded of her by Foolish Virgins in a French Cathedral of the early thirteenth century.

She is of purest Greek style. Her sister is the marble head, Berlin 1934, Langlotz *Frühgriechische Bildhauerschulen* pl. 70, b. Her twin-brother is the bronze kouros in Stockholm, Richter, *Kouroi* pl. 26 no. 21. Other relations of hers are the marble head of a kouros from Rhodes (?) in Istanbul, Richter pl. 83 no. 111, and those clay perfume-pots in form of a female bust, of which three well-illustrated pieces may be quoted, two, CVA Oxford 2, 2 D pl. 7 and one in Copenhagen, Nationalmuseum, Riis, *Oriental og Klassisk Olaud* fig. 16. There are more, but it is not always clear whether the likeness is one of style or physiognomy.

There is to-day agreement that the hawk-priestess is a work of the second quarter of the sixth century, more likely of its later part.

Of the nine ivory statuettes illustrated by Hogarth on pl. 24 two have to be left on one side: no. 2 is one of the eastern copies of Syrian Astarte plaques, recently dealt with by Riis, *Berythus IX* (1949), 69 ff., and no. 4 is an unfinished, abandoned piece, perhaps the votive offering of a poor woman: it is not possible to say what it would have looked like when

---

28 Langlotz *Frühgriechische Bildhauerschulen* 118 ff. gave a list of these works, which he then attributed to Samos.
29 Kunze *Kretische Bronzereliefs* 258. The oinochoe in her right hand and the dish in her left neither confirm nor contradict this date. The dish is of a type of which three examples, bronze, have come down to us: New York, Richter 328, from Cyprus. Ekrem Akurgal, *Beyrakit* (Zeitschrift der philosophischen Fakultät Ankara VIII, 1950) pl. B, two, one from Ankara, one from Manisa. Akurgal adduces the dish of the hawk priestess. The vessels are Greek rather than Phrygian, as Akurgal is inclined to believe: Payne's remarks, *Perachora* p. 161 are instructive. Such a dish with studs on the top surface of the rim, is carried upright by a woman represented in an ivory statuette, *Olynthus X* pl. 2, 8; pp. 14, 15 figs. 1a, 1b. The piece, possibly Ionic, is not much earlier than 480 B.C. David Robinson considered phiale, wreath, or tympanon as possible interpretations of the object and decided for the second. By the way, comparison of the statuette with the marble statue, Buschor *Altsamische Standbilder* 160-2 (p. 14, n. 75) is misleading. The handle of the vessel has nothing to do with those of the bowls referred to on p. 15, n. 75, nor can I see what the studded dish of the ivory figure has in common with the lead disc *Olynthus X* pl. 159 no. 2536.
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finished. There remain seven more. Of these pl. 24. 5, here Pl. XXXIII, h, i, only 3 cm. h., resembles the little electrum sphyrelaton, pl. 4. 14, in a lesser degree also pl. 4. 4, here Pl. XXXIII, g; it is the modest work of an Ephesian ivorist, untouched by Oriental influence.

The Eastern element is strongest in the spinning woman,\(^\text{38}\) pl. 24. 1, here Pl. XXXV, a, b, which is almost indistinguishable from Oriental work, and, very little tempered, in the 'Megabyzos', pl. 24. 7 and 11, here Pl. XXXV, c, d. The kore in Cambridge,\(^\text{39}\) pl. 24. 9 a-c, here Pl. XXXVI, a, b, has still a slight Eastern note in her face, but compare her with the statuette, Pl. XXXV, a, b: body, stance, and gestures of the spinner are of an Oriental languid grace; the kore in Cambridge at first glance seems to be tied with invisible chains of archaic convention, but soon you come to see how she is conscious of her body, full of latent energy: that is Greek. She has her place somewhere after the statue from Auxerre in the Louvre, which was made not long after the middle of the seventh century, and not far from such statues as that from the Ptoion, Athens, National Museum no. 4; Langlotz in Schrader Marmorbildwerke, text 12 fig. 1, left, dated (p. 33 n. 17; p. 41) to the end of the century. She has nothing of that motley which makes Cypriote or Naucratite sculpture unsavoury.

This cannot be said of a second group which comprises the figurines, pl. 24. 3, 8, 10, here Pl. XXXVI, f, d-e, c: in these the Greek element comes to the fore, and of the Eastern ingredient just enough is left to make Pl. XXXVI, d-e, and f repulsive.

The spinner and the Megabyzos were carved by Oriental ivorists who came in the second half of the seventh century and made votive offerings for the Ephesians: they depicted the garments of their patrons with Greek patterns (Hogarth p. 156 fig. 30). The kore, Pl. XXXVI, a, b, might be the work of a gifted Greek Apprentice. In the course of the sixth century the school hellenised: on the one hand there is the hawk-priestess, a masterpiece of pure Greek style; on the other hand those hybrids.\(^\text{40}\)

The strong point of this school of Ephesian ivory-workers was not human but animal sculpture, but this is outside the scope of these pages.

Paul Jacobsthal.

APPENDIX
(to pp. 89-90)

THE NEAR EAST

Chains of lozenges
On painted pottery: Bittel Frühgeschichte Forschung in Kleinasien pl. 7. 3 (Bosser Alt-Anatolien pl. 74. 372), from Kültepe, first half of second millennium. Ghishman Fouilles de Sialk 1 pl. 62; p. 448.

Cup spirals
First half of second millennium. Lid of clay vase from Troy III, H. Schmidt Schliemanns Sammlung trojanischer Altertümer 2470.
Second half of second millennium. In the context of Sacred trees or in lieu of them, on numerous cylinder seals (Weber Alltorientalische Siegelbilder 479. E. Meyer Reich und Kultur der Chetiter 64 fig. 55. Frankfort Cylinder Seals pl. 31. 1, and others). Examples of the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I (1260-30): lead plaques from his temple, Andrae, Die jüngeren Ischtartempel in Assur pl. 46. a-e. Wall-painting from Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta, Andrae Coloured Ceramics from Ashur pl. 1, very elaborate.

MINOAN
Sealings from Zakro JHS XXII (1902) pl. 10. 134; Matz Frühkretische Siegel pl. 12. 3. Gold plaque from the fourth shaft-grave, 669, Karo Schachtgräber pl. 66. Tomb-stele, 1429, Kare, pl. 6. Gold band from Enkomi, tomb 73, Excavations in Cyprus pl. 10. 491, whence JHS XXVI (1911), 246 fig. 31. Stirrup vase CYA Rodi 2, II A c pl. 11. 2 (Italia 497).

\(^{38}\) Barnett JHS LXVIII (1948) 29, took the figure for a male eunuch, spinning as Herakles did when in the bondage of the Lydian Omphale: I wonder whether this is not disproved by the breasts.

\(^{39}\) I owe the photograph to the kindness of Mr. Carl Winter, Keeper of the Fitzwilliam Museum.

\(^{40}\) My sketch differs from the views put forward by Langlotz and Barnett. Langlotz loc. cit. 118, 119 (nos. 16, 18) included Pl. XXXIII, h, i, and XXXVI, a, b, c in his list of Samian works. Barnett's last contribution to the subject is in JHS LXVIII (1948) 17 ff. I can here only refer to this important paper without entering into a discussion of the points on which we disagree.
EARLY NORTHERN EUROPE

WPZ XXVII (1940) 1 ff. Late neolithic clay vase from Strzelitz, South Moravia, of the so-called Lengyel II phase. The pattern and four plastic animals, climbing up to the rim of the vessel, are evidence of influence from the Mediterranean and the Near East: see Hawkes Prehistoric Foundations of Europe 115; 242.

GREECE, ITALY AND OUTSKIRTS 41

(A) Lozenges

Protogeometric


Theraean. *Thera II*, 143 figs. 341, 342, b.

Parian. Munich, Sieveking-Hackl 456, fig. 58 (AM XXII (1897) 238 fig. 6), given to Paros by Buschor, *AM LIV* (1929) 144 n. 1.


Boeotian. Hampe *Früh griechische Sagenbilder in Boeotien* 24 fig. 5. Perrot 10, 29 fig. 16 (Ure, *CVA Classification* 12, p. 2).

Olympia IV *Bronzen* pl. 42, 748, embossed on a sheet, possibly from a belt.

Sixth century

Boeotian terracotta statuettes with the patterns painted on the garments, Grace *Archaic Sculpture in Boeotia* figs. 38 and 41.

Gold finger-ring, Berlin, Furtwängler *Beschreibung der geschnittenen Steine* no. 150 (see Jacobsthal Early Celtic Art 55 n. 1; 125).

Fragment of gold bracelet (?) *Perachora* pl. 84, 33.

Thin gold disc, New York, Myres, *Carnola Collection* no. 3018, no provenience, archaic Greek, sixth century rather than seventh, and not, as suggested by Myres, to be connected with gold plaques from the shaft-graves.

Rhomboid bezel of bronze finger-ring from tholo tomb at Prainsos, *BSA XII*, 67 fig. 2, c; the drawing is too sketchy to give a clear idea of style and date.

(B) Cup Spirals

Seventh and sixth centuries

Cretan. *Pithoi*; from Knossos *BSA XXXI*, 64 fig. 21, 3, and from Sitavrakia *AM XXII* (1897) 234 fig. 2.

Globular figure aryballos, Berlin F. 307, Pfuhl fig. 59; Levi *Early Hellenic Pottery of Crete* pl. 26; the head, Jenkins *Dedalica* pl. 6. 6.

Euphoros plate, Pfuhl fig. 117; Rumpf *JdI XLVIII* (1933) 76, II d 1; advanced phase of the group; late seventh century. On the inner side of Menciolas' shield.


*Vroulia*. *Cups, Kinch Vroulia* 181 fig. 62; 183 fig. 65; *CVA Rodi* 2, II D m pls. 3 and 4 (Italia 483, 484).

Pomegranate vase, Boeotia *Aus jónischen und italischen Nekropolen* pl. 22. Latest seventh century or early sixth.

Olympia IV, *Bronze* pl. 43, 754, fragment of a diadem with embossed decoration.

Electrum coin, Jonia, not attributed, Babelon *Monnaies grecques et romaines* pl. 3-4.

Gold band from Delphi, *BCH LXIII* (1939) pl. 32; Amandry, p. 102 (no. 42), saw its Ionic character and quoted analogies. The bead-and-reel frames resemble those of the gold relief *Ephesus* pl. 8. 18.

*Orthis* pl. 179. 15 and 16, miniature lead copies of gold or silver disc pendants.

*Orthis* pl. 143-2, round ivory seal.

*Excavations in Cyprus* 14 figs. 22 (three spirals) and 23, from Enkomi, ivory discs, not stratified, but very probably seventh century.

Terracotta revetments, *Sardis* X, 1, pls. 18, 20; sixth century.

Cypriote spout jug, *CVA British Museum* 2, II C c pl. 18, 8 (Gr. Brit. 62).

Earrings of the Chiotc kore Akropolis 675; Payne and Young pls. 49, 50; Schrader *Marmorbilderwerke* no. 43, pls. 60, 61 (pp. 91-3), pl. II; Langlotz and Schuchhardt, *Archaische Plastik auf der Akropolis* pp. 21, 22; Lermann *Althellasische Plastik* pl. 16; Alexander, *Metropolitan Museum Jewelry* 24. Langlotz noticed the Ionic style of the earrings: he dates the statue about 510 B.C.

Dress pattern, Kore 594, Payne and Young pls. 46-8 (pp. 29 ff.). Schrader *Marmorbilderwerke* pls. 76, 77; no. 54; Langlotz and Schuchhardt L. c. no. 30. Cycladic, about 500 B.C. The pattern alone Lermann L. c. pl. 13. Still later, of the seventies of the fifth century, is the pattern on a Clazomenian sarcophagus in Cambridge, *JHS* LVI (1936) pl. I.

---

41 In the following list the objects, if not stated otherwise, are pottery. I owe valuable additions to this list to the interest of Mr. Llewellyn Brown.
THE DATE OF THE EPHESIAN FOUNDATION-DEPOSIT

Sword from Melgunov, Ebert Reellexikon 13 pl. 34 A, d, an Assyrianising work, dateable to the sixth century. Small gold disc, Louvre, De Ridder, Catalogue sommaire des bijoux antiques pl. 1. 22, from South Russia. 43

Four tiny gold plaques in New York, Alexander Jewelry no. 102, belonging to a set from South Russia, which is Graeco-Achaemenid of the fifth century rather than of the sixth.

From sixth-century Etruria there are two examples: on the Pontic oinochoe, Munich, Sieveking-Hackl 923 (Ducati Die pontischen Vasen 25, IV, 4; Dohrn Die schwarzfigurigen etruskischen Vasen 147 no. 86 a), and a dress-pattern on the chariot from Monteleone in New York, Richter Bronzes no. 40.

The gold disc in the British Museum, Marshall pl. 16. 1264, ex Blacas, was probably rightly classified as Italic. In Etruria of the early seventh century the lozenge version of the ornament is predominant: gold pendant in Hamburg Aa XLIII (1928) 409–10 figs. 125, 126, with 'maeander hooks' at the corners. Bronze fibulae, Menthe L'archéologie primitive en Italie pl. 290. 2 (serie A pl. 2. 14); Sundwall Die älteren italischen Fibeln 139, C I 8 c 2, from Norcia, and Montelius pl. 307. 7, from Falerii. A contemporary example of the cup-spiral type is the cast handle of a miniature bronze axe from Bologna, Fondo Arnaoaldi, Montelius pl. 82. 6.

Outside Etruria a lozenge appears on a North Apulian Geometric vase CVA Taranto 1, IV D b 1 (Italia 757). Both versions of our pattern reached the North about the seventh century; they became popular in Hallstatt and Celtic arts, 44 and sporadically survive into Roman times. 44

43 I owe a photograph to the courtesy of M. Chaumont.
44 Jacobsthal Early Celtic Art pl. 268, pp. 74–5.
44 Bronze coins, John Evans The Coins of the Ancient Britons pl. 4, 2, 3. Cast handle of bronze implement, Strena Bulicana p. 198, strangely reminiscent of the piece from Fondo Arnaoaldi just quoted. In mosaics of the second century A.D. the rhythm is latent in some of the then popular peltae ornaments: JH XLIII (1928) pl. 14.
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[PLATE XXXVII]

In the islands surprises seem to be as ἀνυνικήθιμοι as the γέλαια of the waves. If news came from anywhere else of the discovery of a circular marble slab carved with a head in relief, experience would lead the archaeologist to expect a late portrait or one of the so-called oscillae. Not so on Melos: here he finds himself confronted with the splendid head of a goddess carved in the purest Early Classical style.

For such in fact is the fragment of a circular marble disc (Plate XXXVII and fig. 1) discovered in 1937 on the slopes of Klema, the site of the ancient town of Melos. It was found lying on the surface of the ground, on the property of Panagioulis Vikhos, to the north-east of Kalyvaki. The distinguished lawyer of Plaka, Mr. N. Kyritses, to whom we must again express our gratitude for having rescued it, readily offered it to the State.

The disc is of Parian marble. Its convex obverse is decorated in relief with a head in profile to the right—an unusual subject. The reverse (fig. 2) is flat and smooth. The flat rim joining the two faces is 0.016 m. wide, but at the centre, where it is broken, the disc is 0.073 m. thick, not counting the height of the relief. The greatest preserved height of the fragment is 0.325 m., the greatest width 0.335. The diameter would have been about 0.448 m.1 A hole, 0.0265 m. deep, cut exactly in the centre of the reverse (fig. 2) was, as its position and depth show, intended for a support to the disc. The practically horizontal cutting of the hole's edges, especially the top edge, allows the disc to be set correctly—an important factor when considering the front face, for it gives the true inclination of the head: slightly tilted, as Plate XXXVII shows with only a small possibility of error.

The head is female. Most of the hair is gathered into a sakkos, of which the front edge may be recognised in the curved line beginning above the ear. This is a normal feature, known from many other monuments. Normal, too, are the strands of hair which originally emerged from the sakkos in front of the ear and on the forehead. Being worked separately and attached, they have not survived, but their outline remains between ear and eye and in a clearly visible curve on the forehead adjoining the broken edge of the relief above the eye. The separately worked hair was attached by means of a hole, 0.025 m. deep, set close to the ear, the outline and modelling of which were modified to conform with it; and there is a second hole, not so well preserved but unmistakable, at the point where the outline of the locks on the temple meets the curve on the forehead (cf. the restoration, fig. 5).

These holes held the pins for attachment, known to the ancients as ὀξελισκοι.2 The separately worked piece of hair (small, but still appreciable in bulk) cannot have been carved in marble; it would have required too thin a slice. It must have been made up of metal: either of bronze (perhaps gilded), or, as Mr. A. Panagiotakos, the sculptor of the National Museum, suggests, of gold, since bronze would have oxidised the marble. Technically, metal hair is associated with acrolithic statues.3 This gives some special importance to our relief, for usually, so far as I know, only secondary details, such as wreaths and weapons, are attached in metal: it is as if we had the epitome of a statue (itself an ἀγαλμα in another sense) of some goddess χρυσοπλάκαμος and—if we may suppose a diadem in the hair—χρυσάμμυς.

But, quite apart from such considerations, it is the impressive design and the surprising quality of its execution that make this head so moving. The tense oblique of nose and forehead, the large eye in its clear-cut hollow, the elegant charm of the lips, the gentle, almost indolent,
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curve of the jaw rising softly to the ear, the corresponding but fuller, more vigorous curve of the sakkos behind—these are the things that strike us first and most forcibly. The face is notably tall, even the part below the nose being unusually deep. Yet the height is balanced by the width; the more so since the width is increased by the sakkos and further accentuated by the rather slender neck. In both outline and internal drawing the composition stresses the horizontal: for example, in the correspondence between the lower edge of the sakkos and the chin, between the nose and the ear, and in the line of the lips. The perpendicular, by contrast, is hardly emphasised at all. Even the sterno-mastoid—a dominant line in such a composition—slants a little. In fact the main effect of the design depends on the interplay of diagonal

Fig. 1.

Fig. 2.

Fig. 3.

Fig. 4.

or oblique lines which continually tend to run off into curves: the line of the jaw, for instance, in relation to the lines of the neck; or the lines of the neck in relation to those of the ear and the hair on the temple; or, again, the lines of ear and hair in relation to the regions of the eye and nose. The various parts of the design are harmonised, not in a static pattern, but in a momentary, unstable equilibrium in which an underlying tension is always perceptible. It must be remembered however that the head would give an impression of greater stability if the top of the skull were not missing.

Turning now to the sculptural execution, the more one studies the carving, the more its fascination grows. The artist delights in subtleties. Prominent features—the cheek-bone, for instance, the lobe of the ear, the upper end of the jaw, the bulging sakkos next to it, the chin, the lower part of the sterno-mastoid—all are in relief of the same height, apart from insignificant local variations. When we consider them as a whole they suggest a front plane which we may regard either as repeating the convex ground-plane, or (better still) as preserving in the finished
work a memory of the convex surface of the original, unworked disc. In the intermediate planes between front plane and ground the depth of relief is varied with astonishing complexity, now conforming with the rise of the ground, now contradicting it (as on the sakkos, the ridge-like sternum-mastoid muscle, the regions of the eye, nose, lips and chin).

Lastly we may note the curved and sloping fillet by means of which the organic part of the neck passes into the geometrical form of the circular frame. As my sculptor colleagues have observed, modern artists might well enjoy this solution of a problem which often baffles them.

From whatever aspect we regard it, then, the design and execution of this relief leave us with an impression of exceptional firmness and completeness. Yet all the time we are aware of a vibrant quality, a living pulse within it (fis. 3 and 4).

Notable among the details is the eye. Drawn between full-face and profile, it forms a triangle with rounded sides, its apex coinciding with the junction of the full-face and profile planes of the eyeball. The fold in the upper lid gives it a more emphatic line than the lower lid. Set somewhat obliquely the eye looks forward and a little upwards; an incised line faintly visible on the eyeball probably marked the iris. The eye is framed by the oblique plane between brow and upper lid and a curious furrow which runs below the lower lid, meeting the plane at the outer corner of the eye. This repetition of its shape on a larger scale greatly enhances the eye's expressiveness. At its inner corner the junction of plane and groove is lost in the shadow cast by the projection of the nose: a noteworthy point in the modelling. The almost intact design of the eye, its consequent freedom from chance shortening, the softness of the surrounding shadow—all these combine to produce an impression of remote purity and benevolence.

Lack of comparable material makes the interpretation of this new work of art from Melos difficult. Even its form is unusual; a large marble disc carved with a head in relief is unique, so far as I know. True, we may classify it generally among those monuments (votive, sepulchral or documentary) in which die Scheibenform nicht mehr die Nachbildung eines mit dem Sinn der Weihung im Zusammenhang stehenden kreisrunden Gerätes wie Diskos oder Schilid ist, sondern der durch Sitte oder Kult motivierte Träger eines in Bild oder Schrift ausgedrückten Inhalts (Jacobsthal). But though several scholars have made excellent detailed observations about them, these monuments have not yet been systematically studied and little light has been thrown on their evolution either as cult objects or as works of art.¹

The oldest surviving parallels in marble are, if I am not mistaken, two roughly contemporary discs of about 500 B.C.: the painted pinax (votive, as I think) of the physician Aineios, and the funerary disc, with inscription only, of Gnathon.² The first of these discs, at all events (I have not seen the second), is shaped just like the Melos disc with flat back and convex front joined at the circumference by a flat fillet. If we had more such early monuments we might know more about the ideas behind the Melian disc; why it was made and how it was set up. Among later examples those connected with the cult of Asklepios are known to us chiefly from representations on Asklepian reliefs. We cannot be sure of their real shape, nor of what is represented on them.³ The only certain disc of this sort which has survived comes from the

---

¹ See A. Maiuri, **Aegean VI (1911)** 10 ff.; J. Svoronos, **Journ. intern. d'arch. Numism 1920-21**, 7 ff.; K. Lehmann-Hartleben, **Arch. f. Religionsw. XXIV (1926)** 21 ff.; E. Kunze, **Krit. Bronze-rel. 50 ff.**; P. Jacobsthal, **Diot. (95 Winkelmannprogramm, 1935)** 23 ff. especially 27 ff. To the monuments referred to in those studies, the following examples, not all of the same kind, can be added (the list is not exhaustive). Bronze discoid sheet: Daidalos, **Greek Rel. 126**, fig. 95/6. F. Matz, **Gesch. d. Gr. Kunst (1949)** 1 pl. 93a. Clay disc in the Museum of Corcyra; incised decoration: sacrificing woman, protome of a horse, part of a funeral banquet (6); H. Bulle in **Archäologische Zeitung E. A. 1928 (Zeichnung nicht zu spät)**, compare P. Wolters **AJA XI (1896)** 147 n. 6. — Poros disc from the Athenian Agora; relief representation of Demeter and Poseidon (end of 5th c. B.C.) (48) **Hesperia X (1941)** 4 fig. 4. — Different is, of course, the spiritual and artistic origin of the series of the round marble pedimental akroteria of which we have an archaic example with a Gorgonion from Sparta: **A.J.A. XXXIX (1881)** 17, 1. 0/22 f. (1899) 16 fig. 8, Tod-Wace, **Sparta Museum 654** (compare K. Rhomaios AE 1933 22, 5); another similar, but earlier, from the 7th c., is in the Tegea Museum; it comes from a temple excavated by K. Rhomaios above the village of Mavriki.


³ The two monuments which show most clearly how the discs were placed on the stele are: Relief in the Nat. Museum Svoronos, pl. XXXV 3. EA 1228, Süsserott, **G. Plastik d. 4. Jhs. pl. 25, 3. Hausmann, Kunst und Heiligtum no. 144, fig. 9 (K. Lehmann-Hartleben, loc. cit.); and relief in the Louvre S. Reinach, **Rep. d. Rel. II** 280, 2, Giraudon.
AN EARLY CLASSICAL DISC RELIEF FROM MELOS

Athenian Asklepieion and bears a snake in relief and the inscription Πυθόδηλος Αθηναίος άνέχτικε (Epigr. Mus. 9004a); it is a circular slab, flat on both faces. On the similar piece, Nat. Mus. 2410, the reverse, on which the two goddesses and the worshipper are carved in relief, is flat while the reverse is convex.

It is not yet clear if we should be justified in connecting the Melian disc with other circular reliefs, nor how the connections would be made—e.g. with such works as the hollow medallions with the head of Kore (?) and Pan on Kyzike stelai of the fourth century B.C., the rock-cut portrait medallion of Artemidoros of Perge at Thera (mid-third century B.C.), the medallions of the busts of the Heroon at Kalydon which copy various classical statues of gods and heroes (end of the second century B.C.), and lastly the portrait medallions of Mithridates’ generals in the Kabeirion at Delos (about 100 B.C.).

I know of only one monument (or perhaps two) which can be compared with ours in form, religious content and date. It is a clay disc from Kyme in the Naples Museum, similar in shape and decorated in relief with a female head wearing a sakkos over the hair. It is much smaller (diam. 0.105 m.) and the head, which, as E. Boehinger remarks, imitates Syracusan coins of series 23, seems to be ten or fifteen years later; but, despite these differences, one has the impression that the Kyme disc was dedicated with much the same intention as the Melian disc, and to a similar goddess.

We may ask in passing how the Melian disc would have been mounted in antiquity. It might have been fixed to the wall by a rod inserted into the hole in the back, or the rod might have been bent downwards at right-angles and the disc fixed on top of a stele or column (cf. the monuments mentioned in note 6). This second possibility reminds us that Melos, where so few archaic and classical monuments have survived, has yielded nevertheless two votive columns—one the famous late archaic Doric Columna Nanniana in Berlin, dedicated to Athena (?) ; the other an Ionic column now in Olympia, dating from near the mid-fifth century and dedicated to Zeus. Neither capital survives to show what was on top of the shaft; but the columns might well, I think, have carried reliefs similar to our disc. If so, it would explain why the artists (Ekphatos and Κόσμως respectively) use the word γράφων = γράφων of their work. In any case γράφων seems to me more intelligible as a verb than a proper name (since the two inscriptions are separated by about fifty years, it would have been difficult for the hypothetical Grophon to be the author of both).

There is perhaps only one general observation that we can make on all these monuments, whose only common factor is their circular form. As all previous students have noted, it can scarcely be accidental that these circular reliefs seem most closely connected directly or indirectly, with the cults of deities whose chthonic character had not been forgotten in classical


11 P. Jacobsthal, loc. cit. 17 and p. 27. Similar seems to be the shape of the disc on the reliefs of the preceding note.

12 K. Lehmann-Hartleben, loc. cit. fig. 2 and p. 22 ff.

13 Stele from Kyzikos with head of Kore (?): JHS XXIV (1904) 88 fig. 3; Hauck, Gysis, vignette; with head of Pan: M. Meier, Cat. d. Sc. pl. II, no. 571; M. Schede, Meisterwerke d. alt. Mus. Konstanzt. pl. XlA; W. Zuchner, D. Berl. Mäanderkrater (98 Winckelmannprobr. 1938) 26 fig. 19.—Artemidos Peragios at Thera: Thera III 86 ff. pl. 5.—Promotion from the Herion at Kalydon: Dygorges-Poulben-Rhomaos, D. Heros v. Kalydon 71 (for the Promotion of the Pheidian Aphrodite see E. Langlotz, Philadelpshprobleme 86 ff. pl. 25 c.).—Promotion from the Kabeirion at Delos: Delos XIII 9 ff. pl. 6, tit. XVI 29 ff.—It is also not certain what is the origin of monuments such as e.g., the ἀντίστροφον ‘πρόσωπον ‘Αρτέμιδος, which appears many times in the inscription from Perge Annuario 6/7, 1923/4, 402 ff. (B. Pace).—To the Greek evidence for the imago clipeata, οἰκονομικὸς άνόητος; add the inscriptions from Lindos: Lindos II nos. 420-421 (I have not seen the thesis of J. Boleh, Imago clipeata).—Still more removed in spirit and provenience, are the painted clay toad from Centuripe.—In general we have not yet the history of the concept and the form of the protome; the articles of S. Ferron, 'Archologica della protome' in the Ann. d. R. Sc. Norm. d. Pisa II (1933) 147 ff. does not advance the problem essentially.

14 A. Levi, Terracotte di Napoli no. 484 fig. 93 = E. Boehinger, D. München v. Surabat 65 fig. 7.—Possibly another disc in the same Museum from Locroi, A. Levi, loc. cit. no. 61 (con foro per la sospensione, tastè muffole di stile bello) is similar, but there is no illustration of it. (Compare ibid. Index x.v. 'Disco' and no. 771 ff.)

times. But apart from this the differences of form and content which we find in detail are too obvious to allow us (in our present state of knowledge) to place great trust in comparative methods for the elucidation of a particular example. This, at all events, will be the view of those of us who are alarmed at the ease with which historians of religion leap in their comparisons from the particular to the universal.

Another line of study bearing directly on the artistic form of the Melian disc and its interpretation is that of Greek methods of tondo composition, especially where a head is concerned. For it we should need to review many works besides those already mentioned—particularly coins and vases. Medallions (i.e. specially painted circles containing heads or busts) are, it is true, rare on vases; but there are many instances where the vase shape itself creates the circle round the head, as does the shape of a coin (e.g. the interior of a kylix or phiale, or a pyxis-lid). Even the Diskophores stele (Nat. Mus. no. 38), a work of the Rampin master, has its place here; for although the placing of the young man’s head within the circle of the diskos seems accidental, yet the artist shows a fine feeling for the problem of matching the living form with the perfect figure of a circle, and of detaching one from the other. But tondo composition is another subject, for which a systematic study of the monuments is still needed; the few observations made by scholars so far cover only sections of the field.

As an example of tondo composition the Melian disc presents one unique feature. On no other circular monument, not even the clay disc from Kyme (note 10 above), is the head pushed so far out from the centre of the circle towards its circumference. This peculiarity of the Melian disc must certainly have an explanation, and to find it we must decide what occupied the rest of the field opposite the head. This brings me to the restoration of the disc as a whole. Believing with Buschor that ‘ein Haltmachen bei Fragmenten wäre grösster Selbstbetrug als die misslungenen Rekonstruktion’ I think that the problem should not be avoided (fig. 5.). We are of course dealing with a work of art, where the υ)}, μικρόν, δίκα, πολλά, αριθμά, γίνεται, and I need not emphasise that my reconstruction is only valuable as an approach, intended mainly to draw attention to the problems which arise in filling the circular, convex field. If we complete the circle of the field with its given diameter of 0.448 m. there is not room for a second head of equal size such as we might expect to find confronting the first. What I think is the spirit of early classical art calls for here (judging from other monuments) is some attribute set in front of the goddess’ head as a symbolic expression of her world, and perhaps, in addition, a votive
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inscription. More than this would not have been tolerated. Our restoration has been made accordingly, on the analogy of a number of vase-paintings, some of which are mentioned in note 13. Some of these—and others where the bust is not framed in a circle 18—show that a hand is not indispensable for holding the flower; in fact it would, I believe, be irreconcilable with the formal implications of the termination of the bust at the circumference of the circle and also with the non-realistic character of the whole.

The restoration of the design brings us back to the question of its interpretation—to the identification of the goddess. For there can be no doubt that we are concerned with a goddess or at least a divine being. The range of our inquiry is limited by two considerations. The circular form of the relief links it, as we have seen, with the cults of chthonic deities, while the sakkos,19 an index of self-conscious beauty, is better suited to a youthful goddess than to a matriarch. Artemis, Kore, Aphrodite, or perhaps some local nymph such as the coins of Syracuse figure, are possible candidates. The find-spot tells us nothing, close though it is to the find-spot of the Louvre Aphrodite; for too little is known of the lay-out of the ancient city of Melos in default of systematic excavations. Likewise there is little evidence, direct or indirect, for its cults.20 The flower which we have restored beside the goddess' head as a symbol of her

domain, would fit any of the goddesses suggested. Admittedly it would be more suitable for Kore or Aphrodite; but Artemis too carries a flower in her hand on the well-known kylix from the Acropolis with a design in relief, and a flower is sometimes associated with the head of Athena.21

We need to inquire the goddess' name if we wish to know the particular circumstances of the dedication. But if after all we must be content with only a general notion of the kind of feelings and ideas that make up the world whence she comes, at least we know that the feelings and ideas concerned are much the same for each of the three goddesses. Since Aphrodite is so frequently represented in association with plant life I should have hazarded the guess that it is she whom we must recognise in the Melian disc. But this is an Aphrodite whose role and rule far transcend the lists of love. Sophocles' lines


![Fig. 5.](image1)

![Fig. 6 (see n. 13).](image2)


18 Compare e.g. the white lekythos E. Buschor, Feldmäuse 7, fig. 8 (ARV 476, 178) with the one in Aξ XLIII (1885) 197.
19 For the sakkos see (apart from the articles in the lexicons) L. Curtius, ἸΔ XIX (1904) 60 ff.; E. Langlotz, Zeitbestimmung 96 ff.; P. Jacobsthal, Μελ. Rel. 73 n. 5; J. Charbonneaux, Mon. Piot, XXXIII (1933) 98 ff.; E. Will, Mon. Piot XL (1944) 59 ff.—Compare the Acropolis frag. O. Walter, Rel. m. Μ. Akrop. Mus. no. 293, a little later than ours.
20 See RE s.v. 'Melos' (29, 567 ff.).
21 Langlotz, Akrop. Vas. II no. 247, pl. 14; C. Robert Arch. Herm. 20 fig. 16.—Busts of Athena by the Bowdoin painter; see below n. 40.
Athens (Paus. I.19.2), are called κυνη. And perhaps we may see in Empedocles’ phrase, σχιστούσις λαμβώνος ἀφροδίτης (Diels-Kranz 31 B 66 = 1, 336) an image which even the ordinary people would have expressed in much the same way: even now the shepherds of Parnassus apply the name of the female member to a small spring near Kalania above Delphi. But the general connection between the goddess and the chthonic powers is well-known and there is no need to insist on it further.22 We need only recall that there is one event common to the life-stories of both Aphrodite and Kore: the ἀνάσα; and that this miraculous epiphany is frequently represented in art. I believe Buschor is right in maintaining that busts on vases are not always to be connected with mythical ἀνάσα regardless of their date and special iconography; that often they must be referred to satyric drama. Yet the ἀνάσα of Aphrodite is so frequently represented that it naturally comes to mind whenever one sees—as so often one does—a head-and-shoulders representation of her. Perhaps the Melian disc would have had much the same effect on its beholders as would eighty years later the well-known Brussels hydria— I mean of course in the religious vision it would have evoked, not in its psychological impact.23 So much for the general religious content of our relief. But this content is expressed in terms of the style and feeling of a particular time and place. If as I hope to show, it was carved about 460–455 B.C., where in Greece would one expect to find work of this kind? The following characterisations of the various local schools of Greek art have of course no absolute significance, but are meant only as instruments of comparison. Take first Attic works: the Sounion stele, for example, the mourning Athena, the statue of Athena (slightly earlier than our disc) recently acquired by the Metropolitan Museum, the slightly later exquisite head Nat. Mus. 381. The distinguishing quality of works like these is, we feel, the dense plastic consistency, the depth and richness of their spiritual life, that pondus or σημείο of Attic art, which the ancients felt to be lacking even in the work of a Polykleitos.24 How different from this is the frank, unsophisticated world of the Melian relief where all lies open before us and there are no unfathomable depths. Nor is Peloponnesian art any closer to the Melian relief. Its permanent architectural preoccupations conjure up quite another world which we meet, for instance, in the Olympia sculpture, or the bust on the bronze hydria in the Metropolitan Museum, on Peloponnesian bronze mirrors, or the outstanding Pelpophoros from Kissamos in Herakleion Museum.25 And when we compare the actual execution of our relief with Attic or Peloponnesian work, we are reminded of the lightness and transparency of water-colour or wash drawing compared with the thick pigments of an oil. Moreover, Attic and Peloponnesian work has a much greater feeling for the body's solidity.

23 E. Buschor, Feldmusee (SB d. Bayer. Akad. 1937) passim (differently, H. M. M., BCH LXVIII/IX (1944/5) 296 ff.).
—Hydria in Brussels, K. Scheidler, Unters. ü. d. Kertcher Vas. NR. 146 pl. I. Buschor, loc. cit. 29 fig. 12; Idem, Gr. Vasen fig. 260.—To the representations of the birth of Aphrodite add: AA 1941, 449 ff.; Beazley AJA XLV (1941) 506.—For the present the question must remain open whether, from the point of view of religious meaning, the protome of the Melian disc can be connected with the protomai of the ‘Melian’ (probably Melian, see AA 1940, 282) of the 7th c. or with the protomai of Daedalic gold sheets, placed often among roses and geometricised cinquefoils (e.g. A 1884, pl. 9, 11) or with the clay protomai, funerary and votives of goddesses (but they have veils and are maternal types), on which see recent B. W. Smith, Hesperia Suppl. VIII, 235 ff.—Compare also, contemporary with the Melian disc, the clay protome from Halmyros E.A. 3409. *Zervos L’art en Grèce* 255.
24 Pondus = θρόνος: B. Schweitzer, Xenocrates 93 ff.—Athens in the Metrop. Museum: Br.-Br. pl. 706/65, Ch. Picard, Manuel II 674 ff. fig. 271. Bull Metr. Mus. 1943, 206 ff. (G. Richter) AJA XLIX (1945) 486 n. 51 (D. M. Robinson). It seems indeed original? Attic work, which as Langlotz rightly emphasises, *Phidasprobleme* 75 (and note 9), continues the tradition of the Kore from the Propylaea, 688. The case for its Attic character is perhaps strengthened by the comparison with the sphinx head of the Satodes’ rhyton in the Brit. Mus. E. 788, ARV 451, 7; the hairdressing is of the kind worn by the frontal figures on the krater by the Villa Giulia p. (see n. 46) and on many other vases.—Head in the Nat. Mus. 381: E.A. 1923/4; Langlotz, loc. cit. p. 90 n. 13.
AN EARLY CLASSICAL DISC RELIEF FROM MELOS

We can however proceed to localise the relief in a positive fashion. A first indication is the place where it was found, Melos. In fact the head on our marble disc has a close general kinship with the Melian clay reliefs which we now know well thanks to P. Jacobsthal's excellent work, and above all with the pieces which Jacobsthal assembles in his Middle Group. It is, however, questionable whether the correspondence is really complete and whether our relief can be regarded as Melian in the same sense, the more so since on the clay reliefs the flesh seems more abundant and softer; this quality may of course be largely due to the mediocre execution of the clay reliefs, but our hesitation is justified by the appearance of the same quality in the head of the young man in the pilos on the well-known coin of Melos. It may be true in a more general way that in the art of the Cyclades the Melian (or 'Melian') workshop represents a rather eastern current.

But within the same sphere of Ionic island art there are other monuments, above all reliefs, in which the same characteristics are recognisable as we have seen in the Melos disc—e.g. the Giustiniani stele in Berlin, the stele of Philis from Thasos in the Louvre, the Vatican stele or even the considerably later one from Pella in Constantinople. Some of the details they have in common will be noticed further on when we come to discuss the date of the disc. Admittedly, these reliefs and those related to them show variations among themselves; but we cannot yet tell whether these variations are due to separate centres or to parallel currents springing from a single source. There is no question of the importance from early times of the workshop of Paros. And I believe that if, apart from the stelai already mentioned, we form a series of undoubtedly Parian works earlier and later than the disc—the head from the Asklepieion of Paros, the head in Thera, the head from the Delion of Paros, the fragment of the stele of a youth in Paros, and the stele of the girl with the doves in New York—we shall find—despite all the differences due to different date or to the idiosyncrasies of artists—that the head on the disc takes its place naturally among them. In spite of the damage to its head, the metrological relief in Oxford, which perhaps comes from Paros, also shows a type of face similar to that of the disc. Finally I think that we may safely recognise the remarkable head from Thasos (though later; perhaps c. 420 B.C.) as a work of the same artistic tradition. It therefore seems to me most probable that the Melos disc originated in a Parian workshop or at least under the direct influence of Parian work.

On the differences between our disc and works of more easterly Ionic art it is unnecessary to insist. It is more useful to distinguish it from certain other similar works which I, like others, would ascribe to the Ionic current in the many-sided art of Magna Graecia; above all the metopes of Temple E (Heraion) at Selinus and the Ludovisi 'Throne'. These works show great resemblances to the Melos disc because they are almost exactly contemporary; but

24 P. Jacobsthal, Mel. Rel. 128 ff. See below, n. 37.
25 Jacobsthal, loc. cit., 154 fig. 34.
27 Stele Giustiniani: Blümel, Katal. III, K 19 pl. 27/8; F. Gerke, Gr. Plastik, fig. 144/5; Kibb 239, 7—Stele Sabouroff: Blümel, ibid. K 18 pl. 26; Jacobsthal, Diskoi fig. 5 pp. 11, 14—Stele of Philis: P. Devambez, BCH LV (1931) 412 pl. 21; Engel. Photogr. (Tel.) III, 169; Ch. Picard, Manuel II pl. 26; Kibb 239, 2—Stele in the Vatican: JdJ XVIII (1903) pl. 8; F. Gerke, loc. cit. fig. 42; Br. Br. 784; Kibb 287, 4—Stele from Pella: AM, VIII (1883) pl. 4; BCH VIII (1884) pl. 11; JdJ XXVIII (1913) 317 fig. 2; H. Bulle, Scb. Mensch 2, pl. 264b. Jacobsthal, Mel. Rel. 158, 11.
28 See relevant chapters in Langlotz, Bildhauerschulen (with additions, for the archaic period, in Schrader, Arch. Marm. d. Akrop. 34 ff. n. 32). The characteristics of eastern Ionic art have been rightly expressed by Langlotz, even if not convincingly applied in all cases). To the more eastern Ionic School belong, I think, because of the looseness of the pose and softness of the modelling examples such as the stele from Nisyros H. Bulle, Sch. Mensch 2, pl. 264a; L. Curtius, D. griech. Grabrel. pl. 7; M. Scheide, Meister türk. Mensch. Konstant. pl. 6; and stele from Samos P. Jacobsthal, Mel. Rel. 159 fig. 38. W. H. Schuchhardt, D. Kunst d. Gr. fig. 260.
29 The real character and quality of the heads from Selinus are revealed for the first time in Langlotz's excellent photographs: J. Charbonneux, Sculpt. Gr. Class. II, figs. 50/1; H. Kähler, D. griech. Motopenbild fig. 58/9; Antike u. Abendland II (1946) 114 ff. (especially 117, 121) fig. 20/1. See also B. Ashmole, Late arch. and early class. gr. sculpt. etc. figs. 56, 64, 75; F. Gerke, Gr. Plastik figs. 190/4. Ludovisi 'throne': AD II pl. 6/7; F. Gerke, loc. cit. figs. 135/14.
for precisely that reason the differences are of greater significance. I would not deny that there appears to be a specially close connection between this western Ionic style and that of the Cyclades. But I feel nevertheless that there is an essential difference between the exuberant sensuousness of the Selinus metopes and the Ludovisi Throne (compare the texture of the flesh and the relationship of eyebrow and eyeball) and the sensuousness of the Melos disc, which expresses itself almost wholly in the charm of the outline and the interior design. And the artist’s use of relief is also, I think, different. On the Ludovisi Throne the outline of the figure against the ground gives a much stronger impression of a complete body, a body existing, though not visible, in its entirety. On the Melos disc this outline remains a design on the ground plane—compare the outline of the Melos head from the beginning of the nose to the end of the sakkos with the corresponding lines on the Aphrodite, the ‘bride’ and the ‘hetaire’. But the same sense of depth is manifested by the other figures in the Birth of Aphrodite; no island artist would, I think, have rendered the folds which hang down from the thighs of the nymphs to their heels in this fashion. In this respect, however, the Melian disc closely resembles the Giustiniani stele, the Vatican stele, the Pholis from Thasos and other island reliefs which we shall meet later on. In spite of variations in its depth we are always aware that the relief proper is an integral part of the design on the ground. A passage of Plato, which is also instructive for the transformation of relief-style at the end of the fifth and the beginning of the fourth century, aptly expresses the impression this kind of relief made on an observer who is already post-classical: φιδίας οὖν ἐστιν... ὅτως μὴ καὶ αὐθής διασχησισθεμένα καὶ περίπλους ἔχοντες ὄστερ οὐκ ἐν ταῖς στήλαισιν καταγραφήν ἐκτεταμένοι, διαστηματισμένοι κατά τὰς βίνας, γεγονότες ὄστερ Ἀριστοτέλει (Symp. 193a). This characterisation applies to practically all the island reliefs; to the Ludovisi Throne and other works of western Ionic art it can hardly be applied.33

The approximate date of the Melos disc emerges naturally from the comparison with other island works—with the Giustiniani stele, which the style of the figure and anthemion dates about 465 b.c., close to the ‘Mourning’ Athena of the Acropolis,34 with the Thasian stele of Philis, a work of the decade 450–440, with the Parian stele of the girl with the doves, a work of the decade 440–430.35 It is obvious that the relief on the disc is later than the first and earlier than the two last, and further that it stands closer to the first. And this receives additional confirmation from its general similarity to the Olympia sculptures, the heads of the metopes of Temple E at Selinus and the Ludovisi Throne. Thus the dating of the Melos disc between 460 and 455 or 450 is not likely to be far wrong.

But can we be more precise? Admittedly, when J. D. Beazley ‘confesses’ that he is not ‘one of those who can tell the art of 317 b.c. from the art of 320’,36 it is not difficult for the rest of us to admit that we cannot distinguish the art of, say, 450 from that of 453. But we are still confronted with the central problem of the Melos relief, the essential character of its art: is the spirit which it expresses severe, looking back towards the past, or is it early classical? For the total effect of the elements combined in it is not at first sight a very clear or certain one. Such an enquiry, however, about the Melos relief is both difficult and dangerous.

It is difficult because the island workshops are represented neither by monuments dated on external grounds nor by a close series of homogeneous works which would help to establish a systematic relative chronology. The only consistent island series is that of the Melian clay reliefs, which have been admirably classified by Jacobsthal.37 He divides them into three groups, of which the earliest begins a little before 470 and lasts till about 460 b.c., the middle

33 Two striking examples of such a ‘διασπερμέονος’ body: the left elbow of the relief from Daphni in Berlin, Blümchen, Kat. III, K 22, pl. 32: AE 1919, 111, fig. 32; Möbius, Ornam. Gr. Grabst. 10, Jacobsthal, Mel. Rel. 156. Almost the whole body of the man on the relief at the Piraeus Mus. AE 1910, p. 67, nr. 4 (fig.): H. Diepolder, Att. Grabstel. 12, 2.
35 See nn. 29 and 30.
36 AJA XLVII (1943) 461 (Panathenaiaca).
37 P. Jacobsthal, Die Mel. Rel. (1931). Additional references: BCH LXI (1937) 353 (S. Papaspyridou-Karouzos); AE 1938, 104 ff. (N. Kontoleon); JHS LIX (1939) 65 ff. (P. Jacobsthal); AJA XLV (1941) 342 (J. D. Beazley).
one roughly covers the decade 460–450, and the latest comes down to about the end of the decade 440–430. With regard to the heads, the first group lays great emphasis on the linear elegance and vivacity of the outline as a whole, and pays much less attention to the interior design; the area of the hair is clearly distinguished from the face proper; the whole effect is rather angular—such as we see not only in the profiles but in the early full-face Penelope, Jacobsthal no. 1 Pl. 1 when we compare it with the three-quarter view of the middle-group Penelope, no. 87 Pl. 40—which is enlivened by the smiling gaiety still present in the riper head of the Nereid, no. 48 Pl. 24. This group is still distant from the head on the disc.

On the other hand we are very near it when we come to the heads of the middle period. Here the outline is more organically determined from within and the areas of hair and face are harmoniously interlocked, the part round the ear acting as the bond. Angularity is replaced by robust roundness, cheerfulness by a certain dourness of expression. Heads like the Aphrodite, no. 84 Pl. 45 (especially similar to the disc in its proportions), or the dancer no. 78 Pl. 39, rounder heads like the Scylla no. 73 Pl. 32, the Eos no. 75 Pl. 37, the still fuller-faced kitharist no. 76 Pl. 38, the Penelopes no. 89 Pl. 51 and no. 95 Pl. 54, the Aktaions nos. 97 Pl. 56 and 98 Pl. 43, and the Phrixos no. 101 Pl. 58—all these have an unmistakable general similarity to the heads on the disc, though they lack its inner illumination, which we do not find in Melian reliefs until we reach the entirely classical but decidedly different heads of the last group.

Nevertheless the lack of individuality in the majority of Melian reliefs and the poor technical quality of their reproduction impairs their usefulness and makes precise comparisons impossible. Conversely also, this Melian series cannot be dated save ‘by projection upon the chronological scale of Attic vases’ (Jacobsthal, op. cit. 174). It is therefore more to the point to turn directly to the latter. The selection that follows has been made from vases with heads that are satisfactorily illustrated.

For his characterisation of the ethos of the time when Diphilos was καλός (460–450) Buschor chooses the Curtius Painter’s kylix in the Villa Giulia.88 Though hastily and lightly drawn, and though the subject is a special one, it presents a type of female face very like that on the disc. The outline with its wide angles gives the countenance amplitude and grandeur; the slanting line of the upper lid runs parallel and close to the open curve of the brow; the chin, rounded but only of moderate depth, joins the throat by a line which becomes horizontal, but its distance from the nose is great, almost as great in fact as that to the eye; the ear and the lock of hair in front of it link the face diagonally to the upper and back parts of the head, which by position and shape help to emphasise the face.

The description of this type of head agrees in general with the head on the disc, and shows that we are far from the head type of the years of Glaukon (ca. 475–65), even from the latest phase bordering on the years when Alkimachos was καλός (465–60). There the face is rather long and narrow, and the tense curve of the chin begins almost immediately below the lip; the eye is small and oblong, and is further away from the brow, which is sometimes straight, sometimes shallow; the ear is set high and tends to continue the mounting curve of the jaw; the capricious outline gives these heads a strongly extroverted look. We find such heads not only in the early group of Melian reliefs, but on the Europa of the kylix from Aigina or on the Hera of the Sabouroff Painter in Munich or on a white lekythos in Brussels with the name of Glaukon.89

The same change is apparent in the female busts which F. Winter long ago collected in an article on outline heads. Passing over the still archaic Elpinikos kylix in Bonn, we find that the Athena of the British Museum white lekythos D. 22, a work of the Bowdoin Painter of about 475 B.C., has a head which is patently of the older type (as has the replica of it in the Spencer-

88 Buschor-Hamann, Sculp. d. Zeustemp. zu Olympia 9, 2; Mon. Linc. XXIV (1916) 890; Dedalo III (1922/3) 88; ARV 607, 2.
89 Europa: FR 114, 1; Furtwängler, Aigina I, 498. Hera: FR 65; Reichhold, Skizzenbuch pl. 71; Schuchhardt, D. Kunst. d. Griech. fig. 178; ARV 556, 14—Lekythos in Brussels: Buschor, Att. Lek. d. Parthenonzeit fig. 11; ARV 579 (connected with the group of Athens 1929, a).
Churchill Collection). But on the British Museum white lekythos D.46, which recalls heads on the Olympia metopes and will have been drawn about 460 B.C., the woman's head is already of the later type; and we see the same type, though now marked by the new introversion, on the white lekythos D.32 in the same museum, with which we are already approaching 450 B.C. The head on the disc recalls the two latest examples, and especially the latest of all, in its breadth of design and the somewhat slacker movement of its curved lines, as well as in its inner character.

Among early classical vase-painters Hermonax has heads comparable with that on our disc. In the series comprising the Athena on the fragment from the Acropolis, which is not later than c. 470 B.C., the maenad of the New York lekythos, the goddesses on the Eriphthion stamnos in Munich and the women on the Würzburg amphora which Langlotz dates about 450 B.C., the head on our disc is most reminiscent of the last in the size of the eye and its position in relation to the brow, in the drawing of the whole profile (although the chin is no longer so deep) and in the introverted expression. The heads on the Eriphthion stamnos are fairly similar, but they have some more old-fashioned details as well (such as the oblong eye, the distance from it to the brow, the more pendent chin, etc.); compared with them the Melos head seems less material. An equally instructive comparison may be made with the heads of the Borax Painter on the krater in New York and on the Acropolis fragment: the head on our disc has something of both, but in attitude and expression it seems closer to the latter, which Langlotz dates about 450 B.C.; it too differentiates the upper lid from the lower by a broader line.

The most appropriate comparison, however, is that with the figures of the Penthesilea Painter. This is the world into which we are transported by the grandeur of the head on the disc. The Penthesilea kylix in Munich, 'das Glanzstück der Alkimachoszeit, das würdige Gegenstück der gewaltigen Komposition des olympischen Westgiebels' (Buschor), stands—even most of its formal details—very near to it; and perhaps the only substantial difference between the two lies in the lively extroversive of the expression on the kylix. From this point of view the head on the disc is nearer to the figures of the later Tityos kylix in Munich and the New York bobbin, works dating from the later years of Diphylos; both of which it closely resembles in the general type and in formal details. On the other hand the Aphrodite (or Persephone) of the Boston skyphos already possesses the spontaneous lightness and certainty of classical form, which are not yet perceptible in the disc.

When we turn to the Niobid Painter, his early period heads (for instance, Eriphyle and the Amazon on the Leningrad fragments), with their narrower faces and sophisticated profile and expression, remind us less of the head on the disc. Nearer to it come heads of his middle period, as on the New York amphora and the Tübingen krater, with their broad, simplified design and the new ατροζημωνος. In the roundness of its flowing lines and in expression the head on the disc likewise recalls the Villa Giulia Painter. On the Villa Giulia krater itself most of the dancing women's heads—for all their thick Attic necks and their more upright profiles—can well be compared in composition, proportion, and ethos with the head on the disc. Other works of this vase-painter show other heads similar to the Melos one; for

---

40 Winter, ΑΖ XLIII 43 (1886) pl. 12, 1 (Elpinikos-cup; ARV 86, 2).—Bowdoin, ibid. pl. 12, 2; JdI XXX (1915) 97 fig. 8; ARV 476, 175 (for the dating see Jacobsthal Mel. Rel. 97 n. 2 and E. Haspels Lekythoi 157 n. 5).—Similar Spencer-Churchill: Greek Art (Exhibition 1946) Catal. J. Chittenden-Ch. Saltman pl. 24, 102; ARV 476, 177.—Compare by the same painter the Lekythos in the Louvre Rayet-Collignon pl. 10; Buschor, Feldmause fig. 4 and p. 7; ARV 476, 178.—Brit. Mus. D. 46: ΑΖ loc. cit. p. 198 (Professor Sir John Beazley kindly informs me that it is a work by the Ikarios painter and a replica of the lekythos ARV 489, 50).—Brit. Mus. D.52: ΑΖ loc. cit. p. 197.

41 Acropolis fragment: Langlotz, Ἀκρόπ. Var. pl. 53, 692; ARV 322, 57.—Lekythos in New York: Richter-Hall no. 85, pl. 33; ARV 321, 85.—Eriphthion Stamos: FR 137; L. Curtius, D. Klass. Kunst. Griech. fig. 413/4; ARV 318, 18.—Würzburg amphora; Langlotz no. 504 pl. 171/2 and, especially 184; FR 107, 7; ARV 319, 41.

42 New York krater: Richter-Hall no. 86 pl. 94; Cook, Zeus III, 1123 fig. 883; ARV 338, 5.—Acropolis fragment: Langlotz, pl. 79, 1024 and drawing on p. 92; ARV 340, 43; Buschor, Gr. Vasen 182.

43 Penthesilea cup: ARV 338, 2.—Tityos cup ARV 283, 3.—New York Bobbin: ARV 388, 114; Schuchhardt D. Kunst. d. Gr. fig. 170/1.—Boston skyphos: ARV 538, 103.

44 Fragments in Leningrad: Webster, Niobidenmaler pl. 96 a—b; ARV 423, 53 and 418, 3.—New York: Richter-Hall no. 97 pl. 100; ARV 429, 50.—Tübingen: Webster pl. 20 ARV 420, 28.
instance a krater and stamnos in New York, a pelike in Syracuse, and another in the British Museum.46

This survey (which does not, I hope, misrepresent the main lines of evolution) shows that the origin of practically all the formal elements of the Melos head is to be sought in the years when Alkimachos was καλός. What was still unknown at this time is the particular manner in which all these elements are combined and co-ordinated in relation both to each other and to the whole—a matter of greater significance than the individual motives. New, and definitely established only in the years of Diphilos, is the formal and spiritual grandeur of the head, the organisation of its outline under control from within, the grouping of the elements of the design around a centre, and finally the poise of the head—an ethos in itself. When, however, we compare these works with those of the following decade, of the years of Euqion and of Axiopethes, we find the former still struggling to realize a new ideal, an ideal which is achieved about 450 B.C.47

If now we return to sculpture, we shall find singularly few original marble works which have been dated with certainty in the critical decade 460-450—perhaps because in our dating we are involuntarily attracted upwards or downwards by the sculptures of Olympia and the Parthenon. But while still basing ourselves firmly on the Olympia sculptures (begun soon after 470 and finished in 457/6), we can, I think, recognise a number of more 'up-to-date' details in the head on the Melos disc.

The eyelids, for instance, though still fairly thick, are clearly differentiated from one another: the upper one is sharply distinguished from the eyeball, with a deep incision concealed above it, and it projects forward so far as to make it likely that the lower edge of the projection bore painted eyelashes, such as are preserved on the well-known head of Athena in the Vatican which copies a (possibly Sicilian) work of the preceding decade.48 The lower lid, on the other hand, closely follows the convexity of the eyeball in lower relief, without turning outwards and downwards. Such differentiation is not found on the Olympia sculptures, which retain the older treatment found, for instance, on the Blond Boy, or the Sounion stele. Nor does it occur in the small Attic (?) head from Serpendzé, a work contemporary with the Olympia metopes, or on island works like the contemporary Giustiniani stele and the slightly earlier head from the Delion of Paros; or, lastly, in the western Ionic art of the Ludovisi Throne and the E metopes at Selinus. On the other hand the differentiation is already seen, in a somewhat more developed form, on the island stele in the Vatican and the kindred fragment in Paros.49

In comparison with most of these works the head on the disc is more advanced. And so it is, too, in its endeavour to prevent the ball of the eye from projecting as far as the lids. Comparison with the slightly earlier Giustiniani stele and the more or less contemporary Ludovisi and Boston 'thrones' (not to mention the sculptures of Olympia), where the proportion between the two last coins). As far as the Arethusa of Syracuse are concerned the pieces Ashmore, loc. cit. fig. 45 and 47 and Hirmer, loc. cit. 9 seem to be still a long way from our head; much nearer is the piece Rizzo Monete Greche della Sic. pl. XXXIXIX (compare W. Amelung, RM XL (1935) 197 ff. fig. 9 'about 450'), and still nearer the one Rizzo XXXIX IX 4; Böhmer R 385 E pl. 20, 553, and Rizzo XXXIX 5; Böhmer R 391 pl. 21, 570. But I think that the Melian head has already something of the slightly later one Rizzo XI 4, Böhmer R 444 Pl. 24, 635, which recalls the 'Sappho' of Alabani.

46 Villa Giulia: FR 178; CV pl. 21/2; Curtius D. Klass. Kunst. Grec. fig. 70 (part); ARV 401, 1—New York krater: Richter-Hall pl. 101; ARV 402, 16—New York Stamos: Richter-Hall pl. 102; ARV 402, 28—Syracuse: Mun. Linc. 17 pl. 32; ARV 404, 42—Brit. Mus.: Cook Zeus pl. 50, ARV 404, 43.

47 Useful help could also be offered by the coins (which have the same essential subject as our disc, a head within a circle), if the coins of the Ionian district, which interest us more directly here, were more plent ful and better dated by external evidence. A glance at the richer series of Sicilian coins shows, I think, that among the coins of Catane the piece B. Ashmore, Late arch and early class, gr. sculpt. etc. fig. 58 (from the first issue after the re-establishment of 466 B.C.) has still in the pose of the head and in the relation of its elements a tension which is much more moderate on the Melian disc; on the other hand the piece A. Pfeiff, Apollon pl. 43a; Langlotz, Ant. u. Abendl. II (1946) 138 fig. 23, and even the somewhat later piece M. Hirmer in sch. Grecenminzen Siz. 13; Pfeiff loc. cit. pl. 44, have in common with the Melian the new relaxation and centralisation (compare in Pfeiff, loc. cit. p. 87 the fine differentiation between the two last coins). As far as the Arethusa of Syracuse are concerned the pieces Ashmore, loc. cit. fig. 45 and 47 and Hirmer, loc. cit. 9 seem to be still a long way from our head; much nearer is the piece Rizzo Monete Greche della Sic. pl. XXXIXIX (compare W. Amelung, RM XL (1935) 197 ff. fig. 9 'about 450'), and still nearer the one Rizzo XXXIX IX 4; Böhmer R 385 E pl. 20, 553, and Rizzo XXXIX IX 5; Böhmer R 391 pl. 21, 570. But I think that the Melian head has already something of the slightly later one Rizzo XI 4, Böhmer R 444 Pl. 24, 635, which recalls the 'Sappho' of Alabani.

48 TdL XXXVII (1922) 127 ff. fig. 12 (W. Amelung, G. Kaschnitz-Weinberg, Scult. del Mag. del Mus. Vat. Nr. 41 pl. XII.

49 Serpendzé head: AE 1901, pl. 9 (A. Furtwängler) Öfth XIV (1911) 58 fig. 61 (H. Schrader); E. Buchor, Olym. 28 E. Langlotz, Bildbursch. 140, 7 pl. 87b.—Giustiniani: note 29.—Head from the Delion at Paros: n. 30.—Ludovisi 'throne' and metopes from Selinus: n. 32.—Stele in the Vatican n. 29.—Fragment from Paros: n. 30.
jection of the eyelid is almost equal to that of the lids, makes the difference immediately obvious. In this detail also our disc is drawn towards later works, such as for instance the Philies of Thasos etc.50

The simple, little artificed design of the ear and its somewhat flat modelling continue practically unchanged on the Philies stele and on another later head in Thasos.51 The ear which conforms to the shape and line of the adjacent piece of hair is set obliquely, as on the Apollo of Olympia, and low down on account of the attitude of the head and the rhythm of the design. The whole effect nevertheless is almost like an anticipation of certain heads from the metopes and frieze of the Parthenon.52

Yet in contrast to these details and to the advanced character of the relief as a whole, other details give at first sight a more old-fashioned impression. Closer examination, however, shows that this impression is misleading. The eye for instance is in fact no longer quite full-face but in three-quarter view. Yet its outline is visible and consistent throughout its length, as for example on the Ludovisi Throne and not unlike that of the Giustiniani stele. But the island workshops, and more generally the Ionian ones, are conservative on this point, so much so that the eye is still treated like this not only on work of the following decade such as the Philies of Thasos, but even much later works such as the Pella warrior stele in Constantinople (c. 420 B.C.) and the stele of Krito and Timarista in Rhodes from Kamiros (c. 410).53 On the other hand, it is absolutely normal for the edge of the upper lid not to overlap the lower on at the outer corner—a way of treating the eye which is usually held to appear for the first time on the metopes of the Parthenon.54 The two lids are, however, no longer joined, but being of different thickness they are separated by a faint stroke—a feature which foreshadows the later practice and which we find again on other works of this time.55

Still more old-fashioned perhaps is the impression given by the upper eyelid, or to be precise by the sudden oblique plane which separates the brow from the lid. It shows no trace of a soft swelling like that on, for instance, the Humphry-Ward head in the Louvre nor yet of the treatment used on occasion by the artists of Olympia and already described by A. Furtwängler.56 On the disc head the upper lid is quite dry and fleshless. But in this we may see another long-established island tradition. The junction of this plane with the incised line on the eyelid exhibits a more instructive evolution; and this tradition holds also for many decades afterwards. We see a like treatment of this surface of the upper eyelid on, for instance, a head in the museum of Thera, most probably a Parian work of about 480, and apparently also on the

---

50 See n. 29.
51 See n. 50.
52 Examples: Jdl. LIV (1936) 56 fig. 36 27—ibid. LV (1931) 250/1 fig. 48, 50 (B. Schweitzer).
53 For the stele and stele from Pella: note 29. The dating of the later by Jacoby, Mel. Rel. 58, 1 about 440 sees rather early: he finds the warrior connected in outline and rhythm with the youth from the Parthenon frieze West 9 (Smith pl. 64), but this youth as well as the comparable youths South 62 (Smith pl. 84), West 4 (Smith pl. 62) 22/3 (Smith pl. 69) have the weight differently divided and the single rhythm of their pose coming from within, not created artificially by the outline. The youth from Pella, looser and more Polyclitan, is held together from outside by the curve of the whole outline; he can hardly be conceived far away from such figures as on the stele of Chairemous Lydia in Piraeus, Diepolder, Att. Grabrel pl. 16—Stele from Kamiros: Gl. Rhod. IV 37 fig. 10/11; ibid. V 31 fig. 37/G. Lachen 1932 pl. 33/3/ (K. Lehmann); RM XLVII (1931) 32/2 fig. (H. Speier) and the same pl. XXXVII (1933) 407 fig. (M. Krickter); F. Gerke, Gr. Plastik fig. 195. On the Kamiros stele there is, I think, a noticeable differentiation in the rendering of the eye: the eye is more hidden in the figure of Krito, who is alive, and it shows more complete in the figure of Timarista who as a dead person is a higher being and it is probably just for the reason that she is more free from the fortuitous foreshortenings which are created by the relations of our world (the details of the linear design of the eyes, but probably not the impression given from a single view point, show better in the fig. Cl. Rhod. IV fig. 10/11).
54 See F. Stuhr in Zfhrscrift Bendorff 173 ff.; V. H. Poulsen, Str. Stil 122.—It is already quite developed in the nice relief fragment from the recent excavations at Brauron PAE 1935 43 89 fig. fig. 7; BCH LXXXIII (1949) pl. 31, 2, work most probably of about 430 B.C. which continues (for religious reason?) the mannerist current which is represented in archaicistic works, or simply affected ones, such as from an earlier period, the Akropolis relief no. 581, Payne-Young pl. 126; Schrader (Langlotz-Schuchhardt) pl. 175, or terracotta, like the head V. H. Poulsen, loc. cit. 61 fig. 40 and the Boston fragment Bull. 1926 28; Langlotz, Bildhauersch. pl. 966 (ARM 433, 20; Jacoby, Mel. Rel. 135, 1); it shows probably connections with island workshops and with the somewhat later grave relief H. Diepolder D. att. Grabrel, 9 fig. 1.
55 Some clear examples: Aphrodite of the Ludovisi throne:—Hanover head Jd. XXXV (1920) pl. 4 (Amelung); B. Asmole Late arch. and early Gr. sculpt. etc. fig. 70; Buschor, Opferaltar. Dresden head, Jd. XXXV 51 fig. 1 and pl. VI E. Langlotz, Bildhauersch. pl. 22—Alimyras head AM LXV (1940) pl. 63/65 (F. Brommer). Bollett. d'Arte 1948, 193 ff. (E. Paribeni). This head should not be earlier than 460, because it recalls in general Perichthon of the West Pediment of Olympia, and the groups of locks at the temples show almost the manner of the 'Omphalos' Apollo.
56 H. Brunn Arch. Stud. 73 (cf. Messera 123).
head from the Delion of Paros which is almost contemporary with the Olympia metopes.\textsuperscript{57} The more archaic rendering of the same surface, together with the incision on the eyelid, is shown by the head from the Asklepieion of Paros of the years of Πενταήμερος καλός; nor are the stelai from Pharsala in the Louvre and from Nisyros in Constantinople very different in this respect.\textsuperscript{58} On the Giustiniani stele the incised line has turned into a shallow incision above the swelling edge of the eyelid, while on the head on our disc the incision, as we have seen, does in fact exist but is concealed behind the edge of the lid (achieving from one point of view a more three-dimensional solution). The girl with the doves from Paros in New York shows a later stage of development.

Unquestionably in this way of modelling the upper eyelid and equally in the furrow (so significant in the Melos head), which separates the lower lid from the cheek and somehow isolates the two, we must recognise favourite artistic means of expression in the island workshops and those allied to them. And we see that they use them, with variations of course to suit the times, for many decades.\textsuperscript{59} Yet in none of them is this medium of expression used in so intense a manner, in none have eye and look been so thoroughly emancipated from their relation to the surrounding flesh as on the head on the disc. It is in this respect the purest of them all—though a Peloponnesian or an Attic artist, with his different conception of the living organism and its translation into modelling, might have added ‘and the poorest.’

In conclusion, the decisive factor for determining the place of the disc in the general evolution of sculpture is not to be sought in isolated details but in the relationship of their functions and the whole. Here we have a sure guide: the conception of divinity which our head displays places it beside the Olympia Apollo—a sister of the same age.\textsuperscript{60} Thus in saying that our head was made in the same years—and let us limit them to 460-455—we are within the bounds of reason and probability. But a no less important conclusion emerging from our examination is that our head does not remain stationary in the stream of change, much less does it look back towards the past. On the contrary it already presages the classical culmination. Even compared with the Apollo and the other sculptures of Olympia its design shows a tendency towards a relaxation of the tension, towards calmer concentration and a gentler introversion. The inner light which seems to radiate from it foreshadows one at least of the significant aspects of the deities of the Parthenon.

Perhaps the ‘spiritual milieu’ in which the Melos disc arose can be more closely defined and our picture gain in colour, if we close the circle of comparisons with some works of major importance or of greater note to which this head—apart from the differences of place and individual idiosyncrasy—is in my opinion essentially akin. From the Peloponnesian zone we may cite the female head of the Barracco-Budapest—Termo type, the marvellous Peplophoros in Herakleion from Kissamos, and in addition the Omphalos Apollo (especially in the profile of the Louvre copy) together with its group.\textsuperscript{61} The same spirit, but in a field perhaps not so distant from the Melos disc, is emphatically expressed by a female head in a German private collection, which V. H. Poulsen regards as a copy of the Alba head but Langlotz (more correctly in my opinion) assigns to the art of the islands; a head of Athena in the Capitoline Museum (mounted on a copy of the torso of the Albani Sappho) shows—especially in the profile—a kindred physiognomy, and hair on the brow and temple in the form which we must restore in imagination on the Melos head; we end with the incomparable Chatsworth Apollo, perhaps

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{57} Head from Delion and Thera: see n. 30.
\item\textsuperscript{58} Head from the Asklepieion: see n. 30, contemporary with the Sphinx head from the akroterion of Aphaia, Meisterwerke 50; G. Welter, Aigina (1938) 88 fig. 79; W. H. Schuchhardt, Kunst d. Gr. fig. 144.—Stele at Pharsala: Langlotz, Bildhauersch. pl. 19; Enzykl. Photogr. (Tel) III 147;—that of Nisyros: see n. 31.—For other examples of the incised line of the eyelid, although I do not know whether we can use this as a criterion for the more precise location of the pieces, see Langlotz, Bildhauersch. 142.
\item\textsuperscript{59} E.g. Vatican stele: n. 39.—Fragment of stele from Paros: n. 90.—Stele from Karystos: Blümel, Kata1. III, K pl. 30/1; F. Gerke, Gr. pl. fig. 293; KIB 287; 51.
\item\textsuperscript{60} Jacobsthal, Mel. Rel. 153, 159.—Stele from Herakleion: Ojh VI (1902) pl. I p. 8 fig. 8; JdI XXVIII (1913) 319 fig. 3; JHS LVII (1937) 42; nearly contemporary with the stele from Karystos.—From Samos: n. 31. From Pella: n. 39. From Rhodes: n. 53.
\item\textsuperscript{61} Cf. the head of Apollo as illustrated in Heges's photograph (Hege-Rodenwaldt Olympia, frontispiece).
\item\textsuperscript{62} Type Barracco-Budapest, etc.: Buschor, Olympia 33. V. H. Poulsen, Str. Stil 64 n. 26 (his doubts do not seem well founded).—Peplophoros in Herakleion: see n. 25. Apollo in the Louvre (Omphalos type): Enzykl. Photogr. (Tel) III 151A. A. Pfeiff, Apollon pl. 29b.
\end{itemize}
the most imposing creation of the Ionic world. The Attic field a terracotta doll in the Louvre is sufficiently outstanding to live at ease in this exalted spiritual sphere; but a more authentic expression is the Pheidias Athena in Brescia, which Buschor has convincingly placed with the Tiber Apollo in the early period of the master; in addition, there is something in the Athena of Myron, particularly as presented by the Vatican copy (though also in that at Dresden), which the Melos head seems to foreshadow.

Such great names alongside the little disc from Melos might well alarm us did not our goddess—whoever she may be—partake of that world in such purity and sufficiency, were she not so χρυσαυταυγή.

CHR. J. KAROUZOS.

42 Head in a private collection: K. A. Neugebauer Antiken in deutschem Privatherz (1938) pl. 3 no. 5; V. H. Poulsen, Berytus VI (1939–40) 9; E. Langlotz in a forthcoming paper (for the Alba head: E. Buschor, Olympia 35).—Head of Athena in the Capitoline: EA 449/51; Helbig 969; Buschor, loc. cit. 33. V. H. Poulsen, Acta Arch. XI (Myron) 39 n. 177.—Chatsworth Apollo: AD IV pl. 21 ff.; Langlotz, Bildhauersch. pl. 12; JHS LVII (1938) pl. 8/9; F. Gerke, Gr. Pl. figs. 108/9; A. Pfeiff, Apollo pl. 34/5.—Among the works of more eastern Ionic art we may mention the head of a goddess from Tralles in Constantinople: BCH XXVIII (1904) pl. 11; RA IV (1904) (2) pl. XIV/XV; Mendel II no. 545; Buschor Olympia 38 (it seems to be near the 'Penelope').

The classicising relief in Turin, ÖJh XVI (1913) 22 ff. fig. 14/5; G. Reisch, Alt. Marm. v. Parus 33 (Buschor, Olympia 30); V. H. Poulsen, Act. Arch. XI Myron p. 40 seems to be based on authentic Parian works.

43 Terracotta in the Louvre: J. Charbonneaux, Les gr. gr. fig. 32.—Idem, La Sculp. gr. class. I fig. 42 = Euryt. photogr. (Tel) II 195 c–d; Poulsen, Str. Stil 50 no. 6; P. Knoblauch, Studien etc. 188 no. 396.—Athena Brescia: Furtwängler, MW 123 ff. fig. 23; EA 194/6; Buschor, Phidias d. Mensch 13 fig. 5 (Idem, Olympia 32); quite different is the opinion of V. H. Poulsen, Berytus VI 8 n. 8.—Athena of Myron: G. Kaschnitz-Weinberg, Souv. del Mag. del Vat. Nr. 59 pl. XVIII. P. E. Arias, Mirone 19 figs. 26, 32.
THE ACROPOLIS AND PERSEPOLIS

Two of the greatest monuments of the ancient world date from the fifth century B.C. and they embody respectively the ideals of the Persian and of the Athenian Empire. There had been nothing in all Asia as sumptuous as Persepolis; the Acropolis of Athens, a quarter its size, was given a magnificence absolutely unprecedented in Greece. A comparison between the two schemes must reflect the divergence between the Persian and the Greek outlook but also reveal some elements in common, if only because of an inevitable resemblance in ways of thinking among contemporaries when confronted with rather similar problems. But it must not be taken for granted that every parallel between them is fortuitous. There is reason to think that the sculptors employed at Persepolis were largely Greeks—conscripted subjects of Persia, no doubt; the sculptors of the Acropolis were by no means all Athenian but came also from other Greek states, and surely there must have been talk among them of the tremendous project from which many of their colleagues had returned to cities east of the Aegean. Persepolis was built steadily from about 500 to 460, by which time the reconstruction of the Acropolis had begun; its earliest Periclean building, the Parthenon, was commenced in 447. It is conceivable that some particular sculptor may have carved figures in the friezes of both Persepolis and the Parthenon; workmen who could attain the requisite standard must have been in demand. At any rate one Greek artist from the Persian service seems to have gone as far west as Delos, to judge by imitation there of the Persepolis type of column-base, in the Thermopolium, a building datable about 480–460.2

The use of Greeks to carve at Persepolis was a matter of deliberate policy. A British public building sometimes incorporates materials from all parts of the Commonwealth as a symbol of unity, and in a rather similar spirit Darius I records how he apportioned among his subject peoples the labour of obtaining and preparing the materials for his palace at Susa; the ‘Ioniasts’ shared with the Babylonians and Lydians respectively the work in baked brick (faience decoration) and on the columns. His pride in commanding the resources and skill of many countries is so evident in the inscription that it tends to obscure a practical motive for all this far-flung activity: his determination to secure the best, both in materials and in workmanship. Actually it was an established principle, inherited from the Assyrian Empire, to recruit from each subject nation men skilled in any occupation for which it had developed special aptitude. Medicine was the first pursuit in which Greeks are stated to have been used, after Democedes’ success in treating an injury that had baffled the Egyptian court physicians. That happened very early in the reign of Darius (521–486 or 485), and Democedes may possibly have been the first Greek to work directly for a Persian king. But within a year or two of his arrival the presence also of Greek sculptors can be deduced from the style of the relief at Behistun that commemorates the troubles of Darius’ accession.

Under Cyrus the Great, Persian sculpture had clung to the tradition of Southern Mesopotamia, admitting only the incongruity of an Egyptian-Phoenician crown. At Behistun the style was in general that of seventh-century Assyria but modified by introduction of a few Greek naturalistic details. By the end of the reign, when Persepolis began to take shape, a fairly comprehensive hellenisation of details was attained, and then the style of reliefs froze, at any rate in the royal monuments.3 In the course of forty or fifty years, during which Greek art

---

1 The fragmentary inscription recording expenditure on the Erechtheum shows a high proportion of alien workers; the section on the frieze mentions three Athenian and five alien sculptors (I.G.1 374).
2 From the inscriptions, Darius seems to have completed only one of the buildings; most of them date from the reign of Xerxes (486 or 485–465), but one of his foundations was completed by Artaxerxes I (465–424). One of the last kings, Artaxerxes III (359–338), made an addition.
3 BCH LIII (1929) 257, fig. 34.
4 Herodotus, III, 139–140.
5 Hellenisation proceeded farther in relief made in Asia Minor for (? Russian) clients (Pope, Survey of Persian Art, IV, Pls. 103–4) and in gems (Richter, Commem. Studies in honor of Shear, Hesperia Suppl. VIII 291).
changed most rapidly, some two thousand figures were carved at Persepolis in almost perfect homogeneity. To achieve that, the sculptors themselves must have been fairly homogeneous and the fidelity with which they reproduce the Greek treatment of details proves that many, if not all of them, were Greeks.

The architectural evidence declares the employment of Greeks even more plainly, on the same work of carving, in buildings of a new style. The palaces of Cyrus had incorporated features derived from several countries, all perhaps in the interior of Asia. Those built at Persepolis by Darius and his successors are in some ways nearest in plan to the Pisistratid Hall at Eleusis, though the resemblance could be due merely to independent evolution from Egyptian precedents. An unmistakably Egyptian feature is found in the cavetto cornices at Persepolis, but the doorways they surmount are Greek in pattern and only vaguely reminiscent of the pylon, while the ornamental features throughout the palaces are at least as much Greek as Asiatic in derivation; the clumsiness of their use, however, suggests that the architect was not Greek. But the Ionic fluting and mouldings of the columns, which numbered several hundreds, required greater precision of carving than figure sculpture, and again the uniformly excellent quality of their workmanship could not have been achieved unless the labour force contained at any rate a high proportion of Greeks, as is recorded in the case of the palace at Susa. They could, of course, have trained masons of other races to take their place, but the king would have seen no advantage in any such substitution; the Persians themselves did not need to practise trades, while the distance from which he had his subjects fetched to work for him, and the diversity of races among them, fostered his pride. The very creation of 'Persian' architecture and art, by the method of amalgamating stylistic contributions of half-a-dozen conquered nations, can only have been intended as a constant reminder of empire.

In building Persepolis, Darius and Xerxes followed the general oriental practice of concentrating the government offices around the king's person in a complex of palaces, walled off from the rest of the town like the Imperial City at Peking, and for choice planned as a unit on a virgin site. At the end of the eighth century Sargon of Assyria had surpassed all predecessors with his new foundation at Khorsabad, built on a platform, and within a couple of generations the Urartians imitated it at Karmir-Blur, on a fairly steep hill. The Babylonian Königsburgen of the early sixth century, which the Persians took over as one of their administrative capitals, consisted of an accretion of buildings, but some attempt was made at a coherent exterior to conform to the rules. At Persepolis (fig. 1) the Assyrian tradition reappears in a very different landscape. A mountain-chain thrusts into the plain at its foot a shelf roughly as long as the Acropolis of Athens and four or five times as wide. The edge of this was trimmed and encased with a wall of semipolygonal masonry, Greek to all appearance. But the plan accords with the Mesopotamian convention for aiding defence or avoiding monotony. The face, though rectilinear, bends inwards and outwards, unsymmetrically as at Karmir-Blur because of the shape of the rock but producing an appearance of symmetry. All the bends are approximately at right-angles, except near the corners of the platform, which are virtually bevelled by a succession of slanting rebates. A free-standing wall across

---

8 The material used at Persepolis is local stone.
9 The view that the Greek element was insignificant (F. Sarre and E. Herzfeld, *Iranische Felstrüfte*, 145) is no longer tenable (Frankfort and Richter, *AJA* L (1946) 6 and 15). Cf. Ionic reliefs of the early fifth century (*e.g.* *BM Cat. I* 1, Pls. xxi-xxx).
8 The tomb of Cyrus appears to show indirect Greek influence, through the medium probably of one of the semi-hellenised races in Asia Minor, and if the constituents of its surrounding colonnade really come from his palaces, the same applies to them.
9 This may have been the foundation for the belief that artisans were fetched to Persepolis from Egypt (Diodorus Sic. I 46, 4), though the Susa inscription mentions structural work by Egyptian labour there. A fragmentary statue of a lion from Persepolis in local stone (Oriental Inst. Chicago, no. AE3) seems to me to have necessarily been designed and carved by an Egyptian; it stood at the entrance to one of Xerxes' buildings.
10 My article in *EB* s.v. 'Persia—Archaeology', though in some respects out of date, is a convenient summary of the ingredients.
11 The excavation of this site (near Ereivan) began in 1939 after an inscription of Rusas II had been discovered; I know only the semi-popular account of B. B. Piotrovskiy, *Izv. i Kultur. Urartu* (Akademiya Nauk, Erevan, 1944) 157, plan fig. 20.
12 *AA* 1941, 807 for plan; *Koldewey, Das wiedererstehende Babylon*.
the foot of the mountain completed the enclosure;\textsuperscript{14} this was built of mud-brick with filled hollows, and had towers of slight projection, so that again the scheme was Mesopotamian. Persepolis, with the sheer walls rising 30 to 40 feet above the ground outside, looked a fortress, but architectural grandeur took precedence over any need for defence; no military eye could approve the entrance (‘L’ on the plan), a gigantic double staircase of diverging and converging flights, planned for several horsemen to ride abreast up each side to a top landing which

\begin{footnotesize}
\item[14] Only partially excavated, hence not complete on the plan (from Oriental Inst. Communications no. 21, Erich F. Schmidt, The Treasury of Persepolis, fig. 5; p. 7 for the wall). Vol. LXXI.
\end{footnotesize}
is 70 feet long and level with the ground within. But adequate security against tribal looters or conspiring nobles was no doubt provided by the doorway through the wall and the approach behind it to the Gate of Xerxes—itself a hall more than 80 feet square but entered between a pair of colossi set a mere 12 feet apart. They were winged, human-headed bulls, significantly different from their Assyrian prototypes; their wings curve upwards in the archaic Greek convention and they have four legs instead of five—proving that the sculptor thought in terms of statues, as a Greek would do, instead of the Mesopotamian concept of two reliefs joined at right-angles.

When Darius chose the untouched site of Persepolis, his future enemies, the Athenians, could see on their Acropolis the remains of nearly a thousand years of occupation. The very existence of Athens as a town must have depended at some periods on the proximity of this huge slab of limestone, tilted by nature so that it was easily accessible at one end and steep-sided elsewhere; it would have formed an ideal refuge for some hundreds or even thousands of people with their possessions, but for a shortage of water. Whether, at any time, the whole or most of the population lived permanently on the Acropolis is very questionable; Thucydides (II, 15, 3; 6) offers the suggestion to explain the current Athenian usage of calling it Polis. In reality the word was being used in its original, though forgotten, sense; etymologically it is equivalent to Burg. Just as Londoners, when they began to speak of the ‘City’, meant the area enclosed by the medieval walls, so at Athens the term could have arisen whilst the citizens lived in an unwalled town with only the Mycenaean fortification on the Acropolis to demonstrate the sovereignty of their state. In fact the notoriously poor soil of the Attic plain cannot have maintained an urban population sufficient to man a greater perimeter than the Acropolis. Not until overseas trade revived would the lower town have received a wall and thereby become a polis; the historians certify the existence of a city-wall before 480, of short extent, but it was probably a comparatively recent work. Its successor, the wall of Themistocles, was quickly made formidable, yet the Acropolis too was thought worth re-fortifying after its destruction by the Persians, and it did not lose every vestige of military importance till the completion, shortly after 460, of the Long Walls, which converted the enceintes of Athens and Piraeus into twin citadels.

By that time the Acropolis had just begun to show signs of a change in status, with a decrease in private dedications and the multiplication of official inscriptions. It was becoming in fact the Record Office of Athens. As a rule a Greek state did not use its acropolis for that purpose; on the other hand Persepolis contained archives by the hundred thousand, in the utilitarian form of clay tablets and parchment scrolls. When Athens began to store its bullion on the Acropolis, that too marked a departure from normal Greek procedure, but the Persian kings had always kept the treasury of their Empire in Persepolis and their other residences.

In most Greek states which possessed an acropolis it may have held the temple of the national patron—in order that no enemy might have the chance of bribing the fickle deity to help the wrong side—but otherwise had little or no embellishment. At Athens embellishment began, as at Persepolis, with the construction of an impressive casing to the rock and an indefensible entrance, but their forms are altogether different. The ‘Pisistratid’ propylon, now ascribed to the years around 465 rather than 500, consisted of two porches, each carried by four Doric columns at the façade, projecting back to back from the actual gateways. (It was destroyed to make room for the Periclean Propylaea.) At the summit of the rock, the site destined for the Parthenon was extended by terracing out to a new external wall, far down the original slope. Along half the circuit of the Acropolis (fig. 2) this wall formed a rectilinear casing to the rock, and in places it stood 40 feet high; it is built of the rectangular masonry which had recently become fashionable. The southward extension of the summit made an

15 Apart from the earliest Athenian decree, only two or three of those from the Acropolis can be older than the reconstruction of the 460's, as Mr. A. G. Woodhead informs me.

16 E.g. Q. Curtius, V, 2, 8; 6, 20; Schmidt, op. cit. 16.

17 Collections of plans: von Gerkan, Griechische Städteanlagen; Dunbabin, Western Greeks. Two important examples: JHS LXII (1942) 39, fig. 1; 51 Winckelmann, progr. Berlin (1891), Koldewey, Neandria, plan at end.

18 Steven, Historia XV (1946) 77, figs. 4, 6.
artificial salient opposite a natural projection of the north side, with the result that the Acropolis now approximated to the symmetrical shape of an elongated diamond. The casing of the south side runs in two straight stretches, longer than any at Persepolis; seen broadside on, they meet at such an obtuse, streamlining angle, that their divergence becomes inconspicuous. The east end, however, runs to a sharp point—a prow, one might say, thinking ahead to the island in the Tiber which the Romans literally cased in the form of a ship. On the north of the Acropolis a presumably slightly older wall, incorporating blocks salvaged from the ruins of 480, wavers along the crest.

Only in the Periclean reshaping of the west end does the outline conform with the emphatic angularity of Persepolis. There (fig. 3) too we find ingenuity of a higher order than Persepolis displays, directed towards the same objects of achieving either an appearance of symmetry where none exists or an asymmetrical balance, and of slurring abrupt corners by means of successive turns, at right-angles or slanting. The casing, presumably not following the line of the rockface, makes three right-angled turns to join the north wall of the Acropolis with its course beneath the outer end of the Propylaea’s north wing, but runs forward from the south wing in a narrow bastion, which carries the temple of Nike. However, the outer end of that temple and the casing beneath it slant inwards towards the north wing, and the difference in axis reduces this discrepancy to the eye. It also puts the temple’s north-west corner in line with the columnar façade of the Propylaea’s south wing, and makes the sides of the temple point to the Parthenon, thereby bringing the whole entrance into relation with the main building on the Acropolis.

To leave space enough for the Nike temple, the south wing of the Propylaea could not project as far west as the other, but to anyone walking between them the façades of the two wings appear to match because the southern façade was made to project farther than the wing itself, by the somewhat dishonest trick of extending the superstructure to an otherwise useless pillar opposite the corner of the north wing. The south wing is also much shallower, so that its south wall is able to point at the south-east corner of the Nike temple, and is open towards the west, where the other wing presents a blank wall. When seen from the west the huge plain mass of the north wing and of its supporting casing equalises the narrow but very elaborate complex formed by the little Nike temple on its bastion in front of the shadowy mouth of the south wing. At a distance then the design relies on balance without symmetry, but close-up it contains the piece of fake symmetry in the wing façades. An unsymmetrical arrangement of door and windows, to the picture gallery behind the façade of the north wing, has also been explained as fake symmetry.

Of the buildings within the Acropolis, the Parthenon is the largest, and it stood on a tall substructure on the highest part of the rock, inside a terrace-like precinct. The only other building that can have attracted general attention from a distance is the Erechtheum, a comparatively small temple on the lowest site available. Nobody wanted it to compete with the Parthenon, but its unique plan and elevation are unintelligible except on the assumption that it was meant, while self-sufficient, to form also an unobtrusive counterweight to the

---

19 The fifth-century approach to the Propylaea was an embanked zigzag ramp (ibid. 84, fig. 1). The space was too narrow for a double staircase, of course, but the effect must have somewhat resembled half of one.

20 Although the Nike temple was not built till the 420s, the site had been reserved in the lay-out of the Propylaea, and I regard it as essential to the Periclean scheme. For corrections of axis inward from the Propylaea see Stevens, Hesperia V (1936) 519 and his restored plan, fig. 66.

21 Stevens, Hesperia XV (1946) 87.
Parthenon. The projection to either side of porches, very different in all three dimensions and built on very different levels, doubles the width as seen from the west. The north porch rests on slim columns set wide apart, and against its dark interior the bright shafts look flimsy. Its roof-line seems like a horizontal off-shoot from the eaves of the central gabled block. The end of the central block consists mainly of blank wall on which the eye refuses to concentrate. The south porch is actually less than half as high as the north porch, barely one-third as high as the central block, but the terrace on which it stands is considerably above their base, and the roof-line is therefore seen level with the capitals in the north porch. But to compensate for its smallness the south porch has a very solid appearance. The caryatids, human figures thickened by voluminous drapery which hangs in folds that resemble fluting, stand on one continuous tall basis and are separated by gaps not much higher than they are wide. These almost square shadow-traps, with their irregularity of outline at the sides, emphasise the elaboration of the figures without seriously diminishing the massiveness of the structure. Accordingly, the central block and the two porches balance when the Erechtheum is seen end-on. Furthermore, with the width of the central block amplified by the little porch attached at mid-height like a blunt finger pointing to the Parthenon, and by the north porch, a translation into thinner columns and slighter superstructure of the sturdy Doric rhythm of the Parthenon, the two temples make a unified composition.

Mesopotamian sanctuaries and palaces had often been designed asymmetrically. But the rule in Greek architecture had been, and continued to be, that the left and right sides of a building should correspond exactly; buildings too are usually aligned in a row—if they are not distributed without regard to one another. Consequently the Propylaea and Erechtheum involve startling abnormalities in their asymmetrical balance. But Greek sculptors had been learning to design statues on this very principle for a generation, and Plutarch’s Life of Pericles (13) records a tradition that he made Phidias director ἐπίσκοπος of all his public works. Persepolis certainly offered no precedent for asymmetry in an individual structure—in every case the left and right sides match—and the various buildings there are aligned; they seem, however, to have been designed in asymmetrical relation to one another, somewhat in the manner whereby temples or palaces in Mesopotamia must have formed a composition with an adjoining Ziggurat. The facts are not easy to determine in the absence of a model of Persepolis, or at the least a trustworthy restoration, but it would seem that the idea was to concentrate attention on the Apadana (audience hall), the largest and tallest building. It extended over the central salient on the frontage, and the comparatively lowly Hall of the Hundred Columns along its other side was recessed behind the line of its façade. Southwards lay a series of low residential and office buildings, the most distant on a lower terrace, whereas to the north there stands only the Gate of Xerxes, small in area but perhaps adequate to balance them by virtue of greater height. It must originally have been around 60 feet high, some 20 feet less than the Apadana attained with the aid of its raised foundation.

Several other buildings are similarly elevated above the general level of the terraces, giving occasion for numerous double staircases. These, and the grand staircase at the entrance, are lined with sculptures in low relief which invariably treat the same two subjects in unalterable form. On each staircase are panels with a symbolic group, the lion of the sun-god pulling down the bull of darkness. Up each staircase and along each landing run friezes which show representatives of all the conquered peoples being led, between files of the Royal...
Guards, in one inward-moving procession, bringing presents for the king. The king himself is shown on the door-jambs of the buildings, in ceremonial attitudes with attendants, or stabbing a monster. Every one of the sculptured figures has the same solemn expression; men of different nationalities wear different costumes, and they stand, walk, or climb the steps, seen in profile or turning, but the faces, dress-arrangement, and poses are interchanged, duplicated and reduplicated with intentional, seldom relaxed monotony. It is all the same, and the same again, and yet again.

The oriental custom had long been to set architectural sculpture on or just above the ground; the frieze on the balustrade facing the Nike temple is the only Greek instance in the open air. The Greeks normally placed their architectural sculpture high above eye-level, where the need for strong contrasts of light and shade enforced the use of high relief. The Parthenon frieze, however, occupies a unique position, at the top of the wall within the colonnade, where projecting legs and arms would have looked grotesque from below. A low relief, comparable to that of the Persepolis friezes, was really unavoidable. Another break with

27 The lion-gryphon, used on Alexander’s coinage apparently as a symbol of his victory over the Persian king (Hill, JHS XLIII 156).

28 The summing-up of the excellent criticism by G. N. (Lord) Curzon, himself a sympathetic authority on pomp (Persia, II 194).
tradition is the illustration of a contemporary subject in the frieze of the Parthenon (and perhaps of the Erechtheum). This must have verged on profanation; at every other Greek temple the sculpture illustrates mythological scenes. The frieze of the Parthenon shows a procession of representative citizens, grouped according to age and sex, bringing offerings—actually the procession which went to the Parthenon once a year to present offerings to the patron deity of the state on her birthday. The Persepolis friezes show a procession of representative subjects, grouped according to nationality, bringing offerings—actually the procession which went into Persepolis once a year to present offerings to the king, to whom 'worship' was due. In each case the procession is carved close to the route upon which it passed in real life and as though moving into its real destination. The Parthenon frieze terminates with divine spectators, above the doorway; at Persepolis the king and his high officials are carved in the doorways of the palace, awaiting the procession. The methods of representation in the friezes, although in many respects as dissimilar in spirit and technique as the two festivals themselves, also have something in common. On the Parthenon frieze too, every face wears a uniform expression of solemnity; each old man is exactly like every other, and so is each young man, and each girl; while even the horses might all portray one individual horse, with a single exception. Conformity to type had seldom, if ever, been enforced so rigidly in Greek sculpture, and it seems out of place in the Athens of Pericles, which some of us tend to regard as a community of individualists. But it fits well enough with the ideology of his funeral speech, that all citizens think alike and behave alike; his younger listeners had not yet begun the un-Athenian activities which enlivened the end of the century. Phidias is said to have been intimate with Pericles, and we may assume that the frieze expresses his vision of Athenian democracy not less accurately than the words of some ten years later as Thucydides has recorded them (II, 35–46; 60–64).

'You think', says the speech of 439, 'that your empire extends only over the allies; I tell you that in the two fields of human action, the land and the sea, you are the absolute masters of the second' (II, 62, 2). And, with reference to the allies, 'The empire you hold is now a Tyranny' (II, 69, 2). This was spoken in sight of the completed Parthenon and almost finished Propylaea, built with the tribute of Athens' allies in the confederacy against Persia. If Pericles aimed at securing for Athens a domination over the West as manifest as Persia's tyranny over the East, what could be more appropriate than to exploit the resources of the empire, as the Persians had done at Persepolis, to build a thoroughly Athenian counterpart, likewise embodying the concept of the state, but a rival concept? 31

Certainly there is nothing comparable in Greece except at Pergamon, the kings of which rebuilt their acropolis in conscious imitation two hundred years later. But of the four Persian capitals, Babylon and Susa were comparatively well-known at Athens, and Ecbatana had a legendary fame, whereas no mention of Persepolis occurs in fifth century literature. Although this silence need not imply ignorance among the cosmopolitan sculptors of the Acropolis—artists were seen but not heard—it raises the question of whether any parallels can be found there to the palaces at Babylon and Susa. There was, of course, the same analogy in function as at Persepolis, in that the buildings included the home of the head of the state (at Athens the temple of the patron deity), the Treasury, and the Record Office. At Babylon an agglomeration of palaces lay behind diverse and unsymmetrical fortifications in brick; at Susa the palace

39 The subject(s) of the two friezes of the Erechtheum can only be guessed from the inscription and the fragments (G. P. Stevens, The Erechtheum 299) but were clearly less formal than the Parthenon's—apparently scenes before or after a procession, with a mixed crowd of spectators. Three galloping chariots must belong to the north porch; on the central block were many figures seated or quietly standing. Perhaps the scenes placed overlooking the agora illustrated the gathering there of the same procession, while on the south its passage to the east end of the Parthenon could have been reproduced or reflected in figures of its spectators.

30 Of a filly, whereas the others are full-grown horses (Markman, The Horse in Greek Art 74, 77). A religious prejudice against the differentiation of human figures is not likely to have applied to equine, and Phidias would not appear to have been a cautious man if he made recognisable portraits of himself and Pericles on the shield of the national cult-image of Athena Parthenos.

31 'Through art Pericles taught the lazy Athenians to believe in empire', said Cecil Rhodes; the intuitive understanding of one empire-builder for another led him to a conclusion which his classical reading could not have substantiated (Herbert Baker, Cecil Rhodes by his Architect 10).
stood on a mound surrounded by a brick wall along the crest. Only at Persepolis and the Acropolis was a mass of rock levelled into various terraces and enclosed by a wall (of Greek masonry at both sites) like that of a fortress; in either case the entrance is not defensible as at Babylon (and probably Susa) but ornamental. The wall makes repeated turns, at right-angles or slanting, to add distinction to a building above or to soften the corners, at Persepolis and the Periclean west end. Within both Persepolis and the Acropolis, a building larger and taller than any other stands on a special terrace as a centre-piece, with other buildings grouped in relation to it, effecting an asymmetrical balance. This certainly did not apply at Babylon, nor probably at Susa. And Persepolis alone yields analogies in sculpture. The reliefs there are close to the ground; on the Nike bastion a frieze is so placed, contrary to Greek custom, as a balustrade. The frieze on the Parthenon illustrates a subject anomalous in Greece but corresponding as closely as was humanly possible to the invariable subject of the Persepolis friezes; it is executed (in a technique necessarily similar) with a uniformity exceptional in Greek treatment of the human figure, though less extreme than the Persian convention. A second subject is added, rather discordantly, in a position different from but analogous to that occupied at Persepolis by an almost equivalent subject.

It appears therefore that Athenian dissatisfaction with the simplicity of Greek civic architecture might have been inspired by vague reports of the splendour of Babylon and Susa, but that Persepolis alone could have exerted a definite artistic influence at the Acropolis. Coincidence must account for some features common to both, but when estimating the chances of that in each individual instance and collectively, we should bear in mind that the more notable resemblances to Persepolis occur in what seem to have been specifically Greek fields of activity there. Since a comparison between the two monuments amounts to a demonstration of the Athenian superiority in artistry and society, I am the more inclined to judge that the resemblances and contrasts alike were to some extent deliberate. Rivalry with Persia might be expected of the generation of Herodotus, which saw Greece in its setting. But even if no one concerned with the design of the Acropolis had given a thought to Persepolis the comparison would still be worth making, because it increases one's appreciation of the Athenian achievement.

A. W. LAWRENCE.
DIS GENITI

All Greek religion is haunted by an anxiety, or a hope, which is generally summed up, since the great work of Mannhardt and Frazer, as the yearly worship of vegetation gods. The name is, admittedly, a little too narrow. No doubt in a simple agricultural community the chief anxiety is about next year's harvest. I am told that in Jerusalem the High Priest went out to see how the barley was getting on, and lengthened or shortened the official year accordingly. Of course there is also anxiety about the young of the flocks and herds, about the weather for sailing and the like; but I think we shall find that it extended much further. The phrase 'Year Spirit' is perhaps better than 'Vegetation God'. Jane Harrison was much criticised for preferring the phrase 'Ενιαυτός δείνων'; but I think she was right, and perhaps more profoundly right than any of us saw at the time.

'Ενιαυτός is a curious word. The new Liddell and Scott gives its root meaning as 'anniversary'. It seems to be formed like έννοι, ένι-οτε, 'there are who . . .', 'there are times when . . .', and to mean 'There is (or 'there is present') the same', ένι-οτός; or, more analytically still, 'there is present-again-this', ένι-οτός. From meaning 'anniversary' it comes to mean a recurrent vital day, or the period, however long, between the recurrent vital days. All kinds of events were due to occur περίπλωοιον ένιαυτών, as in Od. A 16, which seems to mean 'as the anniversaries recur', but easily becomes 'with the passing years'. Children are born ἐπιπλωμένων ένιαυτῶν, (Theog. 493, Asp. 87) meaning, I think, 'when the regular vital time comes on', not 'as the months pass'.

The popular year, of course, was reckoned by rough practical signs, as we see in Hesiod; but astronomy was a very ancient science, and among the learned there were constant attempts to fix for important festivals a μέγας ένιαυτός, a 'great recurrence', when the Sun-cycle and the Moon-cycle, which so obstinately refused to agree in the ordinary solar year, should at last exactly coincide. The tristērís was tried, then the pentetērís; at last an almost exact cycle was discovered by Meton the fifth-century astronomer (Diod. Sic. II. 47). It was an εἰκοσατρίβης, completed at the winter solstice, on the ένι και νέα of the nineteenth and twentieth years, the exact moment at which in the Odyssey text, as at present revised, Odysseus and Penelope come together again (Rise of the Greek Epic, ed. 4, p. 211 f.). There was also the μεγίστος ένιαυτός, when the whole cycle of the Ages would be complete and the life of the universe would either start again and repeat itself or else be finally transformed into the divine fire or soul. It is a doctrine of the Stoics but not peculiar to them. It was also Pythagorean: it is used by some Epicureans and by Heraclitus. Its roots evidently ran deep.

The arrival of each Eniautos is the beginning of a new Αἰών or Age. One knows how greatly this idea was developed in some of the Hellenistic cults, but I think there is evidence of its use at least as early as Heraclitus.

What does he mean exactly by saying (Fr. 52 D), Αἰών ἐστι παῖς παῖζων, πεπούλων, παιδός ἡ βασιλεία. 'The Αἰών is a child playing, moving the pieces; the Kingdom belongs to a child'. Combine that with Euripides Heracleidae 900, which couples together Μοῖρα τελεσιδωτέρα Αἰών τε χρόνου παῖς, 'Fate the giver of fulfilment, and Αἰών the child of Time'. That means, I think, that Αἰών, the particular epoch or New Age, is the child of Time, the continuous. One cannot but compare the probable reading of Fr. 50 D, where Heraclitus says, in his characteristic style, that the whole is διαπερατον ἄθανατον, γεννυτον ἄγεννον, θνητὸν ἄθανατον: so far so good: then it continues λόγον (ἄλογον, χρόνον) αἰώνια, πατέρα υἱὸν where the two words in brackets are Diel's convincing conjecture. 'Reason, Unreason, Time (the absolute), Αἰών (the age of a particular man or generation or race), Ω Father Son'. In reading Heraclitus and his contemporaries it is important to remember what a common and

1 Boissacq and others connect it with έν-λον 'to rest in'. 2 See Wilamowitz on Eur. Her., 669.
regular thing in Greek worship were the mysteries, how familiar every Greek peasant was with the idea of ὀνόματι, 'mystic meanings', and ἄρρητα, things which were not to be revealed to the uninitiated; and also, of course, how vividly the ancient Greek personified things that to us are not in the least like persons.

We have much to learn from Kretschmer's analysis of the name Dionysus (Cook, Zeus II, 271 ff.). It is Thracian; and it appears in the Thraco-Phrygian inscriptions as Dios Nusos, or Deos Nusos. Nusos is known to mean something like 'son' or 'young'. Dios or Deos was taken by Kretschmer to be a genitive, but later research seems to show that it is really a nominative, the name of the Thracian god equivalent to the Greek Zeus. Dionysus is simply the Young Zeus, or Zeus the Son, the New King whose advent is in Greek myth and ritual generally combined with the casting out of the ἀνωμορχή, the old and polluted King of the past. Incidentally we may notice that if Dionysus is the Young Zeus, that explains why he is taunted with being beardless and womanlike. It also explains why his death, unlike that of Osiris and the others, who are publicly mourned, is ἄρρητα (Hdt II 61, 132); the being that is cast out or torn to pieces in the ritual story of the Bacchae and Aeschylus' Edon, cannot really be the New King, Dionysus, but must be his enemy, the Old King, dressed to look like him.3

In terms of vegetation the Old Year dies but has left some seeds of life in the earth; the evergreen pine and ivy show that the Earth is not really dead, and in due course as the Εὔαντος returns, there comes the New Αἰōn or age, with the young kids, lambs, fawns, and the rest. The French word renouveau describes the process; in the magical literature it is sometimes called  ἄλον παλιγγενή, but let us see the myth in its simplest form among the earliest gods.

In the beginning, Hesiod tells us, there was the Old King, Ouranos, the Sky, who wedded Gaia, the Earth, and hated his sons and 'hid' or 'buried them'. Presumably, by analogy from similar stories, he knew that his son would overthrow him (cf. Theog. 464). His youngest Son, Kronos, with the help of the Queen Mother, Gaia, did overthrow him and reigned in his stead. Then Kronos was the Old King; he wedded Rhea, another name, according to Eustathius, for the Earth Goddess; he knew that he was doomed to be overthrown by one of his sons, so he 'devoured' them, except the youngest, Zeus, who was saved and, with the help of the Queen Mother, overthrew old Kronos and cast him and his followers out into darkness. Then Zeus was King, but is he too to be overthrown by his son? Surely that cannot be. Yet the thought of it lingers. In the Prometheus it is not exactly Zeus who will have a son mightier than his father; it is Thetis, his intended bride, who is fated to have this terrible son. So if he does not marry Thetis he escapes the doom. To Aeschylus the Olympian Zeus is the final consummation of these divine wars; the two previous Kings of the World had fought and conquered by brute force; Zeus, the Third, had the power to learn and led man the way to φθόνος (Ag. 160–183). Therefore he is permanent. But there was also another story. Zeus married another Earth-goddess, Semele, and had a son, Dionysus. Let us take the story in its Thracian or Phrygian form: Deos or Dios married Zemela, the Thracian word for Earth which we still know in the Slavonic name of Nova Zembla (J. Harrison, Prolegomena, p. 404), and begot the son Deos Nusos, the Young Deos, the New King, whose normal business is to supersede the Old King. In the Greek myth Zeus marries the mortal princess Semele, who dies giving birth to Dionysus. Dionysus, important as he is in Greek Mythology, does not in the ordinary versions supersede Zeus. I suspect that such an act would be, like the death of Dionysus himself, ἄρρητα, a thing not to be spoken. Yet there seem to be traces of just such a supersession. In one of the Orphic fragments (Proclus on Kratylus 396B, p. 55, 5 Pasquali) Zeus hands over to Dionysus the throne and the sceptre, establishes him as King of the Cosmic Gods, and says to the New Gods—observe that phrase—Κλητε, θεο, τόνδ' ὑμνιν ἐγὼ βουλητα τιθημ. I cannot but compare with this the culminating ceremony of the Anthesterae, when the 'very old xoanon of Dionysus' is brought out of its hidden temple and married to the

3 Possibly this idea of the substitution of a false Dionysus may have had an influence on the heresy of the Docetae, who held that it was not the real Christ but an umbera that had died on the cross.
GILBERT MURRAY

' Basilissa ', the Young Queen; a queer and rude ceremony which I think is perhaps parodied in the final scene of Aristophanes' Birds, where Peithetaros insists on obtaining the hand of the Basileia, the Queen, and becomes thereby a new Zeus, wielding the thunderbolt, ruling the heavens, and hailed as δαμόδον ύπερτατος.

Thus we have two conceptions; in the accepted Olympian myth there were three successive Kings of the Universe, reaching their climax and conclusion by the victory of Zeus, the eternal King; but to another, and apparently more original conception, the series has no conclusion, since the Old Zeus gives way to a Young Zeus, and he at the end of the year will pass it on to another New Zeus. Nay more; if we look carefully, the series not only has no end; it has no beginning either. For Ouranos himself is not the first of things; like all his successors he is the son of Gaia (Theog. 126). She produced him ἵσον ἔστιν, equal to herself; the series lasts as long as Earth herself shall last.

Now let us consider more in detail the separate figures in this sequence, Old King, Earth Mother, and Young King. The Old King is an enemy to his children, σφετερός δ' ἄχοντο τοκῆ, βαλλόν δ' ἄχοντα τοκῆ (Theog. 155 ff., 138), though in the Orphic scheme this is softened down, doubtless for purposes of edification, and Zeus of his free will gives over the sovereignty to Dionysus. Next, the Old King is a pharmakos. In the pharmakos rite at Athens we may notice two elements. There is the strange rite of βαστίζειν εἰς τὸ πέτος with scilla bulbs. That must be symbolic of castration. He is castrated and made incapable of perpetuating his polluted race. That would explain why Ouranos is castrated in Hesiod. Secondly, the pharmakos is cast out, as Kronos and his followers are cast away into the abyss.

Next, notice the Mother. Old Kings may pass and Young kings succeed, but the Earth remains. She is the wife of the Old King, but also of the Young King; she habitually conspires with the Young King, her son, against the Old. When we come down from gods to human beings we shall find that this habit of Gaia throws some light on figures like Clytemnestra and Jocasta, and also, I think, on Gertrude in the original Hamlet story. Then, from the beginning she is a mater dolorosa. She may be comforted and released, but she always suffers first. The Earth suffers, no doubt, in the time of barrenness; that is, in the hard winter, or, under Egyptian conditions, in the scorching heat; she is also cruelly torn by the ploughshare (Soph. Ant. 338-49) and is struck by the lightning in the spring storms. In Hesiod we find that under the rule of Ouranos στεναχίζετο Γαϊα πελώρη, under that of Kronos ῥέν ἔχε πέτος ἑλάστου (Theog. 159, 467). We shall see how strongly this suffering is emphasised when we come to the mortal mothers.

The Son too has a clear character. He is, of course, roughly speaking, good, and the Old King bad. Some of the Christian heretics took this line, making Jehovah an enemy and persecutor of Jesus. But especially he is a general Saviour or Deliverer from the pollution of the past. In all the stories he begins by delivering his mother from her sorrow; in Hesiod he also delivers his brothers from their prisons; Zeus, in particular, goes further. He releases his πατροκασιγνήτους, who belong to the enemy generation. Pindar draws the full moral from this: οὗτος δὲ Ζέως ἀριθτος Τιτῶν (Theog. 501; Pind. Pyth. iv end).

We also find in Zeus, as the Young God, a trait that is very prominent in later cult and legend. His babyhood is dwelt upon. Παιδὸς ἢ βασιλὴν. Being in danger from the Old King he is carried away to Lyctus in Crete, and there danced about by armed Kourites, who shout and clash their shields so that the child's cries are not heard. It is the same with Dionysus. He was worshipped as Liknites, a babe in the cradle. He was guarded by τιμίων, Nurses: he was pursued, and his nurses beaten, by an angry king. Another characteristic which is common to the infant Zeus and the infant Dionysus is that both are apt to turn into Snakes. Zeus Meilichios, at Athens, Zeus Sosipolis at Olympia had snake form; in other cases Zeus is accompanied by a large Snake, while Dionysus makes some of his mystical appearances in snake form. This, however, is a mark of nearly all the Eniautos babies; like Cecrops,

---

4 One might even think of all the row of Ζανες (Paus. V, 21) at Olympia, a new one perhaps added at a suitable day.  
5 Hamlet and Orestes in Proceedings of the British Academy (1913-14, pp. 389 ff.).
Erichthonius and others. The snake which sheds its skin and comes out renewed is a regular symbol of παλιγγενεσία.

So far, roughly speaking, we have been dealing with elemental gods. Let us now consider some borderline cases, where the Father is an Olympian and the Son is not quite a god but has something divine about him.

We have already noticed Zeus—Semele—Dionysus. There Semele is struck by lightning. As a mortal princess this naturally kills her, as Mother Earth it no doubt refreshed her in the spring thunderstorms; but its chief importance is as a mark of the divinity of the child. He is Sōtēr and the bringer of a new Aión. (Is this perhaps why the birthdays of philosophers were celebrated with religious honours, because they seemed to have initiated a new Aión?)

Another obvious case is Zeus—Alcmene—Heracles. Mother and son are condemned to be burned to death, but the son is saved at the last moment, and it is by fire that eventually he mounts to heaven. Heracles has a curious history in Greek thought, but emerges as a great Sōtēr, a destroyer of the enemies of mankind. Like most Eniautos babies he is attended by Snake, but—perhaps by some regrettable misunderstanding—he fights and strangles them.

More interesting still is the great Sōtēr, Asklepios. He is the son of Apollo and the mortal princess Koronis, who, like Semele, is struck dead by the divine lightning, while her babe, like the infant Dionysus, is saved. One is not surprised to read in Pausanias (2, 26) that the babe was exposed on a mountain and suckled by a bitch—hence the sacred dogs in his ritual—or that lightning played harmlessly about his head. I will not enquire why Asklepios in so many stories is struck dead by lightning, not merely after raising Hippolytus from the dead—which was perhaps unprofessional conduct—but even for curing the madness of the Proitides and the blindness of the sons of Phineus. Nor need we ask why he is always accompanied by a Snake. It is interesting, however, to note how much the widespread cry for salvation from the evil of the world which marks later Hellenistic Age, clung to Asklepios and magnified his worship. He was the Healer of Sick Humanity, the Saviour par excellence. His worship spreads all over the Mediterranean world. He grants prophecies and revelations (Reitzenstein, Mysterienreligionen, p. 128). He is connected with Hermes Trismegistos, but, most significant of all, he becomes a special object of Christian polemic. Arnobius (I 49 et saepe) does not deny his remarkable cures, but points out that they were only achieved by regular medical treatment, not, like those of Jesus, by direct word of command. It has also been thought that his art-type, the mild and bearded face, was chosen for the representation of Jesus. The point is disputed. We must wait for Sir John Beazley to tell us who is right.

Rather curious is the case of the Dioskouroi. They are sons of Zeus and the mortal woman Leda or else Nemesis. They are the Kouroi or Young Men of Zeus, and I cannot help suspecting that they are largely thought of as ἑρμικουροί, Helpers in Battle. I will not discuss the special points of their twinship, their connection with particular stars, or with the two pillars that are necessary to uphold a roof. For our present purpose they fall into the class of Sons of God who are Ἑρμιστῆς, Saviours in general, especially from defeat in battle and from the perils of the sea.

In speaking of the Sons of God, we must always remember that the word θεός or Deus in a polytheist society is very different indeed from the word God among Christians or Jews or Arabs; and also, what is not quite so obvious, that the word 'son' in simple ancient communities is often used to denote all sorts of relations for which they had no exact terminology. The Amphictyons, 'Dwellers-round', are sons of an imaginary 'Dweller-round', and when the author of Genesis X wishes to say that some of the population of the great Hittite Empire spread over into the land of Canaan, the way he expresses it is 'Canaan begat Heth.' Remembering this I think we can see how this idea of Sons of Theoi as Sōtēres and inaugurators of a New Age, to save us from all those innumerable things from which we need salvation, became one of the great emotional emblems of man, almost what Jung calls a 'Primordial Image'.
But now let us see what happens when the old elemental gods are supplanted by the Olympians; the myth is made more anthropomorphic and taken in its literal sense. In such a case one begins to judge the god by human standards, and the story becomes repulsive. It becomes, as Satyros says in his Life of Euripides, a tale of μεταφθένων and ὑποκλάτων παιδῶν, the first a well-known ugly crime and the second a disreputable expedient. Why was it such a common theme for tragedy? The answer seems obvious. Because it expressed in parable that birth of the Dios Nisos, or Young Zeus, which was the central myth of the Festival. The story might not be dramatically sympathetic, but ritually it was a necessity. It had to come in somewhere.

I will recapitulate briefly a number of Euripidean tragedies on this theme which I analysed in C.Q. vol. xxxvii, 1943.

**I.** Apollo and the Attic princess Creusa. Misery of Creusa; baby Ion nearly cast to death (1.27.46). “Cradle with golden snakes. Recognised; becomes founder of the Ionians.

**Alope.** Poseidon and Alope, daughter of Kerkyon. Alope walled up by angry Kerkyon. Baby exposed, suckled by mare, brought up by shepherds. Named Hippothoos; recognised, becomes founder of Eleusis. Kerkyon killed.

**Antiope.** Zeus in satyr form and Antiope, daughter of Nycteus. Antiope flies to Mt. Kithairon, there bears twins Amphion and Zethus. Angry father commits suicide, but charges his successor Letus and his wife Dirce to punish Antiope. Recognition. The twins become founders of Thebes. Dirce killed.

**Auge.** Heracles and Auge, daughter of Aleos, the Arcadian king. Baby Telephus born in temple of Athena Alea; angry father; babe cast out to die on Mt. Parthenion, suckled by deer. Mother condemned to be burnt alive. Recognition. Auge saved. Telephus founder of royal race in Mysia.

**Melanippe.** Two plays by Euripides. Poseidon and Melanippe, daughter of Hellen. Twins exposed, suckled by cow. Condemned to be burned as monstrousities; Melanippe in one play to be burned with them (?), in the other imprisoned and blinded. Recognition. The persecutors killed. The twins are Aeolus and Boeotus, founders of the Aeolians and Boeotians.

The same myth-form occurs in at least four plays of Sophocles.

**Tyro.** Poseidon and Tyro, daughter of Salmoneus. Twins, Pelias and Neleus, thrown into river, rescued by a horse-herd (Πηνορώβος). Perhaps suckled by mare? Tyro beaten cruelly by stepmother, Sidero. Recognition; Sidero killed at altar; Pelias founder of Iolcos, Neleus of Pylus.

**Ateleia.** Auge daughter of Aleos with child by Heracles; given by angry father to Nauplius to drown; on the way gives birth to the babe Telephus on Mt. Parthenion. Baby saved; recognised; becomes king of Mysia.

**Hipponous.** His daughter Periboia with child by Ares; sent with baby to Oineus to be killed. Somehow saved; becomes Bellerophon, inventor of horsemanship and slayer of the Chimaera.

**Danae.** Daughter of Acrisios, imprisoned because her child is fated to kill the Old King his grandfather; nevertheless has child by Zeus; thrown into sea in a chest with the child; rescued by Dictys; her son Perseus, slayer of the Gorgon, ancestor of the Persians. He duly kills Acrisios by accident.

Without trying to make a complete list we may note among the works of the other tragedians an Alope by Choiri andos and Karkinos; an Alcmene by Ion, Astydamas, and Dionysius; a Leda by Dionysius; a Semele by Karkinos, and a Tyro by Karkinos in addition to two by Sophocles.

In all these the story is half-humanised. The Father God is an Olympian; the place of
the suffering Earth-Mother is taken by a human princess, and that of the Young Zeus, or New Year God, by a human hero. But we may note two or three points that result from this change.

First the Olympian god cannot, like Ouranos and Kronos, be made a pharmakos and cast out. That role is apt to be taken by the heroine’s angry father, an Old King, who, like Ouranos and Kronos, is the enemy of his children. The heroine, like Gaia and Rhea, is always mater dolorosa. The son, like Kronos and Zeus, is somehow ‘hidden’ or exposed; then he is ‘recognised’ and becomes the Founder of a race or kingdom, bringing a ‘peripeteia’ and a new Aión. Further, like Zeus and Dionysus, he is generally connected with some animal, suckled by a cow, sheep, mare, deer, or goat, or else simply found among the flocks. One is reminded of the manger and the worshipping shepherds. As a baby, like Zeus and Dionysus, he always has a narrow escape from a wicked Herod. It is clearly the same essential story, the story of the Eniautos-Babe, the New King casting out the Old, assuming the throne and inaugurating a New Age.

It is the divine father who gives trouble. Originally, when he was Ouranos, the Sky, wedded to Gaia, the Earth, no moral question arose. Even when he was the local River or Mountain, like Enipeus or Strymon or Pelion, he was fairly impersonal and was the natural source for a royal race. But in these dramas he has been transformed into one of the personal Olympian gods, Zeus or Apollo or Poseidon, and two difficulties arise. An Olympian god does not make a possible pharmakos. He cannot be either killed or cast to the darkness, as an impersonal Old Year could. Also he is a person, and must bear some personal responsibility. If he were human he could repent and be forgiven. But as a god he cannot. Only in one passage (Auge fr. 265) do we find a father saying, ‘I confess I have done wrong, but I did not mean it.’ That is Heracles, who is at least half-human.

One cannot help wondering how the action of the God was treated in these lost tragedies. Was it made mystical or at least inscrutable, and treated in a religious or quasi-religious spirit? Or was the myth, with all its lack of morals, taken as it stood and merely made into an exciting story, with no particular ethical or psychological interest? I suppose this latter hypothesis is on the whole most probable, though it so happens that the one play of this Son-of-god type which is preserved, the Ion, passes very strong moral judgement on the god, and one other treatment of a similar story idealises all guilt away.

The Ion has a cynical tone. Apollo is treated as the villain of the piece, and not only a villain but a coward and a bungler as well. His plots misfire. His victim, in the best scene of the play, curses him before his own altar. At the end he dare not show his face. I have suggested elsewhere that the effect of the Ion may well have been to make the authorities feel that this son-of-god myth, though an essential element in the Eniautos religion, was not suitable for tragedy (C.Q. loc. cit.).

But there is one other treatment of this type of myth extraordinarily different, the story of Io as told by Aeschylus in the Supplices and the Prometheus.

Here the whole theme is put on an ideal plane. Zeus did indeed cause great suffering to Io, but the result was more than worth it. There is no thought of lust. The god only laid his hand on Io and breathed his spirit into her. Her divine Son was born, ἔξ ἐπαρθὲς καὶ ἐπισωλφὸς Δίως, from the touch and the breath, or inspiration, of Zeus. (Suppl. 18 f.). Further on it is by the λόγος, the ὠφυθεῖσα λόγῳ, that she conceives and bears in the end a flawless child, ‘through a long age (or his long Aión) perfect in blessedness’.

This treatment is the more surprising since in the usual story, which is duly accepted in Suppl. 301, Io was transformed into a cow, and Zeus, in order to mate with her, took the shape of a bull. This presumably goes back, as Professor Dodds suggests to me, to a ἱερὸς Γάμος in the cult of Ἡρα βοῶμος. When Greek settlers in the Delta identified Epaphos, the offspring of this union, with the divine bull-calf Apis, who was generated by a ray of the Sun or the Moon, and by his birth spread blessing over the land, they made easy the transition to Aeschylus’s treatment of the whole story. Epaphos of course was born in Egypt, and this idea of Virgin
Birth seems to have been specially Egyptian. Plutarch (Numa 4) attributes the doctrine to 'the Egyptians' and finds it οὐκ ἐπιθετήν. More at length elsewhere (in Quest. Conviv. viii 1) he accepts the Egyptian view that a god begets his son υἱὸς ἐν υἱότητι, ἀλλ' ἐπέκειται ἐπὶ τῶν ἁλών καὶ κατεύθυνεν (Norden, p. 48). As we know, Egyptian influence came to Greece very early.

Apart from the Virginity motive, Aeschylus explains with clear emphasis that the purpose of Zeus from the beginning was to produce a Saviour of mankind; it is a proof of his supreme wisdom and righteousness (see the magnificent hymn, Suppl. 570–599). But now turn to the Prometheus, which of course was later than the Supplices. How do we explain the bitter denunciation of Zeus for his treatment of Io there? (734–740). He is a tyrant and rasher, violent everywhere, βλησό τινα τάνυ ομόν, though it is true that, by this violence, he creates not only a general bringer of blessing, like Apis-Epaphos, but actually the eventual deliverer of Prometheus himself. I think the answer must be that, in the reconciliation which we know took place at last between Zeus and Prometheus, one element was that Prometheus saw that he had misjudged his great enemy. The true Zeus is the Zeus of the Supplices and of Agamemnon 161–183.

The common popular tradition was always apt to meet with one of two treatments. The current myth was either denounced as immoral and therefore untrue, as by writers like Xenophanes and Heraclitus and Euripides, or else it was re-interpreted and allegorised on the lines of, say, Pindar and Aeschylus. But in the theatre of Dionysus this particular theme of the birth of the Young God had, I think, a curious end. As I have suggested in the C.Q. xxxvii, the theme was gradually recognised as unsuitable for tragedy; the God cut too miserable or offensive a figure. Yet the ENIAUTOS theme was essential to the Dionysiac festival. It could not be quite abandoned. It was taken on by the New Comedy in a completely humanised form, with the hidden child, the suffering mother, a recognition and περιπέτεια which 'saves the situation', and—quite a new note—a guilty but repentant father. In the only plays of which adequate fragments exist the passionate repentance of the various sinners, i.e. Polemo, Charisius, and the two old men in the Samia, is an important element in the play.

What then is the main argument of this paper? It is to study the idea of an ENIAUTOS, a Zeus the Son, who is born περιπέτειαν ἐναυτὸν, and brings with him a new Aiôn which is unpolluted, while the old polluted past withers away or is cast out; whose birth brings deliverance to the suffering Mother Earth, and cleansing to the world in general. I am suggesting that this whole complex of ideas is a widespread and profound element in Greek religious tradition. And I think we cannot help noticing that it goes further, and plays a great part in that intense flowering of religious and mystical aspiration which resulted from the meeting of Greek, Hebrew, Egyptian, and primitive Anatolian thought in the age which is called Hellenistic, and which has had such lasting influence on the whole Western world.

The longing for some mythical or human Sôter, inaugurating a new Aiôn and described as the son of a God and a mortal woman, is persistent through all those parts of the ancient world of which we have information. It is constantly recurrent in Greece. It is regularly accepted in Egypt. It takes of course a different form in the territories of the great Asiatic Mother Goddess, and is rejected by Hebrew monotheism. Professor Kenan held that Jahweh was really, like Allah, a desert god; hence his hostility to the Baalim and their odious consorts and fertility ceremonies. When the 'sons of the Elohim' in Genesis vi took wives of the daughters of men and produced heroes and giants, that to the Jahvist was part of the general wickedness which led to the Flood; to the rest of the nations it was either a normal annual process or a special blessing.

The true διονυσία or θεόν παιδεία are always deliverers from past pollution and inaugurators of a new age. But their forms vary. First, we have the divine Baby as he appears in the Fourth Eclogue. We have the baby Zeus with his protecting Kuretes, the baby Dionysus with his Nurses. We have numbers of supernatural babies discovered in a chest, like Perseus, in a cradle like Ión, in a boat like Neleus and Pelias, generally nursed by a cow or
sheep or mare or some wild animal, and especially associated with the mystic snake. In Egypt there was a very special divine Baby, Harpocrates; ‘No God’, says Ermann (Norden p. 73), ‘lay so near the heart of the people as the little Harpocrates’: that is, Har-pe-chrot, Horus the Babe’, whose figurines represent him as a small child playing. Is it not on these lines that we should interpret that oracle of Heraclitus: Ἄλον παῖς ἐστὶ παιὸν παιὸς ἡ ἡμερήμη. ‘The Aiôn is a babe playing: the kingdom is the Babes’? We may remember the strange power in many parts of Europe of the infant Jesus. I have seen in an Italian church a primitive and rather moving adoration of a Bambino who at the suitable moment turned into a lamb.

Then of course the ordinary Διόσκουροι, or Son of Zeus, is a fighter and conqueror. He saves by destroying the enemy. The chief example of this type is Heracles, always delivering mankind from oppressors and monsters. There is the same quality in Theseus, son of Poseidon. He saves maidens from the Minotaur and slays the oppressors Skiron, Sisias, and Procrustes. There is some of the same quality in Perseus, slayer of the Gorgon and of his mother’s enemies; some in the Dioskouroi, who turn the tide in battle and save sailors in storms. This force, I tentatively suggest, lived on chiefly in various Kings, from Alexander and his successors onward. Titles like Sôter and Euergetes suggest it. Mark Antony posed as being Dionysus, and even ‘the Young’ or ‘the New’ Dionysus, while other princes claimed to be Heracles. But this special conception no doubt became swamped by the common ruler-worship of the East. The martial hero-saviour finds some expression in the conquering Dionysus of Nonnus, whose superiority to Perseus and Heracles is the theme of Bk. 25, and it was prominent in the Sol Invictus Mithras, the special god of the Roman army.

Sometimes again the Son of the God is a mediator, interpreter or interceder between the worshipper and the God himself. This comes no doubt from the oriental conception of the God as an unapproachable supreme King, who can be addressed only through his favourites or by the use of their name. Apollo is regularly προφήτης Δίς (Eum. 19, 616) and ‘has never spoken from his mantic throne one word that was not commanded by Zeus’. Athena has at times a similar quality. But the most striking case is to be found in the Hermetic literature, where almost every approach to Hermes Trismegistos is by the mediation of his son Thoth. In the medieval Church, though this part essentially belongs to the divine Son, there is much hope of special intercession by the Virgin and by certain of the Saints.

It cannot but strike any student of these ideas how many of them seem to occur, either independently or by imitation, in many different mediterranean myths and how many have lived on in certain forms of Christianity. They seem to have in them, as I have suggested, much of what Dr. Jung calls Primordial Images; the metaphors or symbols which recur constantly in the human mind, as instruments to express or satisfy certain deep-seated emotions for which there is no scientific terminology. It is interesting to note, among the current Hellenistic phrases of the time, those which the Pauline tradition accepts and those which it avoids. There is of course a great difference between the different epistles. The so-called ‘Four Great Epistles’ avoid the pagan word Σωτήρ, though the need for it was irresistible and it forced its way into Christian language very early. They admit σωτηρία. They accept ιερός θεός, Son of God, though it must, one would suppose, have done violence to Jewish habits of thought. None of the Epistles mentions the Bambine, nor yet the Divine Mother, Θεότοκος, though here again the longing for both of them among the peoples of southern and eastern Europe has proved irresistible. They make considerable use of the conception αἵων which the authorised version translates ‘world’ and rather confuses with κόσμος. (2 Cor. iv. 4, Gal. i. 4, Eph. i. 21, ii. 2, I Tim. vi. 17, II Tim. iv. 10, Tit. ii. 12). They make no use of the special magic power of a Name—in great contrast to St. John (xiv. 13, 14: xv. 16: xvi. 23, 24, 26). They make frequent mention of elements, principalities, powers, and dominions—στοιχεῖα, ἐξουσία, ἀρχαὶ, δυνάμεις, but regard them as enemies to the faith, which the Christian must fight against. Did the writer think of them as real hostile beings, or merely as winds of false doctrine?
These primordial ideas live on. They change names and forms, but cannot be eradicated. They are things which, in Sallustius's memorable phrase ἔγνετο μὲν οὖστος, ἐστὶ δὲ άει. We all remember the old woman in Mr. Lawson's book on *Modern Greek Folklore* (p. 573) who was in a state of great anxiety as Easter approached: ‘Of course I am anxious; for if Christ does not rise tomorrow we shall have no corn this year.’ The Eniautos and its new *Aion* were still a recurrent hope, not an event that had happened long ago, once for all. I suspect that of all these primordial images, if that is their right name, the most permanent and indestructible is the longing for Καθαρία, purification, cleansing, for ‘deliverance from the body of this death’. It seems to take two forms. In most religions, ancient and modern, it is a personal thing; repentance followed by forgiveness and always associated with some half-magical special rite. This message also has its place in drama. The god who appears in the final scene of so many Euripidean tragedies has practically always the same message: ‘Give up your revenges! Repent and forgive one another.’ It is so in the *Electra*, the *Hippolytus*, the *Iphigenia Taurica*, the *Helena*, the *Orestes*, and perhaps we may add the *Alcestis*. And we have noticed how this note of repentance and forgiveness is quite at home in the very mundane stories of the New Comedy. The other form is that which we have been considering, the cleansing not of oneself but of the whole world by the casting out of the polluted past and the Rebirth of all life. The Eniautos is completed; the Old Man or *Pharmaka* is cast away. It is the Day of the New Man, the New Age, the most inspiring and dangerous of dreams. It is splendid in the sixth chapter of Isaiah, in the Fourth Eclogue, in the Book of Revelation; dangerous in every great revolution, ridiculous in many transient fantasies and impostures, a deadly poison in those cases, not unknown to this generation, where the fanatic’s dream serves to let loose man’s insatiable thirst for power. Primordial images shall we call them, dreams of mankind which ‘never happened but always are’? Often we cannot but wish that they would stop and leave us in peace; but I doubt if we could live without them.

*GILBERT MURRAY.*
UN FRAMMENTO DI DOURIS NEL MUSEO GREGORIANO-ETRUSCO

Il frammento è conosciuto, ma non è altrettanto conosciuto come sia entrato, uscito e ritornato nella collezione vascolare del Museo. Ne mancano inoltre riproduzioni a base fotografica completa nel diritto e nel rovescio. A queste lacune intende riparare lo scritto dedicato qui alle onoranze di un maestro insigne, che allo studio della ceramica antica, nelle sue innumerevoli manifestazioni grandi e piccole, ha dedicato una parte cospicua della sua attività scientifica. Esso appartiene ad uno stamnos del Museo Gregoriano-Etrusco, descritto dal Helbig nel I° volume del Führer (ed. 3°, p. 313, n. 503), che si trova ora nella sala VI, vetrina K, n. 22, e che misura cm. 38,4 di altezza e cm. 16,6 di diametro alla bocca.¹

In una delle facce, quella secondaria, si vedono due figure ammantate ritte ed affrontate; quella a destra è un giovine in ascolto, quello di sinistra, forse un maestro di palestra, ha i capelli annodati con un semplice nastro e stringe un alto bastone a nodi con manico ricurvo. Vedi Fig. 1. Nell'altra faccia, la principale, si vede Eracle con le mani protese in avanti verso una donna in atto di fuggire, il quale doveva tenere con la destra uno scettro. Vedi Fig. 2. Ma la scena, così come risulta ora, è opera prevalentemente di restauro moderno. Nell'originale alla figura di Eracle dovevano mancare le mani ed anche la clava, se pure questa esisteva; e della seconda figura rimaneva ben poco: la parte inferiore della persona, da sopra le ginocchia in giù, e la testa nel tratto superiore alla bocca, tanto che, invece di una donna fuggente, il Beazley (loc. cit.) vi ravvisava Nereo; e al loro posto, nella curvatura tra il collo e la pancia dello stamnos, fino dall'antichità era stato inserito un frammento di tazza attica, contrassegnato col nome di Douris e fermato al corpo del vaso con quattro grappe di bronzo, di cui sono ben visibili i fori.² Vedi Figg. 2, 3, 4.

Con questa inserzione, contrastante col resto della scena, lo stamnos era stato deposto in una tomba dell'Etruria meridionale, dalla quale fu estratto modernamente in qualche scavo e passò in possesso della Camera Apostolica, che lo introdusse nel Museo fondato da Gregorio XVI.³ In siffatte condizioni era lo stamnos circa il 1840, quando il Gerhard lo vide e lo fece disegnare per la sua raccolta; ⁴ così esso rimase per un tempo indeterminato, che si estende fino agli ultimi decenni del secolo scorso. Fu all'incirca in quel tempo che la Direzione dei Musei, messa probabilmente sull'avviso da qualche studioso, lo affidò ad un restauratore, perché ne toglisse il pezzo eterogeneo, vi sostituisse un pezzo di terracotta moderna e completasse le parti mancanti della scena e delle figure, prendendo ispirazione ed esempio da altre scene dell'inseguimento di cui abbonda la pittura vascolare.⁵ Il restauratore, invitato ad eseguire il lavoro, estrasse il frammento di Douris, riempì il vuoto con un pezzo di moderna fattura, e accomodò la scena alla meglio, così come gli era stato suggerito.

Benché si trattasse di un frammento che portava la firma di Douris, l'unico pezzo forse che in Italia fosse fregiato con il nome del celebre ceramografo ateniese, nessuno, dentro e fuori dei Musei Vaticani, ne fece caso, e il pezzo, abbandonato nel Magazzino del Museo, per opera del restauratore stesso o di qualche guardiano in fede, poté passare nel mercato antiquario, inserito nella raccolta Branteghemi, per esser poi venduto a Parigi a Teodoro Reinach.

---

¹ Questo stamnos oltrecitò dal Helbig (loc. cit.) fu studiato da altri, Vedi Beazley, Attische Vasenmaler des religiösen Stils (1925), p. 157, n. 15, il quale definisce la scena principale come loita tra Eracle e Niaco.
² L'uno di essi viene a trovarsi a sinistra, al centro della tazza che l'Eter tiene con la destra protesa; il secondo in un pezzo del trapezoforo in basso; il terzo è presso l'orlo superiore a destra; il quarto presso la zampa estrema del trapezoforo posto davanti alla kline.
³ È questa l'ipotesi più probabile; ma i documenti dell'archivio che riguardano la formazione del Museo Gregoriano-Etrusco non danno descrizioni precise; e pertanto potrebbe darsi benissimo che il nostro stamnos provenisse dalla raccolta di vasi, che fino dal secolo XVIII erano posti sopra gli armadi della Biblioteca Vaticana ad ornamento delle sale, e che quelli furono scelti i migliori per arricchire il nuovo Museo.
⁴ Auserlesene griechische Vasenbilder (Berlino 1840-1855) p. 145.
⁵ Nessun nome e nessuna data si trova nell'archivio dei Musei che possa illuminare lo studio sui particolari del restauro. Si può solo congetturare che il restauratore appartenesse alla famiglia Pennelli. Un Pennelli infatti era stato il restauratore preferito dal Marchese Campana per la sua famosa raccolta, e quando questa fu acquistata dal Louvre, egli emigrò con essa a Parigi e svolse colà la sua attività di restauratore. Ma un altro Pennelli lavorava ancora privatamente in Roma, noto per la sua abilità, nei primi anni del secolo corrente, e veniva, all'occorrenza, chiamato a prestare l'opera sua nei Musei Vaticani, i quali mancavano a quei tempi di laboratori di restauro loro propri.
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circa l’anno 1892. Quando circa il 1920, il prof. C. Albizzi si preparava alla pubblicazione del catalogo dei vasi dipinti del Museo Gregoriano, accortosi della scomparsa del frammento, si rivolse al Reinach stesso, perché accennessi a restituirlo al Vaticano. Il Reinach gentilmente promise che alla sua morte il pezzo sarebbe ritornato al suo posto, ciò che avvenne per mano del fratello Salomone a lui sopravvissuto.

Di questa guisa il frammento, fortunatamente ricuperato, ritornò in dominio del pubblico ed è ora esposto nella sala VII (emicultural, vetrina N. n° 16). Esso risulta ricomposto di tre frammenti; tuttavia nel disegno e nella vernice è di conservazione quasi perfetta. Ma se per la tecnica rappresenta, insieme con gli esemplari dei contemporanei Euphrumios e Brygos, uno dei più splendidi periodi della ceramica attica, è pur vero che, per la scena riprodotta, essa è un indice della deprivazione dei costumi che fino dai primi decenni del secolo V inquinava la società ateniese. Tolto dalla sua forzata postura nello stamnos, per il fatto di esser dipinto su entrambe le facce, si vide tosto che doveva appartenere ad un piatto, tazza, ecc. e non è strana siffatta appartenenza, perché è risaputo che Douris fu di preferenza pittore di tazze, tanto che il prof. Beazley, nello studio fatto dei vasi attici a figure rosse, fin dal 1925 potè assegnare a lui piu di centoventi vasi di questa forma. Apparneva quindi ad una tazza e ad una tazza di considerevoli dimensioni, perché un calcolo fatto, sia sul fregio circolare, che doveva racchiudere all'interno la scena centrale (vedi Fig. 5), sia sulla curvatura dello stamnos col quale era combinato, c’è d’un diametro di circa cm. 30,7. Che cosa poi fosse rappresentato nel tondo interno non risulta in alcun modo, perché, oltre il fregio commissimino, non si scorgono altro e immediatamente sotto di esso, che sette lettere della firma dell’artista: ι5 εγγαφ.

Sulla faccia esterna invece erano rappresentate giovani coppie di efebi con le loro etere, adagiati a due a due sulle klinai. Efebi ed etere reggevano ciascuno una tazza. Il gesto dell’etera del nostro frammento fa pensare ai giocoli dei kottabs, che fu di gran moda nei secoli VI–IV in Grecia e in Etruria, ma esso sarebbe stato per mare elementi dell’oggetto è rimasto che possa avvalorare l’ipotesi. Davanti alle klinai erano trapezofori e in alto alle pareti stavano appesi piatti, tazze, a cui potevano aggiungersi anche strumenti musicali, come si vede in altre tazze di Douris.

Tutto sommato, il frammento vaticano di Douris, in sé e per sé, non ha nulla di speciale e rientra per la tecnica e per il genere delle figurazioni nel quadro della produzione ceramica di Atene nella prima metà del V° secolo a.C.; ma esso offre qualche interesse per il modo col quale è pervenuto dall’antichità fino ai giorni nostri attraverso il mondo etrusco. Resta infatti confermato: prima di tutto che i vasi importati dalla Grecia non servivano generalmente all’uso, ma all’ornamento delle case; in secondo luogo che non solo erano conservati con cura i vasi interi, ma venivano ricercati e custoditi anche i frammenti che per l’arte e per il costume potevano attirare la curiosità degli amatori; in terzo luogo che al restauro di un vaso mancante di qualche frammento, rinunciando ad un lavoro d’integrazione logica, si provvedeva anche all’inserzione di un frammento etereogeno qualsiasi, purchè questo avesse in sè qualche pregio di novità e di bellezza. Soltanto il progresso degli studi storici e una maggiore sensibilità del gusto artistico ci hanno insegnato ad apprezzare i monumenti quali essi furono e quali essi giunsero a noi senza artificiose integrazioni anche se dettate da buona erudizione archeologica.

Direttore Generale dei Monumenti, Musei e Gallerie Pontificie.

Bartolomeo Nogara.

---

6 Teodoro Reinach, storico e filologo insigne ai suoi tempi, nato nel 1850 e morto a Parigi nel 1908. La notizia della vendita Brantegehm e dell’acquisto fatto dal Reinach è nel Répertoire des casiers pointés di Salomon Reinach, tom. II, p. 75, n. 8-9. Il Catalogo della collezione Brantegehm porta la data del 1892.

7 Del Catalogo, che fa parte della Collezione Monumenti Vaticani di Archeologia e di Arte, Vol. 2, sono stati pubblicati sette fascicoli di pp. 214 complessive, con 70 tavole in fototip.


9 Non è possibile stabilire, se la frattura in tre pezzi sia di data antica o recente; ma crederei poterla attribuire al lavoro fatto; quando il pezzo fu estratto dallo stamnos. I tre pezzi infatti non sono indicati nel disegno del Gerhard. Vedi Fig. 5.


SIMONIDEA

I

Fr. 13 (Diehl) = 37 (Bergk).


ἐκ δὲ τῆς μελικῆς τὰ Σιμωνίδεα τοῦτο γέγραπται δὲ κατὰ διαστολάς οὕς ὃν Ἀριστοφάνης ἤ ἀλλος τις κατεσκέυασε κάλλους ἄλλ᾽ ὃν ὁ περὶ λόγος ἀπαίτατ. πρόσεχε δὴ τοῖς μέλει καὶ ἀναγνώσωσε κατὰ διαστολάς, καὶ εὐ θεῦ ὅτι λαμβάνεται σε ἐν ῥυθμόν τῆς οὐδεὶς καὶ οὐχ ἐξεῖς συμβεβλήθην ὡς τον τροφήν ὡς τον ἀντιστροφόν οὕτω ἐποιώθουν, ἀλλὰ φανήσεται σοι λόγος εἰς ἐξομενὸς. ἦστι δὲ ἢ διὰ πελάγους φερομένη Δανάη τάς ἑαυτῆς ἀποδυρμομένη τύχας.

§ 1

'You will be unable to comprehend strophe, antistrophe or epode; it will read like a piece of continuous prose'; the question has been long debated, whether Dionysius' claim is justified.¹

Experiment has proved that brute force will be required to hammer the following quotation from Simonides into the shape of a complete strophe and complete antistrophe, with or without all or part of an epode. Specimens may be seen and judged elsewhere.² They need never again be repeated; they demonstrate that either the text is corrupt beyond the possibility of a scientific restoration, or there is no complete strophe and antistrophe present.

It is at least natural to suppose that when Dionysius says, 'You will not recognise strophe, antistrophe and epode,' he must, in this context, imply that all three of these elements are represented; not necessarily that all three are complete, but that parts at least of all three are included.³ It appears therefore prima facie reasonable to look for metrical correspondences between strophe and antistrophe; but of all such investigations one only has led to a result which is widely approved.

Wilamowitz, followed by Schroeder, Diehl, and Davison, created a correspondence between ν. 7 (Diehl) οἶον ἔχω πῶνον → ν. 9 δούρατι as strophic and ν. 20 Ζεύς πατήρ ἐκ σεό → ν. 22 σύγγνωθι μοι as antistrophic. Thus ν. 1 ὡς λάρνακα—6 ὡς τέχος comes from the epode; ν. 7 οἶον—19 φανείη is the whole of the strophe; the remainder is the beginning of the antistrophe.

This reconstruction has gone for long unchallenged, and has been inspired with new life by Davison. But if we look at it afresh without prejudice, we shall see that it is exposed to criticism at several points.

(i) The first corresponding pair is alleged to be:

7 οἶον ἔχω πῶνον
20 Ζεύς πατήρ ἐκ σεό

This does well enough, as it stands; we only regret that the words preceding οἶον ἔχω πῶνον in the MSS. should then have to undergo the torture to which they are usually subjected.

¹ See especially J. A. Davison, C.Q. xxix (1935), pp. 85 ff., including a detailed transcription of Simonides' text from a photograph of the Parusius and a sufficient bibliography of earlier work.
² Among recent examples: Garrod, C.Q. xvi 1922 pp. 117 ff.; Edmonds, Lyra Graeca ii, pp. 292 ff. Both are relatively conservative, yet both have to postulate a degree of corruption far beyond anything indicated by the MS. evidence.
³ I am in accord with, and have nothing to add to, Davison's rejection of those theories which suppose that Dionysius' quotation had in fact no such structure at all.
We make to this apparent correspondence the concession that, although it is not beyond cavil, we could contemplate it without dismay if we had any good reason to do so.

(ii) The second corresponding pair is alleged to be:

8 συ δ’ ακοτες γαλαζημοι

21 οτι δη θεριστεν επος

We accept Caubon’s conjecture, συ δ’ ακοτες, and admit the correspondence συ δ’ ακοτες, στι δη θερ. There is, however, this disadvantage, that we are then compelled to acquiesce in the unsatisfactory reading δη: δη performs no useful or even intelligible function here; a connective or adversative particle is urgently required. It is, however, in the latter half of the line that the alleged correspondence breaks down altogether: γαλαζημοι, -σαλευ επος cannot be proved to constitute a legitimate correspondence, whether -σαλευ επος or -σαλευ επος be understood. Davison supposes that we have here an example of ionic a minore corresponding to iambic: but where in Greek Literature is another such? Neither Wilamowitz nor Davison quotes a parallel. I bring Corinna 4.25 (Diehl) on to the scene, only to dismiss her again at once. There we observe κοσμον at the end of a line which everywhere terminates in ionic a minore: but we do not know what word preceded κοσμον in the Papyrus ( . . . ) . ατω νεκοκσμον: the letter before αν was almost certainly not ι, may have been ρ, and there is nothing in our evidence to exclude νεκοκσμον (Cf. Fr. 14.1 ορισ prob., Π col. iv 25 apparently τεου, col. i 13 prob. τεος, i 22 perhaps φαιος, iii 38 and Fr. 11.2 ωριων, Fr. 16.1 κονη, cf. Fr. 15.1).

The plain truth is that in support of a theory, the freedom of response has been assumed without a particle of true evidence that it was admissable in any verse at any date.

(iii) The third corresponding pair is alleged to be:

9 ηδι (or ητορ) κινοστες εν ατερτει δουρατι

22 ευχομαι και ουσαι δικας συγγυατι
dομη.

Whether we should not rather read κινοστες with the MSS., and prefer ατερτει to δουρατι, may be matters of opinion. What is certain is that the correspondence here has been artificially restored by means of an otherwise unnecessary conjecture. και in 22 is an inference from the Gueflerbytianus (κοφι) alone: the primary MS. tradition points clearly to original ηδι: ηνορи Ρ, ην ορισ- ΜΥ. There is no reason whatever, except the requirements of a preconceived theory, to tamper with this ηδι; the Gueflerbytianus, even if it had offered και, could still not be regarded as a faithful guardian of true tradition in this fragment. και, on which

---

4 Davison himself excludes -σαλευ επος or -σαλευ (Fietos, ionic a minore with first or second long resolved (p. 99 fin.), a phenomenon not found before Euripides’ Bacchae.

5 I see no reason to suppose that the correspondence of trochee to ionic a minore (let alone ionic ‘a majore’), if an example could be found (e.g., Ar. Ran. 336 = 553), has any value as evidence for the correspondence of sambus to ionic a minore. Davison alleges that Simonides 4.21 (Diehl) —και δ’ ακοτες —corresponds to 29 ταυτη τ’ απο τερτιον των της τροκχιου τον ερμιονα, ελεγχιον μεταβλητη μη μεταβλητη σφαιρη: υποστημα, cr. θεος της μετα μεταμεταβλητη σφαιρη. —but even if the tradition were trustworthy (the second line is very easily made to conform to the first) we should still lack evidence that the lines were in correspondence.

Aesch. PV 554 ολιξ ἄνιος ἀντι τους = 543 ἐξίαν γνώσ: too easily squared to be a reliable witness. The most interesting example in this category is Alcæus P. 8.3, xviii 2125 fr. 1 col. ii 20 [ιδι] or [ιδι] ον ποιησαι νόμων = ροσ ποιησαι νόμων. There are, in short, some indications of evidence for ιδι —ιδι: there is none adduced for ιδι —ιδι. For alleged examples in Pindar and Bacchylides see Maas, Responsionesfrelater, passim; the faith which survives his criticism must be sturdy, and may be blind.
the correspondence of this pair—and therefore of all three pairs—depends, has no status but that of a figment designed to support a theory.

Enough has been said to demonstrate that these correspondences have not been found in this text: they have been hammered into it. Dents and cracks are clearly visible. If this is the best that can be done, it would be more prudent to do nothing at all.

§ 2

The most obvious solution of the problem still needs to be stated. It has been supposed that we are required at all costs to detect, or to create, metrical correspondences. We believe that strophe, antistrophe, and epode are represented: it seemed therefore reasonable to look first for complete components in correspondence, secondly for parts of components in correspondence. And numerous attempts have been made, all in vain.

There is only one alternative. Dionysius means no more, and no less, than that a complicated lyric when written like prose will read like prose: you will not recognise the ends of individual verses or of the longer units, strophe, antistrophe, and epode. We must now observe that he may have proved his point by adopting the procedure most suitable to his purpose—by selecting his example in such a way that, although all three components are represented, no metrical correspondences are included. This he can achieve in only one way: by giving the latter part of the antistrophe, followed by the whole of the epode, followed by the former part of the next strophe. We found no metrical correspondences, though we had some reason to believe that we should detect any that might be present in an average example: it is now time to admit that we had no reason whatever to expect that any would be present.

Now if by any chance there were, after all, any metrical correspondences left in the quotation, at least we know where to look for them: they must be confined to the extreme beginning and extreme end. If slightly more than the latter half of the antistrophe were given, followed by the epode and slightly more than the former half of the strophe, there would be a metrical correspondence between the first few words of the quotation (the middle of the antistrophe) and the last few words (the middle of the strophe). We look to see whether so striking a confirmation of our general theory is in fact to be found, and we observe with satisfaction but without surprise that οὐεράκινα corresponds to εἶτι εὐχομα, that the immediately following ἐν διαμαχέσι corresponds to Ἡ νοσφι δίκαις, and that the immediately following ἀνεμος τε μήν (or μω) corresponds to συγγνωθεῖ μοι (or μοι).

If I am told that this is coincidence, I shall reply that at least it is not conjecture; that, unlike all other alleged correspondences, it has been not manufactured but merely discovered. And it is something, perhaps even much, in its favour that Dionysius' argument would best be served by a choice of text which could provide the conditions necessary for just this and no other sort of correspondence.

§ 3

We now confront a second prejudice. Many, or even most, treatments of the text of the quotation appear to presuppose a large measure of serious corruption in the MSS.: it is not the least of Davison's important services, that he has shewn this presupposition to be unjustified. When a few superficial errors have been removed, we shall find that the tradition has preserved good sense and syntax in all but a few places; of which almost all are capable of easy correction. We have therefore no reason to suppose that the metre, as a whole, has been seriously disturbed.

6 See Davison's transcript of the Parisinus: by 'superficial errors' I mean 2 δοδαλεία, 10 μν, 5 ουν MV, ον F, καθ Thiersch; 10 ον εἰρηστός (ον ον ον ον) Αθηναίοι, καθ ον ον ον ον ον; Cassaubon, though Athenaeus may be thought to indicate δώσεις. ἐγαλαζωθείς θα, γαλαζωθείς θα. § 99: Beza. 15 ήκανε, ιν χώλαι MV; 16 ή (ο M, ή V), ου Sylburg, perhaps rather ή, καθ μν (καθ V), 19 μασσαλία (ματτ βουλίον M), = ματταλία, 22 ηίος (καθ MPV), ή μάκρα Viciarius. These are mere clerical slips, admitting of instant (and almost universally accepted) correction.
It may indeed have been: but we are lost the moment we take a step that is not securely planted on the ground of evidence; and we possess no evidence of any serious disturbance, except perhaps at two or three points.

There is no need to suppose that the text is more than slightly, if at all, corrupted in the following places: (i) 1 f. λάρνακα ἐν: unless λάρνακα stood at the end of the line, the hiatus cannot be justified by anything in our evidence. Homer has a few examples of the dative singular in -ιν preceding a vowel; but there is none in early lyrical poetry except the obviously special cases of hiatus before the names ισθμός and Ἑβρός in Pindar and Bacchylides.7 Deletion of ἐν cannot be justified, since we know of no reason why λάρνακα should not have stood at the end of a line. If it did so, we shall have to suppose that ἐν δεδυάλεσα constituted a line by itself, since the hiatus in δεδυάλεσα δενεος is not, so far as we know, admissible within the line. (ii) δ θεου Dion., τέκος Athen. It is fashionable to prefer τέκος; but we must suspend judgment, for επε τ' α δ θεου διον ἕω τονός would present in itself no metrical obstacle (cf. Sappho 5. 6, etc.). (iii) 9 ei the P, i.e. ἤθει, ἤτοι Athen.: again our preference will be wholly arbitrary; both are acceptable, and we have no means of telling which was original. κούσσισες Dion., κούσσισες Athen.: κούσσι- does not occur elsewhere; but if that is the only charge to be brought against it, it will not be easy to justify the fashionable preference for κούσσι-. (iv) 15 πρόσωπον καλὸν πρόσωπον Ρ, πρόσωπον καλὸν Μ. We have no particular reason to suppose that the repetition of πρόσωπον in P is not a mere clerical error of a common enough type; but unnecessary trouble has been made about it. Davison agrees with Nietzsche that the vocative πρόσωπον καλὸν, as used here, is 'not Greek.' That is a hard saying; an over-statement, perhaps, of the suspicion aroused by the suddenness and semi-detachedness of this concluding vocative. Conjectures abound, but none convinces. πρόσωπον καλὸν προφαίνων Ahrens, προσέχων καλὸν πρόσωπον Nietzsche: in both, the verbs—especially the prepositions—are unsuitable; they, if you like, are 'not Greek.' And surely the objection to the vocative, πρόσωπον καλὸν, was altogether unfounded. πρόσωπον καλὸν here is not just a 'vocative': it is a vocative in apposition, and in apposition not merely to some single word, but rather to the whole of the preceding picture. It is even tenable that, regarded thus, it ceases to be a 'vocative'. We have only to suppose that here, as so often elsewhere, we find the careless repetition of a word in a MS.; and then there is no further difficulty in the passage. χαλανίζει Guelz, suggests a different approach: suppose that Κ originated here, as so often, in a misreading of Σ; we then have πορρυρέως εἰμένος ἐν χαλανίζει πρόσωπον (a variation of the normal construction, which would be προσώποι χαλανίζεις εἰμένος). Evidently we are not quite sure of the text here: but we cannot point to any evidence of corruption of either text or metre, apart from the repetition of a word in the Parisinus. (v) 17 λεπτῶν PMV: a small error in the tradition. λεπτῶν ῥήματων is said by its champions to mean something like 'soft words', 'delicate words', 'words spoken in a thin, small voice'. That is not the usual significance of λεπτά ῥήματα, though no doubt we cannot prove that it was impossible for Simonides. But why should Danae speak in a thin, small voice? 'To avoid waking the child', we are told; and refrain from comment. Almost all editors have been agreed on the change to λεπτῶν. (vi) 18 κέλαμαι ἐπί Ρ: neither the corruption κέλομαι εὐ- nor the elision κέλομ' εὐ- has any adequate parallel in the lyrical remains of Simonides' verse. The available evidence is too meagre to justify the positive exclusion of either;8 and of course κέλαμα may have stood at the end of a line. But there is an obvious possibility that a letter has slipped out of the tradition here: κέλαμα δ' Bergk, better perhaps κέλαμα σ'. (vii) 19 Davison has fortunately revived the old reading μεταβολαία. It is indeed a pleasure to witness the unmasking of that impostor μεταβολαία: there was never a word μετα- so far as we know, in any sort of Greek. (viii) 21 δι την δι Ρ Μ. Ρ: δι suggests that Danae admits her prayer to be τοσσαλον and νόσφι δηκος; and common sense replies that she could not have admitted at

7 Quoted in vain by Davison p. 91.
8 There are those who believe in γίγνεσθαι αἰτομ αι or even γίγνεσθαι αἰτομοι in Fr. 6. 1.
least the latter charge. διε μυον must be read; and we may well reflect upon the possibility of δεις (Mehlhorn) for διον.

So far we have discovered a few minor doubts and difficulties; none of them affects the general sense, most of them make a little difference to the metre. We shall now consider the only two passages where faults in sense or syntax may justifiably be thought to indicate serious corruption.

(i) 3 f. 3 τε μυον PM, τε δεις V; 5 f. δεις μυν P, δεις μυν M, δεις μυν V; ἐρπεν P, ἐρπεν MV. The position as it appears to me is as follows: I. There must have existed the finite tense of a verb (or verbs) of which ἄμειον or λίμαξ or both were subjects. ἐρπεν is not likely to have been such a verb, since it is not elsewhere used metaphorically or transitively.10 ἐρπεν on the other hand presents no difficulty, being both transitive and capable of metaphorical use.11 If ἐρπεν is accepted, with ἄμειον and λίμαξ subjects, we shall still not know whether δεις or δεις τε is correct. We may think that the abstract δεις is ill-coupled with ἄμειον and λίμαξ: but it is time to admit that we could hardly know less than we do about Simonides' style, especially in this sort of writing. On this hypothesis we need do no more than correct μυον to μυν and δεις to τε: and then we can no longer say that there was more than the most superficial error in the passage. II. We must not close our eyes to the further possibility that λίμαξ (as also δεις, if δεις is read) is subject of ἐρπεν, whereas another verb, of which ἄμειον was subject, has dropped out above. If μυον represents a corruption of that verb, the object of ἐρπεν may have to be supplied within the λίμαξ- clause; ἐρπεν τε (μυον) or (μυον) would at once suggest itself. III. But it remains possible that ἐρπεν is correct, and that Danae was its subject: it will then be neither metaphorical nor transitive. If so, we must again suppose that a verb has dropped out (subjects ἄμειον and λίμαξ), or that μυον represents the corruption of a verb. There would be no difficulty about guessing a likely verb: from τε μυον to τε μυον is an easy step, ἄμειον τε μυον πνευμα; 12 εν λόγονα would then be governed by τινος, and it is tenable that the elegance of the structure of the phrase would be noticeably enhanced.

There are three satisfactory interpretations of the MS. evidence, and I see no way of choosing between them: (i) ἄμειον τε μυον πνευμα, κινηθεσα δε λίμαξ | δεις τε ἐρπεν μυν, ουκ etc.12 (ii) ἄμειον τε μυον πνευμα | κινηθεσα τε λίμαξ, δεις μυν | ἐρπεν (scil. Δαινατ) ουκ (or ουκ) etc. (iii) ἄμειον τε μυον πνευμα | κινηθεσα τε λίμαξ | δεις τε (ουκ λίμαξ δεις μυν | ἐρπεν, ουκ etc. And no doubt there are other possibilities.

(ii) 10 ff. χαλκογεομεροι δε νυκτι λαμπτε PMV. χαλκογεομεροι must be attached to the preceding δοξαται: the chest is the only thing hereabouts which has bolts of bronze. Willmowitz set the modern fashion of attaching it to the following νυκτι: 'bronze-bolted night' is said to mean 'darkness caused by closing the lid of a bronze-bolted chest'; there are perhaps not many worse things in the Persae of Timotheus and the Deipnion of Philemon. Λαμπτε for MS. Δαινατ is another popular, and equally intolerable, conjecture. How can Perseus be said to shine in the darkness, κανανει δυνατος? We are invited to imagine light filtering through air-holes (thoughtfully punched by Danae's persecutor?); or to admit the ray of hope which Perseus is alleged to offer to Danae (not that any such offer is mentioned in the text of Simonides); or to think of a Child of the Gods blazing with inner light, whatever that may mean; or even 'lit up by the clear-seeing eyes of Mother-love'. These things are obviously not to be contemplated, let alone endured.

The old conjecture δε νυκτι δε λαμπτε gives no satisfactory account of a peculiar feature of the MS. text, the δε preceding νυκτι. νυκταλαμπτε, on the other hand, is a simple and...

---

8 See especially Davison p. 87; but his statement of the case is marred by the judgement, incomprehensible to me, that 'If λιμαξ is the subject of ἄμειον, it must also be the subject of βάλλε καί ἐπερρά'.

9 Hdt. ix 70, Paus. iv 9.24, x 32.6, Qu. Smyrn. xiii 452, are properly rejected as inadequate evidence; LSJ λεβ. etc.

10 Bacchyl. x 13, Στικ ντικ αντίκ δαινατ, make no appeal to me.

11 N.B. in this version δε before λυμα need not be changed to τε: see Denniston, Gk. Particles p. 513 for σ εν . . . B . . .
altogether satisfactory interpretation of νυκτὶ λάμπει: 'agleam in the night' is a good description of the bronze-bolted chest. As for the preceding ἐσι: we notice how easily χαλκεο-
χυματωδὲς could be contracted to χαλκεοχυματωδὲς. ὑπερτερ χαλκεοχυματωδὲς τῷδε νυκτὶ θαυμάζεται would not have been questioned if it had been preserved; as it very nearly was.

11–12 ταῦτ' εἰς σολάεασ PM (σολαίας) V. Schneidewin’s ταῦτ' εἰς; so does Headlam’s τ’ ἄδεις.14 (I accept, though not for the same reason, his deletion of τε before δύσφοις.) σολαίας is vox nihilis; σολαίας (‘curtain’) has not recommended itself to anybody. A feminine accusative noun is required, for βασίλειαν is not to be interpreted βασιλεῖαν, with κοβᾶν: the depth of the sea is much to the point; the depth of the baby's hair is less likely to be mentioned by Simonides. Wilamowitz's δαχαν is too far from the tradition, and not very suitable to the adjective; Bergk's δαμων is fairly plausible. But a likelier word is AXMAN, barely distinguishable from AXLAIAN, which might easily be misread AYLIAN, whence σολαίας and σολαίας.

§ 4

The general result of a survey of the tradition, made without metrical prejudices, is clear and satisfactory. There are a few places where the meaning is, to the first sight, obscured by clerical blunders; but none or almost none where it is not instantly restored by small and easy changes. It is possible that there are places where the metre has been disturbed without visible reaction upon the sense and syntax; so it happens often enough elsewhere. But there is no reason to suppose that the general outlines of the metre of an extensive passage will be irrecoverably lost, if the sense is perfectly or almost perfectly preserved. It ought to be worth our while to accept this part of Dionysius' challenge.

The cause of our failure (for fail we must) is not in the least obscure. It proves impossible in practice to establish the limits of stanzas and lines in this quotation: not because we find no solution to the problem presented, but because we find too many solutions not only possible but also—some of them—highly plausible. This is the heart of the matter, the last word of a century of criticism: whatever scheme we invent, or think we detect, we cannot verify it. We can support our favourite version by parallels from early lyrical poetry, as Davison has done; but we can give no good reason why this version should be preferred to another, for which parallels will be no less readily forthcoming; nor is it tenable that a version for which metrical parallels are found must be, or even is likely to be, nearer to the truth than one for which such parallels are not found.

This is a point of principle, not to be denied or obscured. It would remain true even if we were not so hopelessly ill-equipped for dealing with the text of Simonides. Ignorance and doubt are our constant companions: (i) where a naturally short vowel stands before medial mute + liquid consonants, we shall suppose that it is scanned long; for there is no reliable evidence of the contrary in the lyrical remains of Simonides. Before initial mute + liquid there are examples of both short and long.18 (ii) Initial digamma is employed elsewhere in Simonides to obviate hiatus.17 There is no example of its use to 'make position', but we shall hesitate even to suppose that that use was excluded. (iii) Datives plural in ὀγις, ὀγις are usually, but not quite always,19 found at the end of the line; ὀγις, ὀγις are found within lines, but not at the ends of them. (iv) Syllabic augments are omitted elsewhere to suit metrical convenience;19 there is no absolutely certain example of the omission of the temporal

14 Davison says that the words, with τ’ ἄδεις, will not scan. We do not know which of the four theoretically possible scansion of κεφάλαια is correct here; but I find no insuperable difficulty with any of them.
15 In 20.4 we have no reason to suppose that the metre (of which we are ignorant) excluded παντὸς ὄνομας. In 39, 50 (παρὰ χρῶσις; παρὰ χρῶσις), 49 (κεφάλαιας), 29 (κεφάλαιας), and a few other places, text or metre or both are too uncertain to be used in evidence.
16 11.2 ἐν χρῶσιν, 40.3 ἐκάιτο πρῶτοι, 48.3 τε ἐπὶ λεονίς; but 46.3 ἐπὶ χρῶσις; and contrast 22.1, prob. ὀκριος, with 8.2.

17 6.2 βοῦς (F) βους 30.3 ἐπὶ (F) ὄνο.
18 48.2 ὀγις ποντικοῦ, a certain example of the shorter form within the verse. There are some doubtful examples: but θυρεότευμα may be correct in 5.1, and in 37.4 I should divide ὀδι ποντίου βλυροῦς (5.2) δεκατος, etc.; there are a few other places where text or metre or both are uncertain.
19 4.6 πάνι, 10.2 ἄδεις, 27.2 τοῦτων, 32.1 νάκης, 9.4 prob. ἄδεις; one or two other possibilities.
augment. 20 (v) Paragogic ν is used elsewhere both to 'make position' 21 and to obviate hiatus. 22 (vi) There is no certain example of Epic Correction except in the inelidable monosyllabic diphthongs καὶ μοι τοὶ; 23 there is no example of the elision of a diphthong. (vii) The evidence is not sufficient to establish Simonides' practice in respect of contraction and synizesis. 24

There are many other unknown factors. Clearly it was no exaggeration to say that we were incompetent to solve the problem set by Dionysius. There is only one honest course: to admit defeat. The alternative is to plunge into the morass, already overpopulated, of subjective speculation. I submit the following arrangement merely to prove my contention that there is no difficulty in presenting the text offered by the MS. tradition (only after correction of the most superficial and obvious oversights) in a metrical scheme which would have afforded little cause for doubt and none for surprise if it had been offered to us by antiquity:—

(ἀντ.)

1 ἡτε λάρνακι
ev δαιδαλέαι
dνυμτος τι μὴν τι πνεύμων,
kινθέσα βε λίμαν
5 δείμα τε ἐρειπεν, οὐκ
αδιαντοι παιρεις
ἀφιτε περεάτε βάλλε φίλων χέρα
eπεπ(ν) τε ὁ τέκος οἷον ἐχω τόνου
——

(ἐπ.)

10 οὐ δ' ὥστεις γαλαζηνωί
d' ἦθει κυ(ο) ωσων εν ἐκερτεν
dουρατι χαλκεγούμφωι
tοιδε νυκτιλαμπει
cαινει δυφον ταβειν
dχανον δ' ύπερθεν τεαν
15 κομαν βαθειαν παριντος
cυματος οὐκ ἁλεγει
οὐδ' ανέμου φθόγγων
πορφυρέα κέμυνος εν χλανιδ
πρόσωπων καλόν· ει δε τοι
20 δεινον το γε δεινον ἤν,
cαι κεν ἐμόν ῥμάτων
λεπτον ὑπείχες οὔσας.
——

(στρ.)

25 κελομαί σ' εῦδε βρέφος,
evδετω δε πόντος, εὐδε-
tοι δ' ἀμέτρου κακόν
μεταβουλία δε τις φανείη
ζαυ πάτερ ἵκ σέο·

20 31-3 (ἐνασσα), text and metre of the whole line are uncertain. In 34 ὁσσα has been conjectured.
21 1 βοληθυον καλάσσας, 4.2 χισσον πε; 11.1 dub.
22 About ten examples.
23 καὶ 8.2, 27.1, καὶ 4.4, το 60. Nothing profitable can be said about κλαμε ἐρος in 46, καὶ ἐκ ν.ι. in 39;
24 This is particularly unfortunate. We do not know how to scan. e.g. δοβδαλε, κωσειο, δοσκαλειο. Davison p. 92 n. 4 says that 'Simonides and Bacchylides appear to admit synizesis only in words which are contracted in Attic·: but the evidence is far too meagre to prove this conclusion for Simonides; ἄχατω in 4.21 is, in my view, a certain example of the contrary.'
It is obvious that a good deal of this admits of other arrangements without departure from the textual tradition: \( ^{25} \) it is therefore vain to consider the metre thus offered in detail; enough, that it consists of common elements, thus:

1 [incomplete]. 2 anap. 3 [corrupt]. 4 pherecr. 5 \(-\omega-\). 6 ion. dim. 7 and 8, d. ending \(-\omega-\) (A. Sc. T 971, S. Phil. 827 = 843, etc.).

9 ion. dim. 10-11 various possibilities, e.g. ia. or tr. + d. pent. 12 cr., ba. 13 various possibilities, e.g. cho. + ia., lec. 14 ia., cr. 15 ia., adon. (S. OC 1079 = 1090, Ai. 227 = 251, etc.) 16 hemiepies. 17 hemiepes. 18 cho. (or cr.), hemiepes. 19 glyc. 20 teles. 21 cho., cr. 22 cho., ba.

23 ion. dim. catal., with brevis in longo. 24-5 ia. or tr. tetr. 26? aceph. cho., ia., ba. (or see Davison, p. 93; other possibilities, especially in conjunction with surrounding lines). 27-\(\omega-\) 28 d. tetr. 29 anap. 30 [incomplete].

The combination of elements and types is commonplace enough, judged by the standard of Pindar or the Dramatists, in whom much more elaborate and interesting mixtures abound. The only evidence available for Simonides, the stanza quoted in Plato's Protagoras, reveals not dissimilar combination: dactylic (encomiologicus); ion. + 2 glyc. + ia.; \(\omega-\) + 2 glyc.; \(\omega-\) + \(\omega-\) ia. + \(\omega-\); 2 ba., pherecr., cr., ba.

The meaning which I should attach to such a text would be roughly as follows:

'When the wind... blowing on the carven chest, and the troubled sea and terror brought her low, with cheeks not unwet she threw her loving arm round Perseus and said: 'What suffering is mine, my child! But you sleep on, in your baby way aslumber in this cheerless barque bronze-riveted, agleam by night, in the black gloom outstretched. You need not the deep foam of the passing wave above your hair, nor the voice of the wind, as you lie in your dark-blue mantle, my pretty one. If terror were terrible to you, then you would lend your tiny ear to what I say. But sleep, baby, I bid you, and sleep, the sea, and sleep, my unfathomable woe. Let some change of heart appear, Father Zeus, from you; and for any prayer of mine that is bold and without justice, pardon me.'

II

Fr. 22 (Diehl) = 13 (Bergk).

Ar. Nub. 1355 f.

πρότον μὲν αὐτὸν τὴν λύραν λαβὼν· ἐγὼ κέλευσα· ἀιτεῖσθαι Σιμωνίδου μέλος τοῦ Κρίων ώς ἐπέχθη.

Schol. Rav. i p. 267 Ruth. ἀρχὴ ὁδής εἰς Κρίων τῶν Ἀληγορίας· ἐπέξεθα· ὁ Κρίων οὐκ ἀσκεῖται· φαίνεται δὲ εὐδοκημένως καὶ διαφωμένως εἴναι. ώς ἐπέχθη· ὡς ἑκάρη. fere eadem schol. V. Schol. LB Harl. 5 τούτω τὸ μέλος Σιμωνίδου εἷς ἐπιτυχίος· ἐπέξεθα· ὁ Κρίων οὐκ ἀσκεῖται· ἤν δὲ παλαιώτης Ἀληγορίας. ἄλλως· τῆς πρὸς τὸ σῶτον κοινωνίας τῆς λέξους συνεπλεξε τὰς κοινωνίας ὁ ποιητῆς λέγων· ἐπέξεθα· ὁ Κρίων οὐκ ἀσκεῖται· ἐξένει ἐς θεοῦ θυσίαν Ἀγαλμὸν Διὸς τέμνειος.

2 εἰς δέντρον codd., corr. Bergk.

\( ^{25} \) Apart from removal of clerical errors, for which see p. 135 n. 6 above; to them we now add 12 κετταλαμίαν for κετταλαμίαν, 19 πρόσωπον καλὸν πρόσωπον for πρόσωπον καλὸν (or καλὸν πρόσωπον), 22 λεπτοῖς for -λαι, 23 ἐδόμενος for σ' ἐδόμενος, 25 ἐσθίων ἑα. for ἐσθίου ἑα., 38 ἔτι for ἐδόμενος ἑα., and probably ἐν for ὡτί. In 12, it added to connect κετταλαμίαν and λαθροῦ.
The least gleam of light on the character of Simonides and on the fashion of his Epinician Odes is very welcome. We learn a little about both, if we find that he began his song with ridicule—scornful or jocular—of the vanquished competitor. Does ὃ Κριός ἐπίζωτο mean 'Mr Ram had himself fleeced', or 'Mr Ram had his hair cut'? Upon this ludicrous distinction depends the measure of our enlightenment.

The modern tendency has been to prefer the latter interpretation. Simonides, we hear, must conform to the convention observed by Pindar and (so far as we know) Bacchylides; neither of whom deigns to be jocular at the expense of the unhappy loser in an athletic contest. Wilamowitz once acquiesced in the old-fashioned opinion that ἐπίζωτο means 'was fleeced', and consequently that Crius was the loser. Later he changed his mind, in the belief that the words of Simonides as reported and explained by the Aristophanic scholia imply a song in honour of a victorious Crius. But in truth the scholia say no more than that Crius was an Aeginetan wrestler, and that he 'seems to have been famous and conspicuous': this does not indicate, let alone prove, that he won the match to which Simonides' poem refers. It was easy and safe enough to say of any competitor in the great games, of whom you knew nothing else, that he must have been a celebrated athlete; and it is to be noticed that there is nothing in the scholia to suggest that any record of the date, result, or other detail of the contest had survived.

And now consider certain unacceptable or even absurd consequences of the opinion that ἐπίζωτο means 'had his hair cut', hatte sich schön frisirt. (i) We hardly needed the testimony of Aristophanes to confirm our impression that there is an obvious ambiguity in the words ἐπίζωτο ὃ Κριός. If Simonides is referring to the toilet of a victor, we shall have to suppose that he was blind or indifferent to the ludicrous double-meaning: he has begun his ode to the victor with an expression which may fairly be taken to mean 'he was properly fleeced, when he came to Nemea!'. And even if he were so blind or indifferent: what exactly is it that we require him to do?—To begin an ode in honour of a champion athlete with the sentence 'The victor had a splendid hair-cut . . .'. (ii) Consider further the relation of the main to the subordinate clause: it is natural to say of the loser that 'when he came to Nemea, he got a proper fleecing'; it is comical, or even silly, to say of the victor that 'when he came to Nemea—he had a smart hair-cut'. Wilamowitz saw, or seemed to see, the weakness here, but could do no better than to suggest that Crius was a handsome young man whose beautiful curls would need clipping before the wrestling-match. As if wrestling-championships at Nemea were won (or even lost) by young sparks from town who left their hair in ringlets till the last possible moment.

Simonides (we have no longer any doubt) began this poem with a scornful or jocular allusion to the defeat of Crius the Aeginetan.

The Aeginetans were the principal of those islanders who gave earth and water to Darius c. 491 B.C. At the instigation of Athens the Spartan King Cleomenes was sent to arrest the Aeginetan ringleaders. He met with opposition in Aegina, especially from one Crius, son of Polycrius, whom the King, when finally repulsed, asked what his name might be. On hearing the answer Crius, or Ram, he commented 'Now is the time to point your horns with bronze, Mister Ram, for serious troubles are on their way to you'.

At some time between the battles of Marathon and Salamis Cleomenes returned to Aegina

---

24 Or simply 'was fleeced': for ἐπίζωτο passive, see Wackernagel Vorles. 1 pp. 137 f.; Gow on Theor. 93. 12.
25 Ar. und Athen. ii p. 284 n. 4.
26 S. und S. p. 145 n. 1.
27 Nothing is to be inferred (nor does Wilamowitz infer anything) from the allusion to the poem by the title ὅ Κριός.
28 Pindar p. 118 n. 1.
29 Het. vi 50.
and sent Crius with nine other hostages into custody at Athens. It is naturally supposed that Crius the Aeginetan statesman and Crius the Aeginetan wrestler are one and the same person. And it is now obvious that history, as well as common sense, suggests that our interpretation of ἐπεξειδήθ' ο Κριός as 'the Ram was fleeced' is correct. Simonides' sympathies are with Athens; he who is for Athens is, at all relevant times, against Aegina. Crius, whom the Athenians received (and no doubt demanded) among the ten hostages, was one of the most prominent of their detested enemies and rivals. Simonides mocks an Aeginetan, and indeed one who was a notorious enemy of Athens: that is no less to be expected than the opposite bias in Pindar, who is for ever celebrating the prowess of second-rate Aeginetan athletes, and who can hardly bring himself to name the illustrious Athenian trainer Menander even when his Aeginetan host would take the mention as a compliment.

Wilamowitz said that Simonides' poem 'certainly belongs to the VIth century': it is now evident that it may very well be referred to the early years of the VIth, especially to the period between c. 491 B.C. and the removal of the Aeginetan hostages to Athens.

III

Fr. 40 (Diehl) = 41 (Bergk).

Plut. qu. conv. viii 3.4, 722e, iv p. 270 Hubert.

νημισ τις τίκωδες καὶ γαληνὴ καὶ τούχαντων ὡς Σιμωνίδης φησί· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἕνωσόταν ἀνέμισ τοῦ ἄντι τῆς κοραικῶλε κινημαένα (Wyttenbach: σκιδοιν· cod.) μελισσαία γὰρ χαροπρεπείς ἐκοσιστές βροτῶν.

Simonides is adduced as a witness for the theory that absence of wind is favourable to the transmission of sound, presence of wind unfavourable. If he had wished to say 'there was a wind, (of a kind) to prevent ...', he could have said ἀνέμους ἔγινες, ὅτις κατεκώλε ... but surely the contrary, that 'there was not a wind, (of a kind) to prevent ...', could not be expressed by ἀνέμος οὐκ ἔγινες, ὅτις κατεκώλε ... The indicative after ὅτις in such a context may be used with the modal particle ἄν, but not without it, to describe an action which did not happen, though it might have happened if certain conditions had been fulfilled. Examples in Kühner-Gerth ii p. 424, e.g. Plato Phaedr. 57' οὕτω τις ἔχει καὶ ἀφίκεται ... ὅτις ἄν ... ἀγγεῖλαι οἷος τ' ἦν: a stranger could have told us, if there had been one present (as there might easily have been; but as a matter of fact there is not). So here: a wind would have prevented the transmission of sound, if there had been one (and there is no particular reason why there should not have been a wind; but as a matter of fact there was none). Read ΚΑΤΕΚΩΛΕΥΣ for ΚΑΤΕΚΩΛΕΥΣ, ὅτις κ' ἀπεκώλευς; for the tense, cf. Xen. An. ii 1.4, Dem. xviii § 43. The alternative, 'the sort of wind which used to prevent voices being heard, did not on that occasion arise', seems much less probable.

D. L. Page.

21 Hdt. vi 73.
22 ibid. 85.
23 ibid. viii 92 f.
GORDION CUPS FROM NAUCRATIS

In JHS XLIX, 265 ff. Beazley and Payne, in their important publication of Attic b.f. fragments from Naucratis, put together a number of pieces from Little Master cups of the same special form as that in Berlin from Gordion, with the names of Ergotimos and Kleitias as potter and painter. In JHS LII, 186, Beazley included these fragments in his list of 'Gordion Cups'. Working over the pottery from Naucratis in the British Museum and the Fitzwilliam Museum I have identified other fragments of the same class. Altogether there are now over thirty separate fragments, which I have tentatively grouped as belonging to fourteen cups. Not all the associations are certain, but all are I think probable. Some of those suggested by Beazley and Payne appear to me impossible, and I have noted where I differ from them; but this paper is only an elaboration of a theme from their larger work—τέμπες τῶν Ὀμήρου μεγάλου δεινοῦ.

I have divided the material into three groups:

I. Cups of exceptionally small and delicate make, some bearing the names of Ergotimos and Kleitias.

II. Slightly sturdier cups, some bearing the name of Sondros.

III. Miscellaneous fragments which cannot be closely associated with either of the other groups.

I. ERGOTIMOS—KLEITIAS GROUP

1. Fig. 1. Six fragments or groups of fragments almost certainly from one cup: London, 1948, 8-15.1 and 2; 88.6-1.215, 424(B6014), 425(B6014), and 427(B6015); the last joining Cambridge, N206.

   Exterior: slightly convex black rim, sharply tooled off; handle-zone reserved with black lines at top and bottom; handle-palmette very fine and of unusual form (red: alternate petals, heart, dots at volute-centres); inscriptions:

   [Ε]ργοτίμοις[πό]ιοι οὐκ [Χλίτιος]αῖ γεμακτείν

   Reserved band on bowl.

   Interior: reserved line at rim and at tooled-off junction of lip and bowl; uncertain remains of picture within border of alternate black and red tongues between dot-bands. A line of thinned varnish separates the two rows of dots in each band; white dots between the tongues; the lines dividing the tongues are not relief-lines. The red of the alternate tongues, as usual in this position laid directly on the clay, has been apparently deliberately effaced.

   Inside the lip, near the rim, is a neatly incised inscription:

   ... αὐ[οθον]...

   The inscribed fragments London 88.6-1.424, 425 and 427 were put together by Beazley and Payne, which gives part of the interior picture and takes with it London 1948.8-15.1. 1948.8-15.2 and 88.6-1.215 are of identical make and character, and certain details (breadth and position of black line at top of handle-zone; breadth of reserved line at junction of lip inside) are exactly as those of 88.6-1.424, 425 and 427, and differ from the corresponding features on the fragments collected under nos. 2 and 3 below.

   The palmettes on the Ergotimos—Kleitias cup from Gordion are horizontal, like those on Laconian cups. That here is set like those on normal lip-cups, but is unusually fine and has a red dot at the centre of each volute. A somewhat similar, though inferior palmette, with a white dot at the volute-centre occurs on another fragment from Naucratis in London (Fig. 2;
1948.8–15, 14), apparently from a very small but normal lip-cup. The red dot recurs on a fragment from the Acropolis of Athens, almost certainly from a Gordian.\footnote{4} 2. Fig. 1. Five fragments probably from one cup: London, 88.6–1.237, 324 and 426(B6014) and 1948.8–15.3 and 4; and one lost fragment (BSA V, pl. IV, 50(6)) perhaps from the same.

Exterior: slightly convex black rim sharply tooled off; handle-zone reserved with black lines at top and bottom; trace of handle-root and of palmette-tendril to its left;\footnote{5} inscriptions:

\[ \text{Ερευ\(\text{ν}οκρατισ\text{ας}\)} \]
\[ \text{Κλη\(\text{τ}ι\text{μς} \text{δι} \text{γρα\(\text{φας}\)}} \]

Reserved band on bowl.

Interior: part of palmette (red: alternate petals and heart) and volute, within border exactly as that of no. 1, except that the red has not been effaced.

On the outside of the lip incised inscription .. \(\text{π}\) .. and .. \(\text{λοκ}\) .. no doubt dedicatory.

The London fragments are all of precisely the same character as those listed under no. 1, but cannot come from the same cup. This was observed by Beazley and Payne for 88.6–1.426 (B6014), with the remains of Kleitias's signature.\footnote{7} 88.6–1.237 and 324 are associated by the position and character of the incised inscription, which dissociate them from nos. 1 and 3, as do the position and breadth of the black line at the top of the handle-zone and the breadth of the reserved line at the junction of the lip inside. 1948.8–15.3 and 4, with parts of the interior picture, are shown not to be from no. 1 by the uneffaced red, but the otherwise identical character of the border makes their association with the signature of Kleitias very probable.

The lost fragment is illustrated only by a reduced drawing of the inscription, but Edgar\footnote{8} states that it was on the outside of a b.f. Attic kylix, and that on the inside was part of a tongue-pattern in red and black surrounding the central disc. The scale and, as far as one can judge from the drawing, the character of the letters suggest that it came from an inscription of Ergotimos himself rather than one of his sons; and the fact that the same sherd included part of the inscription in the handle-zone and part of the tondo-border implies that it was from an exceptionally small cup like these. Edgar does not mention dot-bands in the border, but I doubt if this is positive evidence that there were none. No. 1 has no place for a second Ergotimos inscription; no. 3 was uninscribed; no. 2, with the signature of Kleitias on one side, is almost sure to have borne the name of Ergotimos on the other; if therefore the fragment is from a Gordian it seems likely that it belongs to this cup. At the time of Edgar’s publication the fragments had not yet been distributed. Prinz\footnote{9} and (no doubt following him) Hoppin\footnote{10} cite this piece as in Cambridge, but it seems not to be, and they say the same for 50(a) on the same plate, which is in fact in London.\footnote{11}

3. Fig. 1. Four fragments, almost certainly from one cup: London, 1948.8–15.5, 6, 7 and 8. Exterior: lower part of slightly convex black rim, sharply tooled off; black lines at top and bottom of handle-zone, which bears no other decoration (there may have been handle-palmettes, but never a painted inscription). Reserved band on bowl.

Interior: reserved line at junction of tooled-off lip; border as in nos. 1 and 2, except that there is no line dividing the dot-rows, and the tongues (which are shorter) are separated by relief-lines; the red is not effaced; of the picture there remains parts of a red boot or shoe with turned up toe and of a wing (?).\footnote{12}

In the handle-zone is a roughly incised inscription:\footnote{13}

\[ \ldots \text{ομοιοι\(\text{νε}\text{ικε} \text{υπος} \text{θε\(\text{νοσκο\(\text{νος)\)}} \text{(last letter retrograde under second \(\epsilon\).}} \]

\footnote{4}{Alternate petals may have been red (doubtful traces on central one).}
\footnote{5}{Graef, 1773: 'Aussen Rest einer Spiral-Ranke mit rotem Riegel'. The interior tondo (loc. cit. pl. 87) has a border of tongues, with white dots (I do not know if the dividing lines are relief), between dot-bands, the dot-rows in each separated by a line of thinned glaze. I have not examined the original, but from illustration and description judge it to have been a Gordian. The interior picture, in a decent but not especially fine style, shows an odd colloca-

\footnote{6}{On 88.6–1.324: pointed out to me by Mr. P. E. Corbett.}
\footnote{7}{JHS XXIX, 266; pl. XVII, 12.}
\footnote{8}{Loc. cit. p. 55.}
\footnote{9}{Finds aus Nauplia, 78.}
\footnote{10}{Greek Black-Figure Vases, 82 no. 3.}
\footnote{11}{1900.2–144. Beazley in JHS LII, 192, discussing this piece, which bears the fragmentary name of Ergotimos, probably in a patronymic, says: 'There seems to have been a black line at the top of the handle-zone, and I am inclined to think that the cup may have been a Gordian rather than a lip-cup, although the lettering is of the smaller, later type'. The line at the top of the handle-zone, however, is normal in lip-cups as well as Gordions, and there is no evidence here for the line at the bottom or for any other definite feature of a Gordian.}
\footnote{12}{Cf. a fragmentary cup made by a son of Eucheiros, JHS LII, 179, fig. 11.}
\footnote{13}{Nauckeatis I, pl. 33, 446.
1948.8–15.6 takes 7 and 8 with it by the interior decoration and 5 by the treatment of the handle-zone. In make and character this cup goes closely with nos. 1 and 2, but is distinguished from them by certain possibly later features in the tondo-border (relief-line between tongues; absence of thinned glaze line dividing dot-rows), and by being uninscribed. Position and extent of the incised inscription preclude the possibility of there having ever been a painted one.

On a further fragment associated by Beazley with the Ergotimos-Kleitias cups, see below, no. 14.

II. Sondros Group

The fragments grouped under nos. 4–7, though still smaller and finer than most Little Masters, are of slightly heavier build than those of group I. The arrangement of the fragments suggested by Beazley and Payne seems to me impossible; I would associate them as follows:

4. Fig. 2. One fragment: London, 88.6.1.429 (B601a).
   Exterior: black lines at top and bottom of handle-zone, which bears the inscription:
   \[\text{Σονδρος: ι[πίστευσιν]}\]
   Interior: very broad reserved line at junction of sharply tooled-off lip.

Beazley and Payne\(^\text{14}\) associate this with 88.6.1.432 (no. 5 below) and 433 (no. 9 below). The wall of 432, however, is much thicker, and the reserved line on the interior of 433 much narrower than the corresponding features of 427.

5. Fig. 2. Two fragments: London 88.6.1.432 and 431.
   Exterior: black line at bottom of handle-zone (top not preserved) which bears the inscription:
   \[\text{Σον[δρος: ἐπιστευσιν]}\]
   Interior: trace on 432 of reserved line at junction of lip.

Beazley and Payne\(^\text{15}\) associate 432 with 427 (see no. 4 above) and 431 doubtfully with 430 (see no. 6 below). The thickness of the wall, however, is the same in 432 and 431: thicker than 429, thinner than 430.

6. Fig. 2. Two fragments: London, 88.6.1.430: Cambridge, N125.
   Exterior: black line at bottom of handle-zone (top not preserved) which bears the inscription:
   \[\text{Σονδρος: ἐπιστευσιν}\]
   Reserved band on bowl.
   Interior: toes of right foot (male) within border as in nos. 1 and 2, except that the tongues are shorter, as in 3, and there is only one free black line outside the outermost dot-band, as against two in 1–3, 7, 10, 11 and all other cups of this class known to me in which this part is preserved.

These two fragments are connected by the unusual thickness of their wall and by the brownish colour of the glaze on the lower part of the exterior. Beazley and Payne\(^\text{16}\) associate 430 with 431, but see on no. 5 above.

7. Fig. 2. Two fragments: London, 88.6.1.434 and 1948.8–15.9.
   Exterior: line at top but none at bottom of handle-zone, which bears part of handle-palmette and volute (no trace of added colour), and inscription:
   \[\text{[Σ]ονδρος: ἐπιστευσιν}\]
   Reserved band on bowl.
   Interior: apparently no reserved line at junction of lip; edge of tondo-border with outer dot-band, which has no line dividing the two rows, and just detectable remains of white dot and relief-line between tongues.

This cup lacks two distinctive features of the Gordian: black line at bottom of handle-zone and reserved line at junction of lip inside; but the dot-band in the tondo-border is rare.

\(^{14}\) \textit{Hesperia} XLIX 266; pl. XVII, 22.
\(^{15}\) \textit{Loc. cit.} 266; pl. XVII, 18 and 15.
\(^{16}\) \textit{Loc. cit.} 266; pl. XVII, 17. The Cambridge fragment is illustrated in \textit{CVA} fasc. ii, III H, pl. XXI, 8.
in other forms of Little Master, and the character of the lettering as well as the name associates it with this group.

Beazley and Payne¹⁷ associate 434 with 428 (no. 8 below), but the wall of the latter is much thinner; and it must come from a smaller more delicate cup like those of group I.

8. Fig. 2. One fragment: London, 88.6–1.428.
Exterior: no line at bottom of handle-zone (top not preserved) which bears inscription:  
Σον[δρος εποκοιν]  

Beazley and Payne¹⁸ associate this fragment with 434, but see on no. 7 above. The character of the lettering and the absence of any trace of a letter at the left-hand edge of the fragment make Beazley and Payne’s restoration of the name as Sondros nearly certain, rather than Tleson. This, with its small scale and delicate fabric, make it probable that the fragment is from a Gordian cup, though it lacks the black line at the bottom of the handle-zone.

III. MISCELLANEOUS

Nos. 9–11 stand in make and format between the cups of group I and those of group II. They cannot belong to any of the pieces listed above, nor, though very like, do they seem to come from one cup themselves. Nos. 12 and 13 cannot on the evidence be associated with any of the other pieces; no. 12 seems perhaps closer to those of group II and no. 13 to those of group I. No. 14 stands by itself.

9. Fig. 2. One fragment: London 88.6–1.433 (B6014).
Exterior: black lines at top and bottom of handle-zone, which bears the inscription  
[... ε]ποκ[σαν]  
Interior: narrow reserved line at junction of sharply tooled-off rim.

This fragment was associated by Beazley and Payne¹⁹ with 88.6–1.429 and 432, but see nos. 4 and 5 above.

10. Fig. 2. One fragment: London, 1948.8–15.10.
Exterior: black line at bottom of handle-zone (top not preserved); much of the surface of the handle-zone is gone, but there is a trace of black at the extreme left bottom (? volume of handle-palmette); reserved band on bowl.
Interior: trace of reserved line at junction of rim; edge of tondo-border with outer dot-band, the rows divided by a line of thinned glaze; white dot between tongues but no trace of relief-line. See further on no. 11.

11. Fig. 2. Two fragments: London, 1948.8–15.11 and 12.
Exterior: reserved band on bowl.
Interior: tondo-border, with very short, broad tongues, divided by relief-lines and white dots, between dot-bands, the rows divided by a line of thinned varnish.

Small size, fine make, dot-bands with dividing line, and plain reserved band on exterior of bowl combine to make it virtually certain that these fragments come from a Gordian cup and not from some other form of Little Master on the one hand nor a Siana on the other. It is conceivable that they go with no. 10, but one would expect a trace of the relief-line to be visible on that.

12. Fig. 2. One fragment: Cambridge, N124.³⁰
Interior: inner part of border, broad tongues divided by relief-lines, dot-band with line of thinned glaze dividing rows; of the picture remains part of back end of a bull to right, finely drawn.

The combination of line dividing the dot-rows and relief-lines dividing the tongues makes it almost certain that this is from a Little Master cup, not a Siana, and if it is a Little Master almost certainly a Gordian.

¹⁷ Loc. cit. 266; pl. XVII, 11.
¹⁸ Loc. cit. 266; pl. XVII, 21.
¹⁹ Loc. cit. 266; pl. XVII, 19.
³⁰ CVA, fasc. ii, III H, pl. XXI, 24.
13. Fig. 1. One fragment: London, 1948.8–15.13.
Upper part of stem from Siana-type foot. Underneath: at centre, dot and circle in red; on stem, black line. Interior: Orion (homing hunter with club to right).

The identification of the figure is due to Beazley and Payne, who also pointed out that the fragment was not from a normal Little Master cup, the foot being probably of Siana shape. A small cup of delicate make, with foot of Siana shape and decoration in the finest Little Master style: surely a Gordion cup. Beazley and Payne attributed another beautiful fragment in London, 1909.2–16.12 (Fig. 1), apparently from a normal Little Master cup, to the same hand. Recently Beazley has attributed 1909.2–16.12, and presumably our fragment with it, to the Phrynos Painter. That Master’s great London cup, B424, and the other cup, Boston 09.855, which bears the name of Phrynos, seem both, like 1909.2–16.12, to have been normal lip-cups, though in both the foot is missing. The inscriptions on both are in the niggly hand of the younger generation, and do not connect with those on Gordion cups.

14. Fig. 2. Two fragments: London B60140 and B6011.
Exterior: very tall, straight black lip sharply tooled off; black line at top but none at bottom of handle-zone, which contains stout-stemmed handle-palmette and inscriptions:

[... ΚΑ] [ΚΑ] (complete at right)
[ΚΑ] Ν Β Π Π [Σ] Σ [Σ]

Interior: reserved line at rim but none at junction of lip.

Both fragments have been published but have not previously been related. The connection seems to me certain. Beazley and Payne pointed out that the character of the lettering on B60140 connected it with the inscribed fragments of nos. 1 and 2 above. Later Beazley suggested that it might actually belong to one of them, but the absence of a line at the bottom of the handle-zone forbids this. For the restoration [ΚΑ] I am indebted to Professor Beazley. The inscription on B6011 was doubtfully read by Cecil Smith as [Ευξεπος Εργατεος ου νοια νου]. Beazley and Payne saw that this would not do, but offered no alternative. My reading is, I think, sure. Curiously, it suggests a connection with Eucheiros, since it recurs on his Rhodes cup. This last has certain features which recall Gordions: dot-bands in the interior border; lines underneath the foot (one, three, one); a rather narrow foot-plate. The last two features are shared by the London Eucheiros, and in both cases the character of the lettering is similar to that on Gordion cups.

No. 14 was perhaps not strictly a Gordion cup, but without the foot and the interior decoration it cannot be placed exactly. It is rather large; the sharply offset rim is black, but tall and straight, instead of being slightly convex; there is no black line at the bottom of the handle-zone or reserved line at the interior junction of the lip. In all that remains it most closely resembles the London Archikles cup, B418, described by Beazley as ‘special, akin to the Gordions’.

Martin Robertson.

---

21 Loc. cit. 267, no. 48; pl. XVI, 4.
22 Loc. cit. 267, no. 47; pl. XVI, 3; the number there wrongly given in 1909.2–10.2.
23 Some Attic Vases in the Cyprus Museum, 10, no. 11.
24 The work attached to B424 is ancient but not relevant.
25 Another work of the same hand is surely the pseudo-Panathenaic from the Acropolis, Graef no. 925, pl. 59.
26 Mr. F. E. Corbett, who has also carefully examined these fragments, feels some doubt.
27 Loc. cit. 266.
28 JHS LII, 185.
29 Loc. cit. 270, no. 58; pl. XVII, 26.
30 Citra Rhodos, III, 34.
31 B177; JHS LII, 175.
32 JHS LII, 199. Black lip, sharply offset, tall and straight; no black line at bottom of handle-zone or reserved line at interior junction of rim; big lettering; stout-stemmed palmettes; no relief-line in tondo-border; short stem and narrow foot-plate. B419, whose figure work resembles that of B418, also has short stem and straight (but reserved) lip.
PROMETHEUS AND CHIRON

In the last long trimeter speech of the *Prometheus Vinctus* Hermes describes to Prometheus the future course of his punishment: he will be swallowed up in the earth, and then after a long interval of time brought back to daylight for laceration by Zeus's eagle. Hermes goes on (1026 ff.):

τοιοῦτοι μόχθου τέρμα μή τι προσδόκα
πρὶν δὲ θέων τις διάδοχος τῶν σών πόνων
φανῇ θελήσῃ τ' εἰς ἀναύγητον μολεῖν
"Αἰθήν κυραιά τ' ἄμφι Ταρταροῦ βάδη.

The only substantial variant is θέως τις F Tri. in 1027.

There is no proof that ancient critics saw any definite allusion here. The Medicean scholium is simply ὅς τοῦ βοσκοῦντος ταῦτα (ταῦτα Paley) πεισμόνω, an obscure note to which I shall return. Matthias Garbitius (1559), the first scholar quoted by S. Butler in his *variorum* edition of 1809, suggested that the reference was either to Hercules or, more probably, to 'some other hero' destined to free the human mind from darkness and doubt, perhaps a Sibylline vision of the Christian redemption. This last fancy was defended anonymously in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for 1796 and found a belated champion in F. A. Paley, on the eve of his admission to the Church of Rome, in 1846—'Ceterum venturum esse Messian et des censorum in inferos antiquitus praedictum quis hic non agnoscit?' Later Paley silently dropped this theory.

Meanwhile C. G. Schütz in his edition of 1782 had argued that the words meant simply that there was no hope at all of Prometheus's liberation, since the implied condition was plainly impossible. This view is already found in some of the later scholia, for example those of Tri., but the fact is obscured in the corrupt version available to Schütz. Butler himself rejected Messianic prophecy and revived Garbitius's alternative suggestion that Hermes referred to Hercules, 'qui quodammodo successor laborum Prometheo dicatur, non solum quod tot et tam aerumna saque ardua perperos fuerit, sed quod in ips iamferendis ad vitae humanae cultum ac convictum tot et tam praecipua beneficia contulerit'. How Butler explained the reference to Tartarus does not appear, but he may perhaps have taken μολεῖν to mean merely 'visit': he can hardly have pictured Hercules as a god voluntarily spending eternity in Hell. In any case this explanation is plainly wrong, though it may possibly be implied in the Medicean scholium already quoted, where τοῦ βοσκούντος suggests Heracles.

New light was first thrown in 1824 by F. G. Weckler, when he called attention, in *Die Aeschyliche Trilogie Prometheus*, pp. 47 ff., to two passages in the *Bibliotheca* of Apollodorus, already much discussed, but never in this connection. They run as follows:

(a) II.5.4 (§ 85 Wagner) ἐκάθεν δὲ πρὸς Χείρωνα συνεψυγον [sc. οἱ Κενταύροι] ... τοῦτο περὶ περιπτωκάτω τοὺς Κενταύρους τοξεύουν ἤσι βέλος ὁ Ἡρακλής, τὸ δὲ ἐνεχθὲν Ἐλάτων δία τοῦ βραχίων τὸ γόνατον τοῦ Χείρωνος ἑμπήγνυται. ἀναίθεα δὲ Ἡρακλῆς προσδρομών τὸ τε βέλος ἐξετίσκει καὶ δύο βασίλευς φάσματον ἐπέθηκεν. ἀνάστον δὲ ἐξον τὸ ἔλκον εἰς τὸ σπήλαιον ἀνάλαβε. κάκει τελευτήσαι βουλόμενος καὶ μὴ δυνάμενος ἐπέκειτο ἀδάνατος ἦσσ' ἀντιδόντος Διὶ Προμηθέως τὸν ἀντ' αὐτοῦ γενημόνεον ἀδάνατον οὗτος ἀπέθανεν.

The words ὁ Ἡρακλῆς after ἤσι βέλος are found only in the Vatican Epitome. For ἀνάλαβε all editors print Scaliger's ἀπαλλάσσεται. Proposed emendations in the last sentence must be discussed later.

(b) II.5.11 (§ 119 Wagner) καὶ περαιώθεις ἐπι τὴν ἡμερίαν τὴν ἀντικροτάδισκευαι [sc. ὁ Ἡρακλῆς] ἐπὶ τοῦ Καυκάσου τὸν ἔξθειντα τῷ τοῦ Προμηθέως ἦπαρ ἄτον διὰ τοῦ Ἐχίνους
After Τυφώνος the MSS. have ὃς καί, but the omission of ὃς, suggested in 1783 by Heyne, is confirmed by the Vatican Epitome. The Vatican Epitome also omits ἀδάναστον after θνησκεῖν, in which it is followed by Wagner. For διέλυτος Bekker read ἔλυσε, which is generally accepted. The discussion of other emendations may again be postponed.

As they stand in the manuscripts, the two passages are apparently in conflict. While the second is always taken to state that it was Heracles who gave Chiron to Zeus as one willing to die instead of Prometheus, the first plainly asserts that Prometheus gave to Zeus someone (obviously not himself) willing to take over Chiron’s immortality.

Out of the welter of editorial comment one fact starkly emerges: all editors, from the princeps of 1555 onwards, have in one way or another so altered the first passage as to make it state or imply what they have all believed to be affirmed in the second, namely that Chiron, with Zeus’s permission, died in place of Prometheus. It will be convenient to glance rapidly at scholars’ treatment of the first passage before considering their handling of the second.

Aegius in 1555 tacitly printed an unconvincing correction: for ἀντιδότως Δί Ἐρμηθέως he reads ἀντιδότως δὲ Δίος Προμηθέα. How this helps hardly appears, but his quite illegitimate Latin version shows, despite its odd punctuation, what he wanted it to mean: ‘cum per immortalitatem, qua donatus erat, minime interire posset, tamen Prometheo Iouis permisso, immortalitatem adepto Chironis loco, tandem esse dedit’.

Thomas Gale in 1675 repeated Aegius’s text, but in his note called attention to the manuscript reading, Δί Προμηθέως, and proposed to keep Δί but emend Προμηθέως to Προμηθέα, apparently understanding Ἑρμής with ἀντιδότως. In 1743 Hemsterhuis quoted both passages of Apollodorus to illustrate Lucian’s twenty-sixth Dialogue of the Dead (‘Menippus and Chiron’). He proposed in the first passage to read ἀντιδότως τῷ Δί Προμηθέα τὸν ἀντ’ αὐτοῦ γεννημένον ἀδάναστον, though suggesting the possibility of reading (with Gale, but I think in a different sense) ἄντιδότως Δί Προμηθέα as a rare but defensible grammatical construction. Heyne in 1783 printed the manuscript reading, but rejected it. In a long note, substantially repeated in his second edition of 1803, he quotes, as others had done, the second Apollodorus passage as a guide to the meaning of the first and continues thus: ‘Promiserat igni Jupiter, se Prometheus liberaturum, et quantum intelligitur, immortalitatem ei daturum esse, (erat tamen illa immortalis, ut potuit e Tithonum genere) si daret immortalis, qui pro ipso veloc mortalis fieri; accidit ut Chiron dolore cruciatus hoc ipsum in votis haberet; itaque ille ad inferos descendit, ut ap. Lucian. D. Mort. 26.’ Heyne then quotes Hemsterhuis’s correction but adds ‘ex alio tamen loco proculior sum ad legendum: ἀντιδότως δὲ Δί Προμηθέα Ἑρμής (sic) τὸν αὐτό (sic).’ He notes that Gale had already suggested Προμηθέα and his own suggestion is really Gale’s with Ἑρμής expressed instead of understood.

The second passage of Apollodorus (II.5.11) also suffered much emendation before Welcker’s time, but none designed to alter its essential meaning. Gale proposed two changes: first to read ἐλώμενος for ἐλώμενοσ, so as to make Prometheus, as in other versions of the story, the wearer of the memorial wreath, and secondly to insert ὄντα after ἀδάναστον and to transpose the two words to the place before θυσίας (Χείρωνα ἀδάναστον ὄντα θυσίας ἀντ’ αὐτοῦ θεόλοντα). Heyne approved the transposition of ἀδάναστον, but thought that the insertion of ὄντα could be avoided by putting a comma after ἀδάναστον (ἀδάναστον, θυσίας).

Such was the condition of Apollodorus’s text when Welcker in 1824 first brought these two passages to bear on P.V. 1026 ff.: everyone agreed as to what Apollodorus meant to say, but there was much dispute as to how to force him to say it. That this reconstructed story had its oddities had not wholly escaped Heyne, though his naive doubts (‘but after all Prometheus was immortal already!’) were seemingly silenced by his ‘quantum intelligitur’.

Welcker’s own contribution to the interpretation of P.V. 1026 ff. must now be considered. He began by pointing out that Hermes’s words showed that the liberation of Prometheus was
not so simple as an earlier passage (771 ff.) had seemed to imply. Heracles, in fact, would not be enough: ‘Es bedurfte . . . dazu nicht weniger, als dass der Götter einer (d.i. einer von unsterblicher Natur) Nachfolger der Strafe des Prometheus würde, (nicht um hier statt seiner Pein zu leiden, sondern) indem er statt seiner in den dunkeln Tartarus, was immer als das Letzte und Höchste aller Strafen gilt, freewillig wanderte.’ He goes on to reject Schütz’s explanation of the meaning of Hermes’s words in P. V. 1026 ff. as unsuitable on the lips of Zeus’s messenger, and then seeks a new solution in the two Apollodorus passages (combined, for the detail of the memorial wreath, with Athenaeus XV, 674 D).

In the first passage he reads: ἀντιδόντος δὲ Διὶ Προμήθεως τὸν ἄντ’ αὐτοῦ τευνήζομεν ἀδὰντον (statt γενναίομεν ὁσῶς ἀπεδέω, remarking that Hemsterhuisius’s ἄντιδοις τῷ Διὶ Προμήθεα produced the same sense. In the second passage he follows the manuscripts, except for Gale’s ἐδόμενον, which he thinks certain.

That Welcker was right in explaining P. V. 1026 ff. from Apollodorus can hardly be disputed: the vagueness of Aeschylus’s language is typical of all such passages in this play, in which Heracles, the Danaids, Hypermestra, and Lyceus are all foretold, but not one of them is named. It is also to Welcker’s credit that he faced difficulties which many later scholars have shirked, and especially that he dismissed with contempt Heyne’s Oh altitudo! acceptance of the transference of immortality to a Prometheus already immortal. It must, however, be observed that to avoid this impossibility he was forced to the violent expedient of changing γενναίομεν of to τευνήζομεν. He also, as we have seen, insisted most reasonably that Chiron’s voluntary death did not really involve the taking over of Prometheus’s cruel punishment: his own view is summarised in the words ‘Ein Todesopfer wurde nur erfordert, seine Schuld zu tilgen.’ Lastly he discusses the suitability in Hermes’s mouth of a prophecy holding out some hope of Prometheus’s ultimate release, and concludes that Prometheus would have found the words obscure, if not unintelligible, and that in any case dramatic plausibility, in such cases, must not be pressed too far.

Before considering the views of later scholars, it will be convenient at this point to glance at the other ancient references to Chiron’s end, which are surprisingly few. His incurable wound, indeed, became proverbial, and it was regularly ascribed to Heracles’s arrows, though the circumstances were variously imagined, but I have found only two other witnesses to his voluntary surrender of immortality. One is Ovid, who in Metamorphoses II, 649 ff. makes Chiron’s daughter Cucyroe prophesy to him that the day will come when, in agony from a poisoned wound, he will long to be able to die,

\[\text{teque ex acaterno potientem numina mortis}
\text{efficient triplicesque deae tua fila resolvent.}\]

The other is Lucian in the dialogue (Dial. Mort. xxvi) already mentioned, and there he says nothing of the wound, since it suits his satiric purpose to assume that Chiron abandoned this world through sheer boredom without pausing to reflect that the other would be more boring still. No other ancient writer to my knowledge consigns Chiron to Hell, though he was sometimes placed in the sky as Centaurus or later as Sagittarius. Apart from P. V. 1026 ff. no-one but Apollodorus connects Chiron with Prometheus in any way.

Welcker’s view of the identity of Aeschylus’s θεόν τίς found immediate acceptance. In a Leipzig dissertation De Aeschyli Prometheo Saluto published in 1828 (reprinted in Opuscula IV, 253 ff. in 1831) Hermann (pp. 8, 28) assumes its truth, without mentioning Welcker. He returned to the subject shortly before his death in his De Prometheo Aeschylo 1845/6 pp. 12 ff. (reprinted in Opuscula VIII, 154 ff. in 1877). In this dissertation he adopts in the first passage Welcker’s τευνήζομεν ἀδὰντον, and in the second Gale’s ἐδόμενον. In his posthumous edition of Aeschylus, produced by Moritz Hauff in 1852, he twice quotes the two Apollodorus passages, in one case (I. 260) printing Welcker’s τευνήζομεν but omitting the following ἀδὰντον, no doubt by a slip, since he includes it in the other (II. 145) and professes in each case to follow Welcker. Hermann’s own comments are of little moment: the most important
is in the 1845/6 dissertation, where he writes (p. 12) "Nec puto, ut Schoemannus p. 148, mori debuisse Prometheus his verbis significari, sed mortem Chironis mercedem fuisse solutionis e vinculis."); I have not seen the work of Schoemann here criticised.

It is needless to enumerate the readings of the Apollodorus passages adopted by later critics: all alike assumed that the first passage must be altered to suit their renderings of the second, and most were content to adopt one or other of the old suggestions made with that intention. The only significant novelty is R. Wagner's clever correction, first made in Commentationes Ribeckianae, 1888, p. 147, n. 1, and then printed in his Teubner text of 1894, to read αὐτὸν for τὸν in the first passage, thus: ἀντίδοτος Διὶ Προμηθέως αὐτὸν ἄντ᾽ αὐτῷ γεννήσαμον ἄδοντας. This emendation has been widely accepted and is sometimes printed (for instance by George Thomson in his edition of the Prometheus, 1932, p. 31, n. 1) as though it were the manuscript text.

The difficulty of fitting P.V. 1026 ff. to Apollodorus's reconstructed text has mostly been met on Welcker's lines, though two eminent English scholars, Jebb (on Sophocles Trach. 714) and Frazer (on Apollodorus II, 5.11 and later on Ovid Fasti V. 183) were content to assume, in the teeth of all evidence, that Prometheus was mortal till he acquired Chiron's immortality. Even the freak story peculiar to Euphorion (fr. 99 Powell, from Schol. Il. XIV, 295), that Prometheus was the fruit of the rape of the child Hera by the giant Eurymedon, scarcely makes him mortal, and Aeschylus in the P.V. repeatedly emphasises both his divinity and his immortality.

Many of those who have dealt with P.V. 1026 ff. since Hermann have failed to grasp the fact that Apollodorus supports Welcker's interpretation only if Welcker's τετεληγε&omicron;&aomicron;ν, or something like it, is accepted, and in general most comments have been unhelpfully vague. Three discussions stand out from the ruck, those of H. Weil, A. Körte, and W. Schmid. Weil, in Études sur le Drame Antique, 1897, has much of value to say of the lost Prometheus Solutus, but his remarks (pp. 77 ff.) on our passage amount to little more than the suggestion that Aeschylus has imperfectly combined two incompatible stories, in one of which, perhaps derived from an early Titanomachy, Prometheus was in fact confined in Tartarus till Chiron was sent down to take his place. In this Weil at least recognises the important fact that in Aeschylus's version Prometheus's sojourn in Tartarus was only an episode unessential to his punishment, but he does not deal with the Apollodorus passages and says nothing of the immortality problem.

Körte's view, expressed in Neue Jahrbücher XLV, 1920, pp. 211 ff. resembles Weil's, but goes more deeply into the difficulties. Like Weil he holds that P.V. 1026 ff. though genuine, is logically irreconcilable with Aeschylus's version, but he suggests that in the earlier story from which it is derived Prometheus was threatened, as his ultimate punishment, with actual loss of immortality. He thinks that the episode of Prometheus's sinking underground, between Prometheus Vinctus and Prometheus Solutus, was an attempt to veil the inconsistency. In Apollodorus II, 5.4 he adopts Welcker's τετεληγε&omicron;&aomicron;ν.

Schmid's views, expressed in Untersuchungen zum Gefesselten Prometheus, 1929, 78 ff., and briefly repeated in Schmid-Stählin, III 1, 1940, p. 295, n. 7, were of course coloured by his well-known theory that the Prometheus Vinctus is a work of the sophistic age modelled on the genuine Prometheus Solutus. He naturally seizes eagerly on apparent inconsistencies in the extant play, and he considers the Chiron motive "überhaupt unverständlich" in the context of ll. 1026 ff. He is convinced that it can have played no part in the Prometheus Solutus, and he hazards the improbable guess that the story told by Apollodorus may be an invention of late mythographers, designed to explain the Aeschylean lines, which are better understood, he thinks, as an impossible condition ironically thrown out by Hermes: Schütz's theory, in fact, though Schmid does not name him.

It is clear that the whole problem should be reconsidered from the start. Let us begin by imagining the situation in the Prometheus Solutus when the eagle first lay pierced by Heracles's arrows: uncertain as the reconstruction of that play may be, it is likely that Weil, Körte, and Thomson are right in thinking that Heracles's act was an unauthorised defiance of Zeus.
Hyginus, indeed, in *Fab.* 59 says that Prometheus first revealed his secret, and that Heracles was then sent, presumably by Zeus, to kill the eagle. This version has often been attributed to Aeschylus, but it is irreconcilable with Io's question in *P.V.* 771, τίς οὖν ὁ λύσον ἐστίν θέου θεῶν Δίου; and with Prometheus's own words in fr. 201 of the *P. Solutus*, which he addressed to Heracles when σωθῆς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, as Plutarch tells us:

ἐξήρω πατρός μοί τοῦτο φιλαττων τέκνον.

It cannot be doubted that Weil was right in preferring to connect the plot of the *P. Solutus* with a passage of Probus *ad Verg.* *Ec.* VI. 43 which he was the first to cite: Hunc quidem uolurem Hercules interemit, Prometheus tamen liberare, ne offenderet patrem, timuit. Sed postea Prometheus ioum a Thetis concubitu deterruit, pronuntians quod ex his nascetur qui ipsis dis fortior futurus esset. Ob hoc beneficium Iupiter eum solvit. Ne tamen impunitus esset, coronam et anulum gestanda ei tradidit.

Thomson is justified in writing (p. 30): 'Further, it is not unlikely that Zeus now transfers part of his displeasure to his son, who, as predicted of him, has delivered the prisoner without the Father's consent'. Indeed, if Heracles shot the eagle without permission, his offence was surely capital: what punishment could fit such human defiance of Zeus but death?

With this situation in mind, let us turn back to Apollodorus II.5.4, and remind ourselves what the unemended text there says:

κάκει τελευτήσαι βουλόμενος καὶ μὴ δυνάμενος ἑπείτε ἀδάνατος ἢν ἀντιδότως Διὸς Προμηθεῶς τοῦ ὄντι ἀυτοῦ γεννήσαμεν ἀδάνατον ὄντος ἀπέθανεν.

With Chiron added to the picture, we have before us three figures: an immortal, Chiron, incurably wounded, and longing to die, but unable to do so unless some mortal will put on his immortality: a mortal, Heracles, Zeus's favourite son, but fresh from a capital offence against his father: and a second immortal, Prometheus, the most cunning of the gods, tortured by Zeus for ages past, but now on the brink of final release, and ready to conciliate his ancient enemy.

Prometheus, says Apollodorus, gave Zeus someone ready to take over Chiron's immortality, and so Chiron died. Heracles is the only mortal in the picture. We know that he was one of the tiny handful of mortals who in fact achieved immortality, and it is obvious that Chiron's vicarious death would make it easy for Zeus to pardon his son.

I suggest, therefore, that it was to Heracles and not to Prometheus that Chiron, at Prometheus's suggestion, was allowed by Zeus to surrender his immortality. It would be easy to insert ('Ἡρωκλέα') after Προμηθεῶς, either before or after τοῦ (a few lines before, as we have seen, only *Epit. Vat.* gives ἢν ἠρωκλῆα), but it is unnecessary, for the interest of this episode is centred on Chiron, and the important point is that a substitute was found. It seems possible that the Medicean scholium already quoted, ὅς τοῦ βοηθοῦντος τοῦτα (or τοῦτο) πειρομένου is part of a narrative in which Zeus had sworn that any man who helped Prometheus should incur his punishment, an oath which Zeus evaded by letting Chiron take his offending son's place.

Certain points still need examination. Apollodorus ascribes the shooting of the eagle to the eleventh labour and Heracles's attainment of immortality from the pyre of Oeta (II.7.7) to a point some time after the conclusion of the twelfth. Chiron, however, in Apollodorus's story was wounded as early as the fourth labour, and he may well have waited a little longer still for the actual attainment of his desire: or Zeus may have allowed Chiron to die, while keeping Heracles's immortality in reserve till his worldly tasks should be done. Apollodorus's words in II.7.7, ἐκείνην ὄν τυχῶν ἀθανασίας, are reconcilable with such a view, and in any case the order of Heracles's achievements is notoriously variable and the *Bibliotheca* is an amalgam of discrepant sources.

What of the second Apollodorus passage (II.5.11), always taken to state that Heracles gave Chiron to Zeus as one ready to die instead of Prometheus? The passage, as has been
said, runs thus in the manuscripts: καὶ τὸν Προμηθέα διέλυσε δεσμὸν ἐλόμενος τὸν τῆς Ἑλλάδος καὶ παρέσχε τῷ Δίι Χείρωνα ἐνήσκειν [ἀθάνατον] ἀμὴν αὐτὸν θέλοντα (ἀθάνατον being omitted by Epit. Vat.). It would be easy so to emend this as to make it fit the other passage unambiguously, for instance by inserting Προμηθέας at some point in the closing phrase, but no change is really necessary. As they stand, the words can legitimately mean any one of four things: (a) that Prometheus gave Chiron to Zeus as one willing to die instead of Heracles, (b) that Prometheus gave Chiron to Zeus as one willing to die instead of Prometheus himself, (c) that Heracles gave Chiron to Zeus as one willing to die instead of Prometheus, (d) that Heracles gave Chiron to Zeus as one willing to die instead of Heracles himself. The first and last of these alternations, (a) and (d), are both consistent with the essential features of my reconstruction, but since (a), like (b), involves a rather abrupt change of subject in παρέσχε, (d) seems somewhat more attractive: it makes Heracles, indeed, do what the first passage ascribes to Prometheus, but the difference is trivial, a mere variation of emphasis.

Lastly, it may be urged that Hermes’s language in P.V. 1026 ff. suggests that the death of the unnamed god will have a more direct bearing on Prometheus’s release than my theory implies. Chiron, in any case, as many critics have observed, did not in any real sense take over Prometheus’s sufferings, yet he did descend to Tartarus at the moment when Prometheus was released, and his death, on my theory, remains intimately linked with Prometheus’s liberation. Hermes, as Schütz and Welcker saw, had no wish to raise Prometheus’s hopes: his words, like many true prophecies, are meant to mislead.

D. S. Robertson.
THE COINS FROM THE Ephesian Artemision Reconsidered

[Plate XXXVIII. Coins or coin-groups illustrated are marked with an asterisk.]

In 1904-5 the British Museum excavations at Ephesus were resumed under D. G. Hogarth, and resulted in the discovery of what he held to be the foundations of earlier buildings beneath the great Artemision of the Croesus period unearthen by Wood. In these earlier buildings Hogarth distinguished three successive stages:

A. A Central Basis, faced with green schist, standing on virgin sand, and joined in the middle of its west side by a narrow jetty to a second rectangular platform, both of limestone; the whole built, in his view, about 700 B.C., and lasting until it was destroyed by the Kimmerians about 660.

B. A rebuilding and enlargement of the same about 650, the resulting temple lasting till about 600.

C. A further building and enlargement finally superseded by the Croesus temple about 550.

Hogarth's chronology has met with strong criticism, notably from Lévy, who regarded all remains as belonging to the foundations of the Croesus temple. Gjerstad criticising both, but with sound good sense, accepts the general outline sketched by Hogarth for the architectural history but proposes a middle dating:

A. in the third quarter of the seventh century; B. and C. at successive intervals of twenty-five to thirty-five years. Even so, as will appear, such a date for A. must be too early, at least for the finished building, and it is a question whether both scholars have not made too much of the successive reconstructions. The foundations of the earliest structure, the Basis (A), contained a wealth of objects in gold (or electrum, including 24 electrum coins), in silver, ivory, amber, etc., laid between its lower courses in such fashion as to make it certain that they belonged to a foundation deposit. The date of the latest of these objects must therefore determine the date when the deposit was closed, the building constructed. This date cannot be earlier than the first decade of the sixth century, as Paul Jacobsthal shows in a parallel article (pp. 85 ff.) the results of which, with the greatest kindness, he had already communicated to me.

In arriving at this date the coins were deliberately left out of account; for, the evidence for them being vaguer and more limited, it seemed better to date the coins by the objects than the objects by the coins. It is my part first, to show that, properly considered, they are not only compatible with, but actually support his dating; and second, to draw what conclusions such a date suggests for the history of coinage.

During the excavations not less than 93 electrum coins were unearthed, to which should be added 7 silver dumps: 49 and 4 dumps in recorded contact with other objects and with remains of buildings. They have been strangely neglected by numismatists and historians, owing partly to the fact that they were only published in a brief chapter contributed by Head to Hogarth's volume in which the brilliance of the other finds might well have put them in the

---

1 D. G. Hogarth, British Museum: Excavations at Ephesus, hereafter cited as Ephesus.
3 Liverpool Annals XXIV (1937) 15; with further references.
4 Ephesus 297-8.
5 I owe him much more than this, for we have discussed the problems of the Artemision together intermittently for the past ten years, and without his constant help this article could not have been written. Many of my references are due to him and I must here make my acknowledgements once for all.
6 Almost certainly more; Hogarth (p. 74 note) heard of two concealed and sold by his workmen. One of these may perhaps be the coin described below, p. 167 no. 67.
7 E.g. no mention of them in Hist. Num. under Ephesus, and only an incidental one under Lydia. Their publication was a year too late for E. Babelon's Traité des monnaies grecques; Picard, however (ibid. p. 24), was aware of some of the difficulties they raised.
8 Ephesus 74 ff. Pls. 1 and 2. The British Museum possesses electrotypes of nearly all the coins there illustrated and on these, apart from Head's chapter, this article is based. I have not been able to examine the originals in Istanbul, and have relied on his publication for weights and similar details.
shade; but more, perhaps, owing to the nature of this publication itself. Though Head listed and described the coins in general with accuracy and added, on occasion, illuminating comments, he does not appear to have grasped the full implications of the stratified pieces, and made little distinction between them and the unstratified. It is true that, in effect, there is little difference in content between the two, as is shown not only by their types and style but also by the fact that coins from the same dies occur in both categories; but the stratified, viewed in their context, can provide valuable evidence for the chronology and development of coinage. Head's concern, however, is mainly directed towards showing that both together formed a foundation deposit equivalent in pure gold to a round sum of 10 heavy Lydian staters. Even more baffling is the implicit contradiction between the dating which he gave for the coins, and that assigned by the excavator himself to the earliest shrines and the other objects found with them. In his list Head ranged the coins (most of which he regarded, not always with justification, as Lydian) by style, in what seemed their chronological order; and then distributed them among the Mermnadai from Gyges (?) to Alyattes (?), admitting that these divisions were arbitrary and that the date of the earliest (nothing is said of the later!) might be pushed further back.

Hogarth, in discussing (pp. 239–40) the question 'at what date was the earliest basis founded?' obviously found the 24 coins actually discovered in its foundations very much in his way. He begins by quoting Head to the effect that the 'time of Gyges' is 'a heading good for (relative) classification only'; then, assuming a much earlier date than Head's for the beginning of coinage, he pushes the four primitive pieces back into the eighth century, if not before; and, after stating that the date of the remaining 20 coins 'is not more certain', he rides off to the consideration of the other objects. His final conclusion, as was said before, is that the deposits were laid down before 700 B.C.; yet it was clearly Head's impression, though he was not concerned to substantiate it in detail, that at any rate the bulk of the coins, including those from within the basis, belonged at earliest to the second half of the seventh century. One gets the impression that his study of the coins was finished before Hogarth had reached any firm conclusion over the general dating; for he even toys with, and only reluctantly rejects, the idea that the coins might have formed part of a dedication made by Croesus when he superseded the old electrum coinages by his bimetallic coinage of gold and silver, somewhat on the analogy of the spis found in the Argive Heraion, which are held by some to have been a dedication by Pheidon of outmoded currency on the introduction of a silver coinage. No wonder, perhaps, that in the face of such unresolved contradiction the use made of the evidence afforded by the coins has been less than it deserves. Let us examine it again from the beginning. A select list of the relevant coins, numbered and arranged, where possible, by find-spots, with detailed descriptions, will be found in an Appendix. The first step must be the consideration of the stratified pieces themselves. Coins were found in definite contexts on eight occasions:

I. 24 coins from the Central Basis, the earliest building on the site; to these should be added four dumps of silver also found in the same context (nos. 1–28*).
II. 4 coins from the filling of the western platform which was linked to, and roughly contemporary with, the Basis.
III. A hoard of 19 coins from a pot lying on the bottom sand in a space on the south side between these two, but under earth rammed down for the first reconstruction of this primitive complex (nos. 29–47*).
IV. A single coin found in the same conditions in a similar space on the north side.
V. 5 coins found underneath the foundations of the south wall of this first reconstruction.

There are obvious objections to this view: there is no reason to suppose (1) that the coins from all over the site formed a single deposit or (2) that even if so, the deposit was recovered intact; on the contrary, as Picard (op. cit. p. 25) has already observed.

Following Ridgeway's article Coinage in the Cambridge Companion to Greek Studies (1st Ed.), 445.

10 It was this, perhaps, that originally suggested to Head the attempt already mentioned to equate the coins in weight with 10 of the gold staters which Croesus was the first to issue in the form of coin. For Pheidon see below, p. 166.
11 Ephesus 119.
The find spots of three further lots comprising 12 more coins were also recorded. These were:

VI. 8 coins found with a quantity of ivory, jewellery, etc. (pp. 42 and 235) of Hogarth’s A period.

VII. 2 more, from a stone cist of A or B period? (p. 44).

VIII. 2 more, possibly as late as the C period (p. 46).

Unfortunately in the last three lots the record does not describe the coins themselves, so that only the first five are to the purpose, and of these the first and third are really all that matter, the coins in the other deposits being practically repetitions, sometimes from the same dies, of the coins from the two larger ones.

Coins from the Central Basis (p. 157, I)

These were found together with pieces of jewellery, etc., sometimes actually lying between the courses, in such a way, as has been noted above, as to indicate a foundation deposit, and this is, perhaps, a convenient place to say a word about such things.

Foundation deposits are not uncommon in Egypt and the Middle East from the third millennium B.C. onwards. In Egypt they usually take the form of materials and implements (often in miniature) employed in building and in the dedication ceremonies: typical are those at Nebesheh (Ahmose I. c. 1580 B.C.) and at Naucratis (here inscribed for Ptolemy II c. 275 B.C.).

For the Middle East they can be conveniently studied in Mrs. E. Douglas Van Buren’s Foundation Figurines and Offerings. In this area the content is more varied. Inscribed cones, tablets, etc., are commonly met with: of such, for instance, combined with Greek and Lydian coins, consists the deposit laid by Darius I beneath his apadana at Persepolis. Apart from such inscribed records the bulk of deposits consists of statuettes, themselves often inscribed, and buried with apotropaic or propitiatory intent. These are occasionally accompanied, notably in the temple of Im-shushinak at Susa (c. 1150 B.C.) and Sargon’s palace at Khorsabad (c. 715 B.C.) by quantities of small objects, ranging from cheap beads and shells to seals and valuable pieces of jewellery, offered presumably for the use or pleasure of the god.

In Greek lands foundation deposits are rare. Apart from the Artemision we have a hoard of the end of the geometric period from the archaic temple at Delos containing gold, ivory, and bronze objects, but no coins; others from beneath the cult statue of Hera Akraia at Perachora consisting of coins only of about 400 B.C.; from Priene, coins of the mid-second century B.C. of Orophernes of Cappadocia, probably with jewellery also; from Sardis, coins only, of the third and early second centuries, B.C.

In publishing the Im-shushinak deposit de Meckenem made the interesting suggestion, that it was buried in a communal ceremony in which those assisting threw into the foundations each his gift according to his ability. Did our Ephesian deposit arise in something of the same way? It would explain the somewhat haphazard nature of the coins and other small objects; and is there, perhaps, a hint of a similar deposit later, when the Artemision was rebuilt in the fourth century after Herodoto’s fire, in the sentence quoted by Strabo from Artemidorus? έλλον άμισον [νόμον] κατεσχύσαν συνενεγκαντες τόν τῶν γυναίκων κόσμον καὶ τὰς ίδιας οὐσίας.

However that may be, 28 pieces of currency were recovered from this foundation deposit, of which 9 (nos. 1-9*), without type or device of any kind, are discussed later on p. 164. Of the rest 7 (nos. 10-16*) showed a lion's head, 7 (nos. 17*-23) a lion's paw, 2 (nos. 24-5*) a horse's

---

13 Head says 13 (p. 75 Note 2.) and described as being "under B foundations," the evidence for which does not seem cogent. I can find no trace of the odd one.
14 Petrie, Times II 14, and Naucratis I 28 ff. The Toud treasure (Syria XVIII 174 ff.) was an ex-voto not a foundation deposit.
18 Cf. Dhorme, ibid. p. 185.
19 BCH LXXI-III, 148; Payne, Perachora, 108 (a very odd deposit, this); Regeling, Priene; Bel in Sardis, XI Part I, p. 242.
head, and the remaining 3 a hawk’s (no. 26*), a griffin’s (no. 27*), and a seal’s (no. 28*) head, respectively. The coins with lion’s heads are all of the same kind and belong to a single series, the commonest of early electrum issues (Traité Pl. II. 4-13), the style of which we must now examine as a whole. The lions themselves derive from an early Mesopotamian prototype of the second millennium B.C. transformed by Hittite hands, then modified by later, perhaps direct, Assyrian influence. Characteristic is the strong, almost rectangular, shape with practically no surrounding mane to blur its outline, or to cover the large, projecting ear, set well forward; the ruff of hair, in herring-bone pattern, slanting from the base of the ear across the neck, framing the cheek; ravening jaws with no tongue visible between them; a wart-like knob rising from the forehead between the eyes; usually a wart at the upper base of the ear but no stylised pattern along the upper lip as on Hittite lions in general.

The nose-wart is a most interesting feature, particularly important for the chronology, and calls for detailed discussion. It invariably lies flat on the lion’s nose, and may be either smooth or sprouting with bristles. It is to be distinguished from the pair ofwarts sometimes appearing between the eyes of Hittite lions, which was copied in early Greek sculpture. In a sense it is a phenomenon similar to the familiar knobs sometimes borne by griffins, but in their original form the two appear to be independent of each other. The knob on the earliest griffins consists of a slender stem usually crowned by a smooth bulb; occasionally the same beast carries a pair of knobs; later, however, still through contamination with the lion’s wart, the stem may be omitted.

The griffin’s knob looks like some foreign body screwed on to the beak; the normal lion’s wart is a perfectly plausible organic development, if only it were real. The knob is first met with in the early seventh century and in the Aegean basin, not in Mesopotamia; 23 the nose-wart, on the other hand, like the herring-bone ruff which accompanies it on these coins, is found in Assyrian sculpture increasingly from the ninth century onward, but in Greek orientalising art only from the second half of the seventh century. So far as I can trace neither feature appears in Hittite work, so both may have come to Lydia either indirectly through the Aegean or, perhaps more likely, by direct contact in the seventh century.

In Assyrian sculpture a rudimentary nose-wart, an oval hairless swelling in prolongation of the brow, is already visible on the lion attacking the chariot in the famous hunting relief of Ashurnasirpal (883–859, fig. 1). A limestone lion’s head of about 700 B.C. (fig. 2), still of the earlier close-maned type, with eyes and patterned lip-wrinkles once inlaid, has an oval socket on the nose clearly sunk for inlay of a similar protuberance. Under Ashurbanipal (668–626 B.C.) when the lion assumes the later form, with heavy swelling mane masking the outline of the head, the nose-wart becomes comparatively common; for instance in his lion-hunt in the British Museum, or on the relief in Paris from Niniveh showing the King spearing a lion in close combat. About this time the same smooth form appears in the Aegean also, where it may be noted on proto- Corinthian pottery; 29 then a little later on Nebuchadnezzar’s frieze of glazed brick from Babylon (600 B.C., fig. 3) and even on the coins of Croesus.

---

21 E. Auragal’s Spieehutische Bildhauw 39-79, is now indispensable for the study of Hittite lions and their relations west and east.
22 Auragal ibid.; p. 41, for the ear-wart, and passim for the stylised pattern.
23 For Hittite lions with this feature see Auragal, ibid. p. 46 Abb. 35, 38, 39; for Greek lions see, for example, the so-called Menekrates (Rodenwaldt, Kerkyra II, 176 f.) and the lion’s head from Samos (Buschor, Altbömerischer Stand- bildner). 26
24 Jacobson has an exhaustive study of griffin’s knobs in his forthcoming work on Pins. Cf. for the normal form Buschor, Plastische der Griechen, Pl. 21 (Olympia); a very early knob is stylised as a kind of flower (recalling that of Tiamat for which see below) on an early seventh century krater from Samos (AM 1933 Pl. a. p. 86) cf. also Larisa II Pl. VIII 18; occasional absence of the bulb may be due to damage (e.g. de Ridder, Bronzes de l’Aege, I. 150 No. 436); but there are certainly no bulls on, e.g. a pair belonging to a griffin on an early b.f. lebes (BMC Vass II. 86 B 101, described as a large bird with two crests); and on the griffins on a bowl from Olympia (IV. Pl. XLIX b); for knobs without stem see the bronze from Delphi (de la Coste-Messelière, Delphes fig. 13)—here perhaps imitating the lion’s nose-wart, and paired with a knob of normal form; also later coins of Abdera (BMC Gr. Coins Thrace 65, Nos. 3-4, etc.).
25 Furtsaengler, S.V. Orxy in Roscher, Lexikon, who, however, derives the knob from the wart on the coins we are discussing; for the excrecence on the monster Tiamat see below. Barnett (JHS LXVII 10) has suggested a Hittite origin for the knob, deriving it from the lock of hair occasionally worn by similar monsters (e.g. ‘bird-men’) by Auragal, ibid. p. 80, fig. 52.
26 Hall, Bab. and Ass. Sculpture in B.M., Pl. XVIII.
27 Hall, Pl. LIX. Professor Sidney Smith kindly gave me this date.
28 Ibid. Pl. XLVII and Encycl. Phüol. (Louve) II Pl. 7. 8. (I understand from Mr. Gadd that the attribution there given to Semnacherib is incorrect.)
29 Payne, Neronorinthia Pl. XV 7-8 and 11 (c. 600-25 B.C.).
30 Kunstgeschichte in Bildern II Pl. 54a, Koldewey, Wieder- stehende Babylon, Abb. 16 (whence fig. 3).
On the other hand, the nose-wart with bristles has an even longer though less connected history. The lion on an extremely early but isolated cylinder seal from Susa of about 3,000 B.C. (fig. 4) already shows two bristles sprouting in the appropriate place. The monster Tiamat, the lion-griffin, on a relief of Ashurnasirpal (fig. 5) has a form of it like a flower stylised (the whole not unlike that military badge, the stylised grenade) which he seems to owe to the leonine side of his nature. I can trace no recurrence of this feature till it suddenly becomes common about 650 B.C. The earliest instance seems to be on the fresco of Ashurbanipal's palace at Til-Barsip (fig. 6), which shows the nose-wart as a half-globe with bristles radiating from it in all directions exactly as on the most finished of our Lydian coins. In the second half of the seventh century it appears on Rhodian pots and in Syrian and Etruscan products, the bristles sometimes sprouting to exaggerated lengths, as on the Phoenician bowl from the Bernadini tomb (second half of seventh century, fig. 7), or a Clazomenian sarcophagus in Berlin (fourth quarter of sixth century). Nature's lions know no such swelling, either with or without bristles, though occasionally a simulacrum of it, due to shadow or to variation in the colour of the skin, may be noticed between the eyes. In its bristling form it has some analogy with the whirling rosette sometimes portrayed on the lion's shoulder and occasionally elsewhere, on check, hind-quarters, or paw. It has recently been suggested that the shoulder rosette derives from the decorated harness of royal tame lions of the 6th dynasty of Egypt. Whatever its origin, the influence of natural hair-patterns on its development, and the fact that similar patterns appear on other parts of the body, cannot be disregarded in considering its form and significance. It is not easy to resist the view that it sometimes acquires a sidereal, even solar, significance: thus the maned lioness on the side of Inina-Ishtar's throne at Susa (end of 3rd millennium) has a stellate shoulder wshor. The whirling triskeles may be compared, which appears on the shoulder of Apollo's beast, the griffin, on a mid-fifth century stater of Lykia. The lion himself has solar among other associations, and indeed the nose-wart on the earliest of our coins takes the form of a rough, four-pointed star, while on the later it becomes almost a radiate globe (App. no. 66*).

From this lengthy digression we may now return to the general survey of the style of this series. It shows a certain movement covering, maybe, a generation or more: the eye, at first triangular, with slightly concave base, becomes smaller and more rounded; the nose-wart shrinks to a discreet pellet; the ruff becomes neater. Not all these steps are represented among the coins from the basis, but nos. 10*-12 and 14* are among the earliest and latest respectively. There is a general resemblance among the earlier to lions on late proto-Corinthian, e.g. the Macmillan aryballos (fig. 8, note the hatched ruff); and on Rhodian pottery of the second half of the seventh century, e.g. Kinch, *Vroulia*, pp. 207-10, fig. 91 (fig. 9; note the bristling nose-w). Close in style, as Körte has already observed, is the lion with herring-bone ruff from a tomb near Arslan-Tash in Phrygia of about 600 B.C.? Closer still with their ruffs and rectangular forms are the heads of two opposed lions on a neo-Babylonian, or, rather, late Assyrian seal in Paris 42—end of the seventh century (fig. 10).

All analogy, therefore, suggests that this homogeneous series began not too early in the third quarter of the seventh century B.C. and lasted well on into the sixth. It has sometimes, and as

---

21 *Encycl. Photog.* (Louvre) II 69 No. 22 (here reproduced, fig. 4, by permission of Editions 'Tel'). I owe the date to the kindness of Professor Frankfort, who tells me that it is not the only motif from Susa which disappears completely to re-emerge a millennium or more later.
22 Hall, ibid. Pl. XXII.
23 Thureau-Dangin, *Til-Barsip*, Plate LIJII; cf. the coin no. 66*.
24 *Mem. Am. Acad* III No. 23 Pl. XVI and AD II 25.
27 *Thureau-Dangin; Arslan-Tash* 70-2.
28 *Encycl. Photog.* (Louvre) I. 225; Pézard-Pottier, *Ant. de Susiane* 60, No. 52.
29 B.M. (recent acquisition).
30 Payne, *Necropolis*, Pl. I 7 and pp. 67 ff. where the Hittite and Assyrian elements in the type were first distinguished.
31 *AM XXIII* (1868) Pl. III p. 27; delightful picture in *JHS*, 1892, Pl. XVIII. Akurgal however (ibid. pp. 43 and 56) places this piece in mid-sixth century, and at the same time postulates Achaemenid prototypes for it. This is too difficult for me.
32 *Encyl. Photog.* (Louvre) II. p. 98. no. 122 (reproduced here, fig. 10, by permission of Editions 'Tel') where it is described as Neo-Babylonian. My colleague Mr. Barnett tells me that the second is more likely.
I think correctly, been attributed to Lydia, and this attribution must now be discussed. Whether the Lydians invented coinage or not, a question touched below, their coinage must have been one of the earliest. The general appropriateness of the type is obvious. The lion, the royal beast *par excellence* of the Middle East, belongs to Herakles and to the Lydian deity with whom he was identified, perhaps Sandon a sun god, from whom both branches of the Lydian royal house descended. As such, lions are closely involved in their story: one of the women of King Meles gave birth to a lion cub, which, on oracular advice, was carried round the city walls to make them proof against assault; the lion provides the half of Croesus's acknowledged coin-type and also his main dedication at Delphi. It is not unreasonable then to conclude that his predecessors also used the beast as their badge. Lenormant, however, who was the earliest to attribute this series to the Lydian Kings, unfortunately joined to it early electrum coins bearing lions whose varying styles should have shown that they belong elsewhere. Head was at first inclined to give most of the coins to Milctos, but later justly distinguished the series

---

43 Who may be the eponym of Sardis; see the discussion in Roscher, *Lexikon IV.*, 2. p. 319 and *P.W. Suppl. III* s.v. *Herakles* p. 972.

44 *Trait* Pl. X for Croesus's lion and bull coinage. *Herodotos I.* 84, I. 50.

45 *Am. Soc. Fr. Num.* IV 173, No. 9, etc.
now under discussion from the Milesian and other coinages, and gave it to Lydia. As Babelon, for what seem insufficient reasons, reverted to Lenormant’s view that all came from a single mint, but conceived that mint as Miletos not Sardis. As Head saw, the differences are such as to require different mints, and the mint of our present series can hardly be other than Sardis. The reasons, based on style, distribution, and occasional inscriptions are worth tabulating.

**Style.** The chain of lions’ heads which appears in the present series is isolated from other lions by the details of treatment enumerated above; and the style itself, fundamentally Anatolian but with touches of direct Assyrian influence, is especially suitable to the geographical and political conditions of the later Lydian kingdom. The coinage of Croesus provides the last link in this chain.

**Distribution.** Coins of this series are the commonest of the early electrum coins and must have been struck in large numbers. They are met with nowadays not only, or especially, on coastal sites of Ionia, but also widely distributed in up-country districts of Western Anatolia. Further, they often bear one or more little countermarks, money changers’ stamps, added privately after issue to mark them as acceptable currency. This feature, and sometimes even the stamps themselves, they share with the Persian sigloi circulating later in the same area. In a word they were a currency in the same wide-ranging class as the Persian and in a sense its predecessor.

**Inscriptions.** On the coins of a series stylistically preceding that of Croesus two lions’ heads are divided by a vertical inscription which, whatever its meaning, is shown to be Lydian by two of its letter forms, the digamma, which does not occur in Ionic, and another letter, of doubtful significance, known only in the Lydian alphabet. One of these coins was actually found in the basis deposit (no. 14*). Six, who first observed the inscription and realised its importance, interpreted it as the name of Alyattes, and in spite of later objections from Buckler and Jongkees it is difficult to believe that the close correspondence between name and inscription is coincidence. The latter should perhaps be read Alyaš as an alternative form of Alyattes. In the same way we find Adramys and Adramyttes side by side, and similar couples and single names like Madduattes and even Alluuaš in earlier Hittite cuneiform texts from Boghaz-Keui.

It may be concluded, then, that this particular series of lion coins formed the early coinage of Lydia. It was represented in the basis by thirds, twelfths, and forty-eighths of the stater (nos. 10–16), the latest, with the Lydian inscription being about 600 B.C.; and with them will go the twenty-fourths, forty-eights and ninety-sixths with the lion’s paw (nos. 17–23).

The rest of the coins in the basis need not detain us except to note that they confirm the date. A twelfth and a twenty-fourth (nos. 24–5*) with a harnessed horse’s head and a somewhat advanced type of incuse already tending to a conscious pattern suggest a time just before 600. Of the three fractions with creatures’ heads the forty-eighth with the seal (no. 28*) is Phocaean and goes with the well-known stater. It is interesting to compare both with the seal-head water-sprouts on the temple of Artemis at Larisa in the Troad. The other two, a twelfth with the hawk (no. 26*) and a ninety-sixth with the griffin (no. 27*), may actually be Ephesian coins, for both creatures are especially associated with the Ephesia: hawks’ heads, one in terracotta of very similar style, were found during the excavations; while the incuse reverse of the griffin bears the head of another of the Ephesia’s animals, the stag. These again must fall}

---

45 Tread. II, 1, pp. 45–54. A fuller discussion was promised in Vol, I, 2, a part which never reached publication.
46 I have heard of them in the plain of Sardis and in the Troad and have myself been offered one at Lycian Patara. No. 66 (B.M. from the Cunningham Coll.) probably came from the East.
47 BMC Greek Coins, Lydia 2, No. 5, etc.
49 G. Buckler in JHS XLVI 56 and Jongkees Maemysne 1938, p. 25, where all the material is collected.
50 F. H. G. (Müller) II, 191. Αριστομαχίας τὸ χρύσον τῆς... Μυκήτων... καλύπτει ἀπὸ τὸν Αιανατολίαν (sic) κτήτορο... τις δέ ἔστη ἐπὶ θεοῦ... Ερμονίας τοῦ Λυκίου βασιλέως... τὸν γὰρ Ἔρμονιον Λυκίοι... Αἰανατολίαν κολυμνή. Ludolf, A. Göte. Mitt. der unterasiatischen Gesellschaft, XXXII (1927, publ. 1928) 40 ff., the suffix is apparently -tas not -tas.
52 Lanea II Taif. 58, first quarter of sixth century.
53 Ephesus 200, fig. 39. Head called our type a griffin, but comparison with this terracotta leaves little doubt of its identity.
about 600 B.C., the seal with its prominent eye perhaps a little earlier, the griffin, already with an incuse type, the latest of all.

The Pot-board Found beneath the space between the Basis and the Western Platform (p. 157, III)

Hogarth's relative date for this deposit is before the first reconstruction.

Of its 19 pieces one (no. 29*) again h as no type; and this is a convenient place to discuss the curious class to which it belongs, and which includes 5 electrum (nos. 1–5*) and 4 silver pieces (nos. 6–9) from the Basis, and 5 more electrum (nos. 48–52) and 3 silver (nos. 53–5) unstratified. As the earliest coins may be defined as pieces of metal sealed with a private or public mark so as to be recognisable in currency by the issuer and his fellows, and known at large as of honest weight and metal, these typeless pieces, which do not admit of recognition, represent a more primitive stage of metallic currency. They are little ingots, of regular weight indeed, but bearing no mark of origin. Like the true coins which developed out of them, all except the smallest tend to be oval rather than round. Formally they may be divided into three classes. The first class consists of dumps of metal, rough underneath but smooth and concave above, apparently made by pouring a quantity of molten metal of the required weight on to some rough surface, clay, or stone, and letting it cool. The well-known Mycenaean pieces from Enkomi 57 and a little piece from the Basis (No. 1*), all electrum, belong here. To these should apparently be added the 7 dumps of silver 'globular lumps like rude weights or coins but without stamp,' as described by Hogarth on p. 119, of which 4 also came from the Basis and 3 from outside it. Unfortunately they are not illustrated or discussed in further detail. The three weights given, however, 7, 17, 18 grs., whether or not intended to cover all seven pieces, do not look haphazard, and suggest a decimal system: 1, 2, 3, and upwards. But among honest pieces of this form others with a base core wrapped in an envelope of precious metal might pass undetected, and fraud of this nature was not difficult. In 1935, for instance, a small deposit of dumps from Anatolia came to light, of uncertain but presumably primitive date. They appeared to be of gold, and the two shown to me were of uniform weight; their specific gravity, however, indicated that they were almost entirely of lead. In early times the only certain method of testing the metal of pieces turned out in this way was to cut into them, 59 and in the second class of typeless pieces this was actually done by hammering the butt-end of a metal rod from above into the smooth upper-side of the dump with force enough to reveal its interior. This is the origin of the incuse, and the rod ultimately turns into the punch die (χαρωκτήρ). This second class, to which belong nos. 2–5* from the basis, appears to pass very soon into the third, which shows a further development. The rough underside now bears deliberate markings. It is completely covered with a series of striations, close parallel lines, thin or thick (No. 4* from the Basis, nos. 63–4*, B.M.), or with little splashes (no. 65* B.M.). The intention was perhaps to show how much wear, with consequent loss of weight, the piece had suffered, whether through honest circulation or fraudulent sweating. This the blunting of the sharply cut parallel lines would quickly reveal. These are the commonest of the typeless pieces and comprise most of those from the Artemision and elsewhere. The striated obverse implies a prepared surface, even possibly a die, to punch the ingot on; the reverses may have two or even three incuses (sometimes struck from the same punch), and are indistinguishable from those of early type-bearing coins.

To this final category belong the remaining pieces in the pot. All except two (nos. 46–47) consisted of two series, half-, third-, sixth-, and twelfth-staters, with the types respectively of a goat's forepart (nos. 30–4*) and a pair of opposed game-cocks (nos. 35–45*). For no obvious reason Head ascribed both series to Lydia, 60 but there is nothing to tie the types down, and

---

57 It is of course possible to cut pieces of metal off a bar or lump and to use them as currency, and some primitive currency was in fact made in this way, e.g. the leaden lumps of the 2nd millennium B.C. from Ashur (Num. Chron. 1922 pp. 179–80); but the weight would then be more difficult to regulate, and it was from the cast dumb that the earliest coins were developed. The mysterious silver half-shekel of Sargon and Semacherib, some apparently bearing a head of Ishtar, were also cast, ibid. pp. 177–9 and 182.
59 The touchstone would only record the quality of the envelope.
60 Ephesus 9b–1 and 9g. For a cock stater sill from the same obverse die cp. Naville Sale IV (1922) lot 836.
COINS FROM THE Ephesian ARTEMISION RECONSIDERED

their mint, or mints, must remain uncertain. The goat series is particularly primitive in appearance: the field of the convex, but uneven, obverse, is covered with sets of parallel striations running in different directions (nos. 36* ff.). In fact it almost gives the impression of being struck from dies made for the striated third class of typeless coins, on to which the device of the goat has been engraved as an afterthought. The technique of the cock series is rather more advanced: the field is less convex but still covered with sets of short striations, now, however, arranged in squares at right angles to each other, and framing the group of the two opposed birds. It is interesting to note that similar striations appear on another very early coin with the running figure of a winged and bearded daimon, which came on the market during Hogarth’s excavations, and may well be one of the coins to which he refers on p. 74 note 1. For the goats and gamecocks we may compare early Corinthian and Attic pots of the last quarter of the seventh century. The remaining coin (no. 46*), a twelfth with the facing head of a lion-panther, though of less primitive fabric may be compared in style with the beast on a transitional Corinthian olpe. Hogarth’s relative date for the deposit of the hoard is, as mentioned above, before the first reconstruction of the original buildings. It is, therefore, very little later than I, the foundation deposit; that is to say in the light of Jacobsthal’s conclusions, shortly after 600 B.C.; and the comparisons just cited accord well with the view that the coins were struck anyhow not long before that date.

It should, moreover, be observed in general that, while a number of the earliest coins cannot be closely dated, there is, so far as I know, none which by its style requires to be placed earlier than well within the second half of the seventh century. This fact takes on a special significance in view of the contents of the foundation deposit and the pot-hoard, which, as we have seen, must have been laid down about 600 or slightly later. Of the twenty-eight pieces of currency in the foundation deposit, including the silver lumps, nine in all (practically one-third), were typeless; of the nineteen in the pot-hoard, one. The remaining pieces from the primitive area, generally unstratified, were mostly contemporary with those from the Basis, as is shown by the fact that several are even struck from the same dies; and in any case all must have been deposited before the reconstruction under Croesus. This remainder numbers fifty-three in all, including three silver lumps; and among them again are eight typeless pieces, more than an eighth of the total. Now there is no reason to suppose that the finds from the Artemision do not represent a fair sample of the currency actually in circulation at the time they were laid down; and the high proportion of those pieces (otherwise extremely rare) which represent the stages immediately preceding true coinage compels the conclusion that we are very near in time to its invention. As one passes from the mere dump, through the punched dump, the punched and striated dump, the punched and striated dump with a type cut into it, to the normal coin, and all lying in nearly contemporary deposits, little if at all affected in appearance or weight by wear, one has the feeling of assisting at the very birth of coinage. If the deposits may be dated round about 600 B.C., then this great event can hardly have taken place much more than a generation earlier. Were the Lydians the inventors? Xenophanes says so,* but the earliest Lydian lions described above (Nos. 10–16*), though primitive indeed, are without the striated surface beneath them which characterises the uncertain coins from the pot-hoard with the goat (nos. 30–45*). Was it, rather, that Lydians were the first to punch the back of currency ingots of their native electrum, and to give them a striated surface; and Greeks the first to seal them with a device? However that may be, so low a date for the invention of coinage brings interesting historical consequences. The silver coinages of main-

---

61 Num. Chron., 1912, p. 140 No. 11 (B.M.); another example in the American Num. Soc. (Museum Notes III Pl. II 6). The daimon (for whom op. the ivory plaque Artemis Orthia Pl. ClX, 2) moves in the conventional archaic scheme, and striations run up to the underside of his outspread arms where they have been sometimes taken for feathers, and the daimon wrongly credited with two pairs of wings. Other striations appear round the outside of the field, and perhaps formed a frame for the upper part of the figure. The flans are too small to show the whole design.
62 E.g. for goat Nereorinthia No. 339, Pl. 26, 4, aryllhalos with chimaera, and No. 746 Pl. 24, 2; for cock (with comb swept back) b.f. fragment from the Agora, Hesperia Suppl. II (1939) 119, B.34, fig. 85; and Nereorinthia No. 780, Pl. 26, 9.
63 Nereorinthia No. 138, Pl. 11, 2.
64 Pollex IX. 83.
land Greece show none of the preliminary stages through which the electrum coinages of Asia Minor evolved, and are clearly derivative. We can hardly, therefore, date the beginning of the first, that of Aegina, before the last quarter of the seventh century, and if Pheidon had anything to do with it (which there are other grounds for considering unlikely), then his date must be brought down also.\(^{63}\) The long gap between the Aeginean coinage and that of other leading cities, always so puzzling, is reduced to reasonable proportions, and the economic development of the cities round the Saronic gulf is seen to be more uniform. At Corinth there can be no coinage of the Bacchiads, or indeed of the Cypselids before Periander, while the first Athenian coinage, Solon's armorial dirichrams, would fit better if most of it could be put below the nineties of the sixth century.

All these consequences and more must flow from a late dating of the Artemision deposits, and we must be thankful to the excavator who, in the face of continuous and increasing difficulties, preserved and recorded so much of the detailed evidence, though he may not always have read it aright.

\[\text{E. S. G. Robinson}\]

\[\text{APPENDIX}\]

[Coins marked with an asterisk are illustrated on Pl. XXXVIII enlarged 2 diameters.]

65 electrum coins and 7 silver dups were found in all in the excavation of the pre-Croeseian area. Those especially cited in the preceding article are described below under three headings, according as they came from the foundation deposit of the central Basis (p. 157, I), the pot-hoard between this Basis and western platform (p. 157, III), or without context and unstratified. These are followed by coins from other sources cited in supplement or illustration. Numbering is consecutive, the numbers given to the coins by Head in Chap. V. (p. 76) of Ephesus being added in brackets, thus (H 1 etc.). All are electrum except nos. 6-9 and 55-5. Unless otherwise stated the fractions are fractions of the stater once called Phoenician, but now usually known as Mileian or Lydian.

\[\text{From the Central Basis (\(=\) p. 157, I)}:\]


2-3. Obv.: similar. Rev.: square incuse. 70 and 5-5 mm., 0-58 and 0-29 grn. Twenty-fourth and Forty-eighth (H 6 and 9).


5. Obv.: "uncertain type"* \(^{64}\) possibly as No. 2 above. Rev.: square incuse. 0-58 grn. Twenty-fourth.


10-12. Obv.: lion's head r., with nose-wart like a four pointed star rising from between the eyes: triangular eye; short, close-fitting mane with ruff of hair running from ear to chin in herring-bone pattern. Rev.: oblong incuse, divided into two compartments. 130 mm., 4-70-4-73 grns. Thirds (H 52-53, 35). All from same reverse punch.

13. Obv.: similar, with nose-wart like a bristling globe. Rev.: square incuse. 0-65 mm., 1-17 grn. Twelfth (H 39). From same obv. die as H 40-2 from filling of Western Platform, and H 38 from beneath South Wall.

14. Obv.: similar; knob reduced to pellet; mane shaggy; flatter, freer style: on r., downwards, 1\(\frac{1}{4}\) (only tops visible). 70 mm., 1-19 grn. Twelfth (H 43). As on other coins of this series, e.g. Nos. 60-62 below, the type is perhaps one of a pair of opposed lion's heads, the other being off the flan. The letters, unobserved by Head, were first noted by Hill in incorporating the electroworship in the Museum collection. As he saw, they must be the end of the name \(\text{ΣΩΛΩΝ}\) discussed above (p. 169).

15-16. Similar, nearer in style to Nos. 10-12, though nose-wart appears to be absent, perhaps owing to reduced scale. 500 mm., 0-29-0-30 grn. Forty-eighths (H 46-7). Same dies.

17-19. Obv.: lion's paw. Rev.: square incuse. 5-5-6-5 mm., 0-58 grn. Twenty-fourths (H 54-6). Same dies as H 57 from beneath wall of B cella.

20-22. Similar. 4-0 mm., 0-29 grn. Forty-eighths (H 64 and p. 93 add.).

23. Similar. 0-16 grn. Ninety-sixth (H p. 93 add.).


25. Similar, but foreleg also shown. 60 mm., 0-60 grn. Twenty-fourth (H 78).

26. Obv.: hawk's head l. Rev.: square incuse. 60 mm., 1-13 grn. Twelfth (H 84 'griffon' but see p. 169).

27. Obv.: griffin's head r. Rev.: square incuse within which, stag's head l. 50 mm., 0-13 grn. Ninety-sixth (H 85, without mention of reverse type).


\(^{63}\) The coinage of Pheidon has recently been treated from this point of view in an excellent article by Llewellyn Brown in Num. Chron. 1950, pp. 177 ff., with important conclusions for the early coinage of Corinth also.

\(^{64}\) Not further described or illustrated by Head.
From the pot-hoard (p. 157 III).

29. Obv.: flat, striated surface. Rev.: two square incuses, impressed with the same punch, one partly overlying the other. 10 mm., 2.36 grm. Sixth (H 1).

30. Obv.: forepart of goat l., set in field striated with groups of parallel lines running at different angles. Rev.: an oblong, flanked on either side by a square incuse. 15.5 mm., 7.58 grm. Half (H 12). One of the rev. punches was used again for Nos. 31–3, so the coin must be contemporaneous with them though it looks more primitive.

31–3. Obv.: forepart of goat r., with foreleg set in striated field, as in No. 30. Rev.: two square incuses. 1.33–1.30 mm., 4.67–4.77 grm. Thirds (H 13–15). All from the same die and punches. The punch used for the upper incuse was also used on the half stater No. 30. The original obverse die was perhaps made for the stater and carried two goats opposed, but in striking a smaller coin only half the die was used, though traces of the other goat’s nose may be discerned; e.g. on No. 33.

34. Obv.: goat’s head r., in similar striated field. Rev.: square incuse. 7.00 mm., 1.30 grm. Twelfth (H 16).

35–6. Obv.: two cocks standing, opposed; between them, in the field, at breast level, a small cylindrical object (modius?). The field striated as before, but more formally, in a chequer pattern. Rev.: an oblong flanked by two square incuses, arranged as on No. 30. 14.0–15.0 mm., 7.15–16 grm. Halves (H 19–20).

37–42. Obv.: the same die. Rev.: two square incuses. 12.5 mm., 4.70 grm. Thirds (H 21–26).

43. Obv.: similar but without the cylindrical object. Rev.: similar. 12.5 mm., 4.70 grm. Third (H 27).

44. Obv.: similar, same die; all of the design lost except the heads. Rev.: two square incuses. 7.5 mm., 2.38 grm. Sixth (H 28).

45. Obv.: two cock’s heads, opposed. Rev.: square incuse. 6.5 mm., 1.19 grm. Twelfth (H 30). The same dies as H 29 unstratified.

46. Obv.: stylised lion’s head facing. Rev.: square incuse. 7.0 mm., 1.18 grm. Twelfth (H 53).

47. Obv.: uncertain type. (Head ‘cock’s head’). Rev.: square incuse. 6.5 mm., 1.19 grm. Twelfth (H 31).

Unstratified.

48. Obv. and Rev.: smooth, flat surface. 6.0 mm., 0.53 grm. Twenty-fourth (H 7).

49–50. Obv.: smooth convex surface. Rev.: square incuse. 3.0–4.0 mm., 0.14 grm. Ninety-sixths (H 10–11). Head thought that the obverse of No. 50 might possibly bear the type of a lion’s paw like No. 17 ff.

51–2. Obv.: flat, striated surface. Rev.: square incuse. 5.0 mm., 0.57 and 0.27 grm. Twenty-fourth and Forty-eighth (H 5 and 8).

53–5. Globular lumps of silver without stamp, as Nos. 6–9 (H p. 119).

36. Lion’s head, etc., as Nos. 10–12, nose-wart as 4-pointed star. 13.5 mm., 4.73 grm. Third (H 34). Same rev. punches as 11?

57–8. Similar, nose-wart as radiate or bristling globe, traces of inscription on r.? 10.0 mm., 2.33 grm. Sixths (H 35–7). Same dies.

39. Similar lion’s head. Rev.: square incuse. 17.0 mm., 1.19 grm. Twelfth (H 44).

60–2. Obv.: two lion’s heads, with vestigial nose-wart, opposed; between them vertically downwards 7.4–1.4 grm. Rev.: oblong (Nos. 60–1) or square (62) incuse. 13.00, 15.3, 10.0, 8.0 mm., 4.71, 2.37, 1.67 grm. Third, Sixth, Twelfth (H 71–3). The obv. die was made for a stater and used throughout the series with the result that on the smaller coins one or other of the heads is always practically off the flan and the inscription incomplete.

From other sources.

63. Obv.: striated surface. Rev.: oblong between two square incuses. 11.95 mm., 10.81 grm. ‘Babylonian’ stater. BMC Gk Coins Ionia, 189, ‘Miletus’ No. 11; types have been suspected in the incuses, notably a running fox in the oblong, but these seem to me an illusion.


66. Obv.: lion’s head r., with nose-wart like a radiate (bristling) globe. Rev.: oblong incuse. 11.5 mm., 4.76 grm. Third. BMC Gk Coins Lydia, 2 No. 8 (Cunningham Coll.).

67. Obv.: winged daimon, in flat cap, bearded, with long wig-like hair, going r. in the kneeling-running posture with outstretched arms; head, thighs and legs to r., wings, chest and arms frontal; striaions running up to the arms and perhaps framing the whole figure. Rev.: oblong between two square incuses, the bottoms covered with criss-cross lines. 15.0 mm., 7.04 grm. Half-stater obtained in 1906 and perhaps from the Artemision. B.M. Num Chron, 1912, p. 146 No. 11.
ARMILLAE

Every schoolboy knows the legend of Tarpeia, who betrayed the Capitol to the Sabines. She demanded what they carried on their left arms: *quod vulgo Sabini aureas armillas magni ponderis brachio laeo . . . habuerint* (Livy, I, 11). The enemy pressed in and treacherously fulfilled their ambiguous promise by throwing their shields on her instead of the golden ornaments and so killed her. In later years the antiquarian remembers the story when before the Mons Tarpeius in Rome. The historian justifiably disregards the tradition. The mythologist is interested in parallels from Greek or folk-lore. The archaeologist is only concerned when dealing with the denarior of L. Titurius Sabinus or of P. Petronius Turpilanus with the representation of Tarpeia dying under the shields.

At the date of these coins, first century A.D., the story, told most fully in Livy I, 11, Dionysius of Halicarnassus II, 38, and Plutarch, Romulus, 17, was naturally well known. Its oldest form is more important than its alteration to serve Roman patriotism or the desire for a romantic novel. According to Dionysius, who enters most carefully into the question of sources, it was already noted by Q. Fabius Pictor and L. Cincius Alimentus, and was therefore current in the last half of the third century B.C. The golden bracelets (Dionysius calls them φθολῖκαι) were by then established as an element of the story. Have we evidence for such ornaments? The legend of Tarpeia, as far as I know, has never been mentioned in connection with the rings with pendant *bullae*, which have been noticed on numerous Etruscan monuments, worn chiefly by men—where by women, clearly only by goddesses—generally on the left arm, exceptionally on the right or on both. The analogy is in fact striking. That the material was gold is shown by the originals which have been preserved. It is true that we cannot always decide whether these encircled arm or neck. But the bracelet of a woman carried off by Zeus on the inside of a r.f. cup in the Vatican, where the individual *bullae* are added in slip, is gilded. The geographical spread of the ornament is not limited to Etruria in the narrower sense. Dionysius, or his source, says that the Sabines had taken over ἄρβολαστα from the Tyrrenians, and we find these *armillae* also on Latin *cistae* found in Praeneste, including the famous *cista* of Novios Plautius. I know of no examples further south in Campania and Samnium. On Paestan vases amulet bands are common and run diagonally across the breast. Only Herakles on the Herakles krater by Assteas in Madrid has a pearl band round his left arm which has some similarity with those we have discussed, but it is nevertheless different.

The earliest example is the puzzling statue of a warrior from Capestrano. The next still belong to the late fifth century. The monuments—engraved mirrors, vases, statuettes, *cistae*—allow us to assume the fourth century as *floruit* of this particular ornament. Some may continue into the third century, but there are certainly no examples in the second and first. The result for the story of Tarpeia is that the version given by Fabius Pictor cannot have been very old in the lifetime of the annalist, even if the kernel of the legend stretches back into mythical times.

The particular form of the *armillae* suggests the possibility that the *bullae* worn by boys

---

18 I owe my thanks to Professor T. B. L. Webster for translating the German manuscript.
1 RE IV A, 2322-24 (Mielente).
5 Giglioli, *loc. cit.* pl. 376, 2.
6 Id. pl. 275, 1, Beazley, *loc. cit.* pl. 9, 2.
10 Older literature in Otto, *Handbuch der Archäologie* II, 1, 394, pl. 56 (Kaschnitz-Weinberg).
round the neck were transferred to the arm when they grew up and their necks became too big; however that may be, they show that monuments on which they appear must be Central Italian. That is important for one of them, the so-called Argonaut krater (fig. 1) in Florence, for which the older literature is given in full by J. D. Beazley, *Etruscan Vase Painting*, 34 f. There the attributions of Ernst Buschor (Italiote) and Carl Watzinger (Campanian) are rejected on purely stylistic grounds. The latter assumption appears to be only based on the *communis opinio* that the *cista* of Novios Plautius in spite of the artist’s inscription, which expressly mentions Rome as the place of fabrication, is Campanian. Carlo Albizzi first stated that the vase in Florence was Etruscan; Sir John Beazley has confirmed this, and has also refuted briefly and convincingly all the interpretations so far produced for the enigmatic scene. As there are no inscriptions, we must try to use the situation to understand the figures. This must be possible for a work, which, though neither in technique nor in execution a masterpiece, recalls so strongly and clearly the grand manner of the original.

A certain weariness hangs over all six figures, particularly the three on the left. The youth who sits with his knees drawn up is ἵππος κώλος κατηθήματος (Pausanias X, 25, 5). Although he does not cover his head in his cloak, he buries his face in his arms. The same position is sought by the Trojan sitting to the right of Athena on the *cista* in London with the sacrifice at Patroclus’ pyre, he tries in vain to hide his bowed head, but his hands are tied behind him. The man on the extreme left with one hand behind his back also recalls representations of the sacrifice of the Trojans, but he also is unchained. This anxious and troubled company cannot be prisoners of war; some have weapons, none are wounded. There has therefore been no pre-

---

**FIG. 1.---(FROM BEAZLEY, **_Etruscan Vase Painting_**).**

[The editors are indebted to the Oxford University Press for the loan of this block.]
ceding battle. But Buschor's 12 latest idea of the morning before a battle is equally impossible. Such low spirits could in fact prevail in an army before a hopeless battle, but such a demoralised band is not immortalised in painting. Nothing suggests arming for war. On the contrary, three swords and a light throwing spear are much too insufficient an armament for six men, even granting that they are naked because they are heroes. Shield, helmet, sword, and spear are the minimum we can demand for hoplites, for light armed troops at least a club. An army so badly equipped would really have urgent need of a talisman; Albizzati first assumed this for his Jason, Watzinger kept it, and now Buschor requires it again for his army on the morning before the battle. But Sir John has justifiably pointed out that we know no such talismans in literature or art. Amulets are seen on Greek monuments as well as others. But in Greece the use of these περιγίματα is the opposite of the use of armillae in Central Italy. Children have them very commonly, women fairly often, men very seldom. 13 They evidently only help against fever, Evil Eye, or other magic but not against cut or thrust. There are invulnerable heroes like Caeneus or Cycnus and heroes who only have one vulnerable spot like Achilles or Ajax; but these do not wear amulets.

But why is a sixth armband being tied round the bearded man on the right, who has five already? The position of the two standing men recalls pictures, on which a wounded man is tied up, such as Sthenelus and Diomed on the Chalidian amphora sold with part of the Hope Collection in 1849 in London, 14 or Achilles and Patroclus on the Sosias cup. 15 But this is not a bandaging scene. On Greek pictures there are other bands which have nothing to do with surgery. 16 Victors at the games, who win more than one band, wind them not only round their heads but also round their arms and legs. 17 Once one is actually tied round the middle of the body: 18 the only ancient illustration of the absurd scholion to Aristophanes, Plutus, 589, which says that the royal diadem is bound round the body. On a pelike in Florence 19 an older man is tying such a taenia round a youth's arm with just as much care as is used for the armband on our krater. Finishing post and palaestra gear prove that the scene on the pelike is played in the gymnasium.

While the Greeks are satisfied with simple bands, the Central Italians, who cared more for material things, seem to have preferred more lasting prizes. That armillae were treasured as things of value is shown by the Tarpeia legend. If we examine the picture of the krater on the assumption that it is an athletic contest, all the problems are solved. Six men have competed against each other. The eldest is left victorious, and has won each time the golden armband of the vanquished as his prize. The group on the left are three earlier unsuccessful competitors. The man with the boots is the last who has dared to contest the claim of the master. He has just had to give up his armband; while his companion ties it, the sixth, on the final victor, he feels sadly his bare left arm and his right hand grasps the place where the ornament used to be. We can say also what kind of a contest it was. At least some part of it was given to spear-throwing, for the winner carries a light akontion, not the heavy military spear. Perhaps the two lines over his left little finger are the amentum, tied round it. If we have got so far in the interpretation, we can add a final piece of confirmatory evidence. Watzinger 20 has pointed out that three of the men are infribulated. Κυνοσέμη is worn in the palaestra, but not in battle nor when fighting dragons. This removes every doubt about the interpretation of the picture.

Infribulation is found not only in Greece but also in Etruria: the wrestlers and boxers and—significantly—the spear thrower in the Tomba della Scimmia in Chiusi 21 are sufficient as examples. The brutal faces of the athletes on this grave show that on the krater we have no

12 Buschor, loc. cit. 44.
13 Archiv f. Religionswiss., VIII (1905), Beilseft (Usener-festschr.) p. 1-22 (Wolters). On p. 6 fig. 2 there is no band on the man's ankle; it is the edge of his cloak.
15 ARV 21, 1.
16 Literature Ὅβερ I, 42 (Jöthner). Passow, Studien zum Parthenon, 1 ff.
17 ARV 81, 3; 121, 7; 190, 5; 223, 5; 292, 202; 299, 8; 320, 49; 558, 50; 571, 96.
18 ARV 39, 38.
19 ARV 572, 13.
20 FR III p. 351.
scene from daily life but from the heroic age. Infibulation is found there too as on the cista of
Novios Plautios and the Etruscan vase which goes back to the same original. A similar
situation from Greek heroic legend can be quoted, Odysseus' victory over the young Phaeacians.
But there the contest is the throwing of the discus, and the sword which Euryalus (Od. viii,
409) gives to the victor is an atonement for offence given, not a reward for victory. It is more
likely that our picture is an Etruscan story in Greek style. We cannot tell the names, for our
literary tradition is too scanty, and there are no inscriptions as for the adventures of the brothers
Vipinas. Etruscan legends could be depicted in Greek style. Contrariwise, the Etruscans
interpolated their deities of the dead into Greek themes as in the case of Alcestis and Admetus,
the Nekyia or the sacrifice of the Trojans. The last in particular shows that it is not necessary
for all Etruscan pictures which in style are near the punishment of Amykos to derive from the
Argonaut story.

A word more about armbands as a prize for victory. We, like the Greeks, find something
unmanly and unsoldierly in a hero who has several armbands on both arms. That is not the
view of the ancient inhabitants of Central Italy. The Roman soldiers received armillae as a
decoration; they were always given in pairs and therefore worn on both arms. On monu-
ments of imperial times, as on the famous funeral monument of Caelius from Vetera, they
are, it is true, given another form. But the golden and silver armbands which L. Papirius
Cursor gave to his troops in 293 B.C. after the capture of Aquilonia (Liv. X, 44) may very well
have had the form of our rings with bullae. And, in fact, on a Praenestine cista in Berlin,
which represents a triumph and may be no later than the generation of L. Papirius Cursor, the
liticen wears arm-rings of this form. In any case the Roman dona militaria were not talismans
put on before the battle but decorations given after victory.

They are decorations for service in war, not for success in sporting contests. There is
however, also a text for that. In the Scriptores historiae Augustae Julius Capitolinus writes in the
life of Maximinus 2, 4: 'natali Getae, filii minoris, Severus militares dabat ludos propositis praemis
argentis, id est armillis, torquibus et balteolis'. The young Maximinus enters himself. As he is
not a soldier, he can only compete with the baggage-carriers: 'tunc Maximinus sedecim ixas uno
sudore devicit sedecim acceptis praemii minusculi non militariibus iussusque militare'. If he had been in
the army already, he would have won the military prizes. The situation corresponds exactly
with that on our vase picture. The passage is late but we have been able to trace the family
tree of the dona militaria to the time of the Republic. May that not also be possible for the
praemia? The krater in Florence seems to suggest this.

A. RUMPF.
It is a privilege to be allowed to take a part, however humble, in the chorus of heartfelt congratulation, sincere admiration and affectionate good wishes which will greet Professor Sir John Beazley on the occasion of his sixty-sixth birthday. Among my proudest memories is the fact that, during the tenure of my Readership in Greek Epigraphy, my duties were 'to lecture or give instruction . . . under the direction of the Lincoln Professor of Classical Archaeology and Art', and I owe much to his inspiration, his example and his friendship. Nor will it, I hope, be inappropriate if I here offer to him notes on some inscriptions presented to the University of Oxford and housed and exhibited in the Ashmolean Museum, with which the thought of Beazley, the gracious genius loci, is for me, as for many others, inseparably associated. I shall say nothing of the interesting group of Greek inscriptions in Pusey House, nor of the large collection of Latin inscriptions in the Ashmolean, and shall, in the interests of brevity, confine myself in the present article to the Greek inscriptions which were in the possession of the University in 1763, leaving to a future occasion some remarks on the considerable accessions made since that date.

The history of the collection has already been told more than once and need not here be repeated in any detail. Its foundation dates, for practical purposes, in 1667, when Henry Howard (1628–84), sixth Duke of Norfolk, presented to the University all that remained in his possession of the ancient marbles acquired by his grandfather, Thomas Howard (1586–1646), second Earl of Arundel and Surrey, but sadly damaged and depleted during the Civil War and the Protectorate, when Arundel House was unoccupied by its royalist owners and irreparable harm was done to its contents. Fortunately John Selden and other scholars had paid close attention to some of the inscriptions on their first arrival in this country in 1627, and in the following year he published a selection of twenty-nine Greek and ten Latin inscriptions from Lord Howard's collection. In 1676 Humphrey Prideaux (1648–1724) published, at the instigation of Dr. John Fell, the first complete edition of the Oxford marbles as such. This was followed in 1732 by the voluminous compilation of Michael Maittaire (1668–1747), like Prideaux a member of Christ Church, which contains the texts of the inscriptions (though Maittaire thought it superfluous to collate them afresh) together with a mass of notes and comments, chiefly on the Parian Marble, by Selden, Price, Lydias, Reinesius, Spon, Chishull, Maffei, Bentley, Dodwell and other scholars. On a much higher level of accuracy and scholarship was the sumptuous work, published at Oxford in 1765, of Richard Chandler (1738–1810), Demy and later Fellow of Magdalen College, who travelled for the Society of Dilettanti in Asia Minor and Greece. In this he edited anew all the ancient marbles, sculptured or inscribed, at that time in the possession of the University, with illustrations of a considerable number of them. The book is divided into three parts, of which the first deals with 167 uninscribed marbles, the second with ten inscriptions in Egyptian, Cyprian and Palmyrene and ninety in Greek, and the third with 145 in Latin and other languages. Despite its excellence, Chandler's work suffered from two serious drawbacks; it was expensive and it was heavy and unwieldy. This led William Roberts, of Corpus Christi College, to issue in 1791 a cheap and portable volume, without illustrations or 'epigraphical' copies, devoted exclusively to the Greek

---

1 Published by T. B. L. Webster, JRS XIX. 150/2; cf. L. Robert, RE Juvenes, CII. 121.
2 See, e.g., A. Michaelis, Anient Marbles in Great Britain, 538/40, W. Larfeld, Greekische Epigraphik, 19, S. Chabert, Histoire sommaire des études d'épigraphie grecque, 33.
3 Marmora Arundelliana; sic saepe Graeci incisa, ex venerandis prioris Orientis glorios ruderibus . . . publicavit et commentario adjectis Ioannes Seidens J. C., London, 1628. Larfeld's description of the jurist and scholar John Selden (1584–1654) as Archbishop of Canterbury (Graec. Epigraphik, 19) is mistaken and probably rests upon a confusion with another eminent seventeenth-century benefactor of Oxford University, Gilbert Sheldon (1598–1677), who was Archbishop of Canterbury from 1663 to 1677.
4 Marmora Oxoniensia, Ex Arundellianorum, Seldenianorum, aliasque confixa, Recensuit et Perpetuo Commentario explicavit, Humphrius Prideaux Aedis Christi Alumnus, Oxford, 1676. This work incorporates a number of comments by John Selden and by Thomas Lydias, the chronologer.
5 Marmorum, Arundellianorum, Seldenianorum, aliorumque, Academiae Oxoniensis donatorum; Cvm Varia Commentariis & Indice, secunda editio, London, 1732.
6 Marmora Oxoniensia, Oxford, 1763.
inscriptions in the collection; this reproduces in a shortened form the contents of the corresponding section of Chandler's edition and comprises an introduction, inventory, texts, Latin translations and a full index.  

A new era in epigraphical study was reached when, in 1815, the Berlin Academy undertook the publication of a comprehensive Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum; August Böckh, a scholar of extraordinary ability and boundless energy, was appointed as editor, and B. G. Niebuhr, F. Schleiermacher, P. Buttmann and I. Bekker were chosen to assist him in his task. The first installment of the CIG appeared in 1825, and the work, in four large folio volumes, was completed in 1877, ten years after Böckh's death. In this Corpus all the Greek inscriptions published by Chandler naturally found their places, and it may be of interest to tabulate the concordance between Chandler’s numeration and that of the CIG, indicating the provenance of each inscription and the donor who presented it to the University. I follow here the order of the CIG rather than that of Chandler, so observing the geographical arrangement according to the provenance of each text. The donors are indicated as follows:

A = Arundel marble, presented in 1667 by Lord Henry Howard (see above).
D = inscription acquired by Dr. James Dawkins (1722–57), archaeologist and traveller, of St. John’s College, and presented after his death by his brother, Henry Dawkins.
P = presented by Henrietta Louisa, Countess of Pomfret (d. 1761), letter-writer.
R = presented by Dr. Richard Rawlinson (1690–1755), topographer and nonjuring bishop, of St. John's College.
S = presented by John Selden (see above).
V = Olim apud D. Vernon in aedibus suis non procul a Camalodino in Comitatu Essexensi, presumably acquired by Francis Vernon (1637–77), traveller, of Christ Church.
W = presented by Sir George Wheler (1650–1723), traveller and collector, of Lincoln College.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIG</th>
<th>Chandler</th>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>CIG</th>
<th>Chandler</th>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>CIG</th>
<th>Chandler</th>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>xxiv</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Attica</td>
<td>2864</td>
<td>xvi</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Miletus</td>
<td>3307</td>
<td>lxix</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Smyrna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>lv</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>3097</td>
<td>xxi</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Teos</td>
<td>3333</td>
<td>bxi</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>666</td>
<td>lvi</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>3098</td>
<td>lxii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3343</td>
<td>cxiv</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>lvii</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>3099</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3349</td>
<td>lxxvi</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>lvi</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>3110</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3351</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>lvi</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>3111</td>
<td>lxxvi</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3357</td>
<td>lxxv</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>lii</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>3112</td>
<td>lxxvii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3360</td>
<td>lxxvii</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>lii</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>3114</td>
<td>xcix</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3361</td>
<td>lxxviii</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>lxix</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3117</td>
<td>li</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3367</td>
<td>lxxvii</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>427</td>
<td>lii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3121</td>
<td>xxvi</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3369</td>
<td>lii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436</td>
<td>lii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3137</td>
<td>xxvii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3391</td>
<td>lxiv</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498</td>
<td>lii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3142</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3413</td>
<td>lxiv</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>lii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3143</td>
<td>li</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3414</td>
<td>lxii</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525</td>
<td>lii</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>3146</td>
<td>lxvii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3416</td>
<td>lxii</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>526</td>
<td>lii</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>3148</td>
<td>xlvii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3417</td>
<td>lxii</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>597</td>
<td>lii</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>3157</td>
<td>lxvii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3418</td>
<td>lxii</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607</td>
<td>lii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3158</td>
<td>lxvii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3419</td>
<td>lxii</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625</td>
<td>lii</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>3168</td>
<td>lii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3420</td>
<td>lxii</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>526</td>
<td>lii</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td>3172</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3421</td>
<td>lxii</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899</td>
<td>lii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3176</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3422</td>
<td>lxii</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1092</td>
<td>lii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3177</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3423</td>
<td>lxii</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1097</td>
<td>lii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3178</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3424</td>
<td>lxii</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>lii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3179</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3425</td>
<td>lxii</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1597</td>
<td>lii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3180</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3426</td>
<td>lxii</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607</td>
<td>lii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3181</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3427</td>
<td>lxii</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1692</td>
<td>lii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3182</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3428</td>
<td>lxii</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2254</td>
<td>lii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3183</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3429</td>
<td>lxii</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2256</td>
<td>lii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3184</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3430</td>
<td>lxii</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2256</td>
<td>lii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3185</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3431</td>
<td>lxii</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2666</td>
<td>lii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3186</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3432</td>
<td>lxii</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2275</td>
<td>lii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3187</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3433</td>
<td>lxii</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2285</td>
<td>lii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3188</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3434</td>
<td>lxii</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2287</td>
<td>lii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3189</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3435</td>
<td>lxii</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2374</td>
<td>lii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3190</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3436</td>
<td>lxii</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2536</td>
<td>lii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3191</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3437</td>
<td>lxii</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2690</td>
<td>liii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3192</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3438</td>
<td>lxii</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2750</td>
<td>liii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3193</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3439</td>
<td>lxii</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2750</td>
<td>liii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3194</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3440</td>
<td>lxii</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2750</td>
<td>liii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3195</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3441</td>
<td>lxii</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2750</td>
<td>liii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3196</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>3442</td>
<td>lxii</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Marmorum Oxoniensis Inscriptiones Graecarum ad Chandleri exemplar editis, Oxford, 1791 (reissued without change, 1887).
* For Vernon’s diary, which contains a large amount of epigraphical material, see B. D. Meritt, Hesperia, XVI.
* The donor of CIG 3288 was William Dennington, barrister-at-law, of CIG 3337 Sir Andrew Riccard, Alderman of London.
To the foregoing list we may add CIG 6894, an Arundel marble of uncertain provenance, omitted by Roberts because it occurs in Chandler's work among the Latin inscriptions, as being a bilingual epitaph in which the Latin text precedes the Greek.\textsuperscript{10}

Some misunderstanding has been caused by the fact that both Prideaux (pp. 287/307) and Maittaire (pp. 53/62, 90/98) added to their editions of the Oxford marbles an 'Appendix ad marmora Oxoniensia', in which a number of Greek inscriptions (34 in Prideaux, 29 in Maittaire) were published with transcripts and Latin translations. It has sometimes been assumed, not unnaturally and yet mistakenly, that all these also are in Oxford, whereas in reality only one, \textit{CIG 6841}, has ever been there (Prideaux, App. no. II, Maittaire, App. no. Cl.II, Chandler, XIII). Thus, e.g., \textit{CIG 2953b}, 3091, 3151, 3174 are described in \textit{CIG} as 'lapis Oxoniensis' or 'marmor Oxoniense', and T. Homolle discussed the first of these as a 'marbre d'Oxford' (\textit{BCH} II. 333/44; cf. the lemma of \textit{IG} XI. 631).

The inscriptions are drawn from a wide, though limited, field—Attica, Central Greece, the islands of Delos, Paros, Samos, and Crete, Asia Minor, Palmyra, and Rome; but the Peloponnesse, Boeotia, Northern Greece, Macedonia, Thrace, Syria, North Africa, and the western European provinces of the Roman Empire are not represented. One of the documents assigned by Böckh to Miletus (\textit{CIG} 2860) has been shown to be Delian in origin (\textit{Inscr. Delos}, 1425), and the provenance of a number of the stones remains uncertain. In subject-matter also the collection shows considerable variety, containing at least one representative of most of the principal classes of inscriptions—decrees, treaties, royal letters, honorary inscriptions, subscription-lists, ephebic and agonistic records, sacrificial calendars, inventories, dedications, emancipations, contracts, deeds of gift, epitaphs—while the Parian Marble, its most interesting member, may almost be said to constitute a class of its own. The five epigrams included are all re-edited in G. Kaibel, \textit{Epigrammata Graeca}, nos. 114, 241, 554, 866, 956. No archaic or fifth-century inscription is included in the collection; the earliest is the Attic decree (\textit{CIG} 87 = \textit{IG} II\textsuperscript{a}. 141) in honour of the Sidonian King Strato, passed shortly before the middle of the fourth century B.C. (see below).

Before the completion of the \textit{CIG}, the rapid influx of new inscriptions, due to intensive travel and excavation, had rendered its earlier volumes almost obsolete. Wisely rejecting the alternative suggestion of a series of supplementary volumes, the Berlin Academy resolved to start the undertaking \textit{de novo}, but to confine it to Europe. A number of separate \textit{corpora} were planned and to some extent published—Corpus \textit{Inscriptionum Atticarum, Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum Peloponnesi et insularum vicinarum, Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum Graeciae Septentrionalis}, etc.—but happily in 1906 these were combined under the single and convenient title of \textit{Inscriptiones Graecae (IG)}. Of this great work a large proportion has already been published, some of it (notably the Attic volumes) in a second edition, and other portions are in preparation, while others again have been undertaken independently of the Berlin Academy, under French (Delphi, Delos) or Italian (Crete) auspices. Thus almost all of the Oxford inscriptions of European provenance are now to be found in \textit{IG}, \textit{Inscriptions de Delos} or \textit{Inscriptiones Creticae}. These are shown on the opposite page.

To these editions of Oxford inscriptions in \textit{IG}, with their full bibliographies and carefully verified texts, there is little which need be added; but on a few of them I comment briefly.

\textit{IG} II\textsuperscript{a}. 141, the honorary decree for Strato of Sidon, has recently been republished, with some additional bibliographical references and a historical commentary, in my \textit{Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions}, no. 139. An excellent photograph of the stone appears in R. P. Austin, \textit{The Stoichedon Style}, pl. 11. For Cephiosdotus, mover of the decree, see E. Schweigert, \textit{Hesperia}, VIII. 11.

The famous Attic sacrificial calendar, \textit{IG} II\textsuperscript{a}. 1367, is discussed briefly by P. Stengel, \textit{Hermes}, LVII, 548/9, and in detail by P. Graindor, \textit{Athènes sous Hadrien}, 148/58 (with photograph,\textsuperscript{10} The lemma of \textit{CIG} 6894 is misleading, for 'inter marm. Oxon. II, xli' would naturally be understood as referring to Chandler's \textit{Marmora Oxoniensia}; the inscription is in fact found in Prideaux, p. 296, no. CL, in Maittaire, pp. 33, 89, no. XLII, and in Chandler, Pt. III, plate I. no. VII.
fig. 6), who claims it as Hadrianic. S. Dow deals with ll. 4/6 in his article on 'The Egyptian Cults in Athens' (Harv. Theol. Rev. XXX. 224/5). For a photograph see also P. Graindor, Album, pl. xxxv.

Of the ephic documents IG II². 167, 173, 2037, 2130 (Oxford fragment) photographs will be found in P. Graindor, Album d'inscriptions attiques, pl. xii, xv, xxxiv and lxv. Photographs of 1973 and 2130 (Athens fragments) are included in Kirchner-Klaßenbach, Imagines Inscriptionum Atticarum ², 30 no. 124 with pl. 46, 32/3 no. 140 with pl. 59, and of the latter also in J. Svoronos, Das Athenen Nationalmuseum, 617, 253 no. 1470 with pl. cx. — S. Dow comments on 1973.8/10 in Hesperia, III. 169, and J. A. Notopoulos assigns the list to A.D. 50/1—52/3 in Hesperia, XVIII. 25/6, 53. — For the form Ἐφόριος, used in 2037.1, see A. Wilhelm, Wien. Stud. LVI. 87. — Notopoulos dates 2104 in A.D. 171/2 (op. cit. 28/9, 53), and M. Crosby comments on the name Φίλοκτης in l. 8 (Hesperia, X. 21). — Of 2130 one large fragment, from the right-hand half of the stone, is in Oxford, while twenty-eight fragments are assembled in Athens. Notopoulos restores (op. cit. 45) l. 36 (in the Athenian portion), and J. P. Shear discusses, in connexion with a group of coins, the Κόρβιον of l. 69 (Hesperia, V. 313/4).

For IG II². 3765, on a headless herm, see A. Michaelis, Ancient Marbles in Great Britain, 584 no. 178, and J. H. Oliver’s publication of an inscription from the ‘Valerian Wall’ honouring the same youth (Hesperia, IV. 64/5).
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<td>6197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>13194</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>6530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2037</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>VII. 11</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>Inscri. Délos, 502</td>
<td>2266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2104</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>IX (1)</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>1527</td>
<td>2285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2130</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1607</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>2287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3012</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>1594</td>
<td>Inscri. Cret. III. 3. 4</td>
<td>2556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3674</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>XII (5)</td>
<td>2275</td>
<td>2374</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3765</td>
<td>427</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The four Attic epitaphs find their several places in the concluding section of IG II², finished by Kirchner very shortly before his death; to 8151 we may add Michaelis, op. cit., 575 no. 141, and to 13194 Michaelis, op. cit., 583/4 no. 117. Of CIG 6915, an epitaph of uncertain origin, the editor remarks ‘videtur Atticum esse’, but it has not been admitted to IG II².

IG VII. 11 is a member of a large group of Megarian honorary decrees passed within a few years of each other. M. Feyel, Polybe et l’histoire de Béotie, 85/93, argues in favour of assigning them to 239—229 B.C., rather than, as has hitherto been done by all scholars, to 307—285 B.C., seeing in the ‘King Demetrius’ named in them not Poliorcetes but Demetrius II.

Of the Delian inscriptions the most interesting is Inscri. Délos, 502, dated in 297 B.C. It served among the materials for P. H. Davis’s article on ‘The Delian Building Contracts’ in BCH LXI. 109/35, where its text ¹¹ was the object of special study on pp. 120/25; more recently M. Feyel has given a new restoration of ll. 8/12, which for the first time renders that passage intelligible (REA XLIII. 158/62). — IG XI. 1074, honouring Laodice, daughter of Seleucus IV and wife of Perseus of Macedon, has been re-edited in SIG 3 639 and in F. Durrbach, Choix d’inscriptions de Délos, no. 70. — To Delos I would also confidently assign a dedication on a marble seat of unrecorded provenance, appearing in CIG 6841 among the ‘inscriptiones incertorum locorum’. At one time among the Arundel marbles, it passed into the possession of the Countess of Pomfret, who gave it to the University. The comment in CIG runs thus:

¹¹ Davis was not quite accurate in describing it (p. 120) as ‘first published by August Boeckh as CIG 2266’. Prideaux remarked ‘Marmor in uiroque latere inscriptiones habet, sed in neutro ob vetustatem legendas’ (p. 276 no. cxii; cf. Maiskii, p. 504 no. clxviii); but S. Maffei while in Oxford attempted to read the inscription on the face of the stone and published the result in Museum Veronense, 441.

Chandler was more successful in Marm. Oxon., no. xliv.
'Smyrnæae Niconus vindicabat titulum parum probabiliter ob Dorismum. Ne Delo quidem tribuere, etsi titulis Deliacis similiorum.' But since those words were written our knowledge of Delian inscriptions has immensely increased in consequence of the fruitful excavation of the island by French archaeologists, and no one can, I think, examine the epigraphical section of P. Roussel, *Les cœurs égypitens à Délos*, or the dedications to the Egyptian gods collected in *IG XI*. 1215/72 (before 166 B.C.) and *Inscr. Délos*, 2047/74 (after 166) without being convinced that *CIG* 6841 should take its place among them. Very often among the Delian examples 'the priest' (of Sarapis) appears as the dedicant or in some other capacity; the word *χαριστήριον* recurs constantly (with *εὐχι* as a rare alternative) to describe the gift; moreover, the Delian Sarapiea A and B have yielded a considerable number of inscribed marble seats (*IG XI*. 1216/23, 1240, 1243, 1268/9).12 It may be objected that in the Delian Sarapiea dedications are normally made to Sarapis, Isis and Anubis (with the occasional addition of Harpocrates), while the Ashmolean seat the recipients are Isis, Osiris and Anubis. But this objection is not, I think, fatal, for gifts are offered to various deities singly or in pairs or triads, e.g. *Βασιλεύς Ὀσερις in IG XI*. 1248, Osiris in *Inscr. Délos*, 2052, Osiris and Isis in *IG XI*. 1233, Anubis in *Inscr. Délos*, 2043, and Roussel has pointed out (p. 279) that Osiris is one of the *σύννοι θεοί* in Sarapiea A, B and C, and that Osiris was occasionally confused with Sarapis (pp. 90, 112). The seat is described by Michaelis, *op. cit.* 561 no. 87.—I am not satisfied with the accepted text of *Inscr. Délos*, 1527.1. The stone has been damaged at the top left-hand corner since it was edited as complete by Pridaux (150/3 no. cxviii; cf. Maittaire, 25, 87, 478/81 no. xxvi). Chandler (no. xlii) read nothing in l. 1 before ΩΝ or in l. 2 before ΩΣ, and his copy shows one letter missing at the beginnings of ll. 3, 5, 6; traces are, however, still visible of Ε before ΩΕ in l. 2 and of the initial Π of l. 6. In l. 5 one letter only is lost before ΥΚΙΟΣ, and I should retain Λύκιος for the Latin Lucius (as in *CIG* 4716, 5942) rather than write Λ(ε)ύκιος. In l. 1 Pridaux gives ΜΑΡΚΟΝ (accepted by Chandler, Letronne and Strack), but Böckh (*CIG* 2285), followed among others by Dittenberger (*OGI* 133), Durrbach (*Choix d’inscriptions de Délos*, 106) and Roussel (*Inscr. Délos*, 1527), restored[Πολεός]μαρκον. I should accept Μαρκον (though the normal spelling at this time is Μάρκον) were it not that the letter preceding ΩΝ seems to me (and to Miss L. H. Jefferies, who examined the stone with me) to be Χ rather than Κ. But Πολεός could hardly have been crowded into the available space, and I prefer [Δή]μαρκον or [Τί]μαρκον. In *Inscr. Délos*, 1534 (where *Ἀθηναῖος* is a misprint for *Ἀθηναῖον*) we meet a Σίμαλος Τιμάρχον Σαλαμίνος. Of the Parian Marble, *IG XII* (5). 444, I need only say that bibliography and text have been brought up to date in *IG XII Suppl.*, p. 110, to which I would add Laqueur's interesting article in *RE* XIV. 1885/97 and my own brief account in the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, p. 539. In my *Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, no. 205, I re-edit that portion of the chronicle which relates to the years 400–323 B.C. The sole representative of Cretan is the early second-century treaty between Hierapytina and Priansus (*CIG* 2556), re-edited in 1942 by M. Guarducci in *Inscr. Cret.* III. iii. 4, with a full bibliography and commentary; add D. Levi, *Riv. Fil.* LIII. 214, H. van Effenterre, *La Crête et le monde grec*, 142/5, 156, 301. Of the three Roman epitaphs two, *IG XIV*. 1750 and 1966, recur in *IGR* I. 282 and 338; the former is described by Michaelis, *Ancient Marbles in Great Britain*, 580 no. 155, and represented by a photograph in F. Poulsen, *Greek and Roman Portraits in English Country Houses*, fig. 41 (opp. p. 65). *CIG* 9810, once in Rome, is not in *IG XIV*. I pass finally to inscriptions which have not appeared in *IG* or cognate works, either because they lie outside their scope or because the volumes in which they will find their places are not yet published. A greatly improved text of the Delphian proxeny-record *CIG* 1692 will be found in *SGDI* 2674; its date falls between 320 and 306 B.C. (G. Daux, *Chronologie Delphique*, 18 no. D7). 

*CIG* 2254, a letter of Lysimachus to Samos reporting his arbitration between that state and

---

Priene, has been collated and re-edited by C. B. Welles, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period, 46/51 no. 7*; to the bibliography we may add V. Bédard, *De arbitrio inter liberas Graecorum civitates, 55/7*, and M. N. Tod, *Sidelights on Greek History, 53/6*.

*CIG* 2750, found near Aphrodisias, is described by Michaelis, *op. cit.*, 586 no. 201. Of the eight inscriptions of Teos, all presented by Dawkins, 3098 and 3112 are examined by J. H. Oliver, *Hesperia, Suppl. VI*, 18 n. 14, as affording evidence for the Tean yapoues.14

The twenty-nine stones from Smyrna, most of them acquired there by W. Petty for Lord Thomas Howard, form the largest local group of the collection. Six of them are described by Michaelis, *op. cit.* (CIG 3212 = Michaelis, 573/4 no. 136; 3219 = 578 no. 149; 3254 = 587/8 no. 204; 3262 = 578/9 no. 150; 3333 = 577 no. 147; 3360 = 579 no. 152), and seven appear in *IGR IV* (CIG 3148 = IGR 1431; 3170 = 1436; 3191 = 1424; 3202 = 1420; 3204 = 1421; 3208 = 1432; 3357 = 1474). A full account of Smyrna's history and institutions down to A.D. 324 is given in C. J. Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna*, where the epigraphical evidence is fully utilised. — Of outstanding interest is CIG 3137, a treaty, probably of 244 B.C., republished in *OGI* 229. Cadoux gives a translation and commentary, *op. cit.* 118/27 (see especially 127 n. 1), 184/5; A. Wilhelm uses it for dating *SIG* 953 (*Anz. Wien, 1924, 139*); R. Laqueur offers an ingenious analysis of the document in *Epigraphische Untersuchungen, 110/15*; L. Robert quotes II. 6/12 in a discussion of the Delphic Soteria (BCH LIV. 328/9), cites 1. 85 in his treatise of Panta and the Panteenses (*Villes d'Asie Mineure, 186/9*), and identifies the Alexander of 1. 101 (*REA XXXVI*, 525), and F. W. Walbank cites 1. 11 for the third-century *δυναστεα* (*JHS LXII*, 9/10). Cf. also W. Ruppel, *Philol LXXIII*, 295/7, M. Rostovtzeff, *REA XXXIII*, 18.—For CIG 3148 see L. Robert, *Études anatoliennes*, 526, for 3208.10 *op. cit.* 68; 3191 is re-edited in *OGI* 514—3212 is briefly described (with a photograph) by A. J. Evans in *JHS XLI*, 257/8, and more fully in *Gladiateurs dans l'orient grec*, 206/7 no. 234, by L. Robert, who also comments (*Études anatoliennes*, 203 n. 5) on W. H. Buckler's new edition, accompanied by a photograph, of 3304 (*JHS LIV*, 75/7). — CIG 8855 is found in H. Grégoire's *Recueil des inscriptions grecques chrétiennes d'Asie mineure*, no. 74.

Of the five inscriptions from Cyzicus, Lampasus and Phocaea, all presented by Dawkins, CIG 3413 (Phocaea) and 3642 (Lampasus) reappear in *IGR IV* 1322 and 180 (16; 3683 (Cyzicus) is described by Michaelis, *op. cit.* 592 no. 236, and occurs in the epigraphical list of F. W. Hasluck, *Cyzicus*, 279 no. 66. With 3695, also from Cyzicus, I have recently dealt in *JAP LXX*, 114/5.

The bilingual dedication (CIG 4503 = Le Bas-Wadd. 257/1b) brought by James Dawkins from Palmyra, dated 24 January, A.D. 233, is published in *CISem II*, iii. 4031.

Finally, there is a group of twelve inscriptions (to which CIG 4183, there assigned to Pontus, must be added) of unknown provenance. Seven of these are described by Michaelis, *op. cit.* (CIG 6841 = Michaelis, 561 no. 87; 6893 = 589 no. 211; 6914 = 579/80 no. 154; 6915 = 579 no. 153; 6962 = 562/3 no. 91; 6975 = 575/6 no. 143; 7023 = 591 no. 221). CIG 6818 may belong to Teos, 6841 and 6915 I have above assigned to Delos, 6915 may well be Attic. — In the lemma of 6868, 'Maittair. n. 504' should read 'Maittair. p. 504 n. cl.' — For 6975 see E. Pfuhl, *JdI* XX. 127 no. 11. — In 7023 Chandler's text is repeated, but no reference is made to the additional line EIMI... T shown in Chandler, Part II, pl. VIII no. lxx.

Marcus N. Tod.

12 Welles notes (op. cit. 46 no. 1). 'I have been unable to learn the date of this discovery or to identify 'Mr Wood'. 'I quote the relevant facts from *The Concise Dictionary of National Biography, *WOOD, ROBERT* (1777—1777), traveller and politician; travelled in France, Italy; Western Europe, and Asia Minor, with John Bouverie and James Dawkins; published "Ruins of Smyrna", 1753, and "Ruins of Balbec", 1757; member of Society of Dilettanti, 1763; DAWKINS, JAMES* (1722—1757), archaeologist, and Jacobite; born in Jamaica; educated at St. John's College, Oxford; D.C.L., 1749; travelled on continent; assisted James Stuart (1713—1768) and Nicholas Revett in taking measurements of Greek architecture at Athens; *VOL. LXXI.*

13 In CIG 30875 I cannot accept Böckh's [rois ʃe]05, for *NEOΣ is quite clear and the preceding letter seems to be Κ, as read by Chandler. I suggest a double festival, i.e. *νονικας* and *Hephaistos* for *Hephaistos* at Teos see *SIG* 38.33."

14 On CIG 3333 Kaibel (*Epigrarammata Graecia, 241*) notes "I vel l a. Chr. n. sacelum produm litterae PK, unde falsa tradita est 0 forma". But this form of omega is used throughout the inscription, for the script of which see Michaelis, *loc. cit.*, where the monument is assigned to the first century B.C.

15 CIG 3642 = Ehrenberg-Jones, *Documents*, 129.
ATTIC VASES IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND

[Plates XXXIX–XLI]

A growing interest in the study of archaeology has led in recent years to very substantial developments in the several collections of antiquities in Australia and New Zealand. Pottery has perhaps made the greatest contribution to this expansion, and the total amount of available material here has reached a point at which definitive publication in the Corpus Vasorum has become well worth while. Provision for this has already been made, but in the meantime it seemed to me that some account of the Attic vases in this part of the world might be of service and interest to scholars, since our collections by reason of their remoteness are not well known, although they contain several distinguished pieces, including a few which have been lost to sight for some time. For the sake of brevity, and because they are likely to be of wider interest, I confine myself here to Attic black-figure, red-figure and white-ground.

The main Australian collection of Greek vases is housed in the Nicholson Museum at the University of Sydney. The nucleus of this collection was acquired, some 90 years ago, by Sir Charles Nicholson, Chancellor of Sydney University from 1854 to 1862, during his travels in Italy and was catalogued by Miss Louisa Macdonald in 1898. Considerable additions have since been made by gift or purchase, as may be seen from a comparison between the vases listed by Miss Macdonald and those mentioned in the second edition of the Handbook to the Nicholson Museum, published fifty years later.

The Australian Institute of Archaeology in Melbourne has a fine collection of pottery, but it is mostly prehistoric or Cypriot and does not fall within the scope of this article. Melbourne, however, has two other smaller collections—one, in the National Gallery, consisting largely of vases acquired by the late Professor Talbot-Tubb during his travels in Greece and Italy, but with nothing of great significance; the other, in the Classics Department of the University, comprising some twenty representative specimens of Greek pottery purchased as a memorial to John Hugh Sutton, who was killed in the first World War. Some of the better vases from the National Gallery have now been deposited on loan with the University to make their collection more representative for teaching purposes.

In New Zealand the most important collection is that of the Otago Museum, Dunedin. Until recently it contained comparatively few Greek vases, but in 1948 a generous gift enabled it to acquire the collection of Professor A. B. Cook of Cambridge as a memorial to the late Willi Fels, who during his lifetime had been one of the Museum’s chief supporters and benefactors. The gift also included a number of pieces of Greek sculpture formerly owned by Professor A. B. Cook, including the magnificent head which he believed to come from one of the Parthenon metopes (E 48, 218; JHS 1941, 6 ff.; Seltman and Chittenden, Greek Art, no. 156, pl. 37).

There are also a few Greek vases in each of the other main cities of New Zealand—at Christchurch, in the Canterbury Museum and in Canterbury University College, at Wellington in the Dominion Museum, and at Auckland in the War Memorial Museum.

With the exception of those in Sydney, few of the vases have been catalogued or published. Philippart in his Collections de Céramique grecque en Angleterre (Antiquité Classique IV, 210–11)

---

1 For facilities to study the vases in their respective collections and permission to publish them, I am deeply grateful to Professor C. A. Scutt (Melbourne University), Daryl Lindsay (National Gallery, Melbourne), Dr. H. D. Skinner (Otago Museum), Dr. R. A. Falla, Miss M. K. Steven (Christchurch), and Dr. G. Archev (Auckland); for help in many ways to Dr. H. K. Hunt of Melbourne University and Professor G. R. Manton of the University of Otago; and for a grant to enable me to travel to New Zealand, to the Research Committee of Sydney University. Much of the credit for the Nicholson Museum’s recent acquisitions is due to Mrs. Oakeshott, who has also supplied most helpful details and information about them. Lastly I should like to take this opportunity of thanking Sir John Beazley for his never-failing kindness to me over many years and particularly for his help and advice with the attributions of many of the vases here listed.

2 Miss Denise Dettmann of Victoria University College, Wellington, informs me that she will soon be returning there with a small teaching collection of Greek pottery, including a large number of fragments. One b.f. lekythos is included here; the rest will appear in due course in the CV.
ATTIC VASES IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND

gives a summary glance at the A. B. Cook vase-collection, now in Dunedin, and new acquisitions there have been from time to time published in the Annual Report of the Association of Friends of the Museum. The lists which follow include all the vases in the different groups here known to me: there may be a few minor pieces in private hands which have escaped my notice, but not, I think, very many.

I. Attic Black-figure

The early stages of b.f. are represented only by a horse-head amphora in Sydney:

Next comes an ovoid neck-amphora of the Sakonides-Lydos Group:
2. Sydney 13 (R 715). A. Bearded man watching two galloping horsemen. B. Two panthers. A. NMH. 273, fig. 58a; B. Pl. XXXIXa.

The subject of the reverse associates our vase with Athens 902 (Rumpf, Sakonides no. 60, pl. 276, d) and an amphora in the Kent Collection at Harrogate (Charlton, AJA 1944, 254, figs. 4–5), though the drawing is less precise and a rather formless floral has been substituted for the swan. Nearer still is Würzburg 169 (Langlotz, Gr. Vasen in W. pl. 30) which bears the same graffiti K below the design and a similar pattern upon the neck. The Sydney vase leads on to a consideration of the Kleinmeister cups, since our best example (Sydney 39) has already been assigned by Beazley to the hand of Sakonides.

Lip Cups

Band Cups
6. Sydney 49. 236. Fig. 1. A. Horse between two lions. B. Ram between two panthers. From the Fitzwilliam Sale, Christie’s Cat. 15 July, 1948, no. 13, 2. L. handle mended and restored.
7. Melbourne University V 13. Fig. 2. A. and B. Fight. Sotheby’s Sale Cat. 14 March, 1929, no. 72, pl. 2, 1. Right handle broken and repaired.

The Sydney Sakonides is to be most closely related with Munich 2165 (Rumpf, Sakonides, no. 2, pl. 286, d); see also Beazley, JHS 1932, 170–1) which bears the artist’s signature on the obverse and on the reverse the inscription χαρε και πιει τεσι, which appears on both sides of ours, as well as on other cups in Cambridge and the Vatican. The form πιει is probably to be explained as the normal imperative πιει combined with the deictic i. The other two lip-cups belong to the class with figure-decoration inside only (II)—the Canterbury cup has a good deal of repainting, especially on the Amazon’s flesh and tunic, and on the red of the two warriors’ shields and greaves. The Sydney band-cup is a charming and graceful piece with a slightly mannerist flavour about its decoration. Very near in shape and style, though less precise in its drawing, is B.M. B 393 (CV 2 III He, pl. 16, 9)—the animals on the Sydney vase seem of finer breed, with their fragile legs and slender necks. The Melbourne cup (on which the handle has now been restored) seems to be associated with those of the potter Glaucytus (JHS 1932, 187 and 200). The scenes on both sides are the same but for small variations of detail. Between palmettes springing out from the handles we are shown a fight, the supporters of each contestant ranged on either side. The field is full of pseudo-inscriptions—sometimes there is a real letter or two, mostly just signs that bear a faint resemblance to letters, but show that the painter felt inscriptions were a vital part of his decorative scheme.

* * *

* Referred to as Annual Report. The latest issues have been entitled Otago Museum—Annual Report, and a supplementary Bulletin has been issued annually to the Association of Friends.
* Vases in the Nicholson Museum are numbered according to Miss Louisa Macdonald’s Catalogue, with the earlier (1870) Reeve Catalogue number in brackets; pieces acquired since 1868 bear the Museum inventory number. The Nicholson Museum Handbook (2nd edn., 1948) is throughout referred to as NMH. All dimensions are given in centimetres.
* Cp. ἐς and ἐδιότ; see Brugmann-Thumb, Gr. Grammatik, 395.
A somewhat later cup,
8. Sydney 47. 03. I. Gorgoneion. A. and B. Eyes, with a ship beneath the handle. *NMHP*, 280, fig. 61. formerly in the Hope Collection (Tillyard, no. 72; later in the Cowdray collection at Duneeht, Sotheby’s Sale Cat. 2 Dec. 1946, no. 44), was originally published by Tischbein (iii, 60 = RV ii 322) with the ships transformed into something resembling butterflies, doubtless under the influence of the extensive repainting. This has been cleaned off to reveal beneath each handle a ship whose double-prow is due to the desire for a symmetrical design rather than to novelty in ship-construction, and whose sails are depicted conventionally as though seen spread out to the full from the side. The gorgoneion is partly reserved in the red of the clay, as is characteristic with cups of this style.

There are no examples of the work of any of the great b.f. painters here, though several of the later artists and many of the decorators of small vases are well represented. I give, therefore, only lists of the less distinguished b.f., grouped according to shape, with brief annotations where they seem called for.
Neck Amphorae


This is one of the best pieces of b.f. in Australia. The shape shows it to belong to the third quarter of the century and the careful drawing, with precise incision and neatly-rendered hair and beard, seems to place the vase somewhere near the Exekias Group.

10. Canterbury Museum 431.1. Pl. XXXIX c. Only the neck is preserved. A. Seated man between two standing men. B. Athlete between two men. Belongs to the Affected Group and is the work of the artist known as 'Elbows Out'.

Next come four neck-amphorae of the last quarter of the century, showing the influence of the new art of the time.


The vase has been recomposed from fragments, with clumsy repainting at the joins. The figures, however, show no signs of repainting, though much of the added white and red has now disappeared. Beazley has identified the amphora as a work of the Antimenes Painter. Comparison with the B.M. amphora B 232 (JHS 1927, 80, fig. 19) shows it to be a late work, with several of those features characteristic of the later style of the painter, notably the predominance of the Ionic chiton, the double-curve in the knee, and the new drapery system.


There are fragments of two more:

15. Canterbury Museum 431. o. Horses with a standing figure.

16. Sydney 32 (R 706). A. Heracles and Geryon. B. Silen and maenads. This vase, which appears as complete in the early catalogues, turned out to be composed of a few original fragments together with a great deal else that was either modern or taken from other vases.

Pelikai (with scenes in panels)


Hydriai (the main scene first, the shoulder scene after)

19. Auckland 12654. Pl. XXXIX d. Ht. 44-3. Judgment of Paris. Dionysus with maenads and silens. This was a fine vase of the Leagros Group, and it is unfortunate that during its transfer from the old museum to the new it should have met with an accident from which it has not recovered.

20. Dunedin E 48. 66, formerly in the collection of Sir Francis Cook at Richmond. Ht. 49. Chariot scene. Apollo playing the lyre in the presence of the gods. Strong. JHS 1908, p. 44, no. 75; Ant. Class. IV, 225; Greek Art, no. 72.


The last three vases are all a little later than the Auckland hydria, though they belong to the same general class, and may be dated ca. 520-500.

There are also in Sydney fragments of an interesting hydria of kalpis shape by the Acheloos Painter:


For details of its history I am indebted to Dr. Dietrich von Bothmer of New York. It first appeared in Sotheby's Sale Catalogue of 25 June, 1852, no. 155; later in the Forman Sale, no. 288 and as no. 142 in the Vente Hirsch, whence it seems to have passed into the Rothschild Collection. It was again sold at Sotheby's on 27 May, 1936 (no. 76) and reappeared in the exhibition of Greek Art at Edinburgh (no. 380). Messrs. Spink reported its destruction in 1944 as result of bomb damage, but a few fragments survived and these were acquired in 1946 by the
Nicholson Museum. They preserve part of the figured scene and show Heracles fighting an Amazon who has been forced to the ground, with portions of two other Amazons to r. and l. From a photograph of the vase taken before its destruction it may be seen that the picture was in a panel beginning at the neck-join and spreading out over the shoulder to just above the handles. Between the handles on a reserved band runs a b.f. ivy trail separated from the picture by a narrow band of black.

While dealing with the work of the Acheilos Painter, we may also look at a large lekythos in Sydney, which seems to be from his hand.


The subject gives us an unusual version of a well-known legend, since it shows Eurystheus about to step into the pithos and not actually inside it. The same treatment of the subject occurs on Syracuse 9677 (Haspels, ABL 55), which I have not seen, but which from the description seems very close to ours. For the shape we may compare the lekythos Palermo GE 1896. 2 (Haspels, p. 47, pl. 15, 4 and 20, 2), noting the same sharp slope taken by the body below the picture where it meets the foot and the seven palmettes upon the shoulder. Another lekythos of the 'compromise' shape, though somewhat more slender, is:


With it we may compare for shape Syracuse 20539 (Haspels, p. 49), for the subject and its treatment, many of the lekythoi listed by Miss Haspels on p. 50.

From these two we may turn to glance briefly at the remaining b.f. lekythoi, which, as perhaps might be expected, comprise nearly half the total of b.f. here. The earliest is:

26. Dunedin E.48. 258, from the A. B. Cook collection. Ht. 17. Panther and deer. The mouth has been restored.

From the shape and decoration it may be assigned to the Dolphin Class (Haspels, ABL pp. 14, 193 f.), standing near to Syracuse 11398, with lotus flowers and buds upon the shoulder. To the group of the 'Arming' lekythoi (Haspels, pp. 65 and 201) of the Phanyllis Class belongs:

27. Melbourne, National Gallery 80, from Cancell. Ht. 23. Warrior with round shield between two women and two men. On the shoulder upright palmettes (cf. Haspels, pl. 20, 5). With it we may compare a lekythos in Taranto (CV pl. 13, 2–3).

To the same general class, but to the 'Hoplite-leaving home' group, belong two lekythoi, almost identical in design,


and

29. Sydney 48. 11, from Athens. Ht. 16.6 (mouth broken off). Fig. 3a.

Both show 'hoplites leaving home' and are virtually identical with two lekythoi in Copenhagen (CV pl. 109, 7–8; Haspels, p. 205). The Sydney lekythos has three-leafed palmettes on the shoulder.

Not far away from these is a lekythos recently acquired in Athens by Miss Dettmann:

30. Wellington, Victoria University College. Two youths holding a cup between two men.

To the Gela Painter belongs:

31. Dunedin E. 48. 252, from the A. B. Cook Collection. Ht. 24.5. Chariot. The shoulder shows the characteristic three palmettes with a bud on each side (Haspels, 208; division IIIa). It is one of the painter's later and less careful works.

To the Marathon Group and, in particular, the Class of Athens 581, may be assigned:

32. Melbourne University V15. Fig. 36. Ht. 20.5. Heracles and the lion. Very close in shape, decoration and style to Athens 579 (Haspels, 224, pl. 31, 3).
ATTIC VASES IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND

34. Dunedin E 48. 247, from the A. B. Cook Collection. Ht. 15. Two riders. Slighter work.

Two lekythoi may be placed among the 'hound and hare' group of the companions of the Sappho Painter (Haspels, 118 and 230):

38. Sydney 49. 07. Fig. 3c. Ht. 14½. Single combat between two onlookers.

Both have the hound and hare on the shoulder. Probably here also belong the shattered remains of a lekythos in Christchurch, but it is hard to be certain owing to its very ruined state:


Next, a group of vases near to the Haimon Painter, associated with whom, as Miss Haspels points out (ABL, 137), are numbers of careless mass-produced lekythoi. The first three are nearer to the painter himself than the last three, which are hack products of his workshop.

40. Dunedin E 48. 75, from Episcopi, Cyprus, by exchange with the University of California (8/301b). Fig. 44. Ht. 17. Chariot scene.
41. Dunedin E 48. 76. Fig. 4c. Ht. 19½. Chariot scene, similar to above, but on white ground.
42. Dunedin E 48. 251, from Athens, ex A. B. Cook Collection. Fig. 4a. Ht. 20. Peleus and Thetis.
44. Dunedin E 48. 248, from the A. B. Cook Collection. Fig. 4d. Ht. 18½. Chariot with Athena.
45. Dunedin E 48. 249, from the A. B. Cook Collection. Fig. 4b. Ht. 20. Odysseus and two companions beneath the rams. Ant. Class. IV, 210.

With these we may also group as Haimonian in style three cup-skyphoi:

The first two are very similar in shape, style and decoration; the third is smaller and deeper, with the figures on a comparatively narrow zone between the handles, and belongs to the latest Haimonian period.

A few more figured lekythoi, late in date, deplorable in style, and for the most part in a bad state of preservation, which makes attribution difficult:

52. Wellington, Dominion Museum. Dionysus on donkey and symposium.
54. Sydney 106. Chariot scene. Broken, with the design almost completely effaced.

Lastly, two lekythoi with palmette designs, the first on white ground from the workshop of the Beldam Painter (Haspels, pp. 181-6), the second on red ground and much cruder.

57. Melbourne, National Gallery 152. Ht. 15.

The remaining b.f. vases show little of interest.

Olpai

60. Dunedin E 48, 259, from the A. B. Cook Collection. Ht. 20. Silen carrying off maenad. Crude and late work.

Skyphoi

63. Sydney 46, 61d (fragment). Sphinx, man and woman. NMH, fig. 53b.
64. Sydney 47, 16, formerly in the Sir Francis Cook Collection, Richmond. A. and B. Combats between sphinxes. Ant. Class. IV, 225.

Beazley informs me that the first two belong to his group of CHC skyphoi (see Some Attic Vases in the Cyprus Museum, 22-3), and that the fragment also belongs to this group, but is by a different painter. The fourth is closely related in style but has suffered greatly at the hands of the repainter. Somewhat in the same style is the decoration on two kyathoi, both from the Fitzwilliam Sale (Christie's Cat. 15 July, 1948, no. 14) and both ill-preserved with a good deal of restoration.

65. Sydney 48, 253. Dionysus on a donkey between sphinxes and eyes.
66. Canterbury University College 2. Dionysus on a donkey with maenads and silens.

Three late cups, similar in shape and style:

67. Auckland 3771. Fig. 5. I. Silen. A. and B. Two horsemen between seated figures. Under the handles, dolphins.
68. Dunedin E 48, 228, from the A. B. Cook Collection. I. Destroyed. A. Heracles and an Amazon between two sphinxes. B. Amazonomachy between two riders.

Beazley kindly informs me that the Auckland cup belongs to his Leafless Group and is by the Whitworth Painter (the painter of Manchester 16938 and some fragments from Perachora) and that the Dunedin cup belongs to the Caylus Group.

Oinochoai

71. Dunedin E 28, 86, from Taranto, by exchange with the University of California (8/4183). Ht. 19-5. Women seated between youth with lyre and silen. Restored with some parts missing.

* For b.f. olpai, see in particular Haspels, ABL, 59 ff. and H. R. W. Smith, CV, San Francisco Collection, text pp. 31-2.
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Fig. 4.—Haimonian Lekythoi in Dunedin.

Fig. 5a.—Auckland 3771.

Fig. 5b.—Auckland 3771.
II. Attic Red-figure

Red-figure before the fifth century is not represented, and our earliest examples are a few cups, for the most part later works of the great archaic cup-painters.

Cups

75. Sydney 46. 40, from Vulci. Plate XLa. I. Woman spinning wool. Gerhard pl. 302–3, 3-4; Burlington Cat. 1903, G 15, pl. 89; NMH 295, fig. 69; ARV 953, where attributed to the Eucharides Painter, no. 57 bis.

76. Dunedin E 39. 108. I. Youth. A. and B. Symposium. ARV 955, where attributed to the Antiphon Painter (‘seems from the photographs to be by the painter himself’), no. 51 bis. The foot is modern; there is a good deal of restoration and repainting and the upper part of A is missing.

77. Sydney 40 (R 866). I. Seated youth fluting. ARV 252, no. 106, where attributed to the Brygos Painter. Parts of the design have been restored. Late work.


The Sydney Eucharides cup (Pl. XLa), formerly in the Mallet collection in London, is a graceful and charming piece, which must be accounted among this painter’s best efforts in the field of cup-painting. It represents a young woman, wearing an Ionian chiton, seated upon a high-backed chair, her cloak wrapped around her middle and over her lap. Before her is a wool-stand, with a mass of wool on the supports at the top; she holds the distaff in her left hand and from it draws a long thread with her right. In the field is the inscription KALOЅ, originally painted in white, but now barely visible.

The Antiphon and Brygos cups are both ruins, with a good deal missing and much restoration or repainting on what is there. The former shows in the less damaged interior a youth, with the inscription HOPHAIЅ in the field, and suspended in the foreground the athlete’s vade-mecum, an oil-flask and two strigils. The youth to r. on A is a weaker version of one of the young athletes on the Berlin stand (FR, pl. 162, 1).

Not least among the pleasures of vase-hunting in the Antipodes is the unexpected discovery of some vase that has long been lost to sight. Great was my satisfaction therefore to find in the Canterbury Museum in Christchurch the fragments of a cup by Douris, known and published last century but thereafter lost. The cup in question seems to have made its long journey to New Zealand some sixty years ago in an exchange with the museum at Florence for some local material of ethnographical interest, but the precise circumstances have gone unrecorded. Professor Martin Robertson has recently (JHS 1946, 123–5) discussed the Canterbury cup in relation to another vase, similar in style and sentiment, also belonging to the artist’s later period (ARV 291, no. 185). The Canterbury fragments (Pl. XLb–d) preserve nearly all the tondo; there is a small triangular fragment missing to the l. of the boy’s head, and a good deal of repainting along the joins. The inscription HIKET[ES]KALOЅ was painted on in purple red, the two lost letters were in the missing piece beside the boy’s head. The design shows a youth, nude save for a himation draped over his arms and behind his back, being embraced by a girl. His left hand rests on top of a knotty stick, with his right he gestures in the direction of a couch, of which part of the back and the right leg is visible. On this we note the same Ionic volute decoration as on the couches in the symposium scenes on the exterior and on that in the vase figured by Robertson. To right is a closed door with a stool in front of it. The exterior unfortunately has suffered considerable damage and the significant parts have mostly gone; the whole vase must have been one of Douris’ more attractive later pieces, to be dated not far from 480 B.C.

7 At the time of writing the whereabouts of the vase were unknown to Robertson, but it has subsequently been located by Miss Richter in a private collection in Paris and published by her in JHS 1949, 73, fig. 1.
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From the Early Classical period there are a further three cups, all in the Otago Museum.

79. Dunedin E 39, 107. Fig. 6. I. Two youths. A. and B. Seated youth between two standing youths. *Annual Report* 1939–40, p. 4; *ARV* 962, where attributed to the Splanchnopt Painter, no. 9 bis. Some repainting, especially along joins and on the feet of the youths inside.

80. Dunedin E 28, 82, by exchange with University of California (8/931). Fig. 7. I. Two youths conversing. A. and B. Boys with horses. The foot is modern and has been riveted on. Some repainting, especially on B. *ARV* 962, no. 3 bis, where assigned to the manner of the painter of Bologna 417.

81. Dunedin E 48, 292, from the A. B. Cook Collection. Fig. 8. I. Dionysus and a silen, with maenads and satyrs around. A. Man and woman, man and woman and silen conversing. B. The like. Restored from fragments with considerable repainting. *Ant. Class.* IV, 210. Attributed by Beazley to the Orchard Painter.

The first two cups are characteristic products of the workshop of the Penthesilea Painter. That by the Splanchnopt Painter is by far the better of the two; the scenes on the exterior seem to be associated with school-life (cf. Würzburg 488, Langlotz, pl. 156; *ARV* 590, no. 10), on one the seated youth is holding up his writing-tablets and the boy beside him a school-bag; on the other, one of the boys carries a flute-case. All three scenes bear the inscription in applied red Ὅ ΠΑΙΣ ΚΑΛΟΣ, though in the interior it is misspelt, the artist having repeated the last three letters of νας instead of those of καλός. The other vase is dull and ill-drawn, with a horse scene dear to the hearts of Penthesileans. It is a pity that the third vase is so ill-preserved, as conventional and expressionless though the painting may be, the Orchard Painter seems to have included very few cups (none are listed in *ARV*) among his works.

Most of the Early Classical r.f. vases out here are the works of those minor artists of the period who specialised in the decoration of small lekythoi and call for little comment.

**Lekythoi**

82. Dunedin E 30, 202. Ht. 17. Athena seated, holding helmet in her l. hand. *Annual Report* 1930–1, p. 3, no. 2; *ARV* 208, 4, near to the painter of Palermo 4, with some repainting, especially on the l. shoulder of Athena.


89. Dunedin E 48, 339, from the A. B. Cook Collection. Ht. 21. Nike with sash, flying to r. *Ant. Class.* IV, 210; *ARV* 514, no. 77, where attributed to the Carlsruhe Painter, though included in error among his white-ground vases instead of r.f.


91. Sydney 48, 13, from Athens. Ht. 19 1/2. (Mouth broken off) Maenad, with torch and thyrsus.


The last lekythos listed above, which was found in Athens in April 1927, is of the comparatively rare class which has the decoration on the shoulder and leaves the body plain except for meander-bands top and bottom. It has been recomposed from fragments but nothing is missing save for most of the handle and a largish piece of the body immediately below it, though there is a good deal of repainting on the meanders, the palmettes besides the handles, and on the drapery of the two figures. The scene represents a maid holding a box and standing before her seated mistress, who points rather imperiously with her right hand at a wool-basket on the floor in front of her.

The three remaining vases of this period are of greater interest. Two are column-kraters:

93. Sydney 42 (R 701). A. Citharode with three listeners. B. Men and boys. *ARV* 959, where attributed to the Pan Painter as no. 11 bis, correcting the entry on p. 381; *NMH* 299, pl. 7; *The Canon*, Aug. 1939, p. 14, pl. 1.

This is a work of the Pan Painter's mature period, similar in subject to his panathenaic amphora in New York (20. 245, *ARV* 363, no. 23; Richter and Hall, no. 66), and representing
a citharode, head held high as he sings in accompaniment to the strains of the carefully drawn kithara, which he strikes with the plectrum held in his right hand. From the instrument hangs down its decorated cover, ending in a fringe. Grouped around him are three figures, to left a bearded man leaning on his stick and listening with apparent interest, to right two well-draped youths, one standing and the other seated, muffled up in his cloak. The vase has been broken and there are a few small pieces missing, though nothing of moment.

93 bis. Dunedin E 50. 198. Ht. 40:5. A. Damaged, the figure lost. B. Satyr. No frames to the pictures. By the Pig Painter.

The other vase is a small askos recently purchased at Sotheby's (Sale Cat. 21 Dec. 1948, no. 186):

94. Sydney 48. 260. Fig. 9. Women's heads.

It is a charming little piece, attributed by Beazley to the Painter of London D 12 (ARV 628 ff.), showing on each side the head of a young woman between ivy leaves. There are a good many more small askoi, mostly of later date and with animal decoration, which I list here for convenience.

Askoi

100. Sydney 41. A. and B. Silen.
101. Dunedin E 48. 285, from the A. B. Cook Collection. A. Sphinx and griffin. B. Lion with head moulded to serve as a spout. In the centre below the handle a strainer.

The r.f. vases of the second half of the fifth century are a mixed lot, a dozen or so of some interest either for their subject or by reason of their painter, the remainder mostly small pieces of a very minor character, the sort of inexpensive item which is acquired by the passing traveller and brought back home, to find its way in time into one of the local collections, if it does not vanish from sight altogether.

To begin with the larger or more important vases:

Nolan amphorae

103. Melbourne, Rev. J. S. Drought (on loan to the Nicholson Museum, Sydney). Ht. 30:1. A. Woman bidding farewell to man wearing petasos, about to set out on a journey. B. Draped youth. There is some repainting on the obverse, and the reverse is almost completely modern. From the shape and what can be seen of the style beneath the repaint the vase seems to belong to the Group of the Achilles Painter.

Calyx-krater


The vase has been mended and repainted along the break, especially on the head and shoulders of Persephone, and is a good example of the work of one of the painters of the Polygnotan Group (cf. ARV 698–9).

Column-krater

105. Sydney 46. 42. A. Symposium. B. Youths and woman. Greek Art, no. 98; The Canon, Aug. 1930, pl. 2, p. 15; NIM 2, pl. 8.

The scene represents four diners reclining on two couches, beside which are tables and a foot-bath. The pair to l. are making approaches to a hetaira, the youth in the centre (whose face has been chipped away) holds up a kylix after making his throw at cottabos, the fourth diner, a balding, bearded man sings to the accompaniment of his lyre. The vase is by the Naples Painter and seems from the description almost identical with ARV 706, no. 21.
Pelikai
106. Dunedin E 48. 220, from the A. B. Cook Collection. Pl. XLIh. Ht. 22. A. Boreas. B. Oreithyia
AR 1845, pl. 31, 2. "In the manner of Polygnotus, and I thought by the painter himself" according to
Beazley in a letter to its former owner.
B. Maid. ARV 801, no. 16, where assigned to a group of vases in the manner of Aison, and perhaps
even from his hand.
108. Melbourne, National Gallery 861/2, from Cyrene. Ht. 16-1. A. Two women standing beside a
square box. B. The like.
B. Youth. Bad state of preservation, with a good deal of incrustation.

Hydria
110. Dunedin E 48. 221, from the A. B. Cook Collection. Ht. 18-3. Two women, one with sash.
Oinochoai

112. Melbourne, National Gallery 80 S, from Cancelli. Ht. 16-6. Woman with scarf running to l.

Stemless Cups

114. Sydney 58 (R 739), from Cervetri. I. Nude youth. The surface is badly worn.

Oinochoe (shape 3)

115. Melbourne University V 19. Pl. XLIV. Ht. 21. Four boys with lyres. The vase has been recomposed from fragments and there is a large portion missing below the handle, as well as a good deal of repaint ing on most of the figures. Circle of the Meidias Painter.

Two other interesting late classical vases remain. One is the well-known hydria found in Attica and acquired by Professor Cook in 1933.


Cook (*Zeus III*, 99 ff.) discusses the interpretation of the scene in some detail, identifying the woman to l. as Eurydice and the one to r. as the Pythia. The main theme occurs again on a late fifth-century cuv in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, attributed by Beazley to the Painter of Ruvo 1346 (*ARV* 859, no. 1; *JHS* 1921, pl. 12; *Ant. Class IV* pl. 27, 1), but here we have a visitor to the shrine shown busily noting down upon his tablets the oracles uttered by the prophetic head. The Dunedin vase has been considerably restored (especially the middle of Eurydice’s himation, part of Apollo’s body and of the Pythia’s drapery). It belongs to the late fifth century and has recently been assigned by Beazley (*EVP* 40, under no. 7) to the same hand as a hydria in Paris owned by M. Chapouthier (*BCH* 1942–3, pl. 1–2), representing Leda and the Egg.

The other vase is a two-row calyx-krater which I recently discovered in fragments in a cupboard in the basement of the National Gallery in Melbourne. Thanks to the kindness of the Director I was able to bring it back with me to Sydney, where it has been pieced together; a good deal of the reverse is missing. Of its earlier history I have been able to find out nothing beyond the fact that it was acquired by the Melbourne Gallery in 1933.


Two-row calyx-kraters are not very numerous. Jacobsthal, in his study of the New York Nekyia krater, listed some 40 (*Metr. Mus. Stud. V.*, 1934, App. III, pp. 136–40); to these may be added the Cassel Painter’s krater formerly on the Paris market (*ARV* 674, no. 9) and the Dinos Painter’s Prometheus krater in Oxford (*ARV* 790, no. 11), together with a few more fragments (Villa Giulia Pfr., Palermo (1817) *ARV* 401, no. 12; manner of the Niobid Painter, Athens Agora P 104, 110, 2223, *ARV* 424, no. 5; Phiale Pfr., Florence PD 29, 31–3, *ARV* 655, no. 50; Polygnotus Group, *ARV* 700, nos. 77–8; fragments from the Agora Excavations, P 44 (*Hesperia* VI, 48–9, figs. 27–8) and P 14321 (above, feet; below, bull)). The new vase must be one of the latest of the series, with a date not far from the end of the 5th century. In style and shape it recalls the two-row calyx-krater in Agrigento by the Giudice Painter (*ARV* 844, no. 2), to which it stands very close.

There follow the small vases of the later fifth and early fourth centuries. They call for little comment; I put first the earlier and better pieces.

Choes

119. Sydney 46. 49. Ht. 6-6. Girl with patera running to r., preceded by a Maltese dog. To l. a table with cakes. Sotheby’s Sale Cat. 14 May 1946, no. 48; *NMHP* 306, fig. 76, where both are published.

Small squat lekythoi

120. Canterbury Museum AR 430. 2. Ht. 6 (top broken off). Ducks feeding.
125. Sydney 54 (R 733). Ht. 11.3. Woman with box.

**Hydriai**

130. Sydney 50 (R 742). Ht. 17.4. Two women.

**Pelike**


**Owl skyphoi**

133. Melbourne, National Gallery 80 R, from Cancellio. Ht. 8, diam. 10.2.
135. Christchurch, Dr. Broadhead. Ht. 9, diam. 10.5.
136. Dunedin E 48. 257, from the A. B. Cook Collection. Ht. 8, diam. 9.5. See *Zeus* III, 786. There is also in Dunedin (E 48. 354) an interesting Etruscan imitation of an Attic owl vase (Beazley, *EVP* 200, D2; *Zeus* III, fig. 582), and a cup-skyphos (E 48. 368; see *EVP*, 201) with owl-and-olive decoration. On owl vases in general see in addition to the references above: Toronto Cat. 373 ff.; *AJA* 1934, 420; Graef, *Ant. V.* ii 47, nos. 529–37; Beazley, *CV* Oxford 4, text p. 114, pls. 48, 9; 62, 1; Hespels *ABL*, 187–8.

The fourth-century styles are very poorly represented. Best of the early fourth century vases is the recently acquired bell-krater:


It has been fully discussed by Pryce in *JHS* 1936, p. 77, who has shown the obverse design to be an illustration of Bacchylides xviii, describing the arrival of Theseus in Attica. To I. are Athena and Poseidon, in the centre Theseus is shown seated behind the altar of Zeus Meilichios, and to I. are his two companions Phorbas and Peirithoos. The vase seems to me almost certainly by the hand of the Oinomaos Painter, as Beazley (*ARV* 879) had suggested was probably the case.

Another bell-krater


is clearly to be attributed to the Retorted Painter and may be added to Beazley’s list (*ARV* 877) as no. 6 bis, being very near in style and subject to his nos. 6 and 7, to judge from the publications.

There are two other vases from this period, both in a bad state of preservation.

**Lebes gamikos**

139. Sydney 59 (R 756). Ht. 16.6. A. and B. Women; beneath the handles, winged figures. Typical of the hack work of the time.

**Pelike**

140. Sydney 44 (R 784). Ht. 23.7. A. Amazon attacking griffin. B. Two drapery youths.

The pelike belongs to the period immediately preceding the development of the Kerch style, which is represented by two hydriai:

142. Sydney 43. Ht. 29.1. Maenads and silens. This vase has been restored from fragments and a good deal is missing, but originally it was a good piece, ca. 350–40.

There are few significant r.f. fragments; the best are in Dunedin, from the A. B. Cook collection:

143. E 48. 347. Fragment of the rim of a bell-krater, showing the head of a youth, with a petasos slung over his shoulder. In the manner of the Boston Phiale Painter.
144. E 48. 348. Fragment of a calyx-krater, showing a symposium. Late fifth century.
III. White-ground Vases

These are mostly lekythoi, many already listed in ARV, and call for no detailed remarks.

**Oinochoe**

146. Dunedin E 29. 7. *Annual Report* 1928-9, p. 4. Decoration in b.f. on a white panel with a band of red above. Ht. 15. Centaur with branch running r. and looking back to l. Cat. 500 B.C.

**Alabastron**


**Lekythoi**


152. Dunedin E 36. 281. Ht. 38. Woman and warrior beside a stele on which stands the figure of a small boy. *JHS* 1936, 236, fig. 1 and pl. 14; *Annual Report* 1935-6, p. 2. Glaze outlines. School of the Achilles Painter. For the representation of sculptured groups on lekythoi see Beazley *AWL*, p. 20.


154. Sydney 47. 20. Ht. 27.2. Bearded man and woman at tomb. Only the figure of the man remains in any detail; the stele and all but the head and foot of the woman is missing. *NMHP* 313, fig. 79; *Proc. Class. Assoc. N.S.W.* 1947, pl. 2. Glaze outline. By the Thanatos Painter.


157. Auckland 12695. Ht. 24. Woman and youth at stele. The vase has been broken and badly repaired, though little of the actual design, apart from the lower part of the youth, has been damaged. The woman holds a box and a plethochoe in her hand. Matt outline.


159. Sydney Wq. Ht. 48.2. Seated and standing woman at a stele crowned by acanthus leaves. *Union Recorder*, 15 May 1941, p. 65, 3; *The Studio*, April 1946, p. 117; *NMHP* 315, pl. 9b; *ARV* 839, no. 24 bis, where attributed to the Triglyph Painter.

The remaining four lekythoi are very badly preserved and have lost nearly all the details of their decoration.


161. Sydney 48. 15, from Athens. Ht. 26.5. Two women at a stele. Traces of added white. The small vent-hole above the foot shows it to have been a false-bodied lekythos (see Haspels, *ABF* 129).

162. Sydney 48. 16, from Athens. All that remains are traces of a figure wearing a bright red cloak.

163. Dunedin E 48. 370, from the A. B. Cook collection. Ht. 31. Two figures beside a stele, the one to l. holding out a flat basket, to r. wearing a deep red cloak.

A. D. TRENDALL.

*The colourful alabastron Dunedin E 48. 254 (from the A. B. Cook Collection), representing a youth and a girl at a stele, is modern.
AMONG the fairly numerous Boeotian kantharoi with decoration in applied white on black there is a small class of mid-fifth century date, some painted with a garland only, others with figures. My husband drew attention to this small group nearly forty years ago when discussing the undecorated black kantharoi of this shape found at Rhitsona. He knew three vases with figures. The first was the well-known kantharos in Brussels published originally by Graindor and now appearing again in the third fascicule of the Belgian section of the Corpus Vasorum. On each side is a σκευοφόρος carrying on his shoulder a yoke from which two baskets are suspended. The painter has shown us the contents of one of the baskets. It is a consignment of pottery—two kantharoi, six kylikes, and two plates are visible. The vase thus provides an apt illustration of the ψιλοτροφία that the Boeotian in the Acharnians might have taken back from Athens and of the sycophant’s uncomfortable mode of travel. The second, in the Römisch-Germanisches Museum in Cologne, shows a hoplite advancing. The third, in the British Museum, with a large head of Athena, cocks, and hens, is figured on Plate XLII, a—b. To these three there is now a fourth to be added, a kantharos acquired by Reading University in 1938 and said to have come from near the Theban Kabeirion (Plate XLII, c—d). On one side is a reclining figure with enormous head and diminutive body, holding in his left hand a sceptre or branch and extending his right hand, where a bird perches on his finger. On the other side is Hermes in a traveller’s hat and short cloak, leaning on a stick in the familiar pose of an ‘onlooker’. Behind him is a large caduceus, its stem apparently sprouting (Fig. 1). The reclining figure is grossly caricatured; the Hermes, like the σκευοφόρος in Brussels, is moderately grotesque. I have no detailed information about the Cologne hoplite as the vase is not yet accessible.

Kantharoi of this shape were found at Rhitsona in graves 76, 139, and 123. In grave 76, the earliest of these graves, there were three in company with one taller black kantharos, an early example of the kind that was prevalent in 424 B.C., and with two skyphoi of different kinds but both in the manner of the Haimon painter. Miss Hespels, on the strength of the black-figured vases, dates the grave in the second quarter of the fifth century; the excavators, on the basis of the black glaze vases, which are clearly earlier than 424 though not very far from

---

1 P. N. Ure. Black Glaze Pottery from Rhitsona 39 n. 1.
2 REA VII (1903) 325 f. pl. V.
3 Cinquantenaire A1893, CV Brussels III III G pl. 5. 2 a and b.
4 See the drawing op. cit. 5.
5 Aristophanes Ach. 900 f.
6 Inv. 22160; formerly in the Wallraf-Richartz Museum, no. 57.
7 Inv. no. 1907. 5—18. 3. Height to rim 0.15 m. My thanks are due to the Trustees of the British Museum for permission to publish this vase.
8 Inv. no. 98. iv. 9. Height to rim 0.145 m.
9 The white paint has flaked off the right arm and the boot flaps of Hermes and off a good deal of the caduceus.
10 For ‘onlookers’ see Hespels ABL p. 151.
11 I am much indebted to Professor A. Rumpf and also to Dr. Frensmedt, Director of the Römisch-Germanisches Museum, Cologne, for very kindly searching out all the information available about this vase.
12 See Wolters-Bruns Das Kabinenheiligtum bei Theben passim.
13 CV Brussels III 5 where this provenance is queried.
14 Ure Sixth and Fifth Century Pottery from Rhitsona 36.
15 Id. Black Glaze Pottery pl. IX 8 and two others not figured, see the grave catalogue ibid. 40.
16 Ibid. pl. IX 7. For the shape of kantharos predominant in the polychromy of the Thebians who fell at Delium in 424 B.C. cf. no. 7 from the Rhitsona grave 123 Sixth and Fifth pl. X.
17 ABL 189.
that year, date it, together with the slightly later grave 139, in the decade 440–430 B.C. A compromise on the middle of the century will not be far out for the date of grave 76 and the floruit of this kantharos shape, though the single example of it buried in grave 123 shows that it survived into the last quarter. The subjects of the paintings are, if we except the hoplite of the Cologne vase, somewhat unusual. The Brussels σκουφόρος has been dealt with elsewhere. The British Museum vase with a burlesque head of Athena, helmed, with snake-like hair and snakes on the shoulder that may spring from an unseen aegis, associated with a family of cocks and hens, each on its own plinth, cannot to my knowledge be paralleled on Boeotian ware. In Attic we find cocks in company with Athena Polias on a lekythos by the Athena painter in Buffalo. The same painter repeats the head of the Polias, accompanied by an owl, on a lekythos in Dresden. For cocks on stelai or altars a parallel is to be found on a lekythos by the Athena painter in Athens where we have not merely a cock standing on an altar or plinth very similar to that facing Athena on the London kantharos but also two onlookers leaning on their sticks with arms akimbo in much the same pose as the Hermes of the Reading kantharos. The large heavy caduceus of Hermes, however, does not resemble those of the Athena painter, which are slender and light. Nearer to it is the caduceus on a peculiar lekythos in the Cabinet des Médailles, put by Beazley near the Beldam painter, which shows Hermes attacking a strange creature (Argus?). Such resemblances as these may be fortuitous, and there is no need to assume that the painter of these characteristically Boeotian kantharoi owed much to Attic influence.

The only figure provided with an inscription is the reclining dwarf of Plate XLII, d. We will for convenience call him a Kabeir from his resemblance to the reclining Kabeir on vases from the Theban Kabeirion, though they have neither sceptre nor bird. The inscription (Fig. 2) consists in the first place of six letters, retrograde. These, painted in thin paint, comfortably fill the available space, as will be seen from a glance at Plate XLII, d, but they are nevertheless immediately followed by five more letters, larger and coarser, in thick paint laid on with a heavy hand, crowding under the handle and finishing up in front of Hermes on the other side of the kantharos (see Plate XLII, c). There is a certain similarity in the two sets of letters. I suggest that the six thin letters nearest to the Kabeir constitute the original inscription, while the five thick letters, crowding under the handle and out the other side, are a correction of a faulty original added after the available space had been adequately filled. I imagine some such situation as this. A Theban vase-painter was commissioned to paint a Kabeir and to add the inscription χενχ, the word being written down in Ionic characters for him to copy. Kappa, omicron, and epsilon went well, but he boggled over eta (which he thought had no business to be there, being the spiritus asper) and he produced instead a nu. He tried again and produced an eta, still rather nu-like with the uprights on the slope and the crossbar cutting across at an acute angle. He finished with a large cursive sigma in the familiar three-stroke form. Then, it seems, someone else, dissatisfied with the spelling, took the vase from his hand and in thicker bolder lettering painted a more correct version. His first letter, kappa, was not very successful, looking rather like a digamma, but after this poor beginning omicron, epsilon, and eta were correctly and firmly made and he finished up with a four-stroke sigma. There was little room on the front of the vase for this second version.

---

18 Sixth and Fifth Bc.
19 See above p. 194.
20 AJA XLVIII (1944) 123 fig. 2.
21 Haspels ABL. pl. 45 2.
22 AM XXX (1905) 207 fig. 1.
23 E.g. Haspels op. cit. pl. 45 1.
24 CV II pl. 84 8, 9 and pl. 85 4 5.
25 Wolters-Bruns op. cit. pl. 8–9.
26 For an inscription painted to order cf. the kantharos fragment painted in white with the dedication in Ionic lettering . . . χενχ, Wolters-Bruns op. cit. 54, no. 143.
The writer managed a rather cramped omicron under the handle, then turned the kantharos upside down to get the handle out of the way, and epsilon and eta were painted in this position. His last letter, sigma, was made in the course of turning the kantharos back to its normal position, with the result that the letter lies on its side. For the four-stroke sigma there are parallels on Kabeiric vases of approximately the same date as ours, but why the Ionic eta? The painter of the first inscription was an old-fashioned fellow who still did his lettering retrograde, an unlikely person to be in the van of the innovators who introduced the newfangled Ionic form, and it is plain that he had difficulties with it. From that we can gather that he was working from a copy of some sort and not spontaneously. A copy would be desirable if what he had to write was unfamiliar, and actually there is nothing to show that κόης was a word used in Boeotia. But we do know from Hesychius that κόης or κώς was a title of the priest of the Kabeiroi. Buckler and Robinson discuss this word in A.J.A. 1913 pp. 362 f. in dealing with the title κατις given to the priestess of Artemis at Sardis and connect it with the κωπευτις of the Kabeiroi at Didyma and the κώς of Hipponax. It can hardly be doubted that the κόης or κώς of Hesychius is in yet another form. The reclining monstrosity on the Reading vase looks more like a Kabeir than a priest of a Kabeir, but it must be borne in mind that Kabeiroi are not always Μύσιδες Διος but often appear as ministers of a greater deity and the title Koes may be in some cases the equivalent of Kabeirōs.

We do not know in what particular centre or centres of the Kabeiric cult the Koes functioned. Kern suggests Thessalonike and that may well be, but our vase shows that the title was already in use long before the founding of that city. Buckler and Robinson refer it to the much more famous Samothrace and we know from Herodotus and Aristophanes that initiates in the Samothracian mysteries were by no means uncommon at this period. The word may have been in use both in Samothrace and in other seats of Kabeiric worship in the islands and on the east coast of the Aegean. Facing the Kabeir on the reverse of the kantharos is Hermes, not inscribed, but identified by his large caduceus (Fig. 1). Hermes does not figure much on Boeotian Kabeiric ware except in Judgment of Paris scenes or as a herm. It is, however, a well-attested fact that the younger of the two male Kabeiroi at Samothrace was Hermes-Kadmilos or Kasmilos. So on this typically Boeotian vase we see a Kabeir whose appearance recalls both the Megalokephalois and the Pygmies of Hesiod, inscribed in Ionic characters with the title Koes, which was apparently not Theban and may well have been Samothracian, standing before him, corresponding to the Pais of the Theban Kabeiron, Hermes the son-Kabeir of Samothrace. It seems not improbable that the kantharos was specially made in a Theban pottery to be dedicated at Thebes by an Ionian visitor who, like Herodotus, had been initiated in the mysteries of the Samothracian Kabeiroi.

When the above was already in proof my attention was drawn to the Attic r.f. hydria from Duvanlij in Bulgaria (JdI XLI 302–4, Figs. 18–22), attributed by Beazley to the Kadmos painter and dated about 420 B.C. (Rostovtzeff Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World 102). On the shoulder is painted a theoexenia of the Dioskouroi. Left and right of the empty couch stand a priest with a lyre and a woman who is described as a priestess (by
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27 E.g. op. cit. pl. 5.
28 See also Sardis VII 1 p. 67 and the references there given.
29 CIG II 2880–2882; cf. Kern Pauly-Wissowa RE s.v.
30 Kabeiroi 1445.
31 Bergk Poly. Lyk. Gr. 598.
32 It is a question whether κόης is an Ionic form of κώς or a Boeotian form of κόης. Cf. κόπας, Κωπεύτις on the stone in Tanagra Roehl Inscriptions Graecae Antiquissimae 10, no. 157 (a reference that I owe to Miss L. H. Jeffery). The Ionic lettering would seem to indicate Ionic rather than Boeotian dialect.
33 Strabo X 3 151; cf. also the Kabarnoi, priests of Demeter on Paros, RE s.v. Kabeiroi.
34 Loc. cit.
35 A.J.A. XVII 364.
36 Hdt. II 51; Aristoph. Pax 277 f.
37 Wolters-Bruns op. cit. pl. 28 1, 37 2.
40 Strabo VII 3 6.
41 Cf. Diod. Sic. V 47 3 (speaking of the Samothracians) άγγει... οι πολλοί γαν... δηλαδή οι αυτόχθων... η πολλα εν τοις δυσιν... μή περείτων εις τον κόσμον...
Filow and Welkow *JdI* XLV 302; Chapouthier *Les Dioscures au service d'une déesse* 134, n. 2, 161, n. 5; Beazley *apud* Rostovtzeff *loc. cit.*; Hemberg *Die Kabiren* 118, n. 4). Above the couch are the twin stars of the Dioskouroi, and in the background, beyond pillars to right and left, the brethren are seen in human form, leading their horses. Above four of the figures there are inscriptions not discernible in the published photographs. Over each of the Dioskouroi and the 'priestess' is a word of four letters, faint and somewhat uncertain, which Filow and Welkow read as κοςς. The priest is inscribed κομος. Here then, if the reading κοςς is correct, is presumably our κοςς, κοις, κοις in still another form, and the title is attached not to the priest, but to the twin gods. It is true that it is attached also to the 'priestess'. Filow and Welkow conclude that the name has no connexion with the figures over which it is inscribed. But is it certain that the woman with the imposing diadem, for whom a chair is provided near the couch, is a mere priestess and not perhaps a goddess, the companion of the Dioskouroi, whoever she may be (see Chapouthier, *op. cit. passim*? The presence of three thuribles, not two, may be without significance. In this case it seems probable that the third member of the triad is Helen. There is a close resemblance in dress and gesture to the figure of Leda with the egg on the bell krater by the same painter in Vienna (Münchener Archäologische Studien 84, Fig. 595) and to the Leda in a similar scene on another krater (Ann. XXIV–XXVI 125, Fig. 1), but Leda would not be honoured in a theoxenia (Chapouthier *op. cit.* 127, n. 1) while her daughter Helen certainly was (ibid. 132 f.). Assuming that the 'priestess' is Helen, we find the word κοςς applied on this vase to three deities, while on the Reading kantharos κοςς is attached to a being who resembles a Kabei and is in the divine company of Hermes. The connexion and assimilation of the Dioskouroi with the Kabei is too complicated a question to embark upon. Nor is it clear how the title which Hesychius gives to a priest comes to be attached on fifth century vases to representations of gods. But the fact of the occurrence of what appears to be the same title on two widely differing vases may help eventually to throw some glimmer of light on an obscure subject.42

A. D. Ure.

---

42 For the fullest and most recent discussion of κοςς and kindred words see Masson 'Lydien Kaveš (Kaveš)' in *Jahrh. f. kleinasiatische Forschung* I (1950) 182 f., which appeared after this article was written. For this reference, and for others also, I have to thank Mr. Peter Fraser.
A NEW PONTIC AMPHORA
[PLATES XLIII-XLIV]

The amphora here published (Plates XLIII–XLIV) was acquired for the Reading University collection on the London market in 1947. Nothing is known of its provenance. A detailed description with full illustrations will be given in the first Reading fascicle of the Corpus Vasorum, but so notable an addition to the Pontic series (to keep this convenient and generally used name for these vases which are now universally agreed to have been made in Etruria) calls for more comment than is desirable in a Corpus publication. The vase has a triple interest: it has unique pictures of scenes from the Troilus story, it affords new material for the study of the Pontic series, and it helps to connect Etruscan vase paintings with the wall paintings of Etruscan tombs. It thus provides a new item in a group of monuments which I have long believed to have been the source of a whole series of statements about the history of the Tarquin family which were dismissed by historians of the last century as obvious inventions, but which are in all probability the only statements about them which are in fact based on contemporary sources, that is to say, the archaeological material of which we can now speak with some assurance to the work of Beazley and members of his school.

To begin with the pictures on our vase. When I first saw it the gaily coloured pictures at once recalled the painting of Achilles lurking behind the fountain on the wall of the Tomba dei Tori at Tarquinia. The interpretation of the actual scene I owe to Beazley, who has described it with his usual pregnant brevity in Etruscan Vase Painting as a unique representation, in a furious style, of Achilles carrying Troilos to the altar of Apollo (Plates XLIII, b and XLIV, a). This final scene of the Troilus tragedy appears comparatively seldom on vase paintings, and, where it does occur, never, as far as I am aware, depicts this precise moment. Generally Achilles has reached the altar and Troilus is either being killed or has been killed already.

The picture on the other side (Plates XLIII, a, XLIV, b, d) shows an earlier scene in the story, the pursuit. This is a favourite theme among archaic vase painters, but here again we have an unusual version. Normally we see Troilus mounted with a led horse galloping beside him, pursued by Achilles swift of foot. Polyxena's pitcher generally lies broken on the ground and Polyxena herself is sometimes seen fleeing—on foot like Achilles. Only very exceptionally Achilles, on foot, is seen pulling Troilus off his horse. That, however, is presumably the way the other vase painters imagine Achilles as having captured him. But on our vase Achilles, for all his fleetness of foot, finding himself outstripped by the mounted Troilus, has leapt on to the led horse and from there unhorsed his victim. Then, between the two scenes, he must have stripped him and flung him on his shoulder, there to be dealt with as variously pictured on the vases listed in note 3.

The other Troilus picture beloved of archaic vase painters is the first scene of all, where Achilles, fully armed, lies in ambush behind the fountain which Troilus approaches, mounted and leading a second horse and often accompanied by Polyxena, on foot with her pitcher.

1 CAH Plates I 330 b; Wese Etrusk. Malerrei pl. 96.
2 P. 295 (Addenda to chap. II p. 12).
3 So e.g. Thiersch pl. I ('Tyrrenian amphora'); British Museum CV VI pl. 86. 2 (Attic B.F. hydria); Munich 63 (Attic B.F. hydria); Perugia, Hoppin R.F. Handbook I 403 (Beazley ARV 228 no. 56); Palermo CV pl. 10. 1 (Beazley op. cit. p. 315, very early Makron).
4 So e.g. Florence, Hoppin B.F. Handbook 153 (François vase); Louvre CV VIII pl. 73. 5 (Siana cup); Hoppin B.F. Handbook 400-1 (cup by Xenokles); Copenhagen CV III pl. 123. 4 (B.F. hydria); Brit. Mus. CV VI pl. 80. 1 (B.F. hydria); Bibl. Nat. CV II pl. 54. 6-7 (late B.F. rimless kylix); Brit. Mus. JHS XXXII (1928) 171 and pl. II (R.F. hydria by the Troilus painter, ARV no. 11); Louvre CV VI pl. 45. 5, 7 (early classical R.F. pelike ARV 382 no. 2) Berlin inv. 4497 (R.F. calyx krater ARV 401 no. 8 by the Villa Giulia painter).
6 For example Louvre CV I pl. 7, 3 (Lacoan deinos); Louvre CV II pl. 22. 1 (Attic B.F. deinos); Brit. Mus. CV VI pl. 84. 4 and 87. 2 (Attic B.F. hydria); Copenhagen CV III pl. 110. 10 a, b (Attic B.F. lekythos); Athens 12461 Haspels ABL pl. 41. 5 b, c (Attic B.F. lekythos).
This scene, though not depicted on our vase,\(^7\) often shows details which recall it. The fountain often looks like our altar with the water laid on. Achilles is often partly hidden by vegetation not unlike our vegetation. The led horse is a constant feature.

This brings us to the question of style and the place in the Pontic series to which our vase should be assigned. There can be no doubt that it belongs to the principal group which centres round the Munich amphora figuring the Judgment of Paris.\(^8\) In shape and size the Munich and Reading vases are the same. They are the same too in their scheme of decoration: main scenes in panels on the shoulder; below this a purely patterned zone; next a zone of animals and monsters; below this again rays. The necks differ in that Munich has purely decorative patterns whereas Reading has demi-Gorgons, but both are set in an upward continuation of the shoulder panels, and in a third amphora of this group, in the Vatican,\(^9\) again of the same size and shape and scheme of decoration, the neck shows on either side a double-bodied panther. In all three vases the main picture trespasses into the frame. In all three we find the same highly distinctive treatment of the panther's head (Plate XLIV, c).

The Munich and Vatican vases lack the rich vegetation of the Reading amphora, but a variant on our maiden-hair foliage is found on the Pontic amphora Louvre E 703\(^10\) which further resembles our vase in having Troilus scenes, both post-ambush, on the shoulder: on one side Troilus on horseback with a riderless horse beside him is pursued by Achilles on foot; on the other Achilles beside a maiden-haired tree draws his sword on Polyxena as she seeks refuge at an altar. Besides the altar and the tree the loose elbow-sleeve on Polyxena's raised right arm corresponds with the sleeves of the Gorgons. Dohrn lists this vase, as he does the Vatican amphora, among the works of the master who painted the Munich vase, whom he calls the Paris painter. Its exact relation to the best Pontics may be disputed, but it certainly stands near to them.\(^11\)

The palmette zone on the Reading vase cannot be paralleled on any other Pontic, but the unusual chevron palmette occurs singly on a Pontic vase in Munich by Dohrn's Tityos painter, whom he regards as closely related to his Paris painter.\(^12\) This same Munich vase shows a lioness licking her paw\(^13\) in much the same attitude as the Reading lion and a wind-blown variant on our round flower, both motives which persist in Etruscan B.F. well after the Pontic period.\(^14\)

It is generally agreed that the Pontic vases were produced in Etruria and that the fabric was possibly founded by a Greek immigrant.\(^15\) A similar immigrant has often, and with reason, been assumed as the original maker of the famous Caeretan hydriai, who probably started work a little later than the earliest Pontic masters but whose vases have points of resemblance to theirs. Both classes of vase are gaily coloured, both are highly individualistic and sometimes humorous, both are predominantly East Greek in character. Dohrn's study of Etruscan B.F. shows how the Pontic vases lead on to later series of Etruscan vases that run on well into the fifth century. Dohrn himself\(^16\) dates the Paris painter c. 540–530 and the closely related Tityos painter c. 530–520. Mingazzini\(^17\) puts them even later, the Paris painter's group 530–510, later examples 510–490. Ducati\(^18\) and Beazley\(^19\) are less precise, but both suggest

\(^7\) Its first appearance on an Etruscan vase seems to be that on the post-Pontic amphora in the Villa Giulia CV I pl. 2, 1–4 (Dohrn Schwartzfig. Etrusk. Vasen 154 no. 239, by his Siren painter). Its occurrence on the wall of the Tomba dei Tori has already been noticed.

\(^8\) Sieveking-Hackl no. 827 pl. 33, Phul Muç figs. 155–6, Ducati Pontische Vasen pl. 1 and 2, Dohrn no. 38, Mingazzini Gnomon XI 71 no. 1, Beazley Etruscan Vase Painting pl. 1, 3, 4.

\(^9\) Albizzati Vasi del Vaticano no. 231 pl. 21, Ducati pl. 8 a, Dohrn no. 65, Mingazzini no. 2, Beazley pl. 1, 1, 2.

\(^10\) Ducati pl. 9 b, Dohrn no. 74.

\(^11\) Dohrn, who places the Munich and Vatican vases in two different groups (1 and III), places it in yet another group (IV). Mingazzini, still more rashly, excludes it (with many others of Ducati's list) altogether from the Pontic series.

\(^12\) Sieveking-Hackl no. 984 pl. 41 and fig. 194, Dohrn no. 122. Cf. also the chevron palmettes on Ducati pl. 27 a, Dohrn no. 100 'from the Paris painter's workshop'.

\(^13\) Sieveking-Hackl say 'rubbing her muzzle with her paw'. No tongue is visible in the Munich illustrations, but the lioness has her mouth open. In any case her attitude and action recall that of the Reading animal.

\(^14\) See e.g. Munich Sieveking-Hackl no. 850 pl. 35 (Dohrn no. 280, by his Perseus painter; Beazley Race. Guiglielmo p. 80 no. 1 'very near the Micai painter') lion. Sieveking-Hackl no. 863 pl. 35 (Dohrn no. 187 by his Siren painter; Beazley op. cit. p. 78 no. 27 by his Micai painter) round flower. Würzburg Langlotz pl. 234 no. 798 (Dohrn no. 196 by his Siren painter; Beazley op. cit. p. 78 no. 20 by his Micai painter) three large round flowers on branching stalks.

\(^15\) Beazley Etruscan Vase Painting p. 1.

\(^16\) Op. cit. 79 f.

\(^17\) Gnomon XI 73 f.


a rather earlier starting date, ' the middle of the sixth century '. Considering the vast destruction of circumstantial evidence that took place when the Etruscan tombs were discovered and their vase contents scattered with no record kept, this lack of unanimity is not surprising, but the earlier dating of Beazley and Ducati is the more probable, at least for the earlier of the Pontics such as the Munich and Vatican amphorae discussed above. The Reading vase must be dated a little later than these, as is shown by the intrusion of purely Etruscan motives. At Tarquinia in the Tomba dei Tori we have the earliest scene of the Troilus tale with Achilles in ambush behind a fountain which Troilus approaches on horseback. Some aspects of the treatment, the stocky Achilles with pointed beard and elaborate helmet, the masonry of the fountain, the vegetation with maiden-hair foliage (seen on the right of the Troilus picture and on the left of the gable painting in the inner chamber II 29) invite comparison with the Reading vase. For the maiden-hair foliage compare also the Tomba della Caccia and the Tomba dei Auguri. 31 There can be little doubt that Pontic and Caeretan vase painters of this period were in close contact with the tomb painters of Tarquinia. It has in fact been suggested that vase and tomb painter were sometimes one and the same, and the suggestion is by no means improbable. 32 The Tomba dei Tori is put by Weege 33 in the first half of the sixth century, by Ducati 24 ' before 550 ', by Pallottino 25 about 540. The other two are later.

Our vase thus does something to confirm and consolidate the archaeological evidence which points to the activity of East Greek artists in South Etruria in the middle of the sixth century. This is the time when close by in Rome we are told by Livy and Dionysius that Servius Tullius built the temple of Diana on the Aventine in imitation of the temple of Artemis at Ephesus. 27 As the century advanced the pottery industry of Etruria went more and more native. We see the process beginning when we turn from the Munich or the Vatican amphora to that at Reading. Similarly in our literary sources we find that the last of the Tarquins at the end of his reign was employing an Etruscan factor, Vulca of Veii, to make the statues for his new temple of Jupiter. 28 The group of terracotta figures unearthed on the site of Veii 29 can be taken to represent the work perhaps not of Vulca himself, but at any rate of a contemporary school of figures at Veii. It is no longer Greek, but its Greek ancestry is obvious.

Another painting that recalls the Tomba dei Tori leads us in a quite different direction. It is that on the Corinthian bottle from Cleone, in the Argolid near the Corinthian frontier, which likewise depicts Achilles ambushing Troilus. 30 There are notable differences in treatment: the fountain is less solid; the water gushes from the regulation lion's-head spout not half-way up the structure and not from the mouth of a complete animal resting on top; the figures are of course pure Greek; in front of the fountain the impossible symmetrical tree of the tomb painting is replaced by a much more naturalistic tree with long narrow leaves. But trees very similar to that on the vase occur on a lower frieze of the tomb; behind Achilles on the vase is a strip of rhomboid check pattern 31 that recalls the check pattern painted on the roofs of some of the Tarquinia tombs; both vase and tomb painting have painted inscriptions: those on the vase, give, in Corinthian dialect and alphabet, the name of the painter, Timonidas, and of the persons and horses depicted, Achilles, Troilus, Priam, Asobas, and Xanthus. The tomb shows a few words of indecipherable Etruscan.

The Timonidas vase is dated by Payne 32 about 580 B.C. It was produced towards the end of a long period in which Corinth had dominated the pottery industry, at any rate in the

29 Antike Denkmäler II pl. 42 A fig. 5.
31 Weege op. cit. pl. 2, 95.
30 Dohrn op. cit. 82 f.; Webster JHS XLVIII (1928) 205.
34 Pittura Etrusca pp. vi-vii.
29 Mon. Ant. XXXVI 341.
31 Caeretan hydriaca are by general consent attributed to Caere, where they have been exclusively found. For the Pontic vases Ducati op. cit. 82 f. argues that the choice is between Caere and Vulci.
27 Livy I 45. Dion. Hal. IV 96. The cult statue in Servius' temple is said by Strabo, IV 1 5, to have resembled that of the Ephesius at Massalia, which again is stated by Strabo, IV 1 4, to have resembled and been derived directly from that at Ephesus.
28 For Vulca and other Etruscan figurines see E. Douglas Van Buren Figurative Terra-cotta Reliefs in Etruria 32 f. and the sources there quoted.
27 JHS XIII (1921) 213, fig. 6; 215, fig. 7.
31 Found also on other mid-Corinthian vases, e.g. AJA XXXIII 543 fig. 22, from Corinth.
32 NC 314.
Western world. From well back in the seventh century Etruria had been flooded with Corinthian vases, and local potters in Etruria had been turning out masses of imitation Corinthian that can be distinguished from the originals at a glance.\footnote{NC 189, 206–9.} Once again the modern archaeological evidence and the ancient literary sources are in remarkable harmony, for these Corinthian products take us back to the time when Demaratus, father of Tarquiniius Priscus, is related to have fled from Corinth to Tarquinia accompanied by the \textit{factores} Euheir and Eugrammus, and there to have founded the fortunes of the house of Tarquin. The way that the archaeological evidence corroborates the literary tradition was noted by me nearly thirty years ago in \textit{The Origin of Tyranny} \footnote{Pp. 239–45. Since then the evidence has been immensely strengthened by Payne’s convincing arguments, NC 35–42, that Protocorinthian pottery was produced at Corinth and not at Sicily or elsewhere.} and was argued further and traced further back by the late Alan Blakeway in his notable paper \textit{Demaratus.}\footnote{\textit{TRS XXV} 129–40.} Now, thanks to vastly increased knowledge of archaic Greek and Etruscan art, which we owe so largely to work of the Oxford school, we can, I think, go one step further and suggest why the ancient historians and the extant monuments tell the same tale. The extant archaeological material comes mainly from the dwellings of the illustrious dead. In the third and second centuries, when writers like Fabius and Varro and the Greek Polybius wrote the first histories of ancient Rome, all this material was buried underground. But where the illustrious dead were housed as we find them in the Tarquinia tombs there can be no doubt that the illustrious living were equally well housed. So too were the gods. It is safe to assume that these buildings above ground were, like the tombs, adorned with paintings and inscriptions and with votive or commemorative statues. For the temples and the statues in them we have in fact references in extant authors, some of which have been quoted above. It is the inscriptions\footnote{Note that we already find inscriptions on the Tomba dei Tori and the Corinthian vase of Timonidas and that Corinthian artists were already using them on architectural revetments in the seventh century (Payne \textit{BSA} XXVII 124–32; Pfuhl \textit{Mu} III fig. 481).} that concern us most of all. What would they record? Extant monuments tell us the answer. They would record the name of the artist, the name of the person who commissioned or dedicated the work, and, less frequently, the occasion of the dedication or commission. A famous example where we find all three is the statue base on the Athenian acropolis which records that the statue was made by Antenor and was dedicated by Nearchus the potter as the first fruits of his works.\footnote{Payne and Young \textit{Archaic Marble Sculpture from the Acropolis} pl. 51; Dickens Catalogue of the Acropolis Museum I 220.} This inscription is particularly instructive from our special point of view. It is one of the numerous objects, damaged but fairly complete, which is still much as it was left by the Persians after their destruction of the city in 480 B.C. The magnificent museum on the acropolis contains a long series of statues and bases similarly ‘destroyed’ on the same occasion. The Gauls who destroyed Rome in 390 B.C. were no better equipped than the Persians, and their destruction of Rome can hardly have been more thorough than the earlier destruction of Athens. It is highly probable that many monuments in Rome survived the Gallic catastrophe. A further point to note is that the dedicator of the Athenian statue was a potter. We have several vases signed by him.\footnote{Hoppin \textit{Handbook} B.F. 172–6; Richter \textit{AJA} XXXVI (1932) 272–5.} Presumably he was a particularly successful potter, for besides the evidence of the dedication on the Acropolis he is one of the two archaic Attic potters whose work is known to have been continued by his sons, both of whom always sign themselves as son of Nearchus.\footnote{Hoppin \textit{op. cit.} 365–405 (Tleson), 80 (Ergotesses) and 380 (both).} The other of the two potters is Ergotimus, maker of the most notable of early B.F. vases, the famous François vase,\footnote{Hoppin \textit{op. cit.} 81–3 and 148–55.} whose work was continued by his son Euheirius \footnote{Hoppin \textit{op. cit.} 85–7.} who also, unlike most ancient potters, records on his vases his father’s name as well as his own.

Neither Ergotimus nor Nearchus tells us his father’s name. Both may well have been the founders of their firms as far at least as Athens was concerned. Both are already masters of their craft before the middle of the sixth century, Ergotimus unquestionably so a decade or more before then. It is tempting to suppose that they were among the craftsmen who had been attracted to Athens by the law of Solon that encouraged such immigration. One of the vases
of Nearchus is a ball aryballos (the commonest of all Corinthian shapes) now in New York.\footnote{42} Ergotinus, as we have seen, had a son named Euheirus. Considering how very common was the practice of naming the son after the grandfather, may we go one step further and suggest that the potter Euheir,\footnote{43} who is said to have worked for Demaratus at Tarquinia, was no other than the father of the Athenian Ergotinus? This is of course pure speculation. What is certain is that the appearance of a factor of this name in the Demaratus story is not, as has been asserted,\footnote{44} an obviously fictitious element casting doubt on the whole narrative. On the contrary it suggests as the source of that narrative an inscription such as that on the Nearchus base set up in Athens by a member of the one firm which stands on an equality with that to which the Athenian Euheirus belonged. Similar inscriptions are obviously a possible source for the few concrete statements made by ancient historians concerning the temple and statue of Diana set up by Servius on the Aventine, the work undertaken by Vulca of Veii for the last of the Roman kings and other public works of the Tarquins.

It does not follow that these inscriptions were always accurately copied or correctly interpreted by Fabius and his followers. What can be claimed is that the intensive study of archaic sculpture and ceramics, Greek and Etruscan, has provided us with a new approach to one chapter of early Roman history.\footnote{45}

\hfill P. N. Ure.

\footnote{42} Richter \emph{op. cit.}
\footnote{43} I have assumed that Pliny's Euheir is a Latinised form of \textit{E}\textit{u}\textit{e}rt. The Athenian potter was singularly uncertain about the spelling of his name. He gives us \textit{Eu}\textit{e}rt, \textit{Eu}\textit{e}rt and (if the cup without any patronymic \textit{Clara Rhod}us III 34 is by him) \textit{Eu}\textit{e}rt.
\footnote{44} \textit{E}g. Seeley \emph{Livy I} 46.
\footnote{45} It is typical of the pre-archaeological attitude that Mommsen (\emph{Hist. Roma I} 133, cf. Seeley \emph{Livy I} 175) in discussing the temple of Diana on the Aventine, while admitting the possibility of Ionian influence, is preoccupied with the evidence of institutions and festivals that survived into later times, and that one of the few statements on early Roman history in Livy not challenged by nineteenth century historians (see e.g. Seeley \emph{op. cit.} 53) is that which he makes (vi 1) about the destruction of records by the Gauls in 390 B.C.
NOTES ON THE HOMERIC HOUSE

The critics and commentators who read these notes¹ will probably object that I have not paid sufficient attention to the earlier literature on the subject. I must admit that I have not read Gerlach's paper,² which is not accessible in Alexandria, but I have read at one time or another most of the recent papers on the Homeric house in Myres' paper in the Journal of Hellenic Studies ³ to that of Palmer lately published in the Transactions of the Philological Society.⁴ I think that practically all of what was written on the Homeric house before the excavations of Schliemann at Tiryns should now be disregarded. Further since most of that written since the excavation of Tiryns follows the erroneous or 'traditional' interpretation of the two megaras at Tiryns as a man's and as a woman's megaron, it also need not now be taken into account. Palmer's paper makes a great advance, but he did not have the opportunity of knowing the House of Columns at Mycenae.⁵ I have therefore as regards earlier literature confined myself to Homer himself and standard editions like those of Monro, Leaf, Merry, and Stanford, and have read the newer translations of the Odyssey, the Loeb version and those of T. E. Shaw and E. V. Rieu. If I have missed anything of importance I can only plead that Alexandria of to-day does not possess the same library facilities as Ptolemaic Alexandria.

Earlier commentators on Homer, especially those of the nineteenth century, assumed without any obvious reason that the kind of house, great or small, in which Homer pictured his characters as dwelling was of a bungalow type all on one floor. They also assumed that the men and the women had separate apartments and led more or less separate lives. The results of these assumptions can be seen in the plans with which various commentators enriched their works. They never seem to have considered seriously the possibility that the houses of Homer's characters might have basements and upper storeys, or were houses that might really have been built and inhabited. Even when as in the Iliad ⁶ Homer states clearly that Hecuba went downstairs from the megaron to her storeroom to get out her best peplos for dedication to Athena, commentators refuse to believe that, although Homer uses the word κατέβησεν, he means that Hecuba really went downstairs into a basement. 'Κατέβησεν cannot imply that Hekabe descends from an upper floor, for the hall or μέγαρον, the common sitting room of the palace, is always on the ground floor. It can only mean that she went into the inmost recesses of the house, 'into the depths', as we might say, where the treasure-chamber is.⁷ This is almost equivalent to a deliberate mistranslation of the simple Greek κατέβησεν. In the Odyssey there are frequent references to going up and down stairs, and yet the traditional and 'orthodox' plans (Fig. 1) ⁸ of the house of Odysseus all assume that it was all on one level. They do insert a κλημέω, it is true, and speak of ἑπετέμω, but never seem to suggest or imagine that they were intended to be used
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¹ I am much indebted to my wife and daughter for their helpful and constructive criticism of these notes.
³ Vol. XX, 1900, pp. 128 ff.
⁴ 1948, pp. 92 ff. My best thanks are due to Professor Palmer for most kindly sending me a copy of this paper.
⁵ Wace, Mycenae, pp. 91 ff., figs. 32-34, 108, a, b.
⁶ VI 288.
⁷ Leaf and Bayfield on Iliad VI 288. Compare their note on Iliad XXIV, 191 where Priam descends apparently to the same storeroom to select a ransom for Hector's body and they suggest that κατέβησεν can be compared with the phrase 'plunging into the depths of a wood'.
⁸ E.g. Rumpf's plan in Merry, Odyssey Vol. I, p. x; Jebb, Introduction to Homer, p. 56; Autenrieth, Homeric Dictionary, pl. III (after Gerlach).
or inhabited. There seems to be a lack of realism or commonsense which affects even the best of pure scholars when they come to comment on material things like houses.

When Schliemann excavated the palace at Tiryns in 1884, the discovery that the palace had had staircases and an upper storey ought to have led commentators to change their views. Not only did they not do so, but their views of what a Homeric house ought to be like were allowed to affect the interpretation of the ruins of Tiryns. Thus arose the idea of a man's and a women's megaron at Tiryns. The clear indications of an upper storey were ignored, and two separate houses of different dates were assumed, according to the traditional assumptions of Homeric commentators, to be parts of the same house. The existence of basements, as visible only too clearly in the famous galleries, was also neglected and instead fantastic explanations of the galleries were put forward. Now that the results of the latest German researches and excavations at Tiryns have shown that these ideas are mistaken it is time that we should revise our view of the palace at Tiryns as illustrating the house of Odysseus. One difficulty is that editors of Homer are not always well informed about the latest archaeological discoveries on Mycenaean sites. Further, once an erroneous idea has attained the dignity of print and is in an edition of Homer, and has passed thence into students' handbooks and the like, it is extremely difficult to eradicate it. Recently in 1939 the planning and study of a house at Mycenae known as the House of Columns (Fig. 2) has given us an opportunity to make a fresh start in our attempts to understand what Homeric houses could be like, especially as represented by the House of Odysseus.

This is not the place for a full discussion of the Homeric house, but I propose to put forward here a selection of notes based on the results of recent excavations and researches and above all on an unprejudiced effort to adhere to the words and text of Homer and to give them an accurate and reasonable meaning. By adhering to the text of Homer I mean that if Homer says καταβήσας he means that his character really did go downstairs. Or if he says καταβάς κλίμακα ψηφήλιν, I believe that he meant us to imagine Penelope as really ascending a high staircase from the megaron to get to an upper storey.

It is obvious from Homer that he imagined the houses of his characters as adapted for a comfortable and, in some cases, even luxurious existence. This idea is borne out by the discoveries made in the palaces at Tiryns, Mycenae, and Thebes, and will no doubt be reinforced by the further excavations of Nestor's palace. The ruins of big houses like the House of Columns at Mycenae show that others beside the princes lived in comfort and there were certainly well-built and well-equipped houses at smaller centres such as Korakou and Zygouries.

There are one or two general principles that we can lay down as preliminaries. We must not assume that all Homeric houses were alike, built to the same plan and same size like Victorian mansions in South Kensington or the archaistic villas of modern ribbon development. There is clear indication that Homeric houses varied in size and in magnificence. Telemachus when he comes to Sparta and sees the great house of Helen and Menelaus is struck with wonder at its glories. He was accustomed to a comparatively small and simple country house in Ithaca where the court with geese waddling about was more like a farmyard, and thus the great house at Sparta seemed to him like the home of Zeus himself. Not all English country-houses are Chatsworths or Blenheim. Trollope depicts the simplicity and shabbiness of Belton Castle as well as the grandeur of Gatherum. It is unfortunate for us that Telemachus did not visit Mycenae or Tiryns. The palace of Nestor has now been found, but unluckily Homer gives only a brief mention of Nestor's house.

Another point is that Homer's house had an upstairs and a downstairs, even in fact 'upstairs and downstairs and in my lady's chamber'. In the Odyssey Telemachus goes down-
stairs from the megaron to a storeroom of which Eurykleia kept the key. Penelope comes up and downstairs to and from her room and the megaron. Thus we can picture the house as having three floors, a basement, a main floor, and an upper storey. This is reasonable when we reflect that many Mycenaean sites are on hills, like Mycenae itself, and thus basements could easily be provided on the natural slope of the hill. We should not, however, assume that all Homeric houses or Mycenaean houses for that reason had exactly the same plan. We can note points of similarity in plans, shown by the ruins, but it is only natural that plans should vary according to the site and according to the fancy of the builder. Still every house great or small has a somewhat similar division of space. A passage in the Iliad gives what seems to be the three main divisions of the house: the σίδη, the court; the δωματία the main hall and reception rooms; the τοίκη, the domestic section. This triple division of a house calls to mind the modern house-agent’s division of a suburban villa into three reception, six bedroom, and the usual offices.

We must also remember that Mycenaean houses, so far excavated, being usually built within fortifications were naturally restricted in area and thus there would be a tendency for houses to grow upwards, as in Manhattan, rather than sideways. This is well illustrated by buildings within the walls of Mycenae, such as the House of Columns (Fig. 2) which had a basement, ground floor and at least one upper storey, and the Granary which had a basement and two floors above.

Words applied to the various parts of houses do not always have the same meaning. The hall for instance of a suburban villa is not the same thing as the hall of a Cambridge or Oxford college. We have other uses of the word as in Trinity Hall and Haddon Hall. The word room itself, quite apart from the generic meaning of space, can be used for a room of any kind. A don’s rooms in college consist of one or two keeping rooms, a bed room, a gyp room, and, in these days, of a bath room. A college porter could even say, ‘Mr. Annesley is not in college. He’s in rooms,’ meaning lodgings. In an ordinary country house we have dining room, drawing room, morning room, sitting room, gun room, bed room, dressing room, bath room, maid’s room, butler’s room, still room, and so on. Trollope might perhaps have written, ‘Lily Dale quietly left her room and came downstairs. As she entered the room where Mr. Crosbie sat playing with his hat...’ Of these one is a bedroom and the other a sitting-room. Step too is another word which can have different meanings. We might have, ‘The Duke of Omnium went slowly up the steps to Madame Goesler’s front door...’ and ‘Archdeacon Grantly brought the steps to get a volume of his father’s sermons from the top shelf in the bookcase.’ We cannot expect a poet or even a novelist to keep always to the same use of a word like the compiler of a guide book or of a scientific treatise.

Above all we must not forget that Homer imagined that men and women lived in the houses he describes. What would his hearers have said if Homer’s houses appeared to them incredible or fantastic? In epic such as that allowances can be made for the divine or the supernatural, as in Alcinous’ palace, but there are limits. The Mycenaean houses which have been excavated were certainly lived in. The Homeric houses which commentators have conjured up in their studies with the aid of midnight oil could not be lived in, not even by the commentators themselves, except with great discomfort to themselves and their families.

Lastly in describing or mentioning anything Homer takes the ordinary things of daily life for granted just as a modern author would. If Homer says that Hector took his spear and departed, he does not necessarily mean that a spear was all that Hector had with him. So a modern author in saying that the Duke of Omnium took his hat and went round to his club does not mean that a hat was all that the duke was wearing. Anybody but a Homeric commentator would naturally imagine the duke as dressed in the most elegant fashion of an elderly mid-Victorian nobleman.

17 Odyssey II. 337 ff.
18 See below p. 207.
19 VI, 318.
20 Wace, Mycenae, pp. 55 ff., fig. 3, pp. 91 ff., figs. 32-34.
FIG. 2.—House of Columns, Mycenae, Ground Floor. Restored Plan.
(After Wace, Mycenae, by courtesy of the Princeton University Press.)
After this introduction we can proceed to consider with the aid of recent excavations and research some special features of the Homeric house.

**Thalamos.** Although Homer, as might be expected from a poet, does not always use this word very exactly, it seems from a consideration of the various passages where the word occurs and of other passages where parts of the house are mentioned that *thalamos* has two meanings. First of all it seems to mean a room, a domestic or private room of some kind which can be kept locked and is not automatically open to visitors. Secondly *thalamos* seems to be used generically for the domestic quarter of a house as a whole. The standard passage giving the three main divisions of a house is that in the *Iliad* which has already been referred to above. In that *thalamos* obviously seems to mean the domestic quarter or private apartments of a house. This triple division of a house seems to be preserved in the Odyssey when the geography of the house of Odysseus is in question.

As regards the *thalamoi* of the house of Odysseus in particular we observe that these various rooms, bed rooms, storerooms, and so on, are not all together. Penelope's own quarters, which are usually called υπερωτίου but once at least *thalamos* were on an upper floor above or close to the megaron, for sitting in her room she can hear what is going on in the megaron. There were storerooms also above the megaron section of the house. Among these, which are all called *thalamoi*, was the storeroom where Penelope kept the bow and other treasures, and the storerooms from which Telemachus brought arms for his father and the faithful retainers, and Melanthius abstracted for the suitors arms which included Laertes' mildewed shield. Telemachus' room seems to have been separate, perhaps in a kind of bachelors' wing, and apparently above the court. It may have been in an upper storey over one of the colonnades. There was yet another *thalamos* of which Eurykleia kept the key. Telemachus went downstairs to it from the megaron to get supplies for his voyage to Pylos. It was thus presumably in a basement. It cannot be the same storeroom as that where the bow was, because Penelope went upstairs from the megaron to that storeroom and she had the key. It is usual for Mycenaean houses to have basements. At Mycenae itself the House of the Warrior Vase, the Ramp House, Tsountas' House, the House of Columns, and the Granary all have basements and other houses obviously had basements also. At Zygouries the storerooms which contained the stocks of unused vases were in a basement built against the side of the hill. In this basement of Odysseus were piles of gold and copper, chests of clothes, oil, and wine in rows of pithoi ranged along the walls. It would correspond to the room of pithoi (see plan of basement, Fig. 3) in the House of Columns at Mycenae or to one of the magazines at Knossos. This same storeroom apparently also held barley meal. It was thus presumably a storeroom for household supplies and the copper and gold in it may well have been in ingots like the copper ingot from the palace at Mycenae. It was then natural that the key of it should have been in charge of the housekeeper, Eurykleia. The *thalamos* where the bow was kept was upstairs from the megaron and the things kept there were somewhat different. They were κειμήλια of gold and copper and iron. These were presumably objects of wrought and not rough unwrought metal. Among other things for instance was the box containing the iron axes which were used in the test of stringing and shooting the bow. It was, so to speak, the plate room, for there were no food supplies in it and the mistress of the house naturally had the key. Of the other *thalamoi* in the house of Odysseus one was the room to which the arms were removed and another, on an upper floor, that up to which Melanthius stole to procure arms for the suitors. It is possible that there was only one storeroom for arms and that the room to which the arms were removed
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21 Mr. Frank Stubbings has kindly helped me by discussing with me the use of this word.
22 *Iliad VI. 316.
23 Odyssey XIX. 53.
24 Odyssey I. 329.
25 Odyssey XXI. 8 ff.
26 Odyssey XXII. 109, 143, 155, 161, 174, 179 ff.
27 Odyssey I. 435.
28 Odyssey II. 337 ff.
29 Odyssey XXI. 3 f.
30 Wace, *Mycenae*, pp. 56, 64 f., 67, 94.
32 Wace, *Mycenae*, p. 95, fig. 108 a.
34 Odyssey XIX. 574 ff., XXI. 3, 61.
35 Odyssey XIX. 17.
36 Odyssey XXII. 142 f.
MYCENAE: HOUSE OF COLUMNS
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Fig. 3.—House of Columns, Mycenae, Basement. Restored Plan and Section.
(After Wace, Mycenae, by courtesy of the Princeton University Press.)
from the megaron was the same as that from which Telemachus and Melanthius fetched arms and armour. This room was normally locked, but Telemachus accidentally left it open when he went to get arms for Odysseus, himself, Eumaeus, and Philoetius. Since Melanthius went up ἐς θελάμοις Ὀδυσσήσ ἀνά μῆνας μεγάροις  

39 it seems possible that the use of the plural θελάμοι here indicates that there were several rooms above the megaron. It seems likely that there was an upper storey above the megaron of the palace at Mycenae,  

40 and I see no objection to supposing that some of the thalamos above a megaron may have been storerooms.  

Thus we realise that the house of Odysseus contained the following thalamos: the storeroom in the basement to which Telemachus descended from the megaron; the storeroom where the bow was to which Penelope ascended from the megaron; the storeroom for arms and armour somewhere above the megaron section of the house; the bridal chamber of Odysseus and Penelope; Penelope’s own room;  

42 Telemares’ room. In fact we see that every kind of room which can be kept closed or private is a thalamos. Indeed the use of the word is as wide as the use of the word room in English. On the other hand Penelope’s own apartments, though they are, as stated above, once at least called thalamos, are usually called τρποσίων, which the Elymologicum Magnum says is the women’s quarters. The room or rooms where the maids were shut up are always megaras or megaron, perhaps a big room, a kind of servants’ hall. It seems to have been quite apart and unconnected with Penelope’s apartments, for there is no hint that she also was locked in while the slaughter of the suitors was in progress.

Kλιμακα, Klimax. After what has already been said above it is obvious that this word in Homer should not be translated ladder but staircase when it refers to part of a house. Staircases were a common feature of Mycenaean houses (Fig. 2).  

46 Homer, who has so many reminiscences of what a Mycenaean house was like, cannot surely have imagined Penelope as climbing up and down a ladder with her maids in attendance, but instead as coming down a well built staircase suitably accompanied by her maids. The Loeb translator, E. V. Rieu, and T. E. Shaw rightly render the word as stairway, staircase, or stairs.

Λαχαρη, Laura. To judge by the incident of Melanthius in the Odyssey this was, at least in the house of Odysseus, a passage leading from the court to the private domestic quarters of the house and by a side door into the megaron. This is the only use of the word in Homer, but it does occur occasionally in later Greek. It was a narrow passage because it could be defended by one man. In the House of Columns at Mycenae (Fig. 2) there seems to have been a side passage (O, P) from the court through the eastern colonnade (E) and so into the corridor (K) at the bottom of the staircase, which ascended to the upper floor over the rooms on the east side of the megaron and to any rooms there may have been above the megaron itself as well, and to the osophyra (J) in the east wall of the megaron. The exit of this passage into the court could be observed by anyone standing in the porch of the megaron. It thus seems to fulfill the conditions of the text of the Odyssey.  

We should not of course imagine that such a λαχαρη was an essential feature of a house, but only that some houses might have a λαχαρη of this kind. This is the reason probably why Homer specially explains it.

Μυχος, Mychos. This word seems to mean recess or corner. In the passages in the Iliad referring to the tent or hut of Achilles in the camp before Troy it seems to apply to the two inner or back corners of the main, and probably only, room. In these corners Achilles and Patroclus slept.  

On the other hand when in the Odyssey we are told that Helen and Menelaus slept in the dining room in a house of such magnificence that it astonished Telemachus. We
should note too that both Menelaus and Nestor sleep not in a μυκός of the megaron, but μυκός δόμου, ‘in the inner part of the house’. Andromache too is pictured as weaving μυκός δόμου υψηλιό. So there is no inconsistency when in the Odyssey Menelaus and Helen sleep μυκός δόμου, but in the morning a few lines later Menelaus gets out of bed, dresses, and goes έκ θολώμοιο. The existence of the superlative μυκόττατος, ‘inmost’, confirms the generic use of the word μυκός. As just noted, however, Achilles and Patroclus on active service sleep in the μυκό, the back corners of their common tent or hut. Δόμος is usually the house as a whole, but megaron is the great room, the hall of the house, though it can at times be applied to the whole house as well as to a part, just like the word ‘hall’ in English.

We should not of course press the meanings of words too closely. Still we know from Odysseus’ own house that the master and mistress of the house had a private bed room, a thalamos. So we can assume that in the far grander house of Menelaus and Helen the master and mistress would certainly have had a bed room of their own, which could be described as being μυκός δόμου υψηλιό, ‘in the inner part of the lofty house’. This view that μυκός can be used generically as meaning in the recesses, in a private or withdrawn part, of the house is strengthened by the use of the word in the Homeric hymn to Hermes as pointed out by Palmer, whose view should be adopted. So μυκός has two senses, the particular sense of recess or corner, and the general meaning of the inner rooms of the house, such as might be the private apartments of the master and mistress of the house or special storerooms as in the hymn to Hermes.

’Οροσοθύρη, Orosathyre. This from the passage in the Odyssey where it is mentioned was clearly a side door from the megaron leading to the domestic apartments of the house and also giving access to a narrow corridor to the court past the main door of the megaron and so to the outside world. This is made plain by Palmer who quotes a very pertinent passage in the Etymologicum Magnum, ‘the orosathyre is a little door through which one ascends to the upper floor or women’s quarters’. In the House of Columns at Mycenae Fig. 2 there is in the east wall of the megaron proper a small door with a raised threshold (J) which leads into a narrow corridor (K) giving access by a staircase (L) to the storey above and also to the eastern colonnade of the court (E). Thence one could go past the main door of the megaron through the western colonnade of the court and so into the entrance passage and to the front door of the house. The plan of the House of Columns thus interpreted seems to satisfy the requirements of the text of the Odyssey. We have at last an archaeological illustration of an orosathyre and there is no need to look any further. The plan of the House of Columns agrees well with Palmer’s postulates. Homer’s use of δυπλαῖα in describing Melanthius’ exit from the orosathyre on his way to the storeroom where the arms were kept probably refers not to the raised threshold, but to the fact that he had to go upstairs to the storeroom.

Πόλεις, Rhages. This word is a hapax legomenon and no satisfactory explanation for it has yet been suggested. The old traditional view was that these were narrow windows or loopholes looking into the megaron from a staircase which led to an upper storey. Another view was that they were openings in the megaron wall between the ends of the roof beams above the architrave somewhat like open metopes and that by scrambling up to them one could pass through to the upper floor and so obtain access to the storerooms. Jebb and Palmer have pointed out that these views are absurd. How could Melanthius come scrambling through narrow windows or metope openings with twelve sets of spears, shields, and helmets? Even
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52 Odyssey III, 402.
53 Ibid, XXII, 440.
54 Odyssey IV, 307 ff.
55 Odyssey XXII, 145.
56 Ibid, IX, 668 ff.
57 Odyssey XXIII, 178, 192.
58 Line 352.
60 Conington on Aenid II, 884 comments that Virgil’s penetralia corresponds well enough with μυκός. Was Virgil’s description in this passage influenced by that of the θολώμοι?
61 Odyssey XXII, 126, 132, 333.
63 634, 1.
64 Vace, Mycenae, p. 92, figs. 32, 33.
66 See Middleton’s view in Jebb, Introduction to Homer, p. 185.
68 Odyssey XXII, 144.
on his last trip, when he was caught, he was carrying in one hand a fine helmet and in the other a large shield. If the Homeric commentators themselves practised such gymnastics, even they would soon realize that their explanations were absurd.

Palmer suggests that the rhoges were a row of slabs laid round the base of the megaron wall on the inside at a higher level than the rest of the floor. He refers to Myres' authority that at Mycenae there is a broad border of flag-stones all round the floor of the megaron about a yard in width from the wall, though the centre of the floor is as usual of beaten earth or gravel. Unfortunately for this view, though there is at Mycenae all round the base of the megaron wall on the inside a row of large slabs of gypsum, the rest of the floor was paved with cement and painted stucco. This was observed long ago by Tsountas and mentioned by Frazer and confirmed by recent research. It appears also that the gypsum slabs and the painted stucco floor were on the same level. Thus Palmer's suggestion that a man who wished to leave the megaron by the orsothyle had first to step up on to the border of raised slabs before reaching the raised threshold of the orsothyle itself is untenable. Some other explanation must be found. Let us hope that the exploration of Nestor's palace by Blegen will throw some light on this problem.

Homer's words

άνεβαινε
εις θαλαμους Ὀδυσσεὸς ἀνα βάγας μεγάρωι,

seem to suggest that the rhoges were above the megaron and it is noticeable that in this passage he speaks of the rooms, θαλαμος, of Odysseus ἀνα βάγας μεγάρωι, as though there were an upper storey above the megaron. The latest translator ingeniously seeks to avoid the difficulty by rendering the lines as:

'So Melanthius the goatherd went up by devious ways through the palace to the storeroom of Odysseus where he helped himself to a dozen shields and spears and an equal number of bronze helmets topped with horschair plumes.'

This is the load with which one of the gymnastic commentators would have scrambled through a narrow window or metope opening.

If rhoges means openings of some kind, could they refer to a loggia above the megaron from which thalamoi for different purposes could have opened? A loggia is apparently illustrated in a fresco fragment found by Schliemann under the Ramp House at Mycenae and I have ventured to assume one in a tentative reconstruction of the front of the palace megaron at Mycenae. There might have been an internal loggia or minstrels' gallery above one end of the megaron with thalamoi behind as in the hall of a college or of an old manor house.

It is wiser, however, not to conjecture, but to study the existing remains and to hope for further evidence especially about the upper part of a Mycenaean palace or house.

ALAN J. B. WACE.
Miltiades

The red-figure plate in the Ashmolean Museum bearing the inscription Μιλτιάδης καλὸς (Fig. 1) has been ascribed, by the scholar to whom these pages are dedicated, to the Cerberus Painter; and dated to 520–510 B.C.¹

We ask ourselves inevitably: is this the great Miltiades? and he who tries to answer is unusually incurious if he does not ask the second question: is the beardless mounted archer, here depicted, Miltiades himself? He looks to be under twenty, Marathon was fought twenty to thirty years later. What age was Miltiades at Marathon in 490? what age was he between 520 and 510 B.C.?

The earlier dates in Miltiades' life are all controvertible.² I offer the following fasti:³

A. His father Kimon.

2. 536 (or shortly before): exiled by Peisistratos.
3. 536: while in exile wins the chariot race at Olympia.
4. 532: wins a second time, has his victory announced in Peisistratos' name, is reconciled and recalled to Athens.
5. 528: wins a third time.
6. 528/7: within a few months Peisistratos dies, and during the crisis of Hippias' succession Kimon is murdered; possibly on Hippias' orders.

B. Miltiades himself.

1. Circa 550 (554?): born.
2. From 538 to circa 516: Hippias 'treats him well in Athens'.
3. 544: appointed archon for 544/3.
4. Between 528 and 515: first marriage.
5. Circa 516: death of his brother Stesagoras: Hippias sends Miltiades to take over the principality in Chersonese. Accession troubles. [Second marriage (Thracian wife)—or later? see note 43.]
6. 514: Danube episode.
7. Circa 514: Skythians invade Chersonese: Miltiades retires (to Thrace? to Athens?) for a few months, then returns. At the same time Hippias breaks with him and makes alliance with his enemies in Lam猝asos,
8. Circa 507: Kimon (son of his Thracian wife) born.
10. 490 or 498: occupies Lemnos and Imbros.
11. 493: leaves Lemnos and comes to Athens: acquitted of 'tyranny' at his first trial.
12. 492–489: elected strategos in successive years.
13. 490: Marathon.
14. 489: Paros fiasco: found guilty of 'false public statement' at his second trial. Dies in prison.

The matters which most need justification are:

(i) A 3–5: the dates of Kimon's victories.
(ii) B 6: date of Danube episode.
(iii) B 5, 7: interpretation of Herodotos VI. 40.
(iv) B 10: Lemnos and Imbros.
(vi) B 1: Miltiades' age.

(i) The story of Kimon the 'Simpleton'⁴ is told in Herodotos VI 39. 1 and 103. 1–3. He was exiled by Peisistratos: in exile he won the Olympic chariot race twice running.

1 ARV p. 59, Cerberus Painter B. CV Oxford 1 (1927) pl. 1, 5, text p. 2. Cf. Schoppa, Die Darstellung der Ritter (diss. Heidelberg 1933) p. 23. The inscription is not visible in the photograph: it describes a semicircle round the top half of the field. I am greatly indebted to my wife for advice and help throughout this paper.
² Berbe devoted Hermes, Einzelschrift 2 (1937), to Miltiades (henceforward cited by author's name only). Inevitably my references are mainly to disagreements.
³ The passages of ancient authors (chiefly Herodotos) can be found in Kirchner, P(apyrographia) A(frica), nos. 846 and 10212. Add. for the Skythian invasion of Chersonese, Strabo XIII. 1. 22; and for the capture of Lemnos, Diodoros X. 19. 3. Hesychios 'Ἐρυμόνοις Χώρας, Ζενοβίων III 85, and Charax in Stephanos Ἡρασία (Fgr H 103 F 18: the parallel passages are quoted in the commentary).
⁴ Plutarch Cim. 4: δυ δέ νυφήνασ φιλοκαλομος προσαγωγουσ-
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FIG. 1.—RF. PLATE INSCRIBED WITH MILTIADES’ NAME (see note 1).
(Ashmolean Museum photo.)

FIG. 2.—MOUNTED ARCHER IN MARBLE, FROM THE AKROPOLIS (see p. 220).
(After Payne-Young, Akropolis Pl. 134.)
caused the second victory to be announced in Peisistratos’ name, and having made this gesture he was recalled. After this he won a third time with the same horses: ‘having won this third victory, it befall him to die at the hands of Peisistratos’ sons, Peisistratos himself being by then dead’. The same team of horses won all three times. No doubt, then, all three wins were consecutive: this means an interval of 8 years between the first win and the last (otherwise, the interval is of twelve years or more). Peisistratos is dead at the time of, or at least very soon after, the third win: since he died in the year 528/7, this third win was either in 528 or else in 524. The latter, it has been often assumed: but the former is surely more likely.

If we accept the later dates, we must assume (what is likely enough) that Peisistratos’ death in the Attic year 528/7 came after the Olympia of 528. The reconciliation has to be more or less a deathbed reconciliation, the old tyrant hears the news of the race, recalls his generous adversary, and dies. The murder will come (on this view) four years later, in 524/3, and will surely have had a quite finest effect on that union of hearts which the archon-list suggests was being aimed at.

If we accept the earlier dates, it becomes indifferent whether Peisistratos dies before or after the race: his death comes anyway within a few months, and produces the crisis of the succession. During that crisis, Kimon’s enhanced prestige would be formidable: it is not impossible that he was disposed to dispute Hippias’ claim, and (whether or not) he must at least have seemed dangerous. I do not know whether Hippias was really privy to the murder: but the motive (real or alleged) is surely better during this succession crisis than four years later. The crisis once over, the dangerous man removed and Hippias safe on his throne, it was then time to establish goodwill. Herodotos reports this sequence of moods, rather sourly: ‘as if they had not, forsooth, been privy to his father’s death’, Hippias and his brother now ‘treat Miltiades well’: they see to his advancement in Athens, and eventually send him to rule in Chersonese. In these circumstances, the archon Miltiades of 524/3 is likely to be this young man: the archonship is part of his advancement. Hippias’ use of the archonship is noticed by Thucydides, VI. 54. 6, and illustrated by the extant fragment of archon-list (see below, p. 217).

For these reasons I prefer the earlier dates. Let us look once more at the implications of the later dates. Kimon’s third victory is now in 524, during the archonship of a Miltiades who may be his son and (if not that) is probably of his family. This third victory makes Kimon look dangerous enough to kill: and he is killed when leaving the archon’s table.

In the fifth year of Hippias’ reign we have a suspected conspiracy in the family of the chief archon. This is dramatic, sensational, not perhaps impossible: but not, to my mind, probable. It makes the relations between the two houses persistently ambiguous: the favour shown after this to Kimon’s son in Athens, the establishment some 8 or 9 years later of this son on the throne of Chersonese, become things melodramatic and (if I may so put it) opaque: I conceive Hippias’ reign in more transparent terms. I can understand how Kimon’s violent death during the crisis of succession could be followed, more Polystrateo, by the advancement of his son: the more tangled story is to my mind unlikely.

Why was he exiled in the first place? I think, if we may judge by the sequel, that Peisistratos fancied himself threatened by the prestige of Kimon’s racehorses. The quarrel, if so, may be imagined as flaring up when Kimon started for Olympia in 536.

---

1 Der dritte Olympiasieg ereignete sich nach Peisistratos Tod’ (Berve p. 40 note 1). No: it is the murder which is after Peisistratos’ death: the Olympic victory is not necessarily so. It cannot of course have been much earlier.


3 The fragment of archon-list covering the early years of Hippias’ reign was published in Hesperia VIII (1939) pp. 50-65: SEG X. 352. See below, p. 217.

4 Domus a R VII. 3. 1: the name is also in the inscribed list (note 7). See Cadoux JHS LXVIII (1940), p. 110, note 216.


6 Transparency characterises the Attic skolia, the Hipparchos herms. For the kind of quarrel (as I suppose it) see the following note.

7 This date is of course quite arbitrary: it does not affect the argument. The type of quarrel matters more. I am supposing something like the stage quarrels, between Oedipus and Kreon, Theseus and Hippolytos: sc. that Kimon, like Kreon or Hippolytos, stood close to the throne, was its natural prop. The sequel is less bizarre if this is so.
(ii) Herodotos records (IV. 83-142) that Dareios crossed the Bosphorus into Europe, and then crossed the Danube and invaded Skythia. Mandrokles of Samos bridged the Bosphorus for him, a Greek fleet accompanied him and bridged the Danube. Of the Greek princes who followed him many were Asiatics (e.g. from Lampakos, Lesbos, Mitiletes) and a few Europeans (Ariston of Byzantium, and Miltiades). These were left to guard the Danube crossing: when Dareios by misadventure overstayed his time, the Skythians invited the Greeks to break the bridge, and Miltiades advised that they do so: but most of the Greek princes opposed him, so that Dareios found the bridge still guarded and intact. This is the Danube episode.

Most modern scholars think this episode, or at least Miltiades' proposal, fictitious: the event which we will therefore try to date is Dareios' European campaign. There is a growing consensus to put it in about 513 B.C.: so Berve, p. 42, note 3, and Cameron in a careful note in JNES II (1943), p. 313, note 32. Dareios' eastern preoccupations forbid any date substantially earlier, Hippias' medising alliance with Lampakos forbids any substantially later. Dareios' 'list of peoples', on the foundation block of the Persepolis terrace, which mentions the 'Lands overseas', was probably inscribed very soon after the European campaign, and it was inscribed in some year not very much before 511: it could well be of 514 or 513. The approximate date is thus hardly in question. Chance has preserved only one ancient statement of the date, in the Chronikon Romanum (FrG 252 B 8). Here it is synchronised with the murder of Hipparchos and both are dated to 513/2. This absolute date is one year too low for Hipparchos' murder. I believe it is also one year too late for Dareios' campaign: that is to say, the synchronism is correct though the absolute date is wrong by one year.

This synchronism is, I think, implied in Thucydides' statement (VI. 59) that Hippias' reaction to Hipparchos' murder was to make a marriage alliance with Lampakos: for this alliance was in fact Hippias' reaction (and a prompt reaction) to both events alike. After the murder, Thucydides says, Hippias' rule became harsher: he killed many citizens and also took stock of the external situation. 'At any rate [για τον το συν ήτοι αυτού] he now proceeded to marry his daughter Archidice to Aiantides, son of Hippoklos the ruler of Lampakos: though he was Athenian and these were Lampakenes, he saw how well they stood with King Dareios'. Hippoklos was one of the Asiatic Greeks who followed Dareios to the Danube, and when Miltiades suggested deserting Dareios, Hippoklos was one of those who opposed him and saved the King and his army. Thucydides (as I understand him) presupposes this: Hippoklos enjoyed Dareios' favour because he had proved loyal on the Danube.

Thucydides here confirms the substantial truth of Herodotos' story. The alliance was...
paradoxical, since Lampsakos had a long-standing feud with the Athenians in Chersonese: this is Hippias’ decisive break with Miltiades. In concrete terms, he now detaches Sigesion from Chersonese and attaches it to Lampsakos: his communications now run from Sigesion via Lampsakos to Sousa. This volte face is called for only if Miltiades has to some degree compromised himself, or (as I would prefer to say) if the policy of keeping Thrace for Athenians (rather than Asiatic Greeks) has proved futile. I do not now how far Miltiades had shown his hand on the Danube: but Dareios’ advance into Europe had certainly been against Athenian interests. The Asiatic Greeks who supported Dareios (and had saved his life) were now getting their rewards at Athens’ expense. Athens’ three main interests in the north (Strymon, Troad, Chersonese) were all coveted by Dareios’ benefactors. The two chief benefactors (Histiaios and Koês, in Miletos and Lesbos) coveted the Strymon and the Troad: Hippias struck his bargain with Lampsakos, which coveted the Chersonese. Miltiades whom (a very short while before) Hippias had established as ruler in Chersonese, must now be sacrificed to the changed circumstances.

This was most satisfactory for Dareios, who knew something of the quality of Greek civilisation and the value to him of a medizing Athens: and correspondingly disquieting for Sparta. The Spartan attacks on Hippias are the consequence; and the first of these (Anchimolios) can hardly be later than 512. The marriage belongs then probably to 513: it followed fairly promptly on Hippiarchos’ murder. I would expect that it followed equally promptly on the Danube campaign, since Hippias could not afford to wait long before adjusting himself to his dangers in Thrace and the Troad. The marriage in 513 is Hippias’ prompt reaction to both events, so that the Chronikon’s synchronism is good. Both events were in 514.

(iii) Herodotos, in VI. 40, is closing a longish digression. His main theme is the collapse of the Ionian Revolt and the punitive cruise of the Phoenician fleet along the Aegean coast of Asia Minor: this is in 493. This fleet reaches Chersonese at VI. 33: at VI. 34 Herodotos digresses to explain how Miltiades came to be there. He tells of the arrival of Miltiades senor, the founder; of his death and the death of Stesagoras his successor (34–38); next, the accession of the younger Miltiades (39.1), his accession trouble (39.2), and the worse which followed (40). The closing sentence of 40 is, as it stands, nonsense: the necessary correction (as I see it) is made by Dobree, who deleted the words [τρίτον ἔτος] and [τὸν τότε τῆς κατοικίας] and left the simple statement: ‘this then happened earlier: but now, in 493, etc.’

This correction leaves the narrative fairly clear. In 39 we read how Miltiades’ predecessor has been assassinated, leaving everything uneasy: how Miltiades takes the drastic steps which are required (mass arrests, foreign bodyguard, etc.). The story proceeds (40)

‘So this Miltiades, Kimon’s son, had just arrived. And after his arrival there befell him troubles even worse than these: for after two years he must run before the Skynthians.

---

16 Berve p. 35 speaks of this alliance as the culmination of constant hostility between Sigesion and Chersonese. He starts from his belief in the ‘fordernde Freundschaft zwischen den beiden Familien’, and finds any other relation between the two places ‘denkbar unmahlscheinlich’. I do not know how he understands Thucydides’ words ‘Ἀδημήτως ἐν τῷ Λαυκασίῳ’ (VI. 59.3). I understand them to mark the singularity of the act. See note 36.

17 Thucydidès VI. 59. 4: ἔστει τῷ Σύρμῳ καὶ παρ’ Ἀλκαίου τῷ Ἀλκαίου βασιλείᾳ Πελοπόννησος ἔτους ἔς τέτει λαυκασίων ἔστει τῷ Σύρμῳ βασιλείᾳ. Unless Herodotos is wrong (M. 496) it took him some years to reach Sousa. Koês suggested guarding the bridge (IV. 49), Histiaios preserved it (IV. 137). Their rewards; Koês is made ruler of Mytilene, Histiaios is given Mykonos on the Strymon (V. 11). A ruler of Mytilene favoured by Persia was a danger to Sigesion; see, for a generation earlier, V. 94–95; and the possessions of Mytilene in the Troad a generation later can be measured, roughly, from the ‘Ακτιαίας cedants by Mytilene in 427: ATL I (or II), A 93 124–141, 1 A 10 14–27, ATL II, D 22, lines 13–15.

18 Between Hippiarchos’ murder in August 514 and Hippias’ expulsion probably in spring 510, we should probably put the Alkimonean attempt at Leipsydron in 513, the Spartan seaborne attack (Anchimolios) in 512, the preparation of a land approach (Σμεργας) in 511.

20 Dobree’s correction is supported by very strong arguments by Enoch Powell, ΚΩ ΛΕΩΝ (1935) p. 160. Note, also, how like the restored sentence is to V. 2, 1: τὰ μὲν δ’ ἐν τῇ μακραιᾷ διὰ κυρίωτόν τε τῆς, etc.

21 The two comparanda are evidently (a) the trouble he had encountered at his first arrival (described in ch. 39) and (b) the worse trouble which came two years later, namely the Skythian raid on Chersonese. For (a) neither of the two variants τῶν καταλαθόντων προμάχων ταύτης καταλαθόντων προσκυνήσαντα τινά τῆς καταλαθόντων προσκυνήσαντα τινά τῆς καταλαθόντων προσκυνήσαντα τινά. He was sent to take charge of the situation, but it took charge of him?
These Skyths were nomads, who having been provoked by King Dareios, rallied and pursued as far as this Chersonese. Miltiades did not wait their attack but withdrew, until the Skyths went away and the Dolonkoi fetched him back.

All this had happened earlier: but now, in 493 . . .

The Skythian attack comes two years after Miltiades' arrival. It was a consequence of Dareios' campaign, evidently an immediate consequence: 22 Dareios' campaign therefore was just under two years after Miltiades' arrival. If we put that campaign in 514, the Skythian attack will come in 514 or 513, and Miltiades' arrival in 516 or 515.

(iv) The date of Miltiades' action in Lemnos and Imbros makes little difference to the present enquiry. I am accepting D. Mustilli's recent statement, that the contents of the earliest Greek burials at Hephaistia in Lemnos can all be later than 500 B.C., though the deposits of the pre-Greek temple stop perceptibly earlier. The temple, Mustilli supposes, was destroyed by Otanes when he captured the two islands in 513 (Herodotos V. 26–27). Both islands had then still their pre-Greek (Pelasgian) inhabitants. Otanes put in Lykaretos (a Samian) as governor at Lemnos; Lykaretos died (was perhaps killed?) and Lemnos apparently regained its independence under Hermon, presumably a Pelasgian. Hermon handed Hephaistia (one of the island's two cities) over to Miltiades; who captured the other after a siege and then presented the whole of Lemnos to Athens. The Pelasgians were now evacuated and Athenian colonists took possession. 23 Imbros (which Miltiades kept for himself) was perhaps captured in the same operation. 24

The action was hostile to Persia. Miltiades might possibly venture on hostile action at various times, but Athens' complicity (she accepts possession of Lemnos) probably fixes this to the very beginning of the Ionian Revolt, 499 or 498. 25 We have from Hephaistia in Lemnos part of a list of names, arranged by Attic tribes, in the Attic script of this date. 26 It was no doubt a catalogue of some of the Athenian colonists.

(v) Thucydides says (VI 54. 6) that Peisistratos and Hippias left the constitution untouched except that they contrived to have 'always one of themselves' in the archonships. 27 The archon-list from the Agora 28 reveals how this worked in Hippias' reign: so soon as he is safely established, the three archons first appointed, in 526, 525, 524, are himself, Kleisthenes, Miltiades. The concept 'one of ourselves' is stretched to include the leading houses of Athens. For this I have (above p. 214) borrowed Dr. Tarn's phrase, a 'union of hearts'.

In his Translation Powell proposes to change τῶν καταλημπτων to τῶν καταλημψαντων: this rather violent change destroys the sense, since so far as Herodotos has told us Miltiades left no troubles at Athens (39. 1). 22 Unless we alter the text this Skythian raid is only two years after Miltiades' arrival, and is therefore less than two years after Dareios' campaign. It was surely a pursuit (though by translating παρευμενα 'pursued' I beg this question). Strabo XIII. 1. 22 confirms that the Skyths reached Chersonese, but gives no further precision about the date. The Skythian embassy to Sparta (Herodotos VI. 84), if it belongs to this occasion will imply that they stayed more than a few weeks.

It is clear that Dareios was in some trouble: the Bosporos bridge was broken, Byzantion, Chalkedon and Perinthos, all required punishment (V. 1. 1, V. 26): this is evidently why Dareios crossed, in this tumultuary fashion, at Abydos. Did Miltiades help at this point, and so escape his punishment? or was he, when Otanes came, still in flight from the Skyths? Perhaps he, Chersonese was for Hippokloos to deal with: whether he did so, how he did so, why he did not more, are questions we cannot answer. 23 D. Mustilli, L'occupazione ateniese di Lemnos e gli scavi di Hephaistia, in Studi - offerti a E. Ciceri (1940) pp. 149-158. Cf. also A. Passerini, Miltiades e l'occupazione di Lemnos (1935). Herodotos says nothing of Hermon, for whom see the authors named in note 3.

24 He called at Imbros on his way home in 493, Herodotos VI. 41. 2, 104. 1. In the Attic tribute lists, Imbros was probably, down to 447, one of the items covered by Chersonesiotes: see e.g. ATL III p. 46.

25 The alternative date is 510–508: after Hippias' fall, and before the new alliance with Sardis made in 508/7 (Herodotos V. 73) and voided after the second embassy in c. 500 (66, 57, 97, 1). To judge by its position in Diodoros X. 19. 3, Ephoros told the story of Hermon [notes 23 and 9] as part of, or a pendant to, the Danube campaign. But so far as we can judge Ephoros' principles of arrangement, this is no reason for preferring the earlier date. It is to be hoped that eventually the material from Hephaistia will be decisive.


27 VI. 54. 6: ήτοι τανα σφονιον τανιας αρχαγην. I accept Schwartz' argument for changing the text in 54. 5: we must read ρεκυλιδο παλαι ἡ ἀρχαγην [misread as τ ελεγη ἀρχαγη] ἐπακολουθηναι τον. The subject of this sentence will thus be the tyranny, not Hipparchos; τότε ὅτι τανα αρχαγην in the next clause will mean 'Peisistratos and Hippias' (not 'Hippias and Hipparchos'), and these will be the subject of τεκαυανακον in 54. 6.

28 See note 7 above.
The reign was to be founded upon a cordiality between the three families, Peisistratids, Alkmeonids, Kimonids. 29

It seems that Herodotos did not know these facts. This is intelligible, if the text was not publicly displayed before about 425 B.C. 30 The memory of cordial relations with Hippias was not a thing which either Alkmeonids or Kimonids would treasure. Herodotos asserts that the former stayed in exile till Hippias fell, 31 and this makes it certain he did not know of Kleisthenes' archonship. Of the latter he gives a more ambiguous account: this is no doubt because it reflects two things, a charge of undue complicity with the tyrants, and a defence against that charge.

In his last phase, when he was a plain citizen of Athens, Miltiades was twice put on trial; the first time (in 493) on the charge of 'tyranny' . 32 He was acquitted. I believe that Themistokles was his judge, resolved (if necessary, for the public weal) to override the evidence. 33 It was certain in 493, whatever his past record had been, that Miltiades was now the enemy of Hippias and of Hippias' Persian friends; and for Themistokles that was enough. But the prosecutors no doubt made play with the fact 34 that Miltiades had been Hippias' vicerey in Chersonese. Herodotos has more than one echo of this case: the controversy attending Miltiades' return to Athens has caused us to know more about some episodes of his career than about most things in Hippias' reign. This information is 'forensic'. In the Danube episode the motives assigned to Miltiades' opponents (IV 137. 1-2) are assigned forensically: they give the story its value for a defence against the charge of 'tyranny'. It is equally clear, I think, that all of VI. 39 was meant (not by Herodotos, but by the parties whom he echoes) to be damaging: the treacherous arrests, the foreign wife, the bodyguards, not least the help from Hippias, all have the smell of tyranny. 35

In my judgment, the principality of Chersonese was associated closely with the tyranny at Athens. During most of the principality's duration the Peisistratids possessed Sigeion in the Troad. The relation between these two places (just astride the Hellespont mouth) cannot have been indifferent: they must have been either enemies or close friends. When we ask ourselves, which? the answer can hardly be in doubt: it was (until 514) a relation of close friendship. 36 It had been the same in Phryn'os's time, c. 600 B.C.: Phrynos' twin foundations...
were Sigeion and (in Chersonese, immediately opposite) Elaious. The Danube episode in 514 changed this: it made Hippias cut his losses, give up his projects in Thrace, and attach Sigeion to Lampakos and Persia.

The principality was established (so I believe) in 546, soon after the battle of Parnasse. Miltiades senior was (Herodotus says) a man of consequence who found Peisistratos' rule irksome. Motives in Herodotus are not above question, but this motive may be true. He had already won the Olympia chariot race (perhaps in 548?)**: this no doubt was what irked both parties alike. Yet the trouble was hardly more than irksome. I believe that the two men, Peisistratos and Miltiades senior, both belonged to the wealthy non-Eupatrid families which Solon has recently admitted to public life: both were from Brauron in east Attica and both no doubt belonged to the Hyperakris faction. If neither the faction nor Attica was big enough for both men, this was put right when Miltiades went abroad. Trouble started again when Kimon looked likely to rival his half-brother's exploits. Kimon may have been a simpleton, but the Olympic victor sat in the Prytaneion with the high annual officers of state; he stayed there year after year while archons came and went. I do not suppose the Tyrant had this privilege—until Kimon ceded to Peisistratos his second victory in 532. (He had not the wit to cede his third, in 532, to Hippias.)

Jealousy of the family's four victories, in 548 (?), 536, 522, 526, accounts, I believe, for what discord there was. Basically, the two houses were allied. After Kimon's death the Peisistratids saw to Miltiades' civic advancement. So long as he was young and tractable, his place would be next to the reigning house. Of his first wife we know only that her son Metiochos was honourably received by Dariclos in 493: this may suggest she had been related to Hippias. If Miltiades stood as close as I suppose to the throne, it is possible that he was made archon exceptionally young, before he was thirty: but I do not think this very likely. became archons (Plutarch, Thes. 26, no doubt from Aristote): Solon admitted all families which had sufficient landed wealth. (I hope some time to improve what I wrote on this subject in CQ XXI, 1931, pp. 1 ff., 77 ff.)

The name Hyperakris (Herodotos I. 59) no doubt indicates the periphery of Attica, outside the ring of Hyemitos, Pentelicum, Parnes, Aigaleos: opposed to the Plain and Coast inside that ring and visible from Athens. Brauron on the east coast is peripheral. Peisistratos probably retired there between his two first (relatively futile) attempts at establishing a tyranny here: it was only after the second failure that he 'left Attica altogether' (I. 61, 2). Early collaboration between the two Brauronian families may perhaps be seen in the fact that the great Panathenaea were begun in Hippokles' archonship (Pheidon, Fgr H 35 3). I suspect above that Miltiades senior led Attica in 546; his race at Olympia could then be 548. The hypothesis is too uncertain to pursue much further, but I should like to know whether he shared Peisistratos' exile. He may have done; it would have given him Thracean interests, and exiles could train horses and win races (Herodotos VI. 103, 2: cf. Pindar, Pyth. VII): but I rather suppose he has stayed in Attica. The whole Hyperakrian faction did not emigrate.

That is, the Peisistratids and the 'Miltiades house'...

37 Elaious, at the southern point of Chersonese, is the modern Cape Helles (which appears on early maps as Eius Brum). In ATE III p. 269, note 74, we quote ps. Skythnos 707-81.

38 Skymnidas 707-81.

39 έρξα Ἐλαίου Ἀρτιχή οὖσαν

40 Ἑρώδετος VI. 34-36. When Miltiades left Athens, Peisistratos was supreme (35.1); after arrival, Miltiades had time to enjoy Croesus' friendship before Sardis fell (37). Herodotus (I think) considers Peisistratos' first two attempts relatively unimportant: in VI. 123, I 40 χρόνος certainly does not include them, nor 'almost certainly' the '56 years' rule' in V. 65. 1: I do not think he refers to them here (in VI. 35.1). The 36 years began in 546 with the victory at Parnasse, which Herodotus puts perceptibly earlier than the fall of Sardis: Croesus had heard about Parnasse before he sought Sardis' alliance, a posteriori before he attacked Kyros (I. 56, 84). See CAH IV.

41 According to Herodotus, then, Parnasse was in 546 and Sardis fell perceptibly later. Either he is wrong, or else the conjecture is false in the Babylonian Chronicle which makes Kyros march against Lydia in 547 and kill its King: see Sidney Smith, Leith ch. XL-LV (Schweich Lectures for 1940), p. 36 and notes on p. 135. Although I cannot judge the conjecture, I prefer Herodotus. I think the battle between Argives and Spartans at Thrysa was in 544, separated from that at Sepeia (in 494) by a 50-year truce and Herodotus synchronises Thrysa with the fall of Sardis (I. 82). If Parnasse was in 546 and Sardis fell in 544, there is time enough for Miltiades to be taken prisoner at Lampakos, and for Croesus to demand his release (VI. 37).

42 Both Miltiades senior and Peisistratos claimed descent from Homeric heroes (Aias and Nestor): I do not suppose any Eupatrid house claimed to have entered Attica later than the Trojan War. Before Solon only Eupatrids

43 If the archon of 521/2 be Hippias' son Peisistratos (as I believe: Cadoux, JHS LXVIII, 1948, pp. 111-2), it is possible that he too was under thirty when archon. But I am very doubtful of this: Hippias may have married in the middle 'lities (Kleisthenes, Fgr H 393 F 15).
(vi) I have argued above, especially under (i) and (v), that the archon of 524/3 was the great Miltiades. An archon is probably not under thirty, so he was born not later than 554. This makes him 64 at Marathon, so that he is hardly likely to have been born much earlier than 554. This will give the following ages:

- 532: returns with Kimon from exile: aged 22
- 524: appointed archon: aged 30
- 516: goes to Chersonese: aged 38

If he was made archon exceptionally young [see (v) above], and/or if his father’s exile ended in 528 instead of 532 [see (i) above], we have further possibilities. He could return in 532 aged 22 (as above) or in 528 aged 26, or (if he was archon at 23) 45 he could return in 532 aged 15 or in 528 aged 19. I do not think these alternatives very probable.

The Ashmolean plate was painted (if the above dates are anywhere near right) at about the time when Miltiades went to Chersonese (c. 516): I suspect the painter celebrates that event. The young archer perhaps is saying that Miltiades is a fine chap: he may be an aide-de-camp 46 who will accompany the prince to his principality. The archer cannot be Miltiades himself unless the painter (for some reason) represents him as almost twenty years younger than he was. Yet may I with the utmost reserve suggest one possible reason why he might have done just that? I have in mind the Akropolis marble statue of a mounted archer, to whom the Ashmolean plate has been so often compared (Fig. 2). Akropolis inventory no. 606; Dickins, Arch. Cat. I pp. 138-41; Payne and Young, Arch. Marb. Sculpt. p. 52, pl. 134, 2-3; 135, 3; Schuchhardt, in Schrader Die archaischen Marmorbildwerke der Akropolis no. 313, Textband pp. 225-9 (Abb. 249-53), Tafelband 138-9.

Payne and Schuchhardt differ widely in their dating. There are three pieces which come into question. First, the ‘courtyard horse’ (or horseman): this has no number in the Akropolis inventory but stands in the museum courtyard [Schuchhardt adds several numbered fragments, esp. 568 and 4169, probably parts of the rider]: Payne p. 52 note 1, pl. 134, 1: Schuchhardt no. 316, pp. 233-7, Abb. 258-64. Next, the mounted archer (as above): Akropolis 606 (+ 569, 331, 556, 558, 357a): Payne, as above: Schuchhardt no. 313, as above. Last, the Epiktetos horseman: 47 Akropolis 700 (+ 485): Payne p. 52, pl. 137-8: Schuchhardt no. 314, pp. 229-31, Abb. 254, Taf. 140-1. I will call these three, respectively, Sch. 316, Sch. 313, Sch. 314.

Both scholars agree that Sch. 314 comes between the other two. But whereas Payne very tentatively, suggested ‘perhaps about 550-540’ for Sch. 316, and ‘near 520’ for Sch. 314, Schuchhardt puts the former ‘rather after than before 520’ and the latter between 510 and 500 ‘or rather, about 500’ (eher noch am Ende des Jhs.). His date for 316 depends largely on the treatment of the chiton in the fragments of the rider (Abb. 261). 48 The question is whether the rider belongs to the horse (see Schuchhardt’s careful statement on p. 236: there is no actual join): if he does belong, I imagine Payne’s early date is quite impossible. Schuchhardt says 316 is ‘only a little earlier than 313’ (p. 228): 313 thus comes apparently between 520 and 510, 49 which is more or less contemporary with the Cerberus Painter’s drawing.

---

45 This would put his birth in 548/7, within a few months, perhaps, of Miltiades’ senior’s Olympic victory (see note 40).
46 If so, we may see why he took his uncle’s name (Herodotos VI. 103. 4) although not he but his elder brother was to be that uncle’s heir (VI. 38. 1). But there are many ifs here, and some of them not easy: I think in fact that he was born much earlier; and that his name was a family name (note 29), requiring no such occasion.
47 Beardless youths in archer’s dress are frequent in late br. painting, and frequently accompany hoplites (as ἀμφιπόλεα, aides-de-camp?): a catalogue of both br. and rf. examples, Schoppa (as in note 1), pp. 9-24.
48 I use this name because (as Payne points out, AMS, p. 58) Epiktetos has made a careful drawing of the horse. The drawing (ARV, p. 56, Epiktetos no. 18) completely changes the action: the cavalryman is dismounted and leads his horse.
49 The references on p. 235 to Abb. 261 and 262 seem to have been transposed in error.
50 There are I think some small inconsistencies in his datings especially on p. 228. He there says (a) 316 is ‘only a little’ earlier than 313: (b) 316 cannot be before 520 b.C. (see p. 237): (c) 313 is 10 years later than 316: (d) 313 is about 500 b.C. Conceivably ein Jahrzehnt in (c) is a misprint? But even so: if 316 is after 520 b.C., and 313 is (even a little) later again, this should bring 313 somewhere near 515 b.C., yet he says (p. 228) that since Miltiades did not go to Chersonese till 516 or 515 there are chronological difficulties in connecting 313 with that event. Finally, (p. 231) 314 is ‘at least 10 years’ later than 313.
objection to this, perhaps, is that Sch. 314 has now to be put some 10 years later again, close to 500 B.C.: and this will make Epiktetos' drawing of it (see note 47) almost impossible. Schuchhardt believes there is no such particular likeness (p. 231).—There is, further, some divergence between the two scholars on how good our mounted archer (Sch. 313) is. 'Kein Werk ersten Ranges' (Schuchhardt p. 227). Payne on the contrary says that it, 'as is generally recognised, must have been the finest of the whole series': and he includes in this comparison, if I understand him, both the Rampin rider and the Epiktetos horseman.

Payne did not, I think, wish to put the mounted archer as early as 530. The hypothesis which I shall venture to suggest requires (I believe) a date even earlier, namely 532; for that is when I believe Miltiades returned with his father to Athens. This hypothesis is, briefly, that the statue was dedicated (or in honour of) Kimon when he returned from exile in 532: that it represented his son Miltiades: 50 that in c. 516 the Cerberus Painter made a rough likeness of it. 53

I have not, I hope, disguised from the non-archaeologist that responsible opinion puts the statue much later. The rider fragments assigned to the courtyard horse (Sch. 316) cannot possibly (I believe) be so early as this: if they are rightly assigned, my hypothesis demands that the courtyard horse is later than the archer. The hypothesis must be defended in some such way as this: the Epiktetos horseman, whose horse Epiktetos drew, is not later than about 520: the archer is some ten years earlier, and (if it be work of the quality which Payne says) may be earlier than it looks. I doubt if this is a good defence: if it will not hold, then either my dates for Miltiades are wrong, or else the mounted archer does not (either in statue or drawing) portray him.

and this brings 314 into the last decade, or rather to the end, of the century'.

The treatment of the chiton in Akropolis 568 (which Schuchhardt ascribes to 316) cannot possibly, I believe, be much earlier than 520 and Schuchhardt thinks it later. If we hang his chronology on that, we get the following: 316, c. 520—B.C.: 313, c. 515 B.C.: 314, c. 500 B.C. The snag is that 500 B.C. is very late for 314 if Epiktetos drew his horse from it.

50 The Megakles pinax, I think, represents the son of a returned exile (Pfuhl, pl. 175).

51 A rough likeness, but I think a real one, in spite of considerable differences, e.g. in what the rider wears: Payne p. 54, Schuchhardt p. 228. The marble, relatively unfinished on the left side (e.g. horse's left ear, rider's left foot), was meant to be seen from the right; sc. he appeared to be moving to the spectator's right: the drawing quite systematically inverts this. (The Amphitheatros crater seems likewise to have inverted what stood on the kypselos chest. What, incidentally, was the time-interval here between original and copy?) Schoppa, p. 24, thinks that the marble is part of a group which included an adult horseman, presumably on the archer's left. Even so, since the archer's body is turned to the right, the right is no doubt the 'Hauptansicht,' at least for him (and indeed, so far as I can envisage Schoppa's group, for the whole composition).
MASKS ON GNATHIA VASES

[PLATE XLV]

The following list contains all the masks on Gnathia vases which I have seen or know from illustrations or photographs. I have added (nos. 37–44) Gnathia pictures of actors wearing masks, but I have not included either the Würzburg fragment 1 with a tragic scene or the Lenin-grad kalys krater with the prologue of the Eumenides 2 because in both, though the painter may be influenced by the masks worn, he is painting characters rather than actors. I have also excluded satyrs 3 because here again the boundary between character and actor is not clear to me. The list is divided into hanging masks (1–36) and worn masks (37–44). All the actors except the tragic actors belong to the so-called 4 Phlyakes 4 known from a large number of South Italian vases of different manufactures, which are decorated with scenes sometimes inspired by Attic Middle Comedy. 5 There is a case for interpreting the hanging masks also as stage masks since the hanging tragic masks (3–5a) are certainly stage masks and the mask of the old man on the London krater (7) is very like a terracotta actor in Oxford; 6 the mask on the Haileybury krater recurs on an Attic relief. 7 If the vases can be dated approximately, we can say approximately at what time these masks were known in Tarentum, where the best of these vases were made, and from this we may be able to argue something about their introduction in Athens.

Gnathia Masks


Acknowledgements are due for photographs and permission to reproduce to Professors Sir John Beazley, H. Diepold, E. Gjerstad, and to the authorities of the British Museum, Ashmolean Museum, Reading Corporation Museum, Haileybury College, Stockport Municipal Museum, Bowdoin College, Rijksmuseum Leiden, and the Louvre, for photographs to Mr. B. Ashmole, Dr. A. Cambitoglou, M. J. Devambez, Professor H. Diepold, M. H. P. Fournest, Monseigneur Galliati, Mr. K. Garlick, D. B. Harden, Professor C. M. E. Haepels, Miss Lodge, Professor E. von Mercklin, Miss G. M. A. Richter, Mr. J. Spencer and the University of Michigan. Sir John Beazley, Dr. A. Cambitoglou, Mr. J. M. T. Charlton, Professor H. Diepold, Miss G. M. A. Richter, Professor A. D. Trendall, Dr. A. P. Trewweck and Mrs. A. D. Ure have told me about unpublished vases. Dr. A. Cambitoglou, Mr. J. M. Cook, Professor A. Rumpf, Professor C. M. Robertson, Dr. M. N. Tod and Professor A. D. Trendall have helped me on many points. Finally, I ask Sir John Beazley to accept this as a token of gratitude for instruction, inspiration, and help over the past twenty-eight years.

Pickard-Cambridge, Theatre, fig. 55–6; Bulle, Skengraphie; Rumpf, J.H.S., LXVII, 13.

2 Pickard-Cambridge, Theatre, fig. 11; Séchan, Études, 1930, fig. 36 and 38.

3 Heydenmann listed these in Jb. 1886, 260 f., distinguishing them by letters. Zahn added to the list in F.R., III, 180, giving his additions small letters. I quote Heydenmann m, n, Zahn q etc. A new list is given by Wüst in AE, XX, 292 ff.

5 Heydenmann listed these in Jb. 1886, 260 f., distinguishing them by letters. Zahn added to the list in F.R., III, 180, giving his additions small letters. I quote Heydenmann m, n, Zahn q etc. A new list is given by Wüst in AE, XX, 292 ff.

6 Heydenmann listed these in Jb. 1886, 260 f., distinguishing them by letters. Zahn added to the list in F.R., III, 180, giving his additions small letters. I quote Heydenmann m, n, Zahn q etc. A new list is given by Wüst in AE, XX, 292 ff.

7 Ath. Mitt. 1944, 218, p. 73. Document relief from Aixone. I owe the knowledge of this to Professor A. Rumpf and a photograph to Mr. J. M. Cook. Five comic masks decorate the architrave above a low relief of Dionysos and a satyr. The fourth mask from the left is very like the Haileybury mask. It is also like the clay mask from Olympia (IV no. 421), which may therefore be claimed for Comic. Lacus (Ganymed 76) associates with this last a mask from the Kerameikos, A.H. 1942, 245, fig. 267 (7), but I do not feel certain that that is not tragic. The inscription on the new Aixone relief commemorates a comedy produced in the archonship of Theophrastus by Autes of Autolkes and Philexenos of Philai. The proposal was made by Glaukides son of Sostippus and the demarch was Hegesileas. Kyperias and Peak date 313/2, comparing another choric inscription (I.G. II Ἱ 202), which Kircher dates 313/2 on the ground that Glaukides, who also proposed that decree, has a brother mentioned in a catalogue of 393 and that one of the men honoured, Aristokrates, proposed a decree in honour of Demetrius of Phalerum in 317. Although these are strong arguments and, as Dr. M. N. Tod points out, the other two choric inscriptions at Aixone are dated 320/5 and 317/6 respectively, I am inclined to prefer the earlier Theophrastus, 340/399 for the following reasons: (1) in I.G. II 202 one of the men honoured is Kallikrates son of Glaukon; Glaukon son of Kallikrates was choregos in 317/6 (I.G. 1200). Twenty-three years is a better interval than four between the choregia of father and son. (2) Autes son of Autolkes is granted a lease with his father in 346/5 (I.G. 2492); he is more likely to have been choregos when he was 20 than when he was 50. (3) The Dionysos of the new relief derives from the same statue as the Dionysos of the Pome oenochoe in New York dated about 350 (25, 190: Schefind, E.F. pl. 10, U no. 327; Richter, Attic red-figured vases, fig. 232). The relief above I.G. II 1202 is reproduced Br. Br. 785 B, quite different in style, but cannot be more precisely dated. See however Buschor, Misc. Acad. Ber., II, 5, 25 ff.
Masks on Gnathia Vases


20. Ditto. Lund University. Fig. 1. Bell krater without overhanging rim. Yellow spray group. Third quarter.


34. Ditto. Motya. Whittemaker, fig. 95-. Oenochoe. Yellow spray group. Third quarter.


35. Woman with melon hair. Manchester, MWI, 6496. Manchester Memoirs, 83, pl. 38; Greek Interpretations, pl. VIII. Oenochoe. Ribbed group. After 300 B.C.


37. Actor holding tragic mask. Würzburg, 832; Bulle, fig. 1, pl. 2; Bieber, H.T., fig. 216. Kalxy krater. Konnaks group. About 350 B.C.


41. Reseller. Taranto 8953. C.V. 743/3; Bieber, H.T., fig. 395; latopgia VII, 389, fig. 9; RA, 1936, 180, fig. 8. Oenochoe. Konnaks group. Before 350 B.C.
The vases can conveniently be grouped by decoration, although the groups do not coincide with artists or even necessarily with workshops. (1) Bulle's Konnakis group. To this our nos. 12, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 belong. This group has polychrome figures against a black background with much use of incision and comparatively little subsidiary decoration. Its characteristic ornament is ivy with triangular leaves, incised stems, and fruit consisting of three dots. I have omitted nos. 7 and 42 because they have much less incision and much more ornament. I have added nos. 12 and 41. No. 43 is considerably later than the rest and does not belong to this group in the narrower sense. (2) The red and white group, called after the oblongs of alternate red and white (or yellow), which are enclosed in incised lines; egg and tongue pattern and vine branches with red stems are extremely common. To this belong nos. 21, 24, 27, and 42; no. 44 has some affinity in style to no. 42. Probably no. 28 should be included, but the picture is too bad to be certain; no. 6 is also a freak of this group. (3) The red spray group. The long red stems with small leaves seem to have developed from the stems set with small ivy leaves which are sometimes found in the red and white group, e.g. on the back of no. 21. The ivy now normally has painted stems, the base of the leaves is rounder and comes up further towards the point, and the fruits are dot-rosettes. To this group belong nos. 1a, 9a, 13, 25, 25a, 31, 31a. Probably nos. 7, 18, and 18a should be included here: no. 7 has no incision; the jeunique vine has a red stem like the red spray; the triangular leaved rosettes occur also on 9 and 31. No. 18 is a freak but the pendant double red lines with careful ivy leaves bear some relation to the red sprays. No. 18a is by the same hand. No. 10a has this early ivy and this wave pattern sometimes occurs in this group. (4) The dotted spray group. The leaves have shrunken into dots; very often broad red horizontal bands over two white lines surrounding a row of dots support the branches. To this group belong nos. 1, 2, 14, 22, 23, 26, 27a, 32, 33, 33a. (5) The yellow spray group has yellow stems with longer leaves coming close up to or actually joining the stem. Ivy as in the red spray group. Red is used only for the common hanging scarves. Two of the bowls (11, 39) are decorated with dotted sprays at the back. To this group belong nos. 11, 19, 20, 20a, 29, 30, 34, 34a, 34c, 36a (no. 10 should probably be included; shape of vase as well as style and proportions of mask connect it with 11 but the ivy has circles instead of dots for fruit). (6) The ribbed group. Nos. 3, 4, 5, 5a, 8, 15, 16, 17, 34b, 35, 36.

The main lines of Gnathia chronology have been established by Scheurleer; his starting point is the Apulian krater in Naples with a lid in Gnathia technique, which is reasonably dated to the middle of the fourth century B.C. With this he equates the Berlin squat lekythos and pelike with female acrobats and the London kalyx krater with the slave carrying the cake, which has the same kind of elaborate foot as the Naples krater. Bulle himself revised his original fifth-century dating for the beginning of the Konnakis group to late in the second quarter of the fourth century. Konnakis, the Würzburg tragic scene, and the Würzburg actor are too fragmentary to provide any argument from shape. Konnakis and the actor have the characteristic ivy with triangular leaves, three-dot fruit, and incised stem, and considerable use of incision in the drawing, e.g. for the door to the left of Konnakis. This ivy also decorates the neck of the Naples Orestes in Taurus, which Buschor dates perhaps too early at 370 B.C., but the Berlin Marriage of Hebe and the British Museum Boreas (about

---

8 Arch. Anz. 1936, 285; Rocco, Mem. Accad. Napoli, VI, questions his upper date but does not give reasons.
9 Naples 3249; F.R. pl. 179; the lid, J.b. 1917, fig. 26; the main scene, Séchan fig. 31; Trendall, Poemat. Pottery, 62.
10 See Eine Skenographie, 1934, 5; quoting Watzinger, F.R.III, 368, n. 17.
11 See Rumpf, J.H.S., LXVII, fig. 2.
12 Naples 3233; F.R., pl. 149; Pickard-Cambridge, fig. 19; Biebert, H.T., fig. 69; Séchan, fig. 144. The old ivy occurs on the lekanis in mixed technique (N.Sc. 1917, 130, figs. 36 and 38) which Scheurleer dates 340/30; I should put it a decade earlier; the style seems to me to go with the Louvre krater (B.S.R. XI, pl. 15-19), which according to Trendall is considerably earlier than 340 B.C.
13 Berlin 3257; F.R. pl. 149; Jacobsthal, Ornaments, pl. 117 d.
14 1931, 5-11. 1; J.H.S., LI, pl. 4.
360 B.C. according to Trendall), already have the new ivy. The considerable use of incision in the drawing links the Würzburg actor to the Leningrad Eumenides and the Boston old man (40). These two are kalphy kraters with no ornaments other than the pictures. The shape, particularly the handles, stem, and foot, puts them later than an Attic kalphy krater dated by Schefold about 370 B.C. and rather earlier than the latest kalphy krater found at Olynthus and the Assteas kalphy kraters which Trendall dates about 350 B.C. They may therefore be placed rather before 350 B.C.

The handles of the London kalphy krater (38) appear to be rather more turned in and the foot slightly higher, which confirms Scheurleer's dating to 350 B.C. The Vienna kalphy krater (39) shows these characteristics at a slightly more advanced stage and no incision in the picture. Its foot is extremely like the foot of the London krater with the old slave (7); the polychromy of the front and the decoration of the back also associates 7, 38, and 39, although the main decoration of no. 7 agrees rather with the red spray group. The white swans at the handles of no. 7 appear again on the kalphy krater in Leningrad with the young satyr riding a pig, which

Fig. 1.—Bell Krater in Lund University.

Fig. 2.—Oenochoe in Oxford.

has the same shaped bowl as no. 38 but handles and foot like a bell krater. Rumpf has compared the proportions of the satyr to the Lysikrates monument 335/4. I see analogies in the figure drawing—the hanging dotted streamer (which recurs on 39), the swans' necks—and the foot with the Boreas krater in the British Museum, and should prefer to date slightly earlier. The use of bell krater handles and foot on an alien shape finds an analogy in the Manchester krater (13; so also 31a) of the red spray group when compared with the London krater (7). The foot of the Manchester krater is closely paralleled by the bell kraters in Milan (9) and Taranto (25). The direction in which these bell kraters develop is shown by the ribbed bell krater in London which has a high narrow foot like those of the Darius painter's kraters. The bell krater in Würzburg (29) and the rimless one in Lund (20, fig. 1), which belong to the yellow spray group, are scarcely later than Milan (9), and there seems no reason to suppose that the majority of the yellow spray group was not produced in the third quarter of the century, since the cross links in decoration with the red spray group are very close. Four bell kraters have a lower and wider foot than the Milan krater (9); of these one in Oxford with a flying dove has considerable incision in the ornament under the rim. The London krater with the

15 See above, n. 2.
16 Munich 3267; Schefold, U., no. 251; K.V., pl. 4b.
17 Olynthus, V., 96, no. 112; pl. 68.
18 Paestan Pottery, 45. Note that the Berlin Assteas has a foot like Boston and Leningrad; the Rape of Ajax (C.V. Italy 141/3) a foot like our London kalphy krater (38).
19 Leningrad; Bulle, O., fig. 13; Rumpf, Jb., XLIX, 18; Vol. LXXI.
20 F 545; C.V. 37/7.
21 Ashmolean Report, 1939, pl. V. 5. Egg and tongue: battlements: white dots between incised lines: vine wreath with red stem and four pendant red sprays between which flying dove carrying necklace and diminishing lines below two circles.
mask (31) has in addition incision for the ivy stem on the front as well as for the old-fashioned ivy on the back. Both these belong to the red spray group. London 22 F 547 with a running hare between vine sprays exactly like those on the Oxford krater belongs to the red and white group. A bell krater in Manchester,23 which has the same shape of foot but a simple curve to the lip and slim curved handles, is decorated with Konnakis ivy sprays and outline rosettes. These four take us back to the middle of the century. The Vienna bell krater (42) has the more normal foot and handles, which are known from Apulian red-figure.24 The decoration is very like that of a bell krater in the Cabinet des Médailles (941), which has the same shape as Milan (9). Vienna belongs to the red and white group and has no incision on the figure but some between the patterns. Its rosettes, necklaces, vines, and red sprays recur on vases that we have dated between 350 and 325 and there seems no ground for coming much later than 330: the Leiden bowl (6) is very close to it and might be by the same hand. The Toronto oenochoe (24) and the Sèvres skyphos (21) have more incision and should therefore be earlier; the incised stem with small neat ivy leaves on the back of the skyphos is an anticipation of the red spray and recurs on several other early vases,25 sometimes as the sole decoration with incised egg and tongue and outline round-petalled rosettes like those of the Manchester bell krater.

To return, however, to the Konnakis group, Bulle and Scheurleer dated the Naples kalyx krater (43) to the end of the fourth century and this is confirmed by a comparison of the shape with late Kerch kalyx kraters.26 The two oenochoai in Oxford (12, fig. 2) and Taranto (41) with their polychromes drawing, use of incision, and very restricted decoration belong at the beginning of the series before the middle of the century. The shape derives from the Attic chous and appears to me no later than the Pompeii oenochoe in New York.27 An oenochoe in Naples 28 decorated only with Konnakis ivy has the same shape; three early red and white jugges in Toronto (24), Naples and London 29 are already slimmer. The London oenochoe (19) of the yellow spray group is thinner in the neck and fatter in the belly and this agrees with the date (350-325 B.C.) given above to the group. The Oxford oenochoe (22) of the dotted spray group is at much the same stage of development. This group has various patterns in common with the yellow and the red spray vases (e.g. the ivy on no. 26) and the dotted spray itself occurs on the back of two yellow spray bowls (11, 30): the Toronto skyphos (23) is linked with the red and yellow spray groups by the ornament of two small circles over diminishing lines and with the red spray group by having the same decoration on the back as the Milan bell krater (9). The dotted spray recurs on the ribbed Brussels pelike (16), which with its high foot cannot be placed earlier than the kraters of the Darius painter and may well be later. The oenochoe from Crete in Athens (34a) is thinner in the neck than the London oenochoe (19) and the greatest diameter is lower; it is probably one of the latest of the yellow spray group and should be dated after 330 B.C. The earliest of the ribbed oenochoai with masks (15) from its long narrow neck must be considerably later.

It is important to know when the ribbed group starts and how long it goes on. We have a possible indication of the beginning in the squat lekythoi, which also provide some confirmatory evidence for our other dating. Scheurleer dates the Berlin squat lekythos 30 with the female acrobat to 350 B.C.; it belongs to the early stage of the Konnakis group with much polychromy and incision. A lekythos in Bowdoin College (fig. 3) is very similar in shape: the mouth

---

22 C.V. 37/38.
23 Manchester Museum, IV. 1D.
24 E.g., Apulian, C.V. Denmark, 257/1. The kantharos is also a red-figure shape and is not common in Gnathia; our no. 44 is near in style to Vienna (42). A Gnathia pelike in Birmingham (166/85) with Eros flying over floral ornament has the red-figure instead of the Gnathia shape; style in floral ornament and egg and tongue are also not unlike the Vienna bell krater. The subsidiary decoration of the Vienna bell krater connects it particularly closely with three bell kraters of the normal Gnathia shape: Cabinet des Médailles 941, and two in Naples, illustrated RoccO, op. cit., fig. 4 = Bulle, op. cit., fig. 25; fig. 5 = A.M. LIV, 164.
25 E.g., London, C.V. 41/3, 41/19, 43/2; Picard B.C.H., 1907, no. 79; Pagenstecher, Arch. Ant., 1909, pl. 1, no. 20.
26 E.g., Munich 2755; Pfuhl, fig. 603; Scheufeld, no. 298.
28 New York 25, 190; Scheufeld no. 323; R.F., pl. 10; Richter, Attic red-figure vases, fig. 123. About 355 B.C. Cf. also Apulian oenochoe, C.V. Denmark, 264/1, which Johansen calls "proto-Apulian".
29 Picard, op. cit., no. 47.
30 Naples, Picard, op. cit., no. 79; London, C.V., 41/3. There are no obvious parallels for the sharp shouldered oenochoe in the Louvre (27); the yellow spray depending from the ivy gives a cross-connection from the red and white to the yellow spray group.
31 P5,89. Bulle, H, fig. 14; Bieber, H.T., fig. 417.
perhaps flares rather more, the neck is slightly shorter and the greatest diameter of the body rather higher.\textsuperscript{31} A muse in full polychrome technique leans on Mount Helikon, holding two double flutes; on either side of her are elaborate floral ornaments. Shape and subsidiary decoration would date in the forties. The floral ornament, particularly the free spurs, seem to me earlier than the more formal and lifeless spirals of the Darius and Medea vases and find nearer analogies on the Berlin marriage of Hebe\textsuperscript{32} and a column krater in Copenhagen,\textsuperscript{33} which is rather later than the British Museum Boreas but earlier than the Darius group. The Muse has her right hand on her hip, her left elbow resting on the mountain and the forearm foreshortened, her left leg bent and drawn back so that the toes touch the outside of her right foot. An early stage of this stance can be seen on an Attic vase of 390/80 B.C.\textsuperscript{34} Pylades on the Naples\textsuperscript{35} krater is nearer the Muse but his left toes touch the heel instead of the toes of his right foot. Olympias on a Panathenaic amphora\textsuperscript{36} of 340/39 B.C. and figures on several Attic
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\caption{Squat Lekythos in Bowdoin College.}
\end{figure}
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\caption{Squat Lekythos in Stockport.}
\end{figure}

reliefs datable in the late thirties or early twenties\textsuperscript{37} show the same stance but the head three quarters or frontal, as on a Kertch vase of the late thirties.\textsuperscript{38} This is a later development and we are led back to the forties for our Muse. A squat lekythos in Genoa\textsuperscript{39} is slightly later to judge by the more formal floral ornament; the embossed Maenad has been rightly compared with the Siris bronzes in the British Museum (according to Miss Lamb, early fourth century\textsuperscript{40}) but wrongly dated to the end of the fourth century. Its original with the formal drapery acting as a foil to the body must belong to the second quarter of the century,\textsuperscript{41} though of course the mould may have continued in use. A squat lekythos in Stockport (fig. 4)\textsuperscript{42} takes us a stage

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{21} Bowdoin College, 15, 48. Cf. the reticulated lekythos, London, C.V., 41/1, for shape.
\item \textsuperscript{32} See above n. 13.
\item \textsuperscript{33} Bologna 303. Piul, fig. 590; A.R.V., 804/4.
\item \textsuperscript{34} See above n. 12. Compare also for legs and feet Aphrodite on the back of the B.M. Boreas (J.H.S., LI, 89 fig. 2) but her head is turned the other way.
\item \textsuperscript{35} Harvard 1925, 30; C.V. Hoppin, pl. 6; Süsserott, Gr. Plastik des IV Jahrh., 4, 4; 6, 1-2; Beazley, A.J.A., XLVII, 458/2 Nikomachus group.
\item \textsuperscript{37} Athens N.M. 2955; Süsserott pl. 5/4; Binneboess, Urkundrelief, no. 62; about 332 B.C. Süsserott, pl. 22/3, 4, 5 dated by him 390/20.
\item \textsuperscript{38} Leningrad St. 1792; Schefold, no. 358; Pfuhl, fig. 596.
\item \textsuperscript{39} C.F. Italy 927/1.
\item \textsuperscript{40} Greek and Roman Bronzes, 174, pl. 67b.
\item \textsuperscript{41} Cf. e.g. the maenad on the calyx krater quoted in n. 16.
\item \textsuperscript{42} By the same hand, probably, a bottle in Hamburg; Pagenstecher, Arch. Anz. 1909, 1 ff., no. 14. Near also London Fg82, C.V., 40/5. For the head rising from a flower cf. Apulian red figure, C.V., Fogg, pl. XXXV, 10a; C.V. Denmark, 258/1.
\end{itemize}
later; the formal spirals and the flower from which the head rises place it with the Darius group about the early twenties. The Stockport lekythos has the ornament with two small circles above diminishing lines which we have found in our spray groups (e.g. 11, 13, 22, 23, 30, 33); a link across to the yellow spray group can be found in two pelikai and a bottle with the same ornament and with heads, which may be by the same hand as the London bowl 43 (11).

The Stockport lekythos corresponds in shape to a ribbed lekythos in London; 44 the ribbing is very careful and is divided into sections at the shoulder and half-way down the body. The red-figure marriage of Hebe already has careful ribbing but it is doubtful whether any Gnathia ribbed vases can be dated much earlier than the London lekythos and certain that our oenochoai are all rather later. The elaborate ribbed amphora also in London 45 seems to be parallel with the elaborate Apulian barrel amphorae and its lid has close analogies with the small group just quoted (see n. 43). A pelike in London 46 with a low foot also has careful ribbing. Amphora and pelike are both decorated with a woman's head with 'melon hair'; the pelike has also a baby Eros with short wings. Scheurler 47 notes the three pelikai on pl. 3 (=39) of the British Museum Corpus as a chronological series of which the earliest (39/3) belongs to the middle of the century. The latest is clearly the rough-ribbed, high-footed slender example (39/4). The question for us is whether in spite of careful ribbing and shape the head with the melon hair and the baby Eros make a date in the twenties impossible for the intervening pelike (39/1). Heads with melon hair occur on several other Gnathia vases (including our no. 36a), which would be dated at the same time by shape and decoration. 48 Miss Lamb 49 dates a bronze mirror in New York, which has a profile head with melon hair, to the second half of the fourth century, and it seems difficult to bring the melon-haired woman from Herculeanum, which has the same kind of drapery as the Mantinea base, below 320. 50 The type became popular and lasted until much later. The baby Erotes with short wings are a speciality of ribbed Gnathia and Sir John Beazley 51 dates a very slim ribbed oenochoe to the first half of the third century. But Action painted child Erotes in his picture of the marriage of Alexander and Roxane and this may have originated the new tradition; the marriage took place in 327 B.C. and as Pliny dates Action 352/348 B.C. 52 the picture is unlikely to have been painted much later. It seems therefore that we need not go below 320 B.C. for the date of the early ribbed pelike, and the yellow spray fragment in Heidelberg (36a) may still belong to the third quarter of the fourth century.

Sir John Beazley compares three of our oenochoai (3, 8, 17) with the Guglielmi oenochoe and notes an example from Crete, 53 which is very close to our no. 35, as even more elongated. Several pieces of the ribbed group have been found in Alexandria 54 but Alexandrian trade with the West goes back before the beginning of the third century; this is suggested by the curious vase 55 which has been regarded as an Alexandrian imitation of an Apulian Panathenaic amphora of the third quarter of the fourth century, and by the late yellow spray oenochoe from Crete (34a), which may well have reached Crete via Alexandria: moreover, Agathocles of Syracuse apparently issued coins copied from the types of Ptolemy Soter between 310 and 307
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44 73, 8-20, 319: C.V., 41/7.
45 F560: C.V., 39/2.
46 F558: C.V., 39/1.
48 E.g. Furtwängler, Coll. Sométe, no. 96, pl. xxxvii (bottle); Pangenstecher, op. cit., no. 18 (unribbed pelike); Picard, op. cit., no. 35 (ribbed pelike with low foot); C.V., Fogg, XXXVI, 3 (squat lekythos of same shape as Stockport).
50 Cf. Byvanck, op. cit., 35; Süsserott, op. cit., 192; Picard, Sculpture, III, 390.
51 Raccolta Guglielmi, 70, no. 80. Contemporary with the Erotes of the conical amphora, Berlin Inv. 4966 (Neugebauer, pl. 85; Buschor, Gr. Vasen, fig. 280; Pfuhl, fig. 754). The conical amphora lasted for some time: an early example in Birmingham (1670/85) with short neck and wide body has floral ornament not much later than the Stockport lekythos. The Berlin amphora is itself not much earlier than the elephant plate, about 340 n.C. (See Beazley, KVP, 211 E).
52 Texts: Overbeck, Schriften, 1937-8; Pliny, N.H., XXXV, 78; Lucian, Herod, 4. The Erotes of an early fourth century Apulian lekythos (R.A. 1936, 146 f.) are clearly children but have long wings.
53 See Sigglin, II, iii, 22 f.; Edgar, Cario Catalogue, IV, pl. 13. Homer Thompson (Hesp., III, 315) argues that the Chatby find appears to date from the foundation of Alexandria and does not run into the third century n.C. Cf. Beazley, B.S.A., XLII, 20.
54 Sigglin, II, iii, fig. 30 = Brecia, Alexandria ad Aegyptum, fig. 131; Buschor, Gr. Vasen, fig. 271.
On this evidence I am inclined to put the ribbed pelike with the high foot in Brussels (16) and the earliest of the ribbed oenochoai (5a and 15) still in the fourth century and the rest of our ribbed group in the early third century. Those which still have red scarves (3, 4, 17, 35, 36) may be rather earlier than the Michigan jug (8) which goes most closely with the Guglielmi oenochoe.

We can now consider the masks. Even if the unribbed vases should prove in some cases to have been dated too early and the ribbed vases too late, comic masks on the unribbed vases must belong to the Middle Comedy and on the ribbed vases to New Comedy, if we date the beginning of New Comedy by Menander's first production (321 B.C.) and allow a few years for the spread of the fashion to Tarentum. A few of the masks are at first sight doubtful: the Michigan mask (8) must be comic because at that time tragic masks show the triangular onkos clearly (3-5), but what of nos. 9-11? According to Bulle, although the first dateable triangular onkos is in the picture of an actor from Herculaneum deriving from an original of about 300 B.C., its introduction is to be connected with the removal of the action from the orchestra to the shallow logeion in the second half of the fourth century. But there seems to be no evidence for the removal of the action to the logeion until very much later and we have in fact earlier evidence for the onkos. A statue of a tragic poet in the Vatican holds a mask with the high onkos; the style of the drapery suggests a date between the Mausolus (after 351 B.C.) and the statue of Aeschines (322-315 B.C.).

The suggestion therefore that it is a copy of the bronze Aeschylus set up by Lycurgus in the theatre is plausible, and if so, the high onkos may have been introduced at the same time as a reaction against the more naturalistic hair dressing of the middle of the fourth century as seen in the mask of the Würzburg tragic actor (37). Lycurgus was in charge of finance at Athens from 338 to 326 B.C. We cannot date his rebuilding of the theatre more closely unless we can assume that the decree of Stratocrates gives his buildings in chronological order; then we could say that the theatre was before 330 B.C. since the Stadium was being constructed in 330 B.C.

The limits for the introduction of the high onkos seem therefore to be 350/30 B.C.; our doubtful masks were also painted between 350 and 330 B.C. They must therefore be examined on their merits. The London mask (11, pl. XLVI) is not easy to interpret but seems to have the hair tied above the forehead, a hair fashion which can be traced at any rate from 380 B.C. on Attic vases; there is no evidence for a tragic mask with this hair-dressing either in Pollux' description or in the representations; it corresponds, however, to Pollux' description of the First Pseudokore of New Comedy, and if my interpretation is right is an anticipation of the Pseudokore in the period of Middle Comedy. The mask with the long parted hair (10), which appears in profile on the Munich cup (10a, pl. XLV), is somewhat like the mask of Hesione on the Pronomos vase and the mask on a Paestan vase of 340/30 B.C. As the Paestan mask hangs

---

54 Seltman, Greek Coins, 246; cf. Rostovtzeff, Hellenistic World, 395.
56 Bulle, op. cit., fig. 4; Bieber, D., no. 44: H.T., fig. 217; Pfuhl, fig. 653; Wiegand, Antike Fresken, 1943, pl. IX (in colour).
57 Pickard-Cambridge, op. cit., 214.
58 Vatican, Braccio Nuovo, 533; Amelung, pl. 9; Helbig, D., no. 27: H.T., fig. 35; Schefold, Bildnisse, 207. On the relief in Constantinople (Mendel, H., no. 574; Bieber, D., no. 20; Poulsen, From Ny Carlsberg, I, 86; Schefold, op. cit., 160, 1) Euphrides holds a mask with the high onkos. Poulsen argues that it derives from a seated Euphrides sculpted about 330 B.C. Euphrides holds the mask in his right hand and a scroll in his left like the elderly comic poet on a relief of about 380 B.C. (Lyne Park: J.H.S. 193, pl. 13; Robert, Masks, fig. 127; Winter, KIB, 316/3). The scroll which is broken off in the left hand is not mentioned in the publications nor the fact that the poet is bearded and has deep vertical furrows in the forehead and on either side of the nose; the likeness of this earlier grave relief and the analogy of the Aeschylus suggest that the original of the Euphrides also held a mask. Earlier tragic masks on the Pronomos vase (see below n. 65), the Peiraeus relief (Bieber, D., no. 41: H.T. fig. 66-7; Winter, KIB, 316/2) and in the hand of the Muse of Mantinea (Jb. 1917, 79, fig. 45) show no heightened onkos, but even the last is derived from an original not later than 375 B.C.
59 Cf. the overseer on the Panathenaic amphora of 340/39 B.C. quoted above n. 36.
60 I.G. II, iii 351, 457: texts in Pickard-Cambridge, op. cit., 137.
61 E.g. Schefield, Untersuchungen, nos. 72, 228, 232, 336, 370.
62 Illustrated on the Menander relief (Lateran: Bieber, D., no. 129: H.T., fig. 223; Rostovtzeff, Orient and Greece, pl. lxxvii) and by a marble mask in Naples (Bieber, D., no. 174: H.T., fig. 280). For interpretation cf. Rylands Bulletin, XXII, 104.
63 Naples 3240; A.R.F., 849/1; Pfuhl, fig. 575; F.R., pl. 143-5; Pickard-Cambridge, Dictytrum, figs. 11/12; Bieber, H.T., fig. 20.
64 Bell krater by Python in the Vatican: Trendall, Paestan Pottery, 62, no. 119, pl. XVIII; Bieber, H.T., fig. 401.
between two comic masks, it is presumably a comic mask and it agrees with Pollux' description of the Kore of New Comedy. Hesione on the Pronomos vase is a character in a satyr play (or even, as Buschor thinks, in a tragedy). Comedy therefore seems to have taken over the Kore mask from tragedy when Middle Comedy needed the distressed maiden. The Milan mask (g) is extremely difficult to interpret. Dr. A. P. Trewick, to whom I owe my knowledge of it, believes it to be a male mask, and none of the female masks of tragedy or comedy seem to have this kind of hair-dressing nor can we at this date point to a beardless mask of comedy which looks like this (cf. above n. 60). In Pollux' list of tragic masks several young men have pale complexions; the hapalos, 'golden-haired, white-skinned, smiling like a beautiful god', is ruled out because he has long tresses, the two pinaroi because they have wavy hair (epikomos), the parochros because he has thick black hair (like the panchrestos); the ochros, who has a wreath of almost golden hair with a sickly complexion like a ghost or a wounded man, remains. But our mask does not look a ghost or a wounded man, and I am inclined to regard it as a short-haired hapalos, perhaps a Hermes instead of a Dionysus; if so, he may belong to Comedy rather than Tragedy, not, however, as a character (when he would be caricatured) but as a prologue figure. Sir John Beazley's youthful Pan (1, pl. XLVa) may also be the mask of a prologue figure; in New Comedy Pan spoke the prologue of Menander's Dykoilos (137K with 134K); the Sévres Pan (2), however, looks more like a caricature and could be a character in mythological comedy. It seems likely therefore that all these masks are comic masks.

The other comic masks can be identified by the descriptions in Pollux. The old man on the Boston kalyx krater (40) has the hooked nose, bald forehead, energetic expression of the Second Pappos; the nearest parallel is on a kalyx krater in Bari but the relation to the Zeus of the Attic oenochoe in Leningrad is also clear. The Leiden bowl (6, pl. XLVd) has the receding hair, raised eyebrows, sharp beard, and 'rather bad-tempered' expression of the Sphenopogon; the Naples kalyx krater (43) shows that this mask survived into the New Comedy period. The old man on the bell krater in Vienna (42) with a large beard, a nearly bald head, and a straight stick is possibly a leno; the first play with a leno which can be approximately dated is Eubulus' Pornoboskos (350-30 B.C.). The two bearded revellers with torches (39, 41) are nameless because their masks were shaven in New Comedy; both were standard masks as both have Attic ancestors, no. 41 a terracotta and no. 39 perhaps the mask on the right on the Attic oenochoe in Leningrad. The youth with the fair waving hair in Haileybury (9a) is the second episeistos of Pollux. The hanging mask on the London krater (7) is the old slave (pappos), for which parallels have already been quoted. The slave with the cake (38) is the Maison because of his bald head and red hair, a mask used particularly for cooks but also according to Festus for 'sailors and such like'.

We have already mentioned the Kore (10, 10a) and the pseudokore (11); the Gnathia Kore is roughly contemporary with the hanging Kore mask on Python's bell krater in the Vatican but the pseudokore is the only Middle Comedy example except for an Attic terracotta in the British Museum (1907.5.20.79); these masks would be needed for recognition plays with characters from everyday life (as distinct from parodies of tragic recognition scenes), which were introduced at least as early as the thirtysevenths. The mask on the Michigan jug (8) must be a New Comedy mask; it is difficult to tell from the photograph whether it has been restored or not,
but the hair looks good. It is unparted and completely surrounds the head; the pallake is described as perikomos; so perhaps we may imagine Chrysis in Menander’s Samia.

The other female masks are the masks of hetairae, who played a large part in Middle Comedy. They fall into six distinct types. First, the girl with streaming hair on the back of the Boiotian krater (40). She is not in stage costume but there must have been a corresponding stage type and we may recognise an early version of the lampadion, which is also worn by a flute-girl on a phlyax vase. Secondly, the mask with mitra, side hair, and back hair (12, fig. 2; 13) recurs again for the Alcmena of a Paestan bell krater and a later marble version was identified by Robert as the ‘golden hetaira’. Thirdly, the mask with mitra and side hair only (14-20a, fig. 1) has three versions, which may rather represent three different painters than three different masks (14-17; 18-18a; 19-20a). Three of the first version (15-17) certainly belong to the New Comedy period, and their straight noses and solemn eyes may be compared with a marble mask in Naples, which has been identified with Pollux’ wimpled hetaira. The fourth and fifth masks (21-27; 28-34b) have no side hair, the fifth has no back hair. It is possible that the absence of side hair marks the distinction between an independent hetaira and a hetaira who is still a slave. Some in these two groups (21, 24, 27, 28, 29, 32) have snub noses and may therefore be hetaira’s maids rather than hetairae; this is particularly likely where a narrower band, which leaves the front hair free, is substituted for the wimple (21, 24, 27, 28), since they then look very much like certain statuettes and masks which have been identified with Pollux’ mask of the hetaira’s maid. Two masks with melon hair (35, 36) belong to the New Comedy period, but there seems no reason for dating the third (36a) after 325 B.C. Dr. Simon has argued that this cannot be the smoothly parted hair ascribed by Pollux to the kore and suggests that the mask with melon hair may have been one variant of the ‘blooming little hetaira’; if this is right, the Heidelberg fragment (36a) shows that this mask also goes back into the later stages of Middle Comedy.

Bulle identified the mask held by the Würzburg tragic actor (37) as the xanthos of Pollux’ list. The old man on the Ruvo Kantharos (44) must belong to tragedy as he wears tragic kothornoi like the Würzburg tragic actor. Professor Trendall tells me that his beard and tunic are white, his cloak a reddish brown with a purple border and his boots much the same. He is telling a story. The bundle fixes him as a slave; a young hero may carry his own luggage but hardly an old hero. Only the diphtherias is possible since Pollux’ other two male slaves are much younger, but he does not wear the cap (perikranon) of the diphtherias. The old messenger who has come from a distance is not common but we have a clear example in Sophocles’ Electra. Colour does not help to identify the other tragic masks which belong to the ribbed group where only yellow and white are used. Thus the bearded mask of the Würzburg jug (3) must be judged on hair alone: the leukos, the xanthos, and the xanthoteros are the only possibilities; the leukos is probably ruled out by his ‘stiff beard’. Perhaps the sickly xanthoteros is slightly more likely than the ‘healthy’ xanthos. The first Louvre mask (4) has smooth brows and side hair. It is difficult to be certain whether it is male or female. It looks like the masks of Achilles and Medea in the Casa del Centenario, which without colour and the clothing of the figures would.
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77 Apulian bell krater, Leningrad; Bieber, D., no. 123; H.T., fig. 378; Zahn s.
78 See above n. 69; cf. also Paestan bell krater, London F 150; Bieber, H.T., fig. 367; Heydemann b; Trendall, Paeston Pottery, no. 47, pl. IX d.
79 Robert, Masken der neuen Attischen Komödie, pl. I; Bieber, D., no. 177; H.T., fig. 284.
80 6616; Bieber, D., no. 176; H.T., fig. 286; Simon, Comicea Tabellae, 113, 124.
81 E.g. Athens 5092; Bieber, D., no. 157; H.T., fig. 261; Simon, Comicea Tabellae, 111, 116 for identification and further examples.
83 Bieber, D., no. 49; H.T., figs. 520, 521.
be difficult to distinguish. The Achilles mask there is presumably the panchrestos and has smooth brows, high onkos, and long hair like ours; most of the other male masks in Pollux’ list can be excluded by hair-dressing (oulos, paroulos, pinaroi, ochros) or by expression (hapalos), but the parochros, who is the panchrestos when he is ill or in love is also possible. Medea is mesokouros, which does not mean ‘shaven in the middle’ (L.S.9) but ‘with hair half-length’ between the katakomos and the kourimos. The mesokouros ochra and the mesokouros prosphatos are distinguished by colour alone. The second Louvre mask (5, pl. XLVb) has no side hair and the corners of the mouth are pulled down. This is a kourimos, and the onkos (instead of a parting) and the absence of the short fringe of hair prove that she is the Second kourimos who ‘has been unhappy for a long time’, Electra rather than Antigone. As this is certainly a female mask, it seems probable that the other is also female and so we may imagine to ourselves Medea as she appeared at Athens or Tarentum after the reforms of Lycurgus. The Reading mask (5a, pl. XLVc) has short parted hair and no onkos; she therefore seems to be Pollux’ First kourimos, Antigone rather than Electra.

The cross-references from the comic and tragic Gnathia masks to Attic masks whether represented on vases and other monuments or described by Pollux, whose lists are based on Attic tragedy and comedy, show that the Greeks in S. Italy followed in externals also their Attic models. The Gnathia masks add something to our knowledge of Attic tragedy and comedy from the middle of the fourth to the early third century. The masks represented on the later Gnathia vases were being worn when Livius Andronicus was born, who took Greek tragedy and comedy to Rome in 240 B.C.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.

I owe the following information to Professor A. D. Trendall, who has recently visited South Italy, and to Dr. M. Bernardini, who has sent me photographs of vases in Lecce. No. 10 is now in Lecce. No. 39 is now in New York, Metr.Mus.51.11.2. No. 44 is red-figure and not Gnathia, though the figure itself is mostly in added colour.

Add to my list:

ARCHAEOLOGY IN GREECE, 1949-1950

[PLATES XLVI-XLVII]

It is a pleasure to record this year that the promise of more substantial results held out in the previous slender reports from Greece has not been disappointed, and that the discoveries made in the latter part of 1949 and the year 1950 challenge comparison with any pre-war years. The Archaeological Society has undertaken a number of new excavations in different parts of the country and has already achieved some remarkable successes. The foreign Schools have not lessened their endeavours; the Italian School has resumed its activity in the field, and the French have supplemented their achievements on land by commencing a systematic investigation of inshore waters. The Herakleion Museum is now open again. In Eleusis and Tegea the museums are being reconstituted, and that at Sparta has been reopened; the Hermes of Praxiteles has been brought above ground again at Olympia. A new wing comprising an exhibition gallery and workrooms has been added to the Corinth Museum. The museum in Thera is to be set in order, and the archaeological collection at Syra has been re-assembled in the Town Hall. In Athens, there are now six exhibition galleries open in the National Museum with a splendid selection which ranges from early Hellenic to the fourth century B.C.; a new gallery has been constructed in the Byzantine Museum to hold select exhibits, and a library and rooms for study are being fitted out in the cellars of the main building there. Under Prof. A. Orlando’s direction many Byzantine churches and monasteries which needed attention have been put in order in the last year.

ATHEN AND ATTICA

In the National Museum two more galleries have been opened during 1950 in the new wing, making a total of six apart from the small anteroom. The two new galleries contain outstanding works of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., with the same mixture of different classes of art prevailing.\(^1\) Repairs in the old museum, where the final arrangement of antiquities is due to commence, are proceeding. A head carved in relief on a convex marble disk found in Melos is now displayed for the first time; it is an island work of towards the middle of the fifth century.\(^2\) In the fourth-century room a female torso has been re-exhibited in its proper position, turned so as to show more of its left side to the beholder; it was published as coming from Epidauros\(^3\) but the place of discovery is in fact unknown. The bronzes for exhibition have all been cleaned, with a great improvement in their appearance. Plate XLVI, 4 shows a mirror with an embossed design on the cover, where the cleaning has revealed the fineness of the workmanship and silver necklaces and bracelets on the figures.\(^4\)

There are interesting new acquisitions at the Museum, notably an early Attic b.f. kylix—one of the earliest examples of this form, unfortunately lacking the foot—with a siren in the inner circle and pairs of sirens outside. But the main interest this year has been focused on the rich collection recently donated by Mr. Empedokles, which contains some outstanding vases. The large collection of sherds presented in addition by the donor’s relatives contains many fine pieces not previously known, among them fragments of two b.f. kantharoi of fine fabric; the one is a single fragment, which Mrs. Karouzou attributes to the best of the painters of the Comast group, showing Hermes present at the death of Medousa, whose hands are seen stretched in suppliant fashion towards the god; the other kantharos, of slightly later date, consists of a number of fragments burnt grey on the surface, which depict Deianeira seated on the centaur’s back and stretching her head and hands towards Herakles (whose surviving lower leg shows that he was draped in a long robe). Mrs. Karouzou believes that the frag-
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1. The following notice is drawn from a bulletin of the direction of the Museum kindly provided by Mrs. Karouzou. See above pp. 96-110.
3. Compare the previous photograph Züchner Griechische Klapptügel, 170, fig. 83.
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ments of this vase came from the Acropolis excavations; and there is no question that this is the source of some of the vases in the Empedokles collection proper. A piece of a b.f. plaque from this collection joins up with Acropolis, Graef 2544 Pl. 108, to give an almost complete picture of two youths on horseback; and an owl's head with the inscription ho πας καλὸς fits the body Graef-Langlotz 415 (B 209) Pl. 31, displaying a perfection of line worthy of one of the leading painters of the developed r.f. style. Outstanding among the r.f. pieces in their fineness of line are fragments of a footless lebes gamikos, forerunner of those from Keros; on one side are the bride, resting—like Alkestis on the Eretria epinetron—her elbow on the pillow, and two companions holding gifts of a loutrophoros and an amphora, while a few fragments survive from the nuptial equipage on the other side; the melodic design suggests Polion as the painter. A very fragmentary late fifth-century khotis presents the antiquated theme of the death of the Chimaera, with flanking figures of Athena and Bellerophon leaning on spears.

A fragment of a second-century A.D. terracotta lamp with the figure of Hephaistos is of more than ordinary interest. The god stands clad in an exomis reaching to his knees, his left leg relaxed and thrust forward in such a way as to call attention to his lameness, a sceptre in his raised left arm, his right down with his hammer; he wears a cap like that on the marble head in the Vatican which Furthwangler associated with the Hephaistos of Alkamenes, and beside his right leg is the anvil. Mrs. Karozouz recognises in the figure on the lamp a rendering—faithful within its limits—of the statue of the god in the Hephaisteion, and concludes that between the two cult figures in the temple stood an anvil, centrally placed like an altar or table and thus serving to emphasise the divinity of the blacksmith.

The bronzes of the Empedokles collection are not yet unpacked, but there are interesting pieces in the supplementary donation of the family. One is a unique pin of early classical type carrying a convex disk resembling a rhombos, which may have been intended as a love charm (Fig. 1). A fine bronze, which probably came from the Acropolis excavations, is that Fig. 2, above, in the form of a panther's scalp (Inv. 16371), intended for application on a bronze vessel; while the handle of another bronze vessel (Fig. 2, below) takes the form of two lions, plastically modelled, flanking a palmette. Lastly, a small mirror cover is reported with a fine flower-wreathed head in frontal view set in the centre; the treatment of the locks of hair which come down over the ears and the emptiness of expression support a date in the fourth century, while the resemblance of the head to that on the handle of the bronze hydria in Khalkis is so close as to suggest that they came from one workshop; the simple decoration of a small goddess' head is in striking contrast to the elaborate embossed designs on mirror covers made at this time in other centres like Athens and Corinth.

In the Epigraphical Museum M. Mitsos has joined up a considerable number of fragments of ephebe-lists (cf. Πολέμον iv. 17 ff.). The most notable addition to Mrs. Helene Stathatou's collection is an archaic bronze helmet with its gold funeral mask, which comes, together with gold and bronze ornament, from a tomb in Macedonia similar to those of Trebenniste.

Orlandos has repaired the Belvedere bastion on the Acropolis, re-erected a column of the SW wing of the Propylaea, and restored some of the seats in the Odeion of Herodes Atticus. The Kapnikarca has been re-roofed, and two columns have been replaced under the dome of the church of the Transfiguration in the Plaka. On the south edge of the ancient

---

* Meisterwerke, 120 ff.; Collignon, Histoire de la sculpture grecque, 123, fig. 59.
* A fuller discussion of this is to appear in Hesperia.
* Züchner, Klappstieg, figs. 94-95.
city, where an unfluted column remains in situ in Misaraliotis Street, I. Threpsiades is clearing part of a Roman building with an interior colonnade. Just below this he has exposed a short stretch of the Themistoclean Wall with a drain piercing it; it lies a stone's throw inside the known course of the later wall which appears on Judeich's plan, and its inner face is preserved to a height of four courses. In his excavation for the Archaeological Society I. Travlos has successfully recovered the plan of the Early Christian Basilica at the Olympieion. The building was 13'-2 m. broad and 28 m. long including the narthex. The church was divided by rows of columns into a nave and two aisles; the apse, of a type not found in Greece outside Athens, is of the same width as the nave. Numerous inscribed bases and architectural members from the Olympieion have been found incorporated in the walls; among the latter are pieces of the ceiling of the temple which will help to explain the arrangement of the panelling. Travlos dates the construction of the basilica about the end of the fifth century A.D. and finds support in

FIG. 2.—BRONZE ATTACHMENTS IN NATIONAL MUSEUM, ATHENS.

literary sources for its identification with the church of St. Nicholas of the Columns. Though only four of the eight rooms could be cleared on account of the trees, Travlos has investigated and planned the Roman bath complex adjacent to the basilica; it was of excellent construction with fine mosaics and polychrome pavements, and is dated by Travlos to the time of Hadrian's visits to Athens between A.D. 124 and 131.

The complex seems to have continued in use after the building of the Christian basilica, when the semicircular nymphaeum was converted into a sacred fount and the octagonal room probably became a baptistery.

In the American excavations in the Athenian Agora no new ground has been broken, but some areas already opened up before the war have been more thoroughly explored and the buildings underlying the Stoa of Attalos have been examined in preparation for the reconstruction of the Stoa as a museum. The foundations and floors of the Tholos, the Civic Offices,

* Marked as a stoa on Judeich's plan.
and the Odeion also have been renovated to ensure their preservation and to make them more intelligible to visitors.

In the central part of the Agora north of the "Giants" the removal of a complex of private house foundations of the Byzantine and Turkish period has brought to light the continuation of the Panathenaic Way, which is here surfaced with gravel and bordered on its west side by a stone water channel. To the west of this appeared a massive poros foundation measuring 6.3 x 8.9 m., together with a large marble orthostate from its superstructure; it lies on the axis of the Temple of Ares and apparently had steps on its west side facing the temple, so that there can be little doubt that it is the foundation of the Altar of Ares. On the ruins of the altar lay a half life-size bearded male head of marble broken from a high relief of the third quarter of the fifth century; three or four other heads previously discovered hereabouts and a fine draped female torso from a relief of the order of the Nike Temple parapet (Fig. 3) seem to go with this head and may come from a screen for the altar. Among other finds in this area are marble inscriptions, including a prytanion decree of the second century B.C. with a complete roster of the tribe Hippothontis, the mid part of a life-sized marble kouros of the mid sixth century B.C., and a fragment from a life-sized marble group of a male figure attacked by a lion which presumably comes from a hitherto unknown pedimental composition of the late sixth century.

The investigation of the earlier buildings under the Stoa of Attalos is now complete; there were three successive public buildings probably serving market purposes on this site, the second one consisting of a square peristyle with fourteen columns on each side enclosing an open court 39 m. square. Under the north end of the stoa terrace a round base of soft yellow poros, 1.35 m. in diameter and with a series of ten leaded sockets for posts around its circumference, has come to light; it seems to be the base of a rectangular altar of the late archaic period, but cannot at present be identified. Close study has brought out a number of new and interesting points about the Stoa of Attalos itself, such as that in the Roman period most of the very high-ceiled shops of the ground floor were subdivided by the insertion of mezzanine floors to provide living room above for the shopkeepers. Contemporary with the original construction of the stoa was a capacious fountain house of which the foundations and walls remain at the south end of the stoa terrace. In the early Roman period another public convenience was added—a latrine set behind the south end of the stoa so as to be accessible both from the stoa and from the street leading east to the Roman Market. At the north corner of the stoa terrace, from which it is separated by a narrow passage, a Roman colonnade with a frontage of eleven columns has been disclosed; it faced southwards on to the Agora square, and seems to have backed on the old thoroughfare that ran along the north edge of the square. This building, which has been given the name 'Northeast Stoa', is in an Ionic order closely modelled on that of the Erekhtheion.

At the back of the Stoa of Attalos a series of wells ranging from Late Geometric to Roman times has been cleared. The pottery found includes the cup of the Siana class shown in Plate XLVII, 3, which was found badly shattered at the bottom of a shaft that had proved a failure; the cup has a running warrior painted in the medallion and two single grazing horses on the outside. Some official clay tallies, of the same ware as the public measures, have been found in a mid fifth-century rubbish pit in the same area. Fig. 4 shows on the left and right respectively the front and back of two different tallies, with inscriptions in black glaze painted on before the unfired clay plaques were cut in two. On the front the upper pieces bore a demotic and the lower ones the abbreviation TIOA, while the backs of the plaques had the opening letters of a tribe name across the middle. The two tallies here illustrated are of the tribe Leontis, while a third piece, a lower tally, reads Ere(khtheis).9

At the monastery of Kaisariani M. Hatzidakis has exposed a vaulted underground chamber of poor construction with a staircase at the back, approached through an entrance court nearly four metres below the present pavement level; it seems to be an ossuary of late Byzantine times,
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9 Prof. H. Thompson also draws attention to a tally from the Dipylon with the demotic Xypetaion (IG II 2, 916).
but was subsequently used for the disposal of rubbish through a trap-door in the pavement above. At the east end of the church outside the apse, foundations belonging to an extensive earlier building-complex have been revealed; its plan is not yet clear, but it may well have been an Early Christian basilica. At Zagoríou not far east of Athens I. Papademetriou reports the discovery of the funerary epigram of Myrrine, first priestess of Athena Nike, who assumed the office ca. 448 B.C. and died about the close of the century.10

N. Kotzias in 1949 began soundings at Prophetes Elias on the back side of Hymettos above Koropi in order to locate the Propossios sanctuary mentioned by Pausanias (I. 32.2). Inside a large enclosure the remains of a tetrasyle amphiprostyle Doric temple, measuring 16 × 7 m., came to light close to the existing church. A poros corner-triglyph and terracotta cornice fragments with painted decoration have been recovered. Kotzias believes that the temple was erected about the end of the fifth century B.C., and after undergoing repairs until Roman times was converted into a church. The excavation was continued this summer, when Kotzias discovered a second temple measuring 10.7 × 6.66 m. The opisthodomos is well preserved; it was entered from the west where the rock was cut away obliquely to allow access by a narrowing path from the SW corner of the temple. The style of masonry resembles that of the Peisistratid wall at Eleusis. The temple was destroyed by a fire, whose marks are visible on fragments from the tiled roof, pieces of which are decorated with painted palmettes. Kotzias has made other soundings in the vicinity. On the hillock of Christi's Castle no architectural remains prior to the mediaeval castle have come to light, but abundant blades and arrowheads of obsidian have been discovered, together with stone implements and a boar's tusk. Near the foot of the mountain slope below Prophetes Elias the investigation of a 17-m.-deep cave or working in the rock has revealed fragments of striped vases with incised archaic graffiti, and apparently Mycenaean sherds; also black-glazed sherds and an inscribed fragment from the mouth of a Panathenaic amphora. On the foothills of Mt. Mavrovouni Kotzias has noted a roughstone building 26 m. square, with unworked square pillars set at intervals of 5 m., and in the middle a square stone construction which he takes for a hearth or altar.

This autumn Papademetriou has cleared a number of pyres in a family graveyard, which had already been looted by peasants, near Markopoulo in the Mesogeia. He has recovered two early sixth-century Attic lekanides with animal zones, a plate of the mid sixth century with a fine representation of Achilles and Penthesileia, two jugs apparently by Amasis (one plain, the other showing Helen and Menelaos), eight white lekythoi from one workshop dating ca. 420 B.C., and other fine vases.

Papademetriou has continued his excavation on the site of the sanctuary of Artemis at Brauron with remarkable results; the position is at Livadi by the chapel of St. George. There are traces of prehistoric occupation also on the acropolis hill above the chapel, where numerous Mycenaean sherds (including early ones) have been picked up this year, and at other points in the vicinity.11 Unfortunately, little now remains of the above-ground structure of the temple, but traces of the rough substructures indicate that it was prostyle in the Doric order; measuring 20.3 × 10.8 m., and built about the end of the sixth century. The temple was upheld on the north side by a platform wall five steps high, still preserved for a distance of 27 m. and probably of an original length of 100 Attic feet, at whose foot the sockets for a row of steleai have been exposed. On the other side of the temple the rocky slope was worked off to form a floor at a higher level approached by a short flight of steps; it may have been this arrangement of successive terraces which prompted Euripides' phrase σεμασα κλήμακας Βραυρωνίως (I. T. 1462–3). The discovery of later Geometric sherds and small votives in a pit beside the temple attests the antiquity of the cult. A treasury or ἱερός οίκος built against the rocky slope, with a hearth in the main room, was cleared in 1949; and a second such building excavated this year has yielded many sherds of the sixth and fifth centuries.

A series of probes have been carried out to the north where a hundred-foot portico was

10 Cf. IG I' 24–25; Ar. Lyt., with its lively presentation of this elderly priestess.
11 Cf. PAE 1948, 81 ff., where a description of the area and of the first results of the excavation is printed.
detected last year in ground water. The building has a marble stylobate, Doric columns with poros shafts and marble capitals, and triglyphs and metopes of poros and marble respectively; complete antefixes with palmettes, dating about the end of the fifth century, have come to light. The columns, eleven in number, are still lying where they collapsed in a flood of the brook Erasinos, as Papademetriou supposes, in the fourth century B.C. This stoa, whose restoration is now possible, appears to be identical in plan with that of the Brauroneion on the Athenian Acropolis, and should thus shed new light on the architectural arrangement of the latter; similar duplication is apparent also in retrograde inscriptions found in the excavation, giving lists, which correspond to those discovered on the Acropolis, of offerings of clothing and personal ornament to the goddess. The excavation of the sanctuary has yielded many pieces of sculpture—notably the fine relief fragment PAE 1948, 89 Fig. 7, a small female head of the Pheidian circle, and five of a series of fine classical heads of boys and girls; among the small finds are numerous r.f. fragments and an archaic open marble lamp with three lion's heads.

Travlos has exposed the handsome fifty-foot four-arch bridge on the Sacred Way a kilometre from Eleusis, and dates it on literary evidence to the time of Hadrian's initiation in the Mysteries. On Salamis the paintings of the monastery church of Phaneroméní have been cleaned and secured, and the chapel of Capodistria's government building on Aegina has been repaired. For the first time methodical submarine exploration on the Greek coast was undertaken this summer by a group of specialists brought out by the French School. A special diving suit was used which permits the inspection of the bottom to a depth of forty metres. Parts of the Attic and North Peloponnesian coasts have been examined, and near Marathon the remains of a number of sunk ships which were loaded with amphorae have been found. A large number of anchors, mostly of stone with leaden stocks, but in one case of lead with a wooden core, two stone mask sockets, and many amphorae and sherds have been recovered.

The Peloponnesse

At Corinth members of the American School have continued their investigations with a view to the publication of building-complexes, and J. H. Kent has completed the examination of more than seven hundred inscriptions which have come to light since 1927. O. Broneer spent the spring and summer working on the South Stoa. Digging was restricted to the clearing of walls, floors, and drains for the purposes of study. In the course of these excavations there were found, below the stoa, a small but important deposit of Submycenaean pottery, Geometric and early sixth-century pottery from the filling of wells, and fragments of a remarkable terracotta stand apparently for a bronze lebes, in the form of a Doric column surmounted by a concave base with four legs ending in lion's paws. A small excavation by S. S. Weinberg to the east of the Julian Basilica revealed traces of an apse that was added in late antiquity and
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gave clear evidence of the street that ran past the building on that side; at one period this street, like the road to Lekhaion, was paved with limestone slabs. Weinberg's report on the Julian Basilica and the South Basilica will be ready for publication in the near future, as also Mrs. Weinberg's on the ancient tile-factory with its large well-preserved kiln which was found in 1940. At Nemea B. H. Hill has established the existence of a smaller Ionic order surmounting the Corinthian in the cells of the temple.

With Prof. A. J. B. Wace and the indefatigable ephor, I. Papademetriou, in the field, the Argolid has been scene of some of the most exciting discoveries this summer. At Mycenae Wace has resumed the excavations which were interrupted by the outbreak of war in 1939, and has made some very interesting discoveries of which he is preparing a notice to be annexed to this report. Papademetriou, assisted by Ph. Petsas, has been engaged on works of restoration in the dromos of the Tomb of Clytaemnestra, where the east wall in particular was leaning dangerously, and at the Lion Gate. At the latter the two great conglomerate blocks fallen from the façade have been successfully replaced in their proper positions against the right side of the triangular lion relief, so that the sculpture is once again enclosed in its original frame. At the Tomb of Clytaemnestra, where the object was to relieve the pressure on the dromos walls, funds were not sufficient for the completion of the task, but the immediate danger has been averted and interesting discoveries have been made. With the temporary dismantling of part of the east wall of the dromos an inner retaining wall of small unworked stones was disclosed behind the upper courses about a metre and a half back; this was designed to contain the mass of earth beyond and so to relieve the pressure on the dromos wall. The space in between was filled with small stones and waterproof clay. In the loose earth behind, Geometric potsherds and scattered bits of gold leaf, including stamped rosettes, have been found; they probably come from disturbed Geometric graves, whose presence here is known from the excavations of Evangelides. The west wall of the dromos appears to have been damaged in Mycenaean times and undergone repairs in the course of which some of the slanting blocks that belong to the top course of the wall were incorporated lower down, while smaller stones were introduced to fill gaps left between the blocks in places. Fragments of the carved stone decoration of the tomb façade have also come to light; and the lowest row of seats of the Hellenistic theatre and stretches of the walls of the stage building have been revealed in the removal of earth alongside the dromos.

While engaged on these restorations at Mycenae Papademetriou and Petsas took the opportunity to test a spot on the north slope of the lower town about 200 m. south-west of the Lion Tomb where Petsas had noted abundant Mycenaean sherds, and carried out a small excavation with funds provided by the Archaeological Society. So far only one room, measuring 5 x 3-5 m., has been excavated; its walls were of small unworked stones set in clay, bound by vertical and horizontal timbers, and show clear signs of destruction by fire; the upper courses were of brick, and a rough footing, presumably for an external staircase, suggests that there was an upper storey. The room was packed with unused vases, which have been superficially damaged by the plough but were almost certainly arranged according to size and shape (three krateriskoi at one point being stacked upside down); there can therefore be no doubt that the room was a magazine of new vases. This room is a single unit, in the middle of a large, presumably terraced complex which still remains to be excavated; lower down the slope another complex of rooms full of vases has been revealed in probes and will require excavation. On the north of the excavated room other substantial walls, preserved to a height of two metres and more, have been uncovered in the sounding; here also much pottery came to light, but it was not arranged in order, and the discovery of a hearth in waterproof clay argues for living rooms here. LH I–II sherds have come to light in lower levels throughout the excavation. The vases found in the magazine belong to the so-called LH IIIb period; all, whether painted or not, are finely made.

13 AE 1912, 127 ff.
and covered with a slip of refined clay. Those with painted decoration are mainly stirrupvases with or without a foot, three-handled amphorae, conical bowls, fillers, long-stemmed kylikes, and common amphorae; those without decoration are principally long-stemmed kylikes, amphoriskoi, fillers, and small kraters. The painted decoration is in lustrous brown glaze and consists for the most part of bands and stripes in different combinations, but many of the vases have designs drawn from plant or marine life in the handle-zone. The number of vases from this one room which have been re-assembled more or less entirely exceeds six hundred, and it is remarkable that in spite of the limited range of the decoration there are very few true duplicates in this great hoard of contemporary vases. Fragments of fresco painting and numerous terracotta figurines have also come to light in the excavation, while a piece of an inscribed clay tablet, with a range of signs partly matched in the Minoan Linear B script, was picked up a stone's throw away to the
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...south-west. At Priftiani 2 km. to the south two chamber tombs have been dug by S. Kharitonides; the larger one had been robbed, but the other contained some LH III vases.

At *Epidauros* Papademetriou has been engaged in a very productive excavation for the Archaeological Society a mile east of the Asklepieion, where the remains of the hill-top sanctuary of Apollo Maleatas uncovered by Kavvadis have until now escaped serious study. In the clearing of the ground by the temple of Maleatas, which measured 15 × 8.4 m. and was built in the middle reaches of the fourth century B.C., various pieces of the entablature have been discovered, including blocks comprising triglyph and metope and even two triglyphs and a metope in one piece; a marble head and the lower part of a statue with wind-swept drapery in the style of the temple sculptures of the Asklepieion have come to light. To the east of the temple a platform is formed on the steep slope by a great retaining wall of isodomic poros blocks punctuated by buttresses supporting engaged columns, which is 45 m. long and stands as high as 5 m.; the construction of this expensive wall, about the end of the fourth century B.C., is mentioned in a newly discovered inscription which dates to the priesthood of Aristokles. At the back of the retaining wall, where Papademetriou has been digging, the

14 A notice of the first results has now appeared in *Pae* 1948, 92 ff.
15 *Cf. IG IV*, i. 108, 159 ff.
earth fill is black and thick with votive offerings, and this stratum continues under the retaining wall and down the slope to the north; it seems to be the tip from an earlier altar whose existence is attested by Ilythos in his hymn to Asklepios. No trace of earlier buildings has been found, and Papademetriou supposes that there was nothing more than an altar in the enclosure before the fourth-century temple was built. It was here that, as an inscription found by Papademetriou confirms, the suppliants who came to the Asklepicon to be healed made their preliminary sacrifice (προθρόνος) to Apollo; and the finds in the altar tip show that the cult of Maleatas at Epidauros is much more ancient than that of Asklepios (which has not been traced back beyond the middle of the sixth century).

The bulk of the finds is archaic, with some Geometric pottery and r.f. krater fragments of the mid fifth century; many hundreds of miniature kotylai and other small vases of Corinthian and Argive manufacture, a variety of Argive terracotta figurines, and a bronze lion from the rim of a vessel have been recovered. But this year’s finds carry the origin of the cult far back into prehistoric times; for abundant Mycenaean pottery and sherds going back to Early Helladic have come to light here. The Mycenaean pottery dates from LH I to LH III and includes some fragmentary large figurines in animal and human form which seem to have formed groups. The most interesting of the small finds are a fragment of a steatite rhyton with traces of what appears to be a boat and of a row of figures above perhaps walking on a beach, and two sealstones (impressions PLATE XLVI, 1–2)—that on the right a carnelian, the other, of a hard green stone which is found locally, showing a lion and feline deer arranged in a scheme not unlike that of the Chimaira. The absence of any trace of buildings on the spot suggests that this cult was not domestic but an independent one.

The veteran K. Rhomaios has returned to the exploration of Kynouria (cf. PAE 1911, 253 ff.). In an excavation on the Análypiss hill west of Bourboua traces of extensive settlement and fragments of r.f. vases have come to light, but nothing older than the fifth century; no certain trace of the sanctuary of Artemis Karyatis has been discovered. At Phonemíni between Ay Pétrós and Arákhova further investigation of the three stone cairns, in which perhaps are to be recognised the hermae which marked the Laconian boundary with Argos and Tegea, has yielded fragments of terracotta figurines and small Laconian vases and the inscription Ναύπλιος [λός? ] Εύρθην[ας]. At the Moné Loukouí, where in addition to earlier discoveries a banquet relief has come to light, Rhomaios is inclined to locate the sanctuary of the healing hero Polemokrates whose cult was associated with the Thyreatic village of Eua. An inscription discovered in the making of the new road near the top of Mt. Závitsa 20 km. north of Astros has been assembled and read by Rhomaios, who assumes that it was set up on an Argive cenotaph after an engagement with the Spartans and marks their frontier line.

The French School has resumed this year the excavation at the Asklepion of Gortys in Western Arcadia. H. Metzger has now completely cleared the poros foundations, six courses high at the west end and at least eleven at the east, of the temple; but nothing has been recovered of the superstructure except for a number of poros blocks. A building of the Roman period with a large rectangular room on the east and two smaller ones to the west has been partly excavated SW of the temple, as also the foundations of an apsidal structure (perhaps an Early Christian basilica) west of the church of St. Andrew. Metzger has also uncovered a small Hellenistic building like a treasury 100 m. north of the temple, and further north a vast rectangular edifice comparable to the katagogion at the sanctuary of Epidauros. Lower down, a building consisting of a central court or vestibule surrounded by irregular rooms, with a tiled channel leading to a room with a mosaic floor, has been partly cleared; it recalls fairly closely building E at Epidauros. The finds from it include a long piece of iron which may be the butt of a colossal lance, a small bronze frog, and a bronze statuette of a woman draped in a peplos, with her left hand on her kalathos and an oinokhoi in her right, which dates to the second half of the fifth century B.C.
Orlandos reports the repair of wartime damage at the Metropolis of Mystra, repairs to the monastery of Enyalia near Dimitsana and the Byzantine and post-Byzantine churches of Stemnitsa, and the reconstruction of the south side and façade of the Ayia Lavra. At Kangadi near Dyme on the borders of Achaea and Elis prehistoric rock-cut tombs containing LH IIII and later tombs have been brought to light. In soundings at the castle at Patras N. Zapheiroupolis has exposed part of an apsidal Roman building with marble-faced brick walls preserved to a height of 3 m.; some marble fragments of the architectural decoration have come to light. In a surface investigation of the ancient Achaean city site at Mamoussia inland from Diakofto J. K. Anderson of the British School has discovered a bronze of fine style, 20 cm. long, in the form of a goose's head and neck; tests are to be made at the spot in conjunction with the Greek Archaeological Service.

CENTRAL AND NORTHERN GREECE

At Delphi the ramp at the east end of the temple was removed by P. Amandry in 1949, and a Geometric and a Mycenaean level were excavated underneath it; in the Geometric level two buildings with well-preserved ovens were uncovered, and below this fragmentary clay figurines and masses of LH IIIIb sherds (including a handsome vase decorated with an octopus) were found, associated with building traces close by. The ramp has now been restored.

L. Lerat and J. Pouilloux in 1949 explored the north-east part of the sanctuary down to the Mycenaean level. Behind the niche of Lilaia a water channel, which leads from the direction of the Kerna spring at the cliff foot, has been uncovered; it appears that there was a complicated system of tanks in this part of the sanctuary, and Pouilloux considers that Kassotis must have been in the neighbourhood of the niche of Lilaia. Closer study has shown that the Leske of the Knidians, which was built at the beginning of the fifth century B.C., was repaired after serious damage in the fourth century (perhaps in the earthquake of 373 B.C.). The remains of early habitation broached in 1934–5 have been further investigated, and it is now clear that the area north of the Monument of the Thessalians and Temenos of Neoptolemos was not incorporated in the sanctuary until its enlargement at the time of the Achaeanids. Three houses with hearths or ovens have been cleared; two are dated by Protocorinthian Geometric pottery to the second half of the eighth century, while one with Corinthian Geometric pottery dates somewhat earlier. More archaic remains have come to light on the west of the sanctuary, where in the course of his investigation of the Hermonion and the enclosure east of it G. Roux has uncovered traces of a cult preceding the construction of the polygonal terrace walls here about 500 B.C., and no doubt going back to Geometric times; and a Geometric level has been touched in the previously unexcavated region near the East Baths and the Stoa of Attalos, where J. Bousquet has been making tests to locate the sanctuary of Dionysus Phaleopos.

Minor investigations have been made at the theatre. At the level of the podium the removal of later accretions has disclosed a box of sorts which must have been provided with a canopy. It also appears that there was a system for collecting the water under the seats of the cavea and conducting it outside the west retaining wall. It seems that the rocks and worked blocks outside the west door of the diazoma belonged to a ramp or stairway providing access to the road that led to the stadium. In the course of the work in the theatre the excavators have found a number of inscriptions and pieces of sculpture, including a fragment of an archaic frieze in Parian marble. Close study of other monuments of the sanctuary has led to the recovery of the base of the Dancing Girls column and practical confirmation of Lerat’s assumption that the statues of the Philosopher and Themis belonged to the so-called Horseshoe Base.

L. Lerat has made further advances in his topographical research in the western marches of Lokris, and Mme. L. Ghali has published some vases in the museum at Galaxidi. Orlandos reports the restoration of the north wall of the church of St. Basil at Arta: marble columns have been set up in the interior of the Paregoritissa, and the three-light window of the sanctuary.

18 BCH 1959, 48 ff.
has been restored; the mosaics in the dome have been cleaned and the later painting removed (cf. PLATE XLVII, 1, which shows the head of Moses before and after the cleaning). Dilapidated parts of the castle at Iodannina have been restored, and the church of Pórta Panayía near Trikkala has been protected from flooding. From Thessaly N. Verdeles reports the discovery of a Roman bath establishment, fed from a neighbouring sulphur spring, at Rizoma at the foot of the Antikhasia; a sounding has revealed a tile-floored hall, which was probably the frigidarium, and a brick hypocaust. Two and a half km. east of Phársala a fine bronze cinerary urn of the fourth century b.c. has come to light in a tomb; it contained an inscribed gold strip similar to the Orphic plates of South Italy; soundings have revealed the presence here of plundered tombs, which presumably belonged to the ancient cemetery of Phársala. Additions to the Volo Museum include a small Hellenistic marble altar with the inscription ΦΙΑΙΝΝΑ | ΑΥΤΟΝΟΕΙΑ and a Roman pedimental stele with a rider in relief from Larisa, a headless marble statuette of Artemis Dadoukhos of Roman date from Phársala, and marble architectural pieces from Demetrias.

In Western Macedonia, M. Andronikos reports the discovery of a Roman tomb built of marble slabs at the entrance to Véria (Beroea); it contained two skeletons laid in opposite directions, with a small oinokhoe, a bronze strigil inscribed Ἱωάννης and a bronze coin of Hadrian. Near this a section of the city wall has come to light; built into it was a large marble funerary altar of the so-called Macedonian type with reliefs of Hermes flanked by inscriptions, a woman’s bust, and the Thracian Horseman. By the main street of the town a piece of a floor in white, yellow, and black mosaic has come to light, together with two fragments probably from a marble table. Andronikos publishes some late tombstones from Véria, together with a manumission decree which is dated in the twenty-seventh year of King Demetrios and thus presumably throws fresh light on Demetrios II’s regency. Byzantine and post-Byzantine churches in Véria have been repaired, and the early fourteenth-century frescoes of the Anastasis church have been repaired and cleaned. At Áno Kópanós a small sounding has disclosed traces of a large building, which ran in a curve at one point, on the spot where the bust of Olganos had come to light; Hellenistic pottery has been found in a grave shaft cut in the soft rock. At Vergina Andronikos has collected vases and sherds found in a small Early Iron Age tumulus, and some bronze objects of the same period; two fourth-third century b.c. grave stelai from this village, one with a fine relief and an epigram above, and the other apparently with painted decoration, have been brought in to Véria.

The excavation of the extensive ancient cemetery at Kozání mentioned in the last issue has been continued this summer by B. Kallipolites at the expense of the Archaeological Society. Just NW of last year’s grave 4 a complex of graves cut in the soft rock has come to light, and eleven have been dug of which three are double burials. Some of the graves were regular shallow pits sunk vertically into the rock and apparently covered with planks of which carbonised remains have been detected; in other cases the sides of the shaft were continued upwards by a course of unworked stones, especially at the head end. The earliest grave (no. 16), which contained an Attic b.f. hydria depicting Herakles and the Lion dated ca. 480 b.c. (the grave-group, Fig. 5, right), lies deeper than the rest and on a different axis. The latest (no. 6) corresponds closely to graves 1–3 of 1949, and is dated about the turn from the fourth to the third century b.c.; the finds from the other graves are homogeneous and include a black-glazed skyphos of the beginning of the fourth century. The vases from local workshops are generally undecorated. Some are handmade, and the majority are thrown in forms which had survived from prehistoric times (cf. Fig. 5, left). Those in red clay are obviously of local manufacture, as the same clay is used in Kozání at the present day; others are of light or dark grey clay, while a very few—apparently produced in a provincial workshop which may have been Thessalian—are of yellow clay with painted linear decoration. Two of the tombs contained beaten gold rosettes; bronze fibulae and ornaments, and iron spear-heads, daggers and a
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strigil have been found. The presence of fragments of vases painted with spirals, circles, and other geometric patterns in the earth around the graves suggests that further excavation may reveal burials of an earlier period in the vicinity.

Discoveries of no mean interest in Salonica are communicated by Kh. Makaronas. Stretches of the east wall of the city have been exposed in two new building plots on the line between the Cassandrian Gate and White Tower; older material, consisting of broken statues, altars, architectural members, gravestones, etc., dated between the third century B.C. and the third century A.D., has been recovered there. This wall seems to have been built in the time of Galerius when the city was extended to the south-east to include the great new building complexes of the palace, hippodrome, etc. Five hundred metres south of St. George’s Church further building operations have disclosed the walls of a large building which seems in its construction to belong to the time of tetrarchy. The building is eight-sided externally, while the interior consists of a single hall with conches to correspond and a maximum diameter of about 30 m. From the traces of costly marble revetments and mosaic floors, as well as the number of marbles in houses hereabouts, it is clear that this construction was an official building of no little splendour. In the light of Dyggve’s work on the Palace of Galerius, it appears that if the octagonal building formed part of it, the palace must have been more than 300 m. long and therefore considerably greater than that of Diocletian at Split; but Makaronas considers this not impossible, since the rotunda of St. George is on a larger scale than anything at Split, and likewise the octagonal building covers three times the area of the mausoleum at Split, which it most resembles in plan. Further light may be expected from the excavations which are to be carried out with the support of the Archaeological Society.

Prof. Soteriou has continued his study of the Basilica of St. Demetrios in Salonica, and further investigated the remains of the late Roman baths and stadium that preceded the church. Under the Holy Table he has discovered a single apsidal room of the fourth century A.D., constituting the martyron of the saint. S. Pelekanides has completed the restoration of the Church of St. Catherine in its original form, and uncovered a series of frescoes comprising prophets and angels in the dome, the Apostolic Communion in the conch, and scenes from the cycle of Our Lord’s earthly life on the north and south walls; a twelfth-century Byzantine relief of Herakles and the Lion has come to light in the demolition of the minaret. With the removal of the Turkish plaster facing from the west front, the Byzantine brickwork of St. Sophia has been revealed to a height of 5 m. from the modern ground level, and Pelekanides has already been able to reach new conclusions about the form of the church. The great west arch was originally an external one, as in contemporary and earlier buildings at Constantinople; the west gallery now appears as a later addition which necessitated the blocking of the windows, while traces of the springing of the vault indicate that there was a narrow arcade in front of the west face at least of the church.
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\[\text{Fig. 5.—Fifth- and Fourth-century finds from grave-field at Kozani.}\]
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\[\text{AA 1949, 254 ff., fig. 66; cf. JHS 1944, 26.}\]
The work begun in 1949 among the Byzantine churches of Kastoriá has been continued this year. Pelekani has secured, cleaned, and photographed wall paintings in eighteen churches ranging in date from the tenth to the seventeenth century, and a richly illustrated album is projected. The paintings in ten more churches, and the portable icons, wood-carvings, and works of the goldsmith's art are to be attended to in the coming year. Makarou has investigated a plundered 'Macedonian' vaulted tomb of the end of the third century B.C. at Láïá 15 km. NE of Salónica.22 It consists of a chamber 3.1 m. long and 5.1 m. broad and a vestibule 1.5 m. broad, with a connecting door on whose lintel was painted an Ionic kymation. Instead of antae the outer door has two stuccoed Doric columns, partly engaged at the back and with the flutes hollowed at the front only. The façade has not been cleared on account of the depth of earth, but on the analogy of the similar tomb at Vergina 23 it seems likely to have been tetrastyle with a Doric cornice and pediment. Another plundered 'Macedonian' chamber tomb with red-plastered walls, dating probably to the second century B.C., has been excavated at Mesemérie in the district of Epanomi in Chalcidice; it had a simple front and a chamber 3 × 3.5 m.

**North and East Aegean**

Potentially one of the most significant of the new undertakings of the Archaeological Society is that on the site of Abdéra, 7 km. SE of the modern village of the same name, where D. Lazairides began preliminary soundings in September 1950. The site has not hitherto been seriously explored, though considerable traces of the city wall survive.24 Tests were confined to the immediate vicinity of the little plain in the west of the city area north of the Byzantine fort of Polystylos. On the west side of the plain, at a point where a bronze figurine of Herakles Kerdoos was recently discovered, a large building of Roman date has come to light. On the north side a stretch of a wall of good masonry with a threshold 2.5 m. broad has been cleared; the only find was an imperial bronze coin of Thasos, but the enclosure seems much older than this. On the east side of this little plain the west wall of a large enclosure, some 50 m. long and resting on the rock, has been cleared; there is a complex of cross walls on the inside, while at either end a gateway led into a paved area traversed by a stone water channel. Among the architectural pieces are terracotta antefixes, sections of sima, and a miniature terracotta Doric capital. The finds are mainly Hellenistic, though with a sprinkling of Roman wares. The pottery includes black-glaze and West Slope wares, a wide range of Megarian bowl fragments, stamped amphora handles (mostly Thasian), and relief-lamps. Among the metal objects are two lead plaques with representations of a hippocamp and a female term. Numerous terracotta figurines and three moulds have come to light, as also fragments of two large terracotta statues; three of the figurines, in the form of a draped seated figure with a phiale in her hand and a lion at her feet or on her knees, seem to represent Kybele. The enclosure was probably a sanctuary founded in the third century B.C. Three rough-stone cist graves have been dug; they were already riddled and seem to be of a late date.

At Thasos the French School has continued its work in the Agora during the summers of 1949 and 1950. In the north and north-east of the area a number of monuments have now been completely uncovered, including the tholos, which was an open construction built about the end of the third or beginning of the second century B.C., and the many-roomed Hellenistic poros structure further north, which must have been one of the principal public buildings of the city; the fourth-century fenced precinct SW of the tholos, containing the foundations of a temple and altar, has been tentatively identified as that of Zeus Agoraioi. In the south-east of the Agora (Fig. 6) the Oblique Portico, an undistinguished building of about the second century B.C., has been further explored; behind it is a large building divided into twelve independent rooms identified as shops, which seems to have been built in the fourth century B.C. though it
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22 Despite the discrepancies in plan it may be this tomb that is described by Gardner in *BSA* xxxiii 15.
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continued in use much later. The excavation of the Early Christian basilica (Fig. 6, on left) is now completed. The building had three naves and a single apse at the east end; the north nave contained a well furnished with a bench, and the central nave a tomb in which was a skeleton of a man, while it was in front of the apse that a silver reliquary, now lost, was discovered many years ago by villagers digging a well. A hypogeum of three vaults has been cleared at the NW corner of the basilica; it was roofed with re-used blocks bearing painted Latin crosses. Inscriptions found here suggest that the cult of the martyr Akakios dates back to the fifth century A.D., while the basilica in its original form is somewhat older.

Among numerous pieces of sculpture found are the lower part of an archaic kore in Parian marble and an archaic statuette of a seated goddess. The inscriptions from the basilica are especially interesting; they include an early fifth-century boustrrophedon decree on the wine trade, a decree of the end of the fifth century B.C. dealing with subversive activities, fragments of an epistle of Sulla congratulating the Thasians on their behaviour during the Mithridatic war, and other fragments of proconsular and imperial letters.

The excavations of New York University in the sanctuary of the Great Gods at Samothrace, which were resumed by K. Lehmann in 1948, have been continued in 1949 and 1950. In the north of the sanctuary the uncovering of the early remains beneath the Telesterion and Arsinoeion is now at an end. The double precinct is now dated by Lehmann to the seventh
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25 I have to thank the superintendent, Mr. Kallipolites, for this notice, which has been supplemented from a report of the American School.
century B.C. An earlier cult here is indicated by the working of fallen boulders to form an altar with steps and a libation channel; this altar is associated with a Cyclopean retaining wall, in whose fill some coarse potsherds, probably prehistoric, have been found. In the south part of the sanctuary the ‘New Temple’ has been cleared. It is now seen that the second-century B.C. Doric prostyle belongs to the remodelling of an earlier building which probably dates to the third century; a headless Nike akroterion has been found here.

In 1950 these two sectors in the north and south of the sanctuary were joined up by an excavation of the central area of the great terrace. The construction here known as the ‘Old Temple’ seems in fact not to have been a roofed building but simply an open precinct 24 × 10 m. At its NE corner stood an Ionic hexastyle propylon with projecting wings, which together with the precinct is dated in the later fourth century B.C. To this building belonged the archaistic frieze of dancing girls, of which a section is in the Louvre; fresh pieces have been recovered in the present excavations. In addition to the two bothroi or hearths previously found by the Australians, the foundations of two altars have come to light under the level of the marble floor of the fourth-century precinct; and the antiquity of the sacrificial area is proved by the discovery on the NW edge of the precinct of a primitive hearth attached to a sacred boulder and overlaid with an ash layer two feet deep containing numerous animal bones and potsherds. The pottery falls into two classes; the first consists of coarse handmade grey ware, while the second comprises kantharoi and cups of fine ware with subgeometric decoration (mainly panels of dots and dot-rosettes) painted on the lips and handles. Lehmann dates the sacrificial layer in the first half of the seventh century B.C., and regards the mixture of the two classes of vases as evidence of the common celebration by the first Greek settlers and the older inhabitants of the rites of native divinities re-interpreted in Greek terms.

Investigations on the spot where the celebrated Nike of Samothrace was found have now been concluded. It appears that the group was placed on a stepped platform of 6.3 × 10 m., whose front part contained a water tank framed by rocks. The ship’s prow will thus have appeared as though coming obliquely into view from behind a rocky headland. New fragments of the prow have been found and may throw further light on ancient naval construction. The greater part of a right hand has also been found and is believed to belong to the statue; the hand was raised and seems to have held a metal wreath or fillet. Stratigraphical observations on the spot enable Lehmann to give a more precise dating of the dedication in the decade around 200 B.C.

In Lesbos the writer has found traces of prehistoric occupation on several sites, including an extensive stratified one of about the end of the Bronze Age a little north of Pérama on the west shore of the Gulf of Iera. Kallipolites publishes a funerary inscription which shows that in Roman times the archive of the koinon of the Lesbians was in the sanctuary of Artemis Thermitia; 27 and D. Mantzouranes has written two pamphlets—one on the first settlers and survival of place-names in the island, and the other on its agricultural output in antiquity. 28 In Khios the writer has found traces of early Greek occupation on the Kofiná ridge on the north of the modern city, and of the early Greek site, with traces of a building which may have been a temple, at Volissós on one of the promontories north of the modern landing stage. In the Néa Moné the mosaic of the Resurrection has been repaired and cleaned. On the Turkish coast, M. Şenyürek and Ahmet Dönmez have sounded a third-millennium mound at Hesactköy near the Aeolic Kyms; L. Robert and R. Martin have resumed the old excavation at the Temple of Apollo at Klamos, and the Swedish excavations at Labranda were continued this summer; they are being reported on in the Annual Report of the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara. G. E. Bean and the writer have examined sites on the Knidian Peninsula and assembled evidence for the location of the classical city site; nearly forty inscriptions have come to light, and the position of an archaic gravefield has been established.

The joint excavation of the University of Ankara and the British School at Athens was
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27 Από τη λατρεία τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος στὴν Λέσβο (Μυτιλήνη 1950).
28 Οἱ πρώτες ἐγκαταστάσεις τῶν Ἑλλήνων στὴν Λέσβο (Μυτιλήνη 1949) and Τὸ ἔτησιο γεωργικὸ στέγημα τῆς Λέσβου στὴν ἀρχαιότητα (Μυτιλήνη 1950).
continued at Old Smyrna in May–July 1950 under the direction of E. Akurgal and the writer, the work being concentrated almost entirely within the limits of the archaic levels on the site. The housing complex of the sixth century, which had been discovered beneath later occupation levels in the large trench begun in 1949, was cleared; it consisted of groups of three-roomed houses and of one-room houses or shops flanking a blind alley. The spacious seventh-century settlement below this was also cleared and some house-plans have been recovered. Below this again a series of rough footings laid in sweeping curves has come to light. It is hoped that the Greek occupation levels prior to the eighth century will be cleared in 1951.

Behind this housing quarter on the north side of the hill soundings in 1949 had revealed the presence of a temenos. After further exploration at the beginning of the 1950 campaign the systematic excavation of the area was taken in hand. Some remains of a seventh-century temple have been found in situ, but unfortunately the greater part of the foundations, including the whole east end, has been swept away, so that the dimensions of the building can no longer be recovered with certainty. The original cella seems to have measured about twenty by fifty feet. It stood on a raised platform which abutted on the city wall and which seems in the late seventh century to have been extended to receive a larger building which was never completed. This later platform is sixty feet in breadth and must have been about a hundred feet long; it was approached on the south side by a stepped ramp which led up from a sunk entrance passage on to the east end of the platform. A part of the approach has been excavated to the level of the floor (Fig. 7); the pavement has entirely disappeared, but some of the stone flags on which it rested are still in position. The jointing of the ‘Lesbian’ and ashlar masonry here is singularly impressive.

Inside the cella a rough oblong stone foundation was found at floor level; this may have supported the base on which the cult statue stood. The floor was marked by a clear stratum of lime plaster or decomposed whitestone pavement slabs; numerous fragments of Orientalis-
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29 A fuller report on the campaigns of 1948 and 1949 has been published by E. Akurgal, Bogazkale (Ankara 1950).
ing vases and small dedications were found on and in this stratum, and also in a dense layer of whitestone chips which lay outside the platform on the south and west sides. Among the debris were many fragments of a life-size female terracotta statue resembling Cypriot figures, and a pair of figurines of a goddess with her hands on her breasts. Fayence figurines and plastic vases are numerous, and a very few fine ivory carvings have been recovered. Of the bronze objects the most important is a half-draped male statuette. This deposit yielded some fine Corinthian pottery of around the beginning of the Early Corinthian period, in sufficient bulk to leave no doubt of the early date of the destruction of the city. The age of this temple on the platform has not yet been ascertained, though it seems fairly certain that it goes back into the early seventh century at least. One of the most remarkable of the earlier finds is the fragment of a dinos shown in Fig. 8, with a portrait of the newly invented heptachord lyre. No monumental inscriptions have come to light; the most interesting written message found this year is that on a seventh-century cup foot, Δολίων ἐμι οὐλίχη (Fig. 9); the presence of the ω at so early a date is worth remarking.

The city wall has been further explored, especially on the east side where a section has been cut through it. The wall of the late seventh century was over fifty feet thick here, the intervening space between the outer and inner faces being filled with stone packing and mud brick. The extraordinary thickness of the wall is explained by the fact that it encompasses a previous wall which itself was founded on a still earlier one of the eighth century. Numerous pithoi and cooking pots containing infant burials were found in the ruins of the second wall, thus indicating that the fortification was in disrepair for a time before the building of the late seventh-century wall. Investigations were continued at the north-east corner of the perimeter where a sudden turn in the line of the wall offered some hope of the discovery of a gate; no positive evidence of a gate was found, but the angle of the wall of sawn ashlar whitestone blocks resting on an andesite foundation has been explored at this point and identified as a part of the earliest of the three archeaic enceintes. On the south edge of the site an archeaic or early classical fountain house has been uncovered; it consists of a corbel-vaulted tunnel, with a flagged path flanked by an open drain leading up to the draw-basin.

During the early part of the season investigations were made among decrepit stone cairns in the old Meles delta at the east end of the gravefield. A number of the cairns were found to contain cist or cremation graves and sarcophagus burials. The graves had been thoroughly rifled, but several archeaic clay sarcophagi have come to light comparatively little damaged and show substantial traces of painted designs which include animal groups, horsemen, and chariot-scenes.

The Cyclades

The revival of archaeological activity in these islands is especially welcome. The ephor, N. Kondoleon, has been engaged on excavations for the Archaeological Society in Naxos and Paros, and has kindly supplied the following notice.

't On Paros the object was to explore the place Elita, where in 1949 two inscriptions relating to Archilochus were found; these recall the foundation of an Arkhiklokeion containing three altars. The spot is covered with ancient marbles and many other marbles and potsherds have come to light in the excavation, but unfortunately no building traces have been uncovered except for mediaeval walls and some small cistern-like constructions, in one of which in fact the inscribed orthostates from the Arkhiklokeion found last year had been used as cover slabs; a third slab of the same dimensions has been recognised as belonging to the Arkhiklokeion, but the inscriptions on it are of later date (third or fourth century A.D.), thus proving that the Arkhiklokeion was already demolished in late antiquity. The inscription IG XII.v.239 with the dedication μητρὶ τῆς Μεγαλίθου is built into a ruined church near by, where also I have observed a dedication to Agdistis. Thus in all probability there was a sanctuary of the Mother in the
same area; I think it most unlikely, however, that the orthostates with the notice about Archilochus come from this Metron rather than from the Arkhilokheion."

Kondoleon in 1949 started a most interesting excavation on Naxos, on the north shore of the modern town at Grótta near the place where G. Welter had noted prehistoric traces in 1930. Three houses, with walls built of small stones laid in clay, and of rectangular plan but with somewhat rounded corners, have been uncovered. The pottery, which includes many complete vases, consists of black and red monochrome and incised wares; obsidian blades and cores have also been found. 'The excavation has been continued in 1950 at a point where Mycenae remains had come to light at the end of the preceding campaign. A part of a complex of buildings of Mycenaean date, lying at the water's edge and continuing in the sea, has been excavated. The remains uncovered consist of a large rectangular court (Fig. 10) with thick walls which are preserved to a height of about half a metre. In the east side, not centrally placed but nearer to the NE corner, is a large marble threshold. The north wall of the hall runs on eastward but the excavation has not been extended in this direction. To the west of this central hall is a group of smaller rooms, while the south end of the hall is occupied by walls of post-Mycenaean date. Numerous Geometric sherds have come to light in this sector, following on the Mycenaean, whereas in the rest of the area Mycenaean sherds are dominant. Wares of the last Mycenaean period are the most frequent, but earlier fragments are also found; the majority come from long-stemmed kylikes. The small finds include a fragment of a stone vase decorated with a row of leaves in relief, and a small Mycenaean head of green Naxian schist, which formed the handle of an implement and is significant as a link with later times (Plate XLVI, 3). Near the High School of Naxos town a small pit containing numerous fragments of fourth-century figurines and a few of earlier types has been discovered, and some tombs have accidentally come to light in the same area. At other points in the island I have noted inscriptions including a dedication to Δήµητρα, Κόρην, Δίς Εὐβούλευε and Βωσβώ.'

After a season of excavation in 1949 the French School has this year confined itself on Delos to tasks of study and restoration; C. Dugas has completed his study of the r.f. vases of Delos and Rheneia for final publication, and J. Marcadé has made up a number of statues, including the archaic Athena Enhoplos and seated Hera, joined up the fourth-century Hermes Propylaëos to the base with the amphictyonic inscription, and re-arranged the decorative
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sculptures of the Monument of the Bulls. Among the results of the 1949 campaign were the plotting by F. Robert of the remains of a sanctuary-complex on a series of terraces by the shore 100 m. or so south of the Dioskoureion, and E. Will's discovery on the terrace of the Syrian Gods of a large structure which enclosed the little theatre there on all but the west side and was presumably intended to shield the performances in the theatre from observation by the public. The excavation of the big house in the Inopos valley has been completed, and the peristyle court has been reconstructed with its upper colonnade (Fig. 11). The house measured 37 × 19 m.; there were a number of rooms on the ground floor, and the back of the house was no less than five floors up on account of the steepness of the slope; the staircases are well preserved. Some good pieces of sculpture have come to light, notably a fine marble statue (perhaps of a nymph) in a niche of the back wall of the peristyle court. Kondoleon has contributed a valuable, well-illustrated account of the monuments of Delos in the Archaeological Society's series of full-length guides to sites and museums.22

In Amorgos, Kondoleon and L. Polites have discovered two anthemia from fifth-century grave stelai in Katápola and Khóra, a male head in Katápola, and some inscriptions including a fifth- or fourth-century epigram at Aigiále and the missing beginning of the decree IG XII.vii.228. Miss A. Furness of the British School has recovered from peasants at Kastráki north of Vroútsi a Protogeometric conical-footed cup and jug and some Mycenaean bronze weapons. A female head in marble copied from a bronze prototype has been donated to the newly reconstituted archaeological collection in Syra. On Keos Mlle. C. Durant and G. Roux have examined the remains of the ancient sites and noted some unpublished inscriptions. On Tenos Kondoleon in 1949 resumed his pre-war investigations at Xúburgo below the village of Tripónto.23 The foundations of a large building were partly uncovered and traces of other buildings brought to light; work was continued for a few days in 1950, but the limits of the large building have not yet been reached. The earth is rich in potsherds ranging from prehistoric to r.f., and has yielded many fragments of relief pithoi of the Late Geometric and Orientalising periods with scenes that include the Wooden Horse, Lernaean Hydra, a procession probably of Gods, files of chariots, warriors, animals, birds, etc. G. Roux of the French School has made a careful examination of the buildings of the sanctuary of Poseidon and Amphitrite, and especially the temple, which appears to have consisted of a simple cela before the construction of the hexastyle pteron in the third century B.C.; two inscriptions have been discovered in neighbouring walls.

Crete

In the east of the island the French School has begun the exploration of the ancient site of Itanos and its surroundings. The remains on the ancient acropolis have suffered very serious injury in more recent times; pottery ranging from Protogeometric to Hellenistic has come to light, but without clear stratification; the abundance of Geometric pottery testifies to the importance of the city in early times. In the lower town the remains of ancient habitation are covered by extensive constructions of the Christian era, in one of which oddly enough two fragments of Minoan stone vases came to light. A very interesting late metrical inscription mentions a Temenos of Leukothoe hitherto unknown. In the cemetery sporadic Geometric sherds have been found, but the unplundered graves which have been excavated have yielded only undistinguished Hellenistic vases. A little way south of Itanos a Minoan house on a hill has been explored; the building is largely destroyed, but the finds included fine pottery, partly polychrome, mostly belonging to the LM Ia phase and decorated with leafy sprays, spirals etc., and a number of bronze implements including a pick in a perfect state of preservation.

Near Knossos M. S. F. Hood and P. de Jong have examined a Late Minoan shaft grave discovered by chance at Ay Ioánnis close to the Herakleion road; it contained a single burial.

22 Οιδέγος τῆς Δήλου (Athens 1950).
23 Cf. my previous report in JHS 1946, 115.
with interesting bronze weapons but no vases. Hood also, in conjunction with the Herákleion Museum, excavated a Middle Minoan chamber tomb in a newly discovered cemetery area on the slopes east of the Kaíratos stream just south of the Mavropélio. There were fourteen burials in position, five on the floor of the tomb, and nine in pithoi ranged around the sides; the skeletons were in every case tightly contracted. Remains of at least five earlier burials had been swept into a pit about 50 cm. deep at the back of the tomb. Apart from the pithoi grave goods were scanty, and nothing later than Middle Minoan was found.

At Vathýpetro 4 km. south of Arkhánes Sp. Marinatos and N. Platon have uncovered the greater part of a very large Minoan megaron measuring $45 \times 35$ m., with outer walls of great blocks in pseudo-isodomic construction. The building had an upper storey in crude brick; the plaster on the walls was in six colours, but there are no traces of frescoes. In front of the west façade was a paved court in which was a wine or oil press with a basin under the outlet. A rectangular niche containing a built seat was let into this wall face; Marinatos regards this as the storeman's post, since there was a large room nearby, supported by two pillars, which contained sixteen man-height pithoi; masses of vases were found in one of the pithoi and at other points in this store-room. On the east of the megaron lay courts overlaid by later walls which indicate resettlement on the Minoan ruins in early Hellenic times. In the south part of the megaron, which was built exclusively in poros masonry, the blocks were squared on the front only and wedges were inserted to fill the angles in the joints; this technique seems soon to have been abandoned as unsatisfactory. The small finds include a bronze dagger and stone lamps; the pottery is of the LM Ia period only, and the early and apparently peaceful abandonment of the building may have been due to its poor construction. Marinatos has also made investigations in the southern foothills of Ioúktas by Karnári Metókhi, where Minoan, Geometric, and Roman remains cover a wide area, and identifies the site with the ancient Lykastos; a LM III sarcophagus has been found entire. Nearby, Marinatos has explored the cave of Stavromýtí. This consists of an upper cave comprising a number of galleries, and a lower cave which consists of a single chamber connected with the upper one by a narrow passage; in front of the main entrance leading into the lower cave is a poros base on which perhaps stood an altar. The sole finds were of pottery which ranges from neolithic to Hellenistic or Roman times; it includes some dozens of Middle and Late Minoan pithoi and much Geometric and archaic pottery; the skeleton of an infant was found in a neolithic vase, together with obsidian blades and animal bones. Knuckle-bones and other finds suggest that the cult was one of a goddess who was protectress of children, more particularly Eileithyia.

At Phaistos the Italian School has resumed its activity this summer under the direction of D. Levi. The overgrowth of recent years has been cleared, and a beginning has been made with the consolidation and repair of gypsum paving slabs and staircases, especially in the
north quarter of the palace; this is being carried out not only in cement but also with new gypsum slabs prepared in the ancient quarries. During the disengagement and restoration of pilasters in the Grand Propylon a mass of earth, in which the impressions of the timber work were preserved, has been lifted entire, so that a close study can be made of the ancient carpentry. The oven in the east court has also been restored, and the pottery in the layer which separated it from the pavement of the court has been recovered. At the same time a number of tests have been carried out in search of the strata which preceded the second palace. These have produced particularly abundant material of the Middle Minoan period including polychrome wares of Kamares style, and have revealed the existence of two phases clearly distinguished by their pavement levels, not only in the second palace, but also for the first one (whose initial construction will consequently have to be dated further back than has hitherto been supposed). No regular stratum of the Early Minoan period has been encountered in these soundings, but remains of neolithic and subneolithic buildings have been discovered immediately below the foundations of the first palace. At one point, where the rock has been reached at a depth of 5 m. below the floor level of the second palace, two neolithic strata have been exposed, each being 90 cm. thick and separated by a sterile layer 1 m. deep. At another point a wall corner of the first palace has come to light standing to a height of 1·5 m. with its yellow stucco facing intact; fragments of handsome painted Middle Minoan pithoi were found on one side of it, while among dense fragments of Kamares ware on the other side lay the carbonised remains of a wooden chest with a red-washed stucco lining which contained a complete service consisting of some splendid vases with barbotine decoration (including a squat 'teapot') and a large number of simple cups.

The gateway and cells of the Monastery of Arkadí have been repaired, and the paintings in various churches at Latsída of Mirábello have been secured and repaired. The latest issues of the Κρήτικα Χρονικά contain several articles on Cretan antiquities: Miss A. Xenaki, continuing the publication of the Yiamalakis collection, presents the Minoan seal-stones and the metal weapons and implements; S. Alexiou has detected white-painted octopus designs on vases from a chamber tomb excavated near Ay Ioánnis last year, and also on other Geometric vases, and discusses the survival of Minoan decorative elements into early Hellenic times; and N. Platon discusses the Byzantine walls of Herákleion in the light of a newly-discovered tower.

J. M. Cook.

The British School at Athens.
MYCENAE 1950

In the summer of 1950 it proved possible to continue the British excavations at Mycenae which had been suspended in 1939 owing to the war. The Greek Government courteously granted the necessary permission and Dr. Papademetriou, Ephor of Antiquities for Argolis, and Mr. Petsas cooperated most cordially throughout. The work was carried out under the aegis of the British School at Athens which made a generous grant towards the funds and Mr. J. M. Cook, the Director, and Mr. Sinclair Hood, the Assistant-Director, who both took part in the excavations, afforded all possible assistance.

The excavations were especially concerned with the following points: the further exploration, within and without the Cyclopean walls, of the Prehistoric Cemetery 2 to which belonged the royal Shaft Graves found by Schliemann; an attempt to trace the line of the Middle Bronze Age wall of the earliest citadel 3 which preceded the Cyclopean fortress; the re-examination of Tsountas' House, 4 an important building within the walls first excavated in 1886; the clearing of the Epano Phournos tholos tomb; 5 the further exploration of the Cyclopean Terrace Building discovered in 1923 6; and the investigation of a newly discovered building, now known as the House of Stirrup Jars, near the so-called Tomb of Clytemnestra. The architect of the expedition, Mr. Charles Hobbs, R.I.B.A., also assisted the Greek authorities at their request in the conservation and repairs in progress at the Tomb of Clytemnestra and the Lion Gate.

Outside the walls nine more graves of the Prehistoric Cemetery were found. Most had been plundered when later buildings were erected above the disused cemetery, but in one grave (no. XXIII), that of an adolescent, three characteristic Middle Helladic vases were found intact. In this area was found a model of a figure of eight shield in ivory. Within the walls underneath the later House of the Warrior Vase fifteen graves were discovered most of which had been plundered when the house was built. In one, however, the bones of a small child, less than a year old, were found in a Middle Helladic jar.

Tsountas' House when re-excavated proved exceptionally interesting. It had previously been thought to consist of two buildings, but now appears to be one. A stepped street ascends the sharply sloping rock of the citadel with a drain by its side. From it a lane runs northwards and has on its west the entrance of a large hall with a stuccoed floor. Along the east and south walls were benches for cult objects.

At the southern end is a large altar-hearth of stucco which has at its southwest angle a sinking to accommodate the pointed end of a rhyton or libation vessel. From its side a shallow runlet in the stucco led into a two handled jar sunk in the floor. Connected with this is a bolster-like construction of stucco of unknown purpose. Near here also was found a shallow dish 7 probably intended for offerings and in or near this room were three small vases not much larger than thimbles and probably votives.

In a smaller room behind the to the south Tsountas 8 found a painted tablet of stucco showing two women worshipping a divinity bearing a figure of eight shield, together with a wing of ivory, a scarab of Queen Tyi, and some ornaments of gold, glass, and bone. One of the glass ornaments seems to represent a female divinity. In the same room behind the altar-hearth we found a fine piece of ivory inlay which may represent the mane of a horse or lion. Just below the house to the west Tsountas found a fragment of fresco showing a ritual dance of men masquerading with asses' heads. From all this evidence we may regard the building as a shrine.

---

1 Grants were also received from the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford, the American Philosophical Society, the British Academy, Pembroke College, Cambridge, the Leverhulme Trustees, and the Cambridge and Oxford Philosophical Societies.
2 B.S.A. XLV, p. 203 ff.; Wace, Mycenae, pp. 51, 61 ff.
3 Wace, op. cit., p. 69, fig. 18.
4 Wace, op. cit., p. 66 ff.; Tsountas, Praktika 1886, p. 74 ff., pl. 4.
5 B.S.A. XXV, p. 292 ff.
6 B.S.A. XXV, p. 403 ff.
7 The shape is that of Furmark, Mycenaean Pottery, p. 75, fig. 21 no. 322.
8 Tsountas' finds are discussed and illustrated by him in Eph. Arch. 1887, p. 160 ff., pl. 10, 13.
the first of its kind to be discovered at Mycenae. It was in use for some time because the floor and hearth show two or three layers of stucco. At a later date an upper floor of stucco was laid at a higher level in the shrine room and a large stone was set in the floor before the hearth, perhaps as a foundation for the base of a pillar.

From the shrine an internal flight of stairs leads down to a house on a lower terrace. The house is of the megaron type and had a main room opening to the south from a small court which had a verandah on its west side. Other rooms on the same floor were built over a basement consisting of a corridor and three rooms approached by a flight of thirteen stone steps. The house since it is so closely connected with the shrine and seems to have no exit except through it may be considered as that of the priest in charge. All this new information about Tsountas' House is of the first importance and is likely to provoke much discussion.

On the northwest shoulder of the citadel just below the entrance to the Palace a long stretch of wall was identified as being part of the earlier fortification of the Middle Helladic Age. Behind it was a deposit of pottery of the period and it is crossed at one point by a Late Helladic (Mycenaean) wall which probably formed part of the roadway leading to the Palace entrance. Efforts to trace the line of the Middle Helladic wall to the south, west, and east proved fruitless owing to the destruction caused by later building, especially of the Hellenistic period (third to first centuries B.C.).

The tholos tomb known as the Epano Phournos which had never been excavated before owing to the dangerous state of its doorway was cleared as far as safety allowed. The Greek authorities generously supplied the necessary technical assistance and we were able to clear most of the floor of the tomb which was originally floored with pebbles. Among the debris were fragments of a number, at least eight, of large richly decorated vases of the so-called Palace Style of the early 15th century B.C. (early L.H. II). These confirm the date already assigned to the tomb and include good examples of well known patterns of the period.

Early in 1950 just to the west of the Lion Tomb interesting discoveries by the Greek archaeological service attracted attention. They invited us to continue examination of the Cyclopean Terrace Building which was begun in 1923 and forms the western end of the complex. Here we uncovered a room with massive Cyclopean walls three metres high and one and a half metres thick. Below this lies a rich deposit of pottery of the L.H. II—L.H. III A periods. Trials in the neighbourhood revealed similar walls with much pottery and some fragments of fresco. The whole area—a terraced slope—needs careful and thorough examination.

The building now known as the House of Stirrup Jars stands on a wide terrace supported by a strong Cyclopean wall a little distance to the southwest of the Tomb of Clytemnestra and close to the modern carriage road. A trial here revealed the existence of the basement of a large house which had been destroyed by fire apparently about the last quarter of the 13th century B.C. A gallery over twenty metres long which had its walls and floor coated with clay plaster runs parallel to the terrace wall and had at its north end a store of stirrup jars (Fig. 1). These had probably originally contained oil to judge by the traces left in the pottery. There were plentiful signs of the fury of the fire which had destroyed the house. Many of the stones were calcined, the rude bricks of the upper stories were baked and several of the stirrup jars themselves were distorted, fused, and even partly vitrified by the intense heat, to which the oil they contained had no doubt contributed. The vases had been closed by stoppers of clay more or less in the shape of champagne corks which were fitted with strings either for fastening them in the spouts or else for ease of extraction. Over the stopper and spout was fitted a cap of clay which was pincined in with the fingers against the false spout and then repeatedly sealed with a sealstone. Three different seal impressions are quite clear (Fig. 2). One shows three dancing women, another an ox scratching its neck with its hind leg, and a third a demon standing between two lions. Only three previous examples of such stoppers have been found and so this discovery throws new light on the Mycenaean method of packing merchandise for sale.

* B.S.A. XXV, pl. II (1).  
* Nilsson's remarks (Minoan—Mycenaean Religion, p. 19 (7)) on the use of sealstones on the Mainland must now be modified.
From the main gallery side galleries ran eastwards. In one of these there is a row of large jars (pithoi) which probably served for oil storage. They were ranged along the wall and supported by short low walls of crude brick and apparently under one of them was an arrangement for setting a fire below it and heating the contents. In the floor of hard clay there is a shallow sunken basin for catching overflows. Several vessels in fragments were found lying shattered on the floor by the big jars and one which has been reconstructed shows a shape of classic refinement and dignity. The building, as already remarked, had clearly been destroyed by a violent fire and it would seem that it had been well looted first. Many of the sealed stirrup jars had been deliberately unstoppered and overturned. Others seem to have been wantonly smashed or to have had their spouts knocked off. The object of this deliberate damage was probably twofold, the destruction of the stock of oil and the wish to add fuel to the fire.

We made tests below the floor of the main gallery to see whether there were any concealed cists with ingots of copper or other metal. No cists were found, but a surprise awaited us. In the earth beneath the floor some good fragments of gaily painted fresco came to light. Some pieces seem to show parts of garments and the largest piece represents part of a scene depicting a bearer carrying something heavy by means of a pole over the shoulder, perhaps some great

\[\text{Compare Homer, } \textit{Odyssey} \ II, 340 \text{ ff.}\]
man in a sedan chair. These frescoes and other indications suggest that the House of Stirrup Jars was built on the site of a yet earlier building. This house, which seems to be one of a row, is obviously of the first importance and it is to be hoped that the means to excavate it completely will be forthcoming. It may well be that then the records on clay tablets of the Mycenaean oil merchant who occupied it may come to light.

As a supplement to the main work of the expedition further exploration was made at Plesia to see if Mycenaean potteries or kilns were to be found. Modern kilns exist there and clay is still dug from these extensive beds for modern potteries at Argos and elsewhere, but there are no signs of Mycenaean potteries. Enquiries, however, brought to light the fact that northeast of the citadel above the Persia spring and as far as the area called Longaki by Steffen there are other rich beds of good clay of the same character as that at Plesia. There are signs that these were worked in ancient times. In the rock near the spring is a curved cutting lined with clay plaster which may have been a kiln. Near by there is a site where Mycenaean potsherds are to be found together with burnt fragments of crude brick and also tiles of the archaic and Hellenistic periods. Since this area is much nearer to the citadel than Plesia it is more likely to be the source of the clay so freely used by Mycenaean builders as mortar. It would have been an ideal site for a Mycenaean Kerameikos since it has a plentiful supply of water and an almost unlimited stock of good clay. Indeed the modern name for the clay, καννανάια, indicates that its properties are still recognised.

Near the Mycenaean causeway on the east of the road to the Argive Heraeum Mr. J. M. Cook found in connection with the revetment wall along the bank of the stream the ruins of a small rustic sanctuary. Here was unearthed a rich deposit of all periods from late Geometric in the eighth century to the fifth century when Mycenae was destroyed by the Argives. It also yielded a number of interesting archaic terracotta figurines of women freely adorned with jewellery, and of warriors carrying shields. Hellenistic tiles indicate that the sanctuary was revived when Mycenae was reoccupied in that age.

An outstanding feature of this year's work is the new light thrown on the town of Mycenae as distinct from the citadel. The discoveries made by the Greek Archaeological Service and the British expedition on the terraced slope between the Lion Tomb and the Cyclopean Terrace Building, the House of Stirrup Jars, and the buildings found above the Prehistoric Cemetery outside the walls suggest that by the side of the road or roads leading up to the Lion Gate many important buildings stood outside the citadel. These all appear to belong to the late fourteenth and the thirteenth centuries B.C. and to have been destroyed by fire towards the end of the thirteenth century. The citadel, however, itself was then unaffected. Perhaps Mycenae at that time was the scene of acute internal dissension, such as a civil war between Thyestes and Atreus who though brothers were bitter enemies and contested the throne of Mycenae. Perhaps one brother besieged the other within the citadel and to facilitate his operations burnt all the buildings outside and near it. Then perhaps foreign mercenaries were allowed to plunder the tholos tombs just as Pyrrhus centuries later let his Gallic mercenaries loot the royal tombs of Macedonia. This is speculation, but it would fit the present archaeological evidence and agree with the dates usually assigned to Atreus and Agamemnon.

A. J. B. Wace.

12 Wace, Mycenae, pp. 123, 135. 13 Wace, Mycenae, p. 27.
ARCHAEOLOGY IN CYPRUS, 1949–1950

The identification of more Neolithic sites, two on the North coast, six and seven miles east of Kyrenia, throws light on the distribution, and is suggestive of the origin, of the first known settlers on the island.

The publication of the results of the excavations in the Vounous cemetery sponsored by the British School at Athens (E. and J. Stewart, Vounous, 1937–1938. Lund, 1950) offers a wealth of material from the first stage of the Early Bronze Age, which is a valuable complement to that excavated by P. Dikaios and Dr. C. F. A. Schaeffer in the later section of the cemetery.

Several LCII tombs, accidentally discovered at Kalavassos (site Mavrovouni) were excavated by the Antiquities Department. Two of them produced white slip vases of fine quality, which with the other contents are in the Larnaca Museum.

Further campaigns by both Schaeffer and Dikaios carried forward the joint-excavation of the late Bronze Age town site at Enkomi. The grid plan of the street system is beginning to take shape and a new section of the town wall has been laid bare. But both excavators in their 1950 campaigns were mainly occupied with the further investigation of the two impressive buildings, mainly of ashlar construction, previously discovered. Schaeffer recovered evidence of re-use, after a fire, evidently in the twelfth century; and of this period found two seated bronze statuettes, one of them on a throne. In the building excavated by Dikaios (JHS LXX, pl. IIIe) the pottery was mainly of the same period extending into the early eleventh century (including Mycenaean III c and decorated LC m). However, the structural remains on the site go back to the LC I period, and under the street outside the building was found an intact tomb with good Mycenaean pottery of the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries, including the interesting amphora illustrated on Fig. 1.

At the site Pigadhes near Myrtou, tested by Miss J. du P. Taylor in 1949, excavations were carried out by her and Miss V. Seton-Williams on behalf of the Ashmolean Museum and the University of Sydney. Much of the site was covered by a large deposit of Iron Age pottery, including a few imports from the Aegean and some terracottas. Below this was found a complex building constructed round a courtyard in which stood an altar, a monumental structure of large ashlar blocks, one of which has a coffered panel cut on one face. The building, evidently a sanctuary, appears to have been in use about 1300 B.C. and after destruction by earthquake the cult seems to have continued in its ruins until about 800. Deep soundings indicated the presence of earlier constructions of two levels, the lower possibly of the Middle Bronze Age. Finds included an imported cylinder seal, a fine specimen of the Mitannian style, which was allotted to the Cyprus Museum in the division. The Museum has also acquired two other cylinder seals, from the local market (Plate XLVII, 2): one of them (the lower one) with an inscription in the Cypro-Minoan script, and the other a fine specimen of Syro-Hittite work.

T. B. Mitford and J. H. Iliffie led a team which carried out trials on the site of Palaepaphos at Kouklia, where nothing had been done since the work of the Cyprus Exploration Fund in the sanctuary of Aphrodite (JHS IX, 193 f.). West of the area cleared in 1887 were found superimposed remains, totalling nearly 4 m. in depth and including late medieval, Roman, and archaic-Hellenistic structures overlying the lowest layer, which contained Mycenaean pottery. The discovery of quantities of copper slag in this layer throws new light on the wealth of the ancient city. On the Marcello hill overlooking the village, the same expedition investigated a mound where stone-gathering had previously yielded fragments of archaic stone statues and syllabic dedications (JHS LXX, 14). This proved to be a well-packed pile of rubble, encircled by a retaining wall and containing throughout a proportion of sculptural and architectural debris from an archaic sanctuary. Among other interesting finds were fragments of an archaic marble sphinx, including considerable parts of the wings with well-preserved red and black colour. The mound, the purpose of which is still obscure, was found to overlie
part of a massive wall of mud-brick faced with stone, possibly the outer wall of the Late Bronze and Iron Age Paphos. It is hoped to resume work on these sites in 1951.

For the Hellenistic period, further work on the slopes below the derelict cave-sanctuary on Kaphizi hill produced numerous new fragments of the vases with syllabic and alphabetic Greek dedications, which were a feature of the cult of the unnamed nymph (AJA XXX, 249 f., DARC 1937–39, 124 f.). Miss Anne Wilson of St. Andrew’s University was engaged on a study of Ptolemaic coins in Cyprus and prepared a catalogue of the Cyprus Museum series of this period. This and other series in the Museum collection have greatly benefited by the gift, received from the American Numismatic Society, of a substantial part of the coin collection made in Cyprus by the late Godfrey C. Gunther. The Museum has also acquired, by purchase from the local market, a group of gold bracelets and finger-rings of the Graeco-Roman period,

believed to come from Mora. Among the rings are two with a nodus Herculeus in place of the bezel and one in the form of a coiled serpent.

At Curium, De C. Fales completed his investigations, for the Pennsylvania University Museum Expedition, of the theatre and the adjoining baths. The former, first constructed in the third century B.C., was turned into an arena in the middle Roman period but reverted to its original use before destruction by earthquake in the fourteenth century. The construction of the bath building, with its fine mosaic pavements, is shown by new coin finds to be rather later than was previously supposed and to fall probably in the early fifth century A.D. A preliminary report on both buildings with plans has appeared in the University Museum Bulletin XIV, 4, pp. 27 f. At the Apollo sanctuary G. McFadden cleared the site of the main temple. Originally a single cella entered through a shallow porch at the narrow south end, it was doubled, probably at the end of the first century A.D., when the cult of Apollo Caesar was added to that of Apollo Hylates. Each cella had a central nave with two side-aisles, raised above the naves behind Doric colonnades. The partition wall and the aisles backing on it were inter-
ruptured at the north end where there was through communication between the two naves. Below this double temple were found the foundation walls of an earlier building with a different orientation, possibly the classical temple. McFadden also cleared part of a large building with paved porticoes round a central court. It antedates the South Building (completed in A.D. 102), which it adjoins on the east. In one of the rooms on the west side of the court a podium had been constructed against the back wall, possibly to receive a group of statuary, for in the debris above it were found two female heads of marble. One is illustrated in Fig. 2, the other is perhaps from an Aphrodite. A preliminary report on the Roman bath adjoining the sanctuary, excavated in 1949, has been published by McFadden in the University Museum Bulletin XIV, 4, pp. 14 f.

Acquisitions for the medieval collections of the Cyprus Museum included 20 Byzantine gold coins, mostly Heraclean solidi, from a hoard of 50 found at Mandres (Famagusta District). After the whole hoard had been recorded, the remainder were purchased by the Fitzwilliam Museum and a private collector. A hoard of 525 billion deniers of the Lusignan coinage (Henry II and Hugh IV) was purchased in Paphos, and some additions were made to the collection of Cypriot glazed pottery.

At the Monastery of the Panayia Kanakaria work carried out for the Archbishopric by the Department included the cleaning and protection of the mosaic in the apse of the church. During this work a series of mosaic medallions containing busts of the Apostles, forming a border across the front of the apse, was freed from later masonry which had almost completely masked it.

Excavations on medieval sites included further work for the Antiquities Department by Th. Mogabgab in the citadel of Famagusta, where investigations in the courtyard have been started. In the Ravelin, the outwork defending the Land Gate, he completed the clearance of the great underground gallery which was ruined by the Turks in the siege of 1571 and subsequently filled in. In the Castle of Kyrenia investigations designed to disentangle the work of different building periods have been put in hand following its transfer to the Department.

A. H. S. Megaw.

---

1 Soteriou, Βυζ. Μνημεία τῆς Κύπρου, A (1935), pl. 61b; Dalton, Byz. Art and Archaeology, 386–7.
NOTICES OF BOOKS


This is an important book, full of facts, opinions, suggestions, and original analysis. Yet eminently readable, for Professor Thomson is not only learned (overwhelmingly learned), but he has so lively a mind that facts, theories, and observations seem to crowd in upon it. The result is a quite excellent book, and one which, rather surprisingly at first thought, is to be read through rather than used for reference.

His general arrangement is a wise one: he takes periods, to Herodotus, to Aristotle, to Eratosthenes, the Roman Republic, 'the Great Days of the Roman Empire', and the Decline, and divides his treatment of each into two parts—first, actual knowledge of the earth's surface and of astronomy (so far as that is relevant), and, second, theory. This entails a certain amount of repetition; but if it is correct and important about such scholars as Pomponius Mela or Dionysius Periegetes, we begin perhaps to feel impatient; but even there Thomson shows afterwards that we were wrong, for these writers played a part in the subsequent dark ages. This last, the influence of earlier theories on later times down to the renaissance (particularly on Columbus) is a fascinating story, and is very well told. But the whole is good, and in no other book that I know is ancient geography so well handled. In only one matter I think we might have asked for more: he flattens the layman by assuming a greater knowledge of elementary astronomy and of modern map-making than he often possesses—the obliquity of the ecliptic, the precession of the equinoxes, foreknowledge of eclipses, etc.—or, at least, we do not, without help, grasp the importance of such knowledge in antiquity, what amount or kind of scientific observation and thought it implied and how it affected geographical theory. Hence his text-figures (62 and 63) illustrating Ptolemy's first and second projection, need more explanation for the layman, while fig. 61, Marinus' projection, seems to be inconsistent with Thomson's description of it, though that may be my ignorance; and, too, more about the MSS. tradition of Ptolemy's text and of his maps would have been welcome.

In two particulars Prof. Thomson deserves our special thanks: he does not write at length in footnotes (which are almost exclusively reserved for references), but says what he wants to say in the text; and he has these footnotes at the bottom of the page, not at the end of the chapter or of the book, so that the reader is spared the maddening business of turning to another part to discover whether a particular reference has meaning for him. Yet he promises: it is common for a page in this book, inevitably, to need six or eight or more references; Thomson combines such groups into one (and quite unsystematically); i.e., formally there are only one or two footnotes to the page, but these are aggregates. The disadvantage of this is obvious—it is more difficult to find your reference; its advantages are dubious—I doubt whether it even saves space, for Thomson has, within the footnote, to indicate in some way to which sentence his reference refers. He does this, with the utmost care, as shortly as possible, by single words or phrases, as 'Merv' or 'some writers', which are quotations from the main text, and abbreviations, as 'Bab.' and 'Hamm.' (for Babylonian and our old friend Hammurabi), and 'Cop.' for Copernicus. But confusion is very easy, and not all. Thomson's care has enabled him to avoid it: e.g., p. 153, n. 1, 'tomb of King "Red" (Erythras) on island, Str. 760, etc.; but neither tomb nor king, nor island, had been mentioned in the text. P. 152, some credit him (Heraclides of Pontus) with the further expansion of the Ptolemaic world; but he (Heraclides) is a sun, but the text is corrupt and perhaps really refers to Aristarchus, with n. 2, 'refers to A., Heath, Aristarchus of Samos, 1913, p. 282', etc.; but with no reference to the Greek text, except 'heard Pyth., Diog. Laert. v 36', which refers to an earlier statement about Heraclides having heard some Pythagoreans. p. 163, 1, after two differing theories have been mentioned, gives two further theories, 'who are explicit', and seven modern; but it is not clear who supports which theory. P. 45, n. 2 contains twenty-seven references on a variety of subjects mentioned in a page and a half of text: here are a few: 'population, W. S. Ferguson... Tod... Gomme, Pop. of Athens, 1933 (citizens under 50,000, slaves 120,000)'; but this leaves it obscure whether I meant 50,000 to be the number of all males or of the citizen population. 'Meg. blind, Hdt. iv 144, Str. 320', refers to Megara and Byzantium; and a little space could have been saved by omitting 'Str. 320' (unless it should be there because Strabo in fact says something different from Herodotus and from Thomson). 'A's brother, Str. 617': A. is Alcaeus this time, and the reference is to his brother's campaigning in Babylonia and should be A's own poem, not Strabo. (Similarly, p. 151, n. 2, the reference to Pomponius should be to F. Gr. H. rather than to Strabo.)

'Thin-soiled, Thuc. i 2, ii 96, Str. 333'; but in the text Thomson has 'Greece is a poor land, thin-soiled and with few considerable plains', which is not at all what Thucydides says in i 2 and Strabo repeats; Thuc. ii 96 is also an unnecessary reference. 'It is also true that... could still [in Caesar's day] repeat the old blunder of a Danube branch to the Adriatic'; and in the note: 'branch, even Hipp. ap. Str. 57: Nepos', etc.; we might have been told who Hipp. is, especially as he is Hipparchus of Samos, who was a good deal earlier than Caesar, and the index does not recognise him here. Incidentally this form of reference to Strabo, by the page only, saves some space, but costs the reader a good deal of time and trouble; and another small grievance is the number of references to pp., etc.: Thomson has read almost everything (he admits to ignorance of two obscure theses), but his systematic bibliography is short, and all the rest is in the footnotes, and some of the opera citata are hard to find. The anonymous author of the Periplus maris egyptiacus is called on p. 268 'a Graeco-Egyptian skipper'; thereafter he has many times just 'the Skipper', as on pp. 301-4, about India and Ceylon; the reader may have forgotten who he is, and the index does not know him under this title. In other ways too the index is inadequate. For a book covering such a wide and varied field as practical and theoretical geography, names such as Aristotle, Hipparchus, Ptolemy followed only by very many page-numbers, hardly help when what we want to look up is Aristotle's view of the shape of the earth and so forth. It seems indeed that Professor Thomson, from his great store of knowledge, and the generosity of his heart, has tried to give us too much. We accept everything gratefully, but something of what he offers we lose, not only because we cannot pocket it all, but because we are a little confused.

On some points I am inclined to doubt his judgement, as on Plato's 'positive contempt for observation, upon which natural science rests'; not only does this lead him to undervalue such passages as that on the geography of Attica (Critias, 115), but he fails to see that when he says, in the next paragraph, 'Geography shared in the prejudice against "physics"', Speculation about unknown parts was dialogue, this may not be actually inconsistent with a contempt for observation, but at least the two things do not obviously go together. But in general he is very sane, and refreshingly free from any contempt for ancient errors, frequently comparing our own. His is a book much to be welcomed for reading more than once, even though difficult to refer to.

I do not believe that anyone has written a long book in
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which the points of the compass are important without once at least writing 'west' for east or vice versa. Even Thomson does this, on p. 260.

A. W. GOMME.

Die Stoa : Geschichte einer geistigen Bewegung.


The sub-title of this book 'Geschichte einer geistigen Bewegung', suggests Prof. Pohlenz's aim, which is not only to present the doctrines and external history of Stoicism, but also to show its effect upon the contemporary and later world. With the attention of a courteous scholar, Pohlenz himself, there is more in other parts of the book that will be of general interest to most readers. Nowhere else has the reviewer read as clearly a guide to the main development of Hellenistic philosophy down to and including Antiochus, while the last 100 pages of the first volume give an admirably lucid picture of the way in which both Christian and neo-Platonist thought was formed by contact with Stoicism, now assimilating what was nourishing, now being sharpened in opposition; in particular it is well shown how the Christian doctrine of immaterial being was provoked by Stoic materialism. P. neither exaggerates nor minimises the debt owed by Christianity to Stoicism, and rightly finds that primitive Christianity, whatever its coincidental likenesses with Stoicism, was formed by a different spirit. The Stoic relies on human reason and the assurance of the gods, and is constrained by the transgressor. Two quotations will show where P. finds the source of the Christian faith. In the Stoics of the imperial period we clearly feel how the need grows to enter into a personal relation to God; but God remained the World-Reason, identical in nature with the human spirit, and quite remote from the Father in Heaven'; 'Agape, springing directly from the heart, and hardening to the relief of any distress, could awaken in human beings quite other moral powers than those aroused by Oikotesis and Philia, that were said to originate in the consciousness of the affinity of rational beings. The influence of Stoicism on the modern world receives no more than a summary treatment, and even so P. ends his story with Kant. He hopes that a historian of later philosophy will tell it in full; but he insists that the task needs a scholar who besides being a historian of philosophy, can follow stoicism as a spiritual force in the lives of men and women in many countries and many occupations.

The first public lectures were on the Stoics, and in his long life he has written some two hundred books and elaborate articles on particular aspects of the subject. In these two volumes, which were written by 1943 but delayed in publication, he has gathered up and unified his results. Although he succeeds in including a great amount of information, this style is pleasing and the proportions just; he never forgets that his main business is to give meaning to the facts and to consider the value of the doctrines. He states his views dogmatically, and can afford to do so, since he has argued them for detail in his preliminary works. The second volume gives (with extraordinary concision) references to his own works, to ancient sources, and to modern writers; it also includes facts that would have spoiled the breadth of the picture in the first volume. Little of value appears to be omitted. A number of longer notes provide an original handling of certain topics, of which the following may be mentioned: Stoic grammar (23), Dio's Beryshenetha myth mainly Stoic (45), the use of the atomic swerve to account for free-will an afterthought on Epictetus's part, in opposition to Stoic determinism (59), the sources and composition of Cic. Tusc. I (113), Posidonius and peri auros (121), the developed theory of re (174), Bardeanes (197). It is also to be observed that the references, which are in the first volume, include a list of the 200-odd known names. One or two more names might have been included, perhaps with the question-mark: Alaincuis (Philostorus, P.S. I. 24. 2), Seneaca (Peripatetic), possibly Cassius Accius, who accompanied Sarisans into exile, several of Crispypp's pupils whose names are not quite e.g. A(mara)taurus and Arce(ph)on, Theocren (I.G.

III. 2. 1359); Claudius 'Agaturinus' was probably in fact Agathinus.

Within the limits of this review it is not possible to give a full account of the contents of such a comprehensive work, nor to argue the point of Aristotle's 'agathos' does not feel complete satisfaction. Comment on a few topics will illustrate the range of the book.

The Stoics were much more coherent. Prof. Pohlenz, with the caution that we 'know nothing of the soul of a four-century Phoenician', but nevertheless feels that much of Zeno's thought would be surprising in a Greek. It is hard to go all the way with him here. If Zeno had reflected comparatively closely upon the Greek language he surely would have made better progress in grammar than he did, nor would the Stoics have taken the elements of speech to be the 24 sounds represented by the letters of the Greek alphabet. Would not his epistemological interests (p. 116) have been quite natural in one who spoke Greek from birth? Did it need 'Rassengefühl' (p. 86) to lead him to say that ζωοσκοπων φωναί came from ancestors as well as parents? Is it true that Greek ethics are based on 'The fear of God and the Academic influence, drawing upon the arguments of ancient philosophers? Surely not, unless more modern arguments are left out of account. It was an inconsistency of Stoic thought to hold simultaneously that everything was determined by Fate and that the human will was free, but this inconsistency has its root in nothing, without any appeal to 'Semitic fatalism' (p. 167). On the other hand P. may be right in finding that the Stoic anthropocentrism un-Greek, and its best parallel in the Old Testament.

The question of Aristotelian and Peripatetic influence is somewhat weakly handled. Zeno 'became familiar with the fundamental views of the Peripatetes' (p. 23). How? We do not hear of his studying in the Lyceum. What were the fundamental views of the Peripatetics of his time? P. constantly speaks of Zeno as agreeing, or more often disagreeing, with Aristotle on this or that point. Did he know, could he know, what Aristotle's views were, apart from those that were expressed in his published works? What looks to us like agreement with Aristotle may sometimes have been agreement with the Academy; and P. does not reject the story that Zeno studied under Polemo, although he thinks it was given currency by Antiochus to support his view of Zeno as a dissident Platonist. I think P. underestimates the number of unwarranted conclusions from the facts that Polemo's own writings were uninspiring and confined to ethics. G. Wiesema's excellent article in Mmuses 1943 probably appeared too late to be taken into account. On the other hand, too much is made of the story that even Stoic logic, which is unthinkable without the Aristotelian syllogistic, does not use his words for premise and conclusion.

It can be said that Heraclitus influenced Zeno, rejecting the view that he was found, perhaps by Cleanthes, to have anticipated Stoic doctrine. In this he may be right, but few will agree that the ἄρτικος was really to be found in Heraclitus.

Ethics. P. puts very lucidly the views that he has previously advanced in Zeno and Christos and Grundfragen der Stoischen Philosophie. He gives a central position to the doctrine of σωφροσυνή and attaches more importance than so many scholars to the various formulations of the word. I find him less clear on ἄνευ μόρφου and κατὰ τῆς τοπίας ἐν ὑπάρχει καὶ τοῖς χρόνοις καθαρός καὶ ἐν ἔγγειον.

Aristotle. The works that circulated under his name are summarily ascribed to his Peripatetic name sake, although perhaps the title is not always appropriate. If the lives who admitted the genuineness of the letters only, must be believed (and this is correctly reported), it would be better to suppose forgery. It is surprising that Pohlenz appears to have no difficulty in reconciling his belief that Aristotle left no written treatises with an acceptance of Jensen's view
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that Philodemus attacks an elaborate theory of poetry due to him. If Jensen’s restoration of τῶν αὐτού· τῶν Ἐλισάβετ is right, the words are not a natural way of describing Zenon’s heretical people, who, he being to the truth, detached himself from them; it seems possible that the phrase describes someone who was primarily a ἰσαρχείον rather than a philosopher.

Posidounis. This chapter can be highly recommended to anyone who wants a sympathetic but unfanciful and facing account of Posidounis. P. holds that there is a deep admiration for his breadth of interest, eclecticism, enthusiasm, and imagination, and palliates his mistakes and credulity. He is not disposed to find his influence everywhere, and notably denied the immediate influence of Aristotelism in his thought; he enters a warning, too, against supposing that Posidounis must be the source of Platonist thoughts common to him and later authors. He explains the compative paucity of references to Posidounis by saying that Stoics disliked him for his heresies and non-Stoics for his style of thought.

Roman Stoicism. P. argues (II 140) that it was the Romans, unless Posidounis led the way, who developed the idea that virtue might confer immortality and divorce after death. It might be added that the Di Mante may have helped in this; there is something to be said for emending Cicero de legibus 1, 22 to read Deorum Manium tura sancta sunt. <bo>...</bo> nos leto datu dnuo habento, Tacitus, however, writes defunctus. Theophanes (Lib. xii, 7) says that the Carthaginian traders brought back images of goddess of thee least − Stoic literature (Ann. 6, 18). At several places P. develops a suggestion that the Romans invented the concept of will; he points out how voluntas sometimes stands for deo, ad te velle for deo creare. No doubt the Roman Stoics, who lies both useful and likely to subject would repay further investigation. P.’s account of Senea is a fair one, and without concealing his vices, very properly insists on his virtues. He ascribes to him an original development of the doctrine of katharsis.

Occasionally P. lets his pen run away with him and writes a phrase that might mislead, e.g., the description of Diogenes’s book on rhetoric as a ‘rhetorisches Lehrbuch’ (p. 522), the statement that virtue is identical with the virtuous act (p. 65), the claim that ‘Stoic-Roman virtus serves the community in selfless devotion’ (p. 473). A few translations may also be noted with a warning. P. 139, ἐν τοιοτο αἰκιόνι και ὑπὸ τῆς δοκίμως, ‘a meniscus demissio die auf demselben Territorium wohnt und von einem Gesetz durnahende wird (my italics: P.’s object is to show that the Stoic concept of πάθος would include the new monarchies; he is unsympathetic towards Hellenistic cities, thinking they have importance only to a ‘futurist’ temple, temple, art. ‘Wert in Hinsicht auf’ (better ‘Wert in Hinsicht auf’). P. 190, κατά τὰς ἱερὰς ‘uns zukomende’ (better ‘einigungen zukomende’; the emphasis is at least as much on ἱερὰς as on ἱεράς). P. 170, Antigonus’s famous reference to his monarchy as ἐνδυκασμένη ‘devolved’ on him, Fr. ‘Devolutionary, fragmentary, dating from an xenonymon (historians, please note) ρανmolle Sklaverei’; ἐνδυκασμένη is used by the Stoics of popular repute, opposed to true glory.

I add a few miscellaneous remarks. The Stoic Poleteüke has not been excavated, but I doubt whether it contained rooms that the city could allow Zeno to use (p. 24); in any case anecdotes about him suggest no such privacy. It is commonly believed that Cic. Ac. Pr. 11-60 are derived from Antiochus’s Ｓτουάρτες τοὺς αὐτοῖς. P. has dealt with them and good reason is given. Virgil’s antique res stat Romana virisque (p. 275) is probably a slip of the pen. Did Roman aristocrats of the Republic really have little time for personal life? (p. 278). When P. speaks (p. 433) of the Stoic division into κοινοκλήτωρ and προκαθήκων, does he retract the view expressed in Begründung der abendländischen Sprachlehre pp. 191 f., that the division was not specifically Stoic?

Minor criticisms must not be held to detract from the merits of an outstandingly good work, which will long be indispensable to students of philosophy. If I had not ‘clung’ as it is not only in material but also in stimulating suggestions. It has also the advantage, not always possessed by valuable works of scholarship, of being printed (so far as the first volume is concerned) with a legibility that matches its clarity of style.

F. H. Sandbach.
which, as Professor Bosco reminds us, should provide a key to the decipherment of a new Indo-European language, the language written in hieroglyphs, a problem to which he himself has devoted so much research. His chapter provides an authoritative survey of a complex subject, and his summary of the history and mythology which the inscriptions record will be of special concern to readers of this journal. He concludes that the references to the Dianthus and King Asituwanda's alleged descent from Mopsos.

The book is amply illustrated by the photographs, plans, and drawings which make up the plates, but a map of the district is definitely a useful addition. Particularly welcome are the many photographs of the reliefs, which can thus easily be studied and enjoyed. The proportion of pictures devoted to the expedition's living quarters is, perhaps, a little large; nevertheless the authors have done rightly in not excluding from their report the personal element. For it may provide something unexpectedly delightful, as we learn from Professor Bosco's introduction.

Turkey is a land where folk-songs are still invented, and Karatepe inspired at least two by a workman, which was sung by his companions, the other by a workman's child ten years old. Both are reproduced, in Turkish and in a German translation, since everything in this publication is, like the inscriptions themselves, bilingual.

W. LAMB.


The excavation by the American School of the Potter's Quarter at Corinth was begun in 1928 and continued during the following three years. From this comparatively small area the finds were extraordinarily rich. 850 baskets of sherds were recovered, and no fewer than 2,300 terracotta ware inventories, in addition, 110 moulds for the manufacture of such figures were found. A brief publication in AJA XXXV (1931), pp. 1 ff. and XXXVII (1933), pp. 605 ff. gave tempting glimpses of the treasures. A comprehensive publication has been long and eagerly awaited by all who are interested in Corinthian art, especially in that of the archaic period.

Unfortunately, they must wait still. The volume before us has a very limited scope: it includes only a report on the buildings, the Architectural and Sculptural Fragments, the Terracotta Moulds and Molds, pieces of metal and glass. The reader will gather from the title and from notes on pp. 10 and 91 that publication of the pottery and figures is preparing. But meantime Mrs. Stillwell has kept rigidly within her limits, and her book will become fully comprehensible only in the light of what is to follow. No doubt there is good reason for publishing the pottery as a whole in a separate section, for it is a pity that it could not have been bound up with the present volume; but surely it is illogical to discuss groups of vases (e.g. pp. 6-11) without any pictures of any persons of individual objects such as those mentioned on pp. 12-13, 26 and 52 which are of capital importance for the chronological conclusions of the author. It also seems illogical to publish the terracotta moulds in a separate section and volume from the series of figures as a whole, by which the context of the moulds might have been illuminated.

Pp. 3-81 contain a careful and clear description of the scope and lay-out of the excavation itself and of architectural and other stone fragments. It was no easy task to distinguish the complex of walls disclosed, and to assign each to its period; and this has been very competently performed, so far as one may judge, without knowledge of most of the artefacts used for establishing the chronology. Of special interest are the shrines, with their curious styles, and the large number of objects which, with good probability, served as offering-tables, such as 22-29, 49-53, 63-66, 72-76.

The Terracotta Factory, a building with a storage gallery which contained many fifth and fourth century moulds, is clearly described and illustrated, and the date discussed on pp. 48-49. Among architectural fragments the triglyph altar (pp. 67-68, 77, 79) and a magnificent archaic Doric cap (pp. 69-70, 80) are interesting. The whole section is illustrated with excellent photographs and plans.

By far the most interesting of the finds published are the terracotta moulds (pp. 82-113 and plates 48-49). These date from the seventh to the fourth century B.C., and a number of the archaic moulds were discovered at Perachora. After some useful notes on technique, the author describes 106 of the moulds individually, and the plates show photographs of each and of a cast from each. The figures, as far as they can be identified, are divine, and the descriptions given in the text are often complete or incorrect as regards the style and date of the objects. A few notes on the first half a dozen may illustrate this. No: 62 is certainly oriental and certainly early; but there is no concrete evidence for dating it earlier than its context (third quarter of the seventh century). It may be a mould pirated from an East Greek alabaster, and it should in any case be compared with Perachora no. 275. No: 63 is not so certain; and the third quarter of the seventh century. But the author seems to use it as evidence to suggest that the Delphi bronze kouroi is Corinthian. The decisive similarity to the Cretan head-vase from Arkhanes (Dedalica, pl. VI, 1, 2) she was unable to see, and if the use of the mould is not decisive, this would not add an argument for calling the kouroi Corinthian, but only subtract an argument for calling them Cretan. The elements in him which Mrs. Stillwell compares with her no: 2 are elements common to all Dedalica no: 3. Mrs. Stillwell does not compare with late geometric (1) and late Dedicac heads, and dated to the third quarter of the seventh century. This is at least half a century out, since the head does not belong to the seventh century at all, but to the third quarter of the sixth; cf. Neurocrinitha pl. 48 no. 5, and BSA XXXIV (1939), pl. 93, with Lane's comment, ibid. p. 133, lines 4-6. I must add that I do not know any arguments for calling the head 'male' convincing. No: 2 belongs, not to the third quarter, but to the last of the seventh century; cf. BSA XXXIII (1934), plate 11, no. 3, to which it bears a very early resemblance. No: 6 cannot be as early as the seventh century, imprinted as it appears to date from the second half of the sixth. It will be seen from these examples that the author tends to date the moulds too early, and I should be surprised if her nos. 62 and 63 were as early as the seventh century. The metal fragments, apart from the beautiful Aphrodit inscription on plate 47 (cf. AJA XXXV, p. 2), are not very interesting.

The review of this book is at a disadvantage because there is so much undisclosed information about the finds which is known to the author but not known to him. It is, in particular, unfair to the reader to cite by inventory number objects which have never been published and can be known only to the excavators themselves. We must hope that the rest of the evidence from the Potter's Quarter will soon be before us, and then Mrs. Stillwell's notable contribution will be appreciated better.

R. J. H. JENKINS.


This doctoral thesis is a philologist's attempt to determine the sources used by Tacitus in his account of the Jews; it is not therefore concerned with the archaeological and historical evidence for the Jews.

After a brief introduction giving a history of the problem and the plan of the thesis, Dr. H.-J. prints a text of Tac. Hist. V. 2-13 based on Goeler's 1939 edition with the following variant readings: 4. 7 compliant; 5. 9 sinuate; 7. 2 solidum (cf. Dial. 9. 4: ad omnem certam et solidam pretium); 12. 5 quem et Bargioram vocatum admit; text after Ioannes and taken to be an error due to Tacitus (P. 135).
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Accompanying the text is a Dutch translation on facing pages, which is generally accurate. The following points may however be noted: 5. 11 abnormalis is a weak translation of abalors; 6. 5 zijn, vervolled depressor which domestica; 9. 11 Abduceus translates excludet which make it clear that liquorum refers toertility; 11. 5 the subject of viderunt is taken to be Hierosolyma which forms a less natural subject than Roma et opes colubratae.

Ch. II. The chapter which acknowledges Kowrovi, the edition, and Pliny the Elder. The 1st cent. A.D. might have concerning the Jews. Western peoples came to know the Jews as a result of the Diaspora; the earliest Greek accounts are friendly, since Greek philosophers would be sympathetic to Jewish aniconic monuments; but in the later days, the distortion between Greeks and Jews in Alexandria and was aggravated by the Jewish tendency to support Roman policy. Further offence was caused by the aloofness of the Jews in religion and social life. So from Alexandria came a stream of anti-Jewish literature, which at first spared Jewish religion, but later seized the opportunity furnished by the mystery surrounding the áortov at Jerusalem to introduce the slander that the shrine enclosed the figure of an ass.

Dr. H. J. next turns to the references to the Jews in Latin Literature and concludes that the Romans were in general favourable but that some authors (for instance Horace, Martial, and Juvenal) mocked or ridiculed the country.

Consideration of the relations of Jews to Greeks and Romans raises the question of the Jewish Sibyllina and their Messianic prophecies. Tacitus as quidquidvivat sacri faciundus would have had access to these or at least to those included in the official lists. Indeed his interest in the priesthood may have depended on this fact.

Philosophers and Josephus had little influence on non-Jewish authors; nor is there any evidence to suggest that the Cubans were known to any Greek or Roman author of this period.

Ch. II. deals with Tacitus as ethnographer and historian. Ethnography as a literary genre was a new thing, but can be traced back to Herodotus and the Ionians. It comprised three elements:

(a) the early history of the people with special reference to their origin;
(b) a description of the land;
(c) the religion and customs of the people.

Tacitus had already used this form in his accounts of Britain and Germany.

In the Histories 1 Tacitus refers to three earlier writers, Varro, Pliny the Younger, and Philo the Elder; there is no evidence to suggest that the first two wrote on the Jews, but the Arados-inscription as restored by Mommsen does suggest that Pliny served in Palestine, so that he may be a source.

Some 7th and 8th official documents which may be assumed to have included reports on the Palestinian campaigns. Moreover, his detailed knowledge of incidents in the campaigns suggests that he knew also the 'commentarii' of Vespasian.

In ch. III, Dr. H. J. makes a careful study of the text of Tacitus section by section and attempts to determine the source of each one. The relevant passages from other ancient authors are quoted in full. Her general conclusion is that Tacitus relied chiefly on one source, but used several ecclesiastically: this has led to the inclusion in his account of contradictory statements on the nature of Jewish religion. Her detailed conclusions are that Tacitus relied on Alexandrian anti-Jewish sources for the early history of the Jews and on Hellenistic Stoic ethnography (in which Posidonius' influence is important) for his description of Palestine. No source can be suggested with any certainty for the more recent Jewish history, but for the campaigns of the Jewish Revolt Vespasian's commentarii and possibly those of Titus and other eye-witnesses were used.

The thesis concludes with a lengthy summary in English, lists of editions consulted and passages cited, and a bibliography.

Frequent misprints mar a book that is otherwise well produced.

A. TRELOAR.


When I received the publisher's invitation to give the Mary Flexner lectures at Bryn Mawr for the autumn of 1941, it did not take me long to decide my subject: for I had been working for several years on Kowrovi and was eager to expand the extensive notes I had accumulated on archaic Greek art into a more general work. This book is therefore really a sequel to Kowrovi and many of the findings there set forth are here adopted. But whereas Kowrovi was addressed chiefly to archaeologists, Archaeic Greek Art against its Historical Background is intended also for the general reader. The archaeologist as well as the general reader may be grateful to Miss Richter for expressing herself in so readable a form, without abating any of the apparatus of scholarship—accurate references, bibliographical notes, and so on. The subject gains from the effort required for clear expression, and the archaic art of Greece receives its due as something which is worth the attention of all cultivated persons.

The art with which Miss Richter is most concerned, as her reference to Kowrovi indicates, is sculpture. There are many pictures of coins and vases, some of bronze reliefs, metal vases and ivories. But most of the objects illustrated are fragments in marble, ivory, and sculpture, primarily in marble, stands in the foreground of the text. This emphasis has some far-reaching effects on the plan of the book. The period of archaic art is taken as 650 to 480 B.C., the earlier date being chosen as that at which monumental sculpture began to be used, even if some of the small works are indeed strong arguments against supposing, as has been thought by some scholars, that there were life-size statues in Greece much before the kore of Nikandre. But it is perhaps 100 years to omit the smaller works which preceded her, some of which have certainly a monumental character. The ivory women from the Diphylon would have been a good starting point. Another effect of this opening date is that, if it were applied strictly (which happily it is not always), the development of seventh-century, so-called "decadal" sculpture, as established by R. J. H. Jenkins on the basis of both small and life-size works, is cut in half. One would have liked to have Miss Richter's opinion on Jenkins' scheme of chronology and development.

The plan is regional. Within each of three periods (650-575, 575-555, 555-480) the monuments are discussed region by region, beginning always as is proper with Attica. Miss Richter, as is well known, is sceptical of regional classification in general, and she questions whether even the best known of the famous works appear under their place of finding, not the centre to which they have commonly been attributed. In the case of Olympos and Delphi this is abundantly justified, for it is more important historically that so many of the famous works of archaic art were dedicated to the Hellenistic sanctuaries than that they can with more or less measure of agreement be ascribed to an often hypothetical artistic centre. None the less, it is to be hoped that in years to come it may be possible to reach more solid ground for distinction of regional or other groups, and it may be that further study of workshop groups will prove fruitful.

Given the ease with which great artists, and humber others also, moved from place to place, and the speed with which, as Miss Richter has demonstrated, technical improvements were adopted in all the Greek world, it may perhaps be possible to trace the influence of the great masters through groups of works attributable to their following, though not necessarily found in the same place. A beginning has been made in Attica, with the Sounion group of early kourai, which expresses a single strong personality, and groupings of korai. But there is still a long way to go, even in Attica where the material is relatively abundant.

A few particular points. The remarks on the influence of Greek art in neighbouring provinces, Lydia, Persia, Etruria, and Spain, are welcome. It is good that Boeotian art of all periods receives its due, though perhaps Boeotian vases are here over-rated. There are many illuminating passages in which new or little-known monuments are evaluated; the appreciation of the metopes from the
Heraeum near Paestum is especially important. There are also many passages in which a controversy is briefly summed up and, it may be, solved, or a new opinion is expressed. For instance, Miss Richter adduces new evidence to put the metopes of Temple C at Selinous about 540, and adds "to explain them as the work of a provincial or conservative artist is hardly possible, for we should then expect a mixed rather than a consistent style." The ascription of the earliest heads of Athena on coins of Athens to the Paestum Metopes may meet with less general approval. Some other useful datings (it will be observed that Miss Richter is not afraid of a high date and ignores many recent heresies): Prinias sculptures, third quarter of seventh century B.C.; Hera at Olympia, around 620-610 B.C.; Tomb at Xanthos, not later than first quarter of sixth century; pediments of arcaic temple of Apollo at Delphi, 'last decade or so of sixth century.' Of the Temple of the Athenaean at Delphi, she asks, in the hope of reconciling contradictory elements which have led to dates twenty years apart, 'Is it possible that the building was begun soon after 560 . . . but was interrupted for some reason and not completed until after Marathon?' Lastly, she shows proper scepticism about the person of the Alaces who seems to be connected with the building. The peripteral temple of Samos at Gela of the early sixth century is, according to Miss Richter, dated in the last third of the sixth century. Why not go the whole way and reject the identification with Polycrates' father, whose activity should have ceased before the beginning of his son's tyranny, which fills the first half of this period of a third of a century?

It is perhaps expected of a reviewer that he shall find some points of disagreement, but my bar is a poor one. Bathylus' throne at Amyclae should belong to Miss Richter's last period, not about 550 as put on p. 87 by Buschor, AM 1927, 21. It is surprising to find no mention under Cyrene either of the Temple of Apollo and its early arcaic marble reliefs or of the late arcaic korai, nothing in Ch. VI on the late arcaic sculpture found on Paros (not Parousa) in Agrigentum, of the Tetrapylon in Kos, of the aryballos in Samos, or of the Cretan vases which seem to be illustrated; he was surely a journeyman repeating a common theme; the importance of his signature is that it proves that not only great artists but also lesser men travelled. The metope from the Sicynian Treasury at Delphi (fig. 148) is in limestone, not marble. Cambyses ruled 529-522 (p. 132). One may protest against a few eccentric spellings, which need however cause no difficulty.

In a book like this the pictures are half the story, and here we are richly favoured. There are 107 pages of plates, many of them of objects not previously made known to such a wide public. Especially valuable are the many excellent photographs of objects in New York, previously published only in the Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum. Many of the vases are illustrated from G. M. Young's photographs, and it is gratifying that in some cases the reproduction is more successful here than in Konreif. If one may express a single regret, it is that there are not more pictures of smaller works in gold and ivory, bronze reliefs and so on, which are less commonly and acessibly illustrated than the great sculptures.

Finally, a word of gratitude is due from the historian. Miss Richter says in her introduction: 'There is, unfortunately, no up-to-date account of Greek history during the arcaic period.' But a book such as this is the indispensable preliminary of any attempt to write a history of arcaic Greece, and in itself a great part of the work. It is more a book like this to put into the hands of students, discouraged by formal references to 'archaeological evidence' but quick to enjoy the beauty of arcaic Greek art.

T. J. DUNBARIN.


Wagner on Greek music have, inevitably, concerned themselves largely with post-classical treatises and melodia Wagens, in this very welcome book, sets out to record what the contemporary evidence tells us about the classical period. The literary evidence is notoriously inaccurate and tawdry. Wagen includes in his survey, but devotes most attention to the monuments and especially to the vase-paintings. Therein lies the chief value of his book. For, although this type of evidence has of course been used before, few students of Greek music are fully equipped to handle it, and with the increase in our knowledge of vase-paintings the time was ripe for such an inventory to be compiled.

The evidence is collected under various headings, e.g., Myths, Instruments, Song, History—a method which is convenient, though it gives a somewhat artificial grouping. This is the case also with the commentaries, which are an important part of the evidence. The The text is without references (except to the reproductions), the documentation being contained in an alphabetic register, in which is recorded, under appropriate headings and sub-headings, the ancient literary and monumental evidence, together with some material provided by music: the under Aulos and Barbiton is found a list of seven RF vines on which the two instruments appear together, under kithara- Herakles Kitharodas is an eight of RF Bves, and so on. Valuable though this is, the absence of references from the text to the register is a disadvantage, since, although any vase mentioned in the former can be identified in the latter, it may take a matter of minutes to do so. The illustrations—53 on 32 plates—are well selected and excellently reproduced; would, however, have been grateful for approximate dates.

In dealing with literary evidence, Wagens makes some ill-considered statements. Thespis' speech at Agamemnon 246 is not addressed to his father. In Plato, Laws 708b any isYW no isYW (if they are the same, as supposed by the dithyramb had its origin from Dionysus. Clouds 1355 ff. does not imply that singing to the were the old-fashioned feature, nor did it 12 f. that Agamemnon found the music of aubis strange as such (did he also find the sailors strange as such?). These are unimportant details in a book whose value lies in the handling of monumental evidence. From this Wagens builds up a picture. Is he entitled to call it 'the musical life of the Greeks?' Within limits the answer is yes. It is a commonplace that the life of the Greeks was largely music: a reading of this book brings home the truth of it impressively. Yet the picture is necessarily devoid of sound and movement. Nor is this type of evidence always easy to assess. A large part of it is concerned with musical instruments, the representations of which are clearly governed by conventions, while their accuracy of detail is often doubtful. The vogue and conjunctions of instruments appear to vary from period to period; but how far can we depend upon conclusions which are based upon counting vase-paintings?

One fact recorded by Wagens should put us on our guard. Representations of the syrinx disappear, if he is right, for a hundred and fifty years, and yet no instrument is likely to have had a more continuous and uniform employment, and Wagens is generally aware of these limitations, but sometimes, e.g., when he passes a sweeping judgement on late-fifth-century music, it is well to remind oneself that, except for one papyrus fragment, every note of classical Greek music is now lost.

In conclusion, this is a valuable book. Much work still remains to be done, especially in applying the evidence of vase-painting to the problems of ancient instruments—a field of research which could be commended to any student of Greek art who is also interested in music.

R. P. WOODIN-INSERAM.


'The primary aim of this book,' says the author at the beginning of his preface, 'is to provide an indispensable and religious companion to the Greek classics.' It is not, then, an introduction to the subject for the general public, and it is not certain that it would succeed in that function, to judge by the recent review of it in a not contemplative weekly, written by a journalist less informed than the students, in which the characteristic features of the work were entirely missed.

For students, however, of various grades who know something of Greek style and thought in general and want to make sense for themselves out of the innumerable references and allusions to religious matters which occur throughout classical literature, it is likely to be very useful and generally a perfectly safe guide; in a notice to appear in C.R. I have mentioned some trifling slips and some disagreements.
with the author on controversial points, but do not intend to
discuss either here.

Evidently an interesting work of such modest size
must limit itself in subject-matter, and Mr. Guthrie has
chosen an approach by setting the Greek character as
some outstanding religious ideas and handling these in
comparatively full detail. After a chapter on the history
of the study of Greek religion, he devotes his second to
'The Divine Family', giving an account of eight principal
deities, with a brief introduction to the Greek religion.
Chap. III deals briefly with 'a central problem', viz. which
is the more characteristically Greek idea, that the gap
between men and gods is unbridgeable, or that man has something
divine in him. In the eclectic religion, Chap. IX, 'The
cthonists', in which, after a short general introduction,
the author treats of a typical chthonian god, Trophonius,
Heraclides as the best-known hero and Asklepios as a doubtful
and therefore interesting case. He hopes to study the
ordinary fears of the new churchmen, and include such
things as religious organisations, the general attitude
towards witchcraft, and not least the feelings concerning
death and the dead. Mr. Guthrie's special subject, Oracles,
the subject of the chapter of Elements, is to be found in Chap.
and most modest and reasonable tone, and very properly,
since he is dealing with Greek religion generally, not
simply with cult and ritual, philosophy is given a hearing
in a final chapter on Plato and Aristotle. The whole
book is interestingly written, the author's opinions are
forthright and contrary views handled courteously.

H. J. ROSE

The emphasis of this attractively-written book is upon
the dramatic element in Plato's life-story and his abiding
message as poet and artist. His philosophical thought as
such is set aside, and the appeal is to the non-classical
reader. Copious excerpts are given in translation; the
book would be of more use to students if the page-references
to the original texts were indicated. The chapter on
Plato's life dwells mainly on the Sicilian episodes, with
dramatic reconstruction and psychological interpretation,
which though often speculative are interesting and
suggestive. His portrait of Socrates is elicited from descriptive
study of the Apology, Crito, and Phaedrus. Socrates was, the
author states, an echo of Platonic philosophy, his dialogue
with prophetic insight throughout, and the aggressive tone
of the Apology is somewhat ignored. Discussion of Plato's
of his treatment of the Sophists includes the interesting suggestion
(p. 194) that Gorgias is the Gorgias that represents Plato's
if that is what follows Socrates. The Republic is found to
exhibit throughout the influence of Socrates, and Plato's
struggle against his own poetic instincts. In the last
chapter the topic of Love is fully treated from the Symposium
and Phaedrus, with special study of the character of
Alcibiades; the 'transpositions' (the author's word)
necessary for modern application are adroitly made.
The enthusiasm which pervades the book makes it pleasant
reading, and it contains much valuable interpretation.

D. TARRANT

Pan ! Sur l'ion de Platon. By L. ROUSSEL. Pp. 121.
The author of this small book accepts the authenticity of
the Ios, and argues from it with much inventive Plato's
complete ignorance of the subject-matter and the nature
of poetry, his inability to criticise, his general lack of taste
and much besides. At the outset the dialogue is described
as badly written (examples are given, pp. 18-19), which
leads him (p. 19) to the conclusion that it is genuine
by Plato. The humour is found poor
(pp. 14-15) and the character of Ion an insolent caricature
(it is suggested on p. 61 that Plato was jealous of the actor's
costume and crown); the inexact quotations from Homer
are taken seriously and used to indicate Plato's stupidity.
Socrates is found to show (here as elsewhere) bad faith in
argument and 'aucun savoir-vivre' (p. 94). The author's
motive begins to appear in the reference to 'plusieurs
hellénolâtres' (p. 97) who have tried to save Plato by
calling in the Ion spuriously, and becomes clearer in his violent
attack (pp. 113 ff.) on an unnamed French Hellenist with
whom literary opinions he disagrees. The reviewer cannot
resist quoting Professor Roussel's closing sentence: 'Il ne reste qu'à
démontrer par une étude approfondie, qu'au premier
souffle, s'il n'était, dans sa petite, un monument d'ignorance, d'erreur, et de fétichisme.'

D. TARRANT

Pindar carmina cum fragmentis. Ed. A. TURYN. Pp. xiii + 403. Cracow:
Academia Polona litterarum et scientiarum, 1948.

Professor Turyn's edition of the epinician, published at
New York in 1944, has already been reviewed in this
journal, and since in the present work the part
containing the epinician is reprinted without change, I am concerned
not only with the part of the new edition that contains
the fragments. To the establishment of the text of these
the book makes no particularly important new contribution:
its main advantage over its predecessors lies in its incorporating
the results of Professor B. Sme the important article on
the Paean in Hermes lxiii (1938). Not that any blame
attaches to the editor on this account; in dealing with the
fragments preserved by Schol. Schol. he has too well to
leave much scope to his successors, and any advantage which T. might have derived from a re-
examination of the papyri has been denied him by the war. T.
deserves credit for approaching more critically than
contemporary editors of lyric fragments to a Lobelian severity
in relegating to the apparatus criticus all supplements
that are not certainly or almost certainly correct. But
the main value of his work upon the fragments consists in
the greater mass of subsidiary information which he has assembled.
Not only does he offer one full and accurate apparatus
which contains variants and another containing cross-
references to Pindar's own work and testimony from other
ancient writers; but the source or sources in which each
fragment is preserved are fully and clearly set out and the
modern works which T. considers most helpful in its
interpretation are exhaustively enumerated. T.'s assemblage
of mediæval quotations is by far the most complete
yet made, including several items that eluded even
Schol. Schol. T. is particularly assiduous in ensuring that it
is always to the latest edition of the author he is quoting
in that he refers. He also appends to each poem long enough
to make this possible a useful concensus metrumorum: through this perhaps the main value of his
work is that his comments are less useful than the lines of longs and shorts by which he describes them. It is a pity that T. has thought it
necessary to change the order of the fragments; any
advantage which may be got from placing together any
segments of fragments which he himself seems to have
come from the same poem is easily outweighed by the
inconvenience which the reader suffers in having to cope
with yet another rearrangement. For, invaluable as the new

1 By Professor E. S. Forster (JHS, lxxiv, p. 121).
2 One might find fault with T.'s handling of some of the
fragments of doubtful authorship. He does not print
Bovra's F 341, nor (in spite of Snell's remarks at Hermes
lxii [1946], p. 154) Bovra's F 342, nor (in spite of
Bergk's Lyr. adesp. B5, cutting the perplexing knot
presented by the genitives in -ov by changing them to -ov
with an irritatingly complement 'correxi'.
3 But Professor Forster's complaint that English
work on Pindar is neglected by comparison with continental
must be reiterated; for example, references to Sophoclean
fragments in Nauck 'n' may well be supplemented
by references to Pearson. In dealing with his F 137
(1933) T. quotes a style in which he calls the cola
less useful than the lines of longs and shorts by which he
describes them. It is a pity that T. has thought it
necessary to change the order of the fragments; any
advantage which may be got from placing together any
segments of fragments which he himself seems to have
come from the same poem is easily outweighed by the
inconvenience which the reader suffers in having to cope
with yet another rearrangement. For, invaluable as the new

4 At F 118 (111 S.) he scans τραχί (occurring before
τραχόνος) as an inambus, saying of the ου 'notabilis est
prosodía', a comment which seems equally applicable to
his scanion of the first syllable of this word.
NOTICES OF BOOKS

editions, its appearance does not mean that one can do without Schröder’s edition major and its supplement. Not unnaturally, T. has only found room for the great mass of fresh information which he offers by the omission of much in Schröder that has still some value, and the most part of quotations and references to earlier works on Pindar since the revival of learning. And T. does print Schröder’s numbers and brackets and a table of references to them at the end. Unfortunately he does not accord the same privilege to the Oxford text. The print and the paper of his book leave nothing to be desired; the binding, which is of paper, does. There are remarkably few misprints; though on pages 294, 359 and 360 the names of two of the Italian poets are omitted, and on page 359 the composer has added an unnecessary ‘c’ to ‘Oxyrhynch.’

HUGH LLOYD-JONES.


This Swedish publication presents in English the results of the work of Professor Kakrides on the Homerische poems; it incorporates material previously published in Greek, which has been added to and revised. The thoroughness, expression and neatness of the English translation reflect the greatest credit on all concerned.

K.’s approach (for which he uses the term ‘neo-analysis’) is that of a unitarian who is concerned with the discovery of the sources by historical analysis. He differs from the extreme unitarians in his willingness to look for sources, and from the older analysts in insisting that a single poetic genius has put the Iliad into its present shape. Thus the purpose of neo-analysis is not to disintegrate the Homeric epic into so many small pieces and then to rejoice in attacking the ‘bungle-r,’ the ‘incapable botcher,’ the ‘foolish compiler’ and all the other names which have been applied to the poet of the Iliad and the Odyssey. The main purpose of neo-analysis is, even when it tries to distinguish the sources and models of Homer, to understand Homer better himself, to appreciate the art and technique of our Iliad and our Odyssey as they are given to us. In this manner, the theory reconciles the two warring parties, the separatists and the unitarians, bridging the chasm which separated them and created such violent disputes.

Modern scholarship, recognising that the battle of the separatists and the unitarians has in the past caused the whole Homeric Question to be seen in false perspective, tends to concentrate on this reconciliation. The thoroughgoing separatists are in a minority; uncompromising unitarians are few; there is a general insistence that the conflict is resolved at last. But the precise nature of this reconciliation is still different by different emphases by different authors: for example, E. Bickel in his book Die Lösung der homerischen Frage (Bonn, 1949) lays stress on ‘Elementenanalyse’, but differs sharply from K. in his views on the personality of Homer, for he regards our Iliad and Odyssey as the product of many poets, not of one.

Homerische Schule. ‘Die Suche nach der Persönlichkeit Homers als Dichter von Ilias und Odysseus Dunst erzeugt statt Klärung des Problems’. K. on the other hand speaks of the personality of the poet emerging objectively from a study of his work, and says of the personal Homer, ‘He does not ignore the old tradition, nor does he imitate it blindly, but he uses the material bequeathed to him and assimilates it in order to create something new.’ This is the sound and balanced conclusion of K.’s admirable and concise introduction to his book.

K.’s method of analysis depends primarily on regarding the poems as works of art. We can discern certain poetic contradictions (K. rightly pours scorn on the old separatist argument from logographic corruptions); there are places where some of the motives do not precisely fit in, or where some aspect of a scene clashes with its general poetic effect.

He uses this method for the story of Meleager, and in a closely literate analysis of the speech of Phoenix in Iliad IX, and by the use of comparative folk-tale, he gives his account of the early versions of this story, showing what elements of it were present in Homer’s epic predecessor, and how Homer adapted the story artistically to suit his own purpose.

The same method is applied to the scenes between Hector and Paris, and Hector and Andromache, in Iliad VI, and K. argues that the story of Meleager is one of the sources here too, and certain poetic contradictions in these scenes are thus explained.

In an interesting passage K. attributes Schadewaldt’s discomfiture to accept the Meleager story as Homer’s own, consisting of material taken from the poem of Hector and Paris, to his preconceived idea that such great poetry cannot but be a completely free creation of Homer. ‘That Homer,’ says K., ‘was inspired by the Meleagris to compose this scene of leave-taking, I am convinced that we may regard as certain. This theory has much important, it is true, but it would be incorrect to subscribe to the idea that, as so many of us can so easily unconsciously subscribe, that the greatest poet of antiquity did not, and on pages 359 and 360 the compositor has added an unnecessary ‘c’ to ‘Oxyrhynch.’

HUGH LLOYD-JONES.

In the course of his analysis of the influence of the Meleager story, K. deals with the development of two conflicting folk-tale themes. The first places the love of a sister for a brother above all else, in contrast to which K. makes some interesting suggestions about matrarchy, and (in Appendix III, where he returns to the subject) about the famous disputed passage in Sophocles’ Antigone (905 f.), where he argues that the thought expressed is necessary to the understanding of the work. He differs from Schadewaldt in Greek: he adds modern Greek folk-songs as parallels. The second theme places conjugal affection above all else: K. has carefully developed sections about the ‘ascending scale of affection’, and to this theme also he returns, and to it at length, in a chapter called ‘The Alcestis motif’. The combination of these two conflicting themes goes far to explain the poetic incon sistencies in those parts of the Iliad which are based on the Meleager story. Chapter III to apply his method of analysis to scenes in the Iliad concerning Patroclus, and he maintains that the story of Patroclus, which is Homer’s own creation, is modelled on an earlier tale of Achilles, and is based either on the Aethiopis or its predecessor.

He argues that the poetry of the epic cycle may have preceded the Iliad, maintaining that at all events chronographic epics of this type must have preceded the dramatic epic of the Iliad. K. does not claim to have proved this contention about the epic cycle, and he expresses the hope that the problems may be elucidated in the light of the questions he raises: at our present stage of knowledge it is certainly easier to accept Schadewaldt’s suggestion of a common source for parts of the Iliad and the Aethiopis.

As can be expected, in his book Die Lösung der homerischen Frage (Bonn, 1949), there follows a chapter on elements of popular style in Homer’s poetry. K. begins here by making it clear that for him the Iliad and the Odyssey are ‘individual creations that stand clearly apart from the popular poetry’, but not to allow Homer to be ‘the embodiment of a self-made and anonymous old popular poetry which develops among the people’. He goes on to analyse the influence of popular poetry on Homer, stressing style rather than content, and illuminating his argument with many parallels from modern Greek popular poetry. This is a fertile field for investigation; K.’s contention is that modern Greek folk-tale sometimes represents a continuity of tradition that reaches back to ancient times, and is largely free from literary influence. The same fascinating method is used in Appendix I, where he studies the passages of the Meleager story in modern folk-tales of the Eastern Mediterranean area.

Many of the conclusions to which K.’s analysis leads him are necessarily controversial, and it will be some work to be done in this comparatively neglected field of Homeric study, and much of Homer’s material can never be known to us. But our appreciation of the Iliad is enriched by passages of this kind. K. insists, very rightly, that ‘we do not depreciate the poet by admitting that he was stimulated by older epic scenes into creating scenes of his own’. K.’s keen and always carefully reasoned search for the sources, his literary sensitivity, his wide knowledge of modern Greek folk-tale, and his ability to expound com-
NOTICES OF BOOKS


This is a carefully documented account of a group of pottery disappointingly meagre in its content, as the author herself admits. Neither the individual pieces nor their context yield much material to our knowledge of the development of Greek and Roman glazed wares of the sigillata type, to which class belongs the bulk of the pottery included in the volume.

The several attempts which have been made to classify Eastern Sigillata fabrics have been shipwrecked on the uncompromising fact of the absence of any evidence for a local attribution, except in the single case of Tschandarli ware. It still remains true that finds of kilns or definite evidence of manufacture are necessary to place their study on a firm basis, as in the case of Western fabrics. The present Report retains the old names 'Pergamene' and 'Samian' for the two most common groups of Eastern Sigillata; of these 'Pergamene' only is said to occur at Dura. This practice is partly responsible to a certain extent to the confusion by which 'Pergamene' is classified here as an 'imported' ware, just one of the points at issue. It is not perhaps very likely, but for all we know not impossible, that some 'Pergamene' was made at Dura: and almost certainly in Cyrenaica, but in either case the term 'imported' would seem to need revision.

The Report consists of a very brief introduction of three paragraphs, followed by a Catalogue of types of vessels illustrated by section drawings, and divided into Imported and Local Wares. The former includes Black Glaze, Red Glaze and Late Roman wares, the latter Grey, Red Wash, and Red Burnished wares. A two-page conclusion relates the evidence of the various wares to events in the history of Dura as known from other sources.

There would appear to be some uncertainty in the author's mind concerning the technique of these Roman Sigillata and allied wares. However poor the glaze or slip with which they were covered, it was a glaze and cannot be described as a burnish, which is the polishing of a slip or other surface. On p. 15 (Late Roman A Ware: Group 1) the author speaks of 'tool marks . . .'; these combined with the thin glaze covering the vessel, give the pottery the appearance of having been burnished (ibid. ref. to Waage, 'Hesperia' II p. 294, PL IX, 116, and Technah, 'Athen. Mitt. LIV' (1929) pp. 3-64, Fig. 41). There is no mention of 'burnishing' in Waage's article referred to (p. 15, n. 85): one wonders whether the glaze in some cases is a mere surplus:

There would seem to be a confusion between glaze and burnished ware. The two techniques are as different as chalk and cheese. Again, p. 16 (Local Wares) the following occurs: ' . . . the local potters found in red burnished ware a more effective imitation of red sigillata. Although a good imitation of red glaze, the red burnish soon died. Some centuries later . . . it was revived . . . copying Late Roman A ware types.' Does the author really mean 'burnished', i.e. having a slip (not a glaze) polished with a similar instrument? In many of her remarks on p. 15 above quoted as to the similarity of glaze and burnish, one is tempted to suspect a confusion here. This is reinforced by the further application (p. 16) of 'Pergamene' to 'red wash, red burnish, and common wares'. However widely the term 'Pergamene' may be applied, it has never to my knowledge been stretched to include any type of burnished or 'common' ware, whatever exactly this term may mean.

The two large volumes by Dr. Argenti and Professor Rose on the folk-lore of Chios constitute a valuable contribution to our knowledge of that interesting Greek region. The information on most branches of popular activity in the island has been collected just in time; the increasing inroad of Western civilisation in the last twenty years is rapidly effacing or altering many of the traditional customs and sayings included in this book. The Folklore of Chios contains chapters on a great variety of subjects, on popular occupations, social customs, etc. The issue of a Report on folk-lore of the island is perfectly illustrated and many of the folk-tales, proverbs, riddles, locutions (wishes, curses, oaths, etc.), a lot of this valuable material comes—as the authors tell us—from the researches of the Chian schoolman Stylianou Vios, who has successfully preserved the folk-lore of his native island. The accuracy and value of the different chapters vary. Some are excellent, for instance that on popular occupations, in which the agricultural, pastoral, and sea-faring life of the island is perfectly illustrated and many of the folk-tales described accompany the text; other chapters are less complete and less accurate, for instance the one
on the folk-tales (in which the Greek texts are not given), or the folk songs and especially the one on proverbs and proverbial sayings. In these hardly any references are given to standard books like Politis' Εὐθυμία or his Παραπάνιο, Pasquale's Carminum popularem, or Hesseling and Pernet's Εἰρηναία, etc., which would have been a great help to the reader, and there are many errors and misconceptions. For instance the first folk-tale, 'Hadji Nicholas' daughter', is certainly not 'a patchwork of themes which has been somewhat mutilated'; but is the same story Sir William Halliday studied in Professor R. M. Dawkins' Modern Greek in Asia Minor under the title 'The beautiful girl sweetmaker', in γαρομποτομάτι τῆς Αθηναίας, p. 508; or p. 701, it is not the flower but the colour that interests the poet—pink and fresh, as opposed to the πετροφάσα of the previous line; or p. 847 no. 40 η καρφία με το βελόνα as a proverb does not mean 'he takes it together with the cotton', and is not said 'of a person who takes everything seriously', but means 'he wipes it off (or gets hold of it) with a piece of cotton-wool' and is said of a person who proceeds gently (but firmly) towards his ends.

The English translations which accompany the Greek texts are often inaccurate and inelegant. Errors, and some of a grave nature, occur, e.g. p. 724 no. 8 καρφία γιαλάκι του ατηυχένου is translated 'may nails of glass pierce him', which of course means 'may nails and bits of broken glass be put into him', when the Greek is translated 'stupidity' instead of 'madness'; or p. 708 Τα τα μάτια σου έκει πετύγχανε κι' έκει τα καρφιά, πρώτα να σαλιγγιόνει etc., which is rendered into English as 'your eyes are a sea in which, wherever you turn, you must swim', etc., but the καρφιά means here 'and whoever swims in them', etc. Moreover there are various other errors in many parts of this work, some rather startling, as for example the statement that the Easter of the Orthodox church occurred on a movable feast (p. 288)! The book ends with an appendix on children's games, dress, flora, fauna, etc., and a useful and comprehensive index.

C. A. TRYFANIS


The present work is not the first in which an attempt is made to trace the origin, functions, organization and influence of the Athenian ἡγεμόνες, but it marks an important advance on its predecessors and rests on a much larger basis of evidence than was previously available, especially when compared to the epigraphical evidence in which the first edition was an acknowledged master. He starts from the Oriental eagerness, attested for the late seventh and the sixth century B.C., to recover the authentic text of the ancient religious literature, an eagerness which in Greece led to the collection of the works of Homer and Hesiod, Orpheus and Musaeus. Hence he passes to the unofficial, yet influential, χρησιμολογία and μύσια, such as Lampion, Hierocles and Diopeithes, who were not priests and had no clearly defined function. Chapter II discusses the excavation of the sacred law of Eleusis before the fourth century by the Eumolpides; not until 329 have we a clear reference to a college of exegetes composed of members of that γίγνος. Chapter III deals with the origin of the exegesis, showing that the earliest mention of an exegetic official, the οἰκονόμης (Euopilus, calling Lampion οἰκονόμης in 424, uses a general description, not an official title) occurs in Plato's Euthyphro, the dramatic date of which is 399 B.c.; hence Oliver infers that the office was probably invented in the last quarter of Solon's laws at the end of the fifth century, when the χρησιμολογία suddenly and completely disappear from public and religious life. The next chapter inquires into the number and types of Athenian exegetes, authoritatively sanctioned by the sacred, but not of civic authority, and the first question asks whether the οἰκονόμης and the οἰκονομίτης were elected by the δήμος from the euripatiae or appointed, with the special title τεκτονικοῦ, by Delphian Apollo, determines their status within the framework of Attic law, and gives (p. 44) several known holders of the office from 305 B.C. to 282 B.C. Chapter IV examines in detail the passage in Plato's Laws, 759 d, e, proposing exegeses for the new colony, and the inferences which may be drawn therefrom regarding the selection of Athenian exegetes, and in a specially interesting and original passage (pp. 85-87) redraws the political development of Attica down to Cleisthenes' legislation and traces the importance of the early division into three regions, each composed of four Old Attic trittyes. In Chapter VI the author discusses the high priesthood of Greek religion, the Imperial cults, the marriageable families of the period—the Claudius Herodes of Marathon, the Flavius of Dionysius and the Claudii of Melite—and gives a list of the known high priests (pp. 81-4) and notes on the hipter in general in relation to the Imperial cult, the Emperor, and the honorary title φιλοκαπρία and φιλομετρία. In the last chapter he deals with Greek terms used to represent Roman offices, notably by Dionysius of Halicarnassus and by Herodes Atticus, 'the most influential of the Atticists', whose title δικαιοτάτης is, in Oliver's view, a translation of Χρονίς τοις έτοις. The chapter ends with a suggestion that the Attic δικαιοτάτης may owe their origin to the example of Rome, mediated by 'the Greeks of Southern Italy', possibly through Lampion. A valuable appendix contains the ancient references to the ἡγεμόνες τῶν ἔρωτων at Athens, 33 of them literary (I do not know why, as Thuc. VIII. 1. 1 is included (T 22), Thuc. II. 8 and 21. 3 are omitted) and 54 epigraphical (in 1 and 45 the brackets need revision), and an index of names and in index of 'passages discussed', among which are 140 inscriptions. The value of this list would have been enhanced if, following the example of some American scholars, Oliver had asterisked those inscriptions not found in the present work, for which the present work offers new readings or restorations.

It is in his survey of early Attic history, the feast fully argued and documented section of the book, that I find it most difficult to follow Oliver. Here he comes much closer to one. He accepts chapter of the 'Αθηναία, as giving a true and reliable account of the 'Draconian' constitution, though for him 'Draco' means the anonymous statements [sic] of the seventh century, the period just before Solon (p. 60). But he fails to mention Aristotle's assertion [Pol. II. 9, 9] Δράκων ὁ τεκτονικὸς μὲν εἶ, πολέμις τίς ὑπεράνθισεν τους νόμους θεοὶ, or to draw attention to the almost, or, in my view, wholly insuperable objections to the acceptance of this chapter as a genuine record of a historical constitution. On this basis we are told that

Draco gave active citizenship to the hoplite class, i.e. the zeugites. Alongside of the Council of the Areopagus... he created another Council in which the big majority would be plebeian hoplites. This was to be a legislature divided into four-hundred-and-one members, a number divisible neither by four nor by three. Now it is not likely that Solon reduced the membership of the Areopagus, and the notice does not state the nature of the corruption of the word for four-hundred into the phrase for four-hundred-and-one is palaeographically improbable. On the other hand it was very easy to mistake τεκτονικός for τεκτονικόν. Thus amended, Aristotle in Chapter 4 says that Draco established a Council of Five Hundred and One. The unremovable words 'and one' now make sense; the number was the nearest possible approach to five hundred with a system in which there is no exact divisor.
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have had, with the rapidly expanding population of Attica, a Council of 300 under Draco, 400 under Solon and 500 under Cleisthenes. Similarly Oliver's account of the 51 juries in the year 470 is based on a conjecture, since three, fails to convince me. If 3 had been the decisive factor, would not 30 or 60 have been a more natural choice, and in the light of the numbers recorded for Athenian juries—201, 401, 501, 1001, 1501, 2501 (Gribell, M. S. 20), 1500 (Smith, II. 150)? Is it not likely that the avoidance of a tie in voting was the reason for the choice of 51 rather than 50?

Despite the exemplary care shown in the preparation of the book by the author and the editor, it has been generously acknowledged, a few errors, omissions and inconsistencies have inevitably escaped detection. Accents and breathings are occasionally omitted or wrongly inserted, punctuation is sometimes faulty, words are misspelt (e.g. ἐπιστῆνα for ἐπιστῆνα on p. 5, ἑπιστῆνα for ἑπιστῆνα on p. 126, νόμος for νόμος on p. 135, ὁ οἰκείος for ὁ οἰκείος on p. 127, Ὀινύδεμι for Ὀινύδεμι on p. 178), and personal names incorrectly written (e.g. Heraicus for Herecis on pp. 5, 175, though correctly spelled on p. 168, Bernadakis for Bernhardikis on p. 137, Janoray for Jannoray on p. 161). On p. 142 the exact reference to Amandry's discussion of the νόμος is B.C.H. LiXIII 1939, 190-2. I deprecate the phrase 'of the Thoric deme' (p. 99), especially in view of the general tendency here in inscriptions to refer to Phocaea and Thurea. But the very triviality of these criticisms must be taken as a tribute to a remarkable book, valuable in content, lucid in expression, usually cogent in argument, dealing with an important aspect of Athenian law and based on a comprehensive collection and exhaustive examination of the relevant evidence, alike literary and epigraphical.

M. N. Tod.


It was easy to damn this book, for its faults are very obvious; but it would be unfair, for its authors have done some useful work. It will perhaps be best to clear the ground for constructive criticism and appreciation by warning readers of its defects. It bears signs of hasty compilation and insufficient revision. Facts are piled together higgledy piggledy and there is much repetition and overlapping: the account, for instance, of how the many diverse legal categories of land which existed in the Roman empire were imposed in the fourth century, leaving only private land, is repeated in very similar words on pp. 18 ff., under 'the Land', and on pp. 94 ff., under 'the People'. The authors are naïve ignorant of the general history of the subject and probably further be misinformed that 'Egypt followed the Athenian theology in general, and so remained outside the pale of the churches of Rome and Constantinople' (p. 6). More serious, since it affects more closely the subject of the book, is the ignorance shown of the administrative and financial system of the empire. On p. 292 it is stated that 'in a.d. 541 the actuarium of the numeri certifies the needs of the troops to the tribune of the praetorii notarii'. The reader who, puzzled by the unusual function here performed by a tribune and notary, looked up Cat. Max. 67320, will find that the actuarium communicates perfectly normally with preses of the Thebaid, who enjoyed the honorary rank of tribune and notary. Again in note 1 on p. 179 a γραφής τῶν γεωργίων is dismissed with the remark that he 'may be a private banker'. This interpretation does violence to the Greek language, and when on looking up PSI, 310, one finds him paying for silver supplied ὑπὲρ τῶν διαταγὰς ἐπισκοπῆς, will wonder whether the remark that he 'may be a private banker' is correct. This interpretation does violence to the Greek language, and when on looking up PSI, 310, one finds him paying for silver supplied ὑπὲρ τῶν διαταγὰς ἐπισκοπῆς, will wonder whether the remark that he 'may be a private banker' is correct.

The Novel VIII, reveals extraordinary misconceptions. The novel actually sets out the ὀφθαλμικά or fees which are to be paid by various grades of governors to palace officials: for instance, the governor is to pay on p. 291 it is 'whether ὀφθαλμικὰ means salary or whether it is the regularisation of the gifts from the provincials', and on p. 228 the fee of 9 solidi payable for each appointment to the chartularies of the sacred bedchamber is spoken of as a yearly salary and compared with a soldier's ἀμονία, which would be easy to explain if such a thing existed as a 'soldier's ἀμονία', but which has perhaps been said to indicate that the authors have embarked on an undertaking beyond their powers. The time has perhaps not yet come to attempt to weave together the various strands of the novel with its frequent references to the Codes and Novels. Many preliminary studies are needed to straighten out pieces of the pattern, and the task requires not only an intimate knowledge of the papyri, but a through grasp of the legal and literary material. Leaving the latter qualification the authors would have been better advised to content themselves with a more modest objectiye, that of tabulating and elucidating the scattered and in many cases rather fragmentary papyrological evidence.

This task they have performed over a number of fields. Not only are there tables of sales and leases of land, exports and imports, prices and wages, natural products and industries, but the evidence on some other topics, such as the ἀμονία μεταρίστου, is assembled, though less methodically, in separate chapters. One could wish that the authors had given a more detailed presentation of the evidence. In the tables a fuller description of the transactions involved would often have been useful, it is for instance misleading to state an official rate of adaratio (P. Leipz., 69) as if it were an actual market price, as is done on p. 176. Students, however, will be grateful for the labour which the authors have expended on assembling material of this kind. Very helpful, also, are the appendixes, which are the abstracts of financial documents, which make inelligible to the layman these forbidding labyrinths of figures, symbols, and abbreviations. Here again one could wish that the analysis had been more detailed and more careful. On p. 293 for the survivals, following the editors of the documents, give a table of ἀμονία as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wheat</th>
<th>Barley</th>
<th>Wine-Meat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2434</td>
<td>2916</td>
<td>9584</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

They are justifiably puzzled by the large quantity of barley, and suggest that the abbreviation (which one finds on consulting P. Lond. 1693 in quite clearly ὸδαρια) should be read as chaff. They fail to observe that 9584 + 19344 = 28924, which bears roughly the same relation to 2916 as does 240 to 2434. This suggests that the Jan.-Apr. account specifies 8 units which the 19344 is divided in, and that accordingly 9848 stands for ωδαρια; this conjecture is confirmed when one finds that in the papyrus the letters following the second figure read ωδαρια, not ωδαρια, which shows that the number of units of meat is about half the number of sextarii of wine. In another document, the great Antaeopolis tax register referred to below, the ἀμονία payments of wine are exactly double those of meat (212,356 wine units; 166,175 meat units). This relation must surely be linked with the fact that the normal ration of a soldier (as shown in P. Oxy. 1920, analysed on pp. 225 seq.) included one pound of meat and two sextarii of wine per diem. It would seem then that the payments of military ἀμονία in kind imposed on the cities were calculated on the ration standard of the units receiving them, and that the unknown units of 'wine-meat' must be sextarii of the former and pounds of the latter. If this is so, it is for a study of prices worth noting that for purposes of adaratio, pounds of meat and sextarii of wine are equated in value at 200 to the solidus.

Another document which would have repaid more careful analysis is the great sixth century taxation account of Antaeopolis (P. Cairo MA 6057), discussed on pp. 275 seq. of this volume. This is a particularly valuable document, the text is virtually complete, and appears to contain all the year's payments, classified under ἀλεύρι (the wheat for shipment to Constantinople, reckoned in artabae of wheat), the ἀμονία in gold and in silver, the salaries of officials, the account of the pagary (more fees to local officials), and the ὀφθαλμικὰ and other transport charges (the last four headings all reckoned in gold). The
adduced parallels to suggest that δεσπότην was sometimes used as an equivalent of delegato. The word should therefore mean 'not on the delegatio', and might describe supplies levied by consent, as opposed to supplies ordered to be paid in kind in the regular delegatio. If the rules laid down in the laws were kept the price of these levies should have been deducted from the gold taxation. It may have come off the annona in gold, in which case it was not recorded in the annona, or the later laws might have stipulated that in the entry under κανονις, λαγρυλιζε (sic) τῆς μετὰ τὸν κορυνη, the κορυνήζων is the rebate in compensation for συνωτή. Some support is given to this view by the summaries of taxation from Apeirokrito (tabulated on p. 283). These are like the Anteaecus account classified under κανονις, annona, and συνωτή (all in gold; the summaries do not record any payments for μπολι και νυάλα), and in one year the annona payment shows a marked increase and the canonica a marked reduction; the editors in this case, rightly as it seems, suggest that the reason is special levies for a local expedition. Be that as it may, it would seem certain that the total of 10,421 solidi 18s carats recorded in the papyrus, less a payment of 668 solidi and 15 carats for arrears of canonica, plus the 9624 solidi for νυάλα, that is, roughly 10,332 solidi, is the normal gold assessment of Anteaecus. In this particular year the city would have been mulcted of a further 1000 solidi or so, the difference between the official price and the real price and their real value. To the gold total must be added the value at current prices of the μπόλι, which comes to 6167 solidi, and the grand total, 16,490 solidi, must be assessed on the total area, 51,655 arurae. Even with the corrections made above this makes a rather startlingly high figure, about 105 carats if it is reckoned all in gold. If one year’s record for one pagarch is a sufficient basis for a generalisation, the authors would seem to be justified in claiming that in the sixth century Egypt was not grossly overtaxed.

Students of the Byzantine period will find this book useful as a collection of evidence, which, if it is not ideally arranged, seems fairly comprehensive; and in this connection the reviewer records with gratitude that the innumerable references are, so far as he has checked them, accurate. They will also find helpful the arithmetical analyses of the more complicated documents. The authors would have produced a more useful book if they had confined themselves to tabulating in full, analysing in detail, and, in many cases, re-editing the documents, a task which is a necessary preliminary to any historical or economic study of Byzantine Egypt, and for which their wide experience of the material would qualify them.

A. H. M. JONES.


This well-produced little volume is an attractive memorial to a great scholar and teacher of ancient philosophy. Mr. Guthrie's excellent introduction should go far to give those who did not have the privilege of working with Cornford some idea of the quality of the man, of how, as Mr. Guthrie says, φίλος τι ψηφωτικη, and why those who studied under him, even if later, his work has gone in very different directions or their lines of interpretation, his schoolmen have divided, and why, in the beneficent influence of his teaching and example as continuously the source of anything good in their work.

Mr. Guthrie praises Cornford, rightly, as a historian and a poet (and a historian, it should be added, the delicate accuracy of whose scholarship is largely revealed by his poetry). The essays collected in the present book illustrate very well this combination of historical scholarship and poetic insight and power of expression. It was very appropriate in Cornford's interpretation of Plato, and probably the last part of his work: his mind seemed to fit Plato's with a closeness attained by few others of the distinguished line of Platonic commentators. In this volume Plato is the theme of two relatively slim but very satisfying essays, and a very interesting piece in several of the others. What was, as Mr. Guthrie points
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out, Cornford's predominant interest, the relation of ancient philosophy to its background of traditional thought, is the theme of the essay which gives its title to the book, *The Unwritten Philosophy*, and the same sort of theme recurs again in *The Unconscious Element in Literature and Philosophy* and elsewhere in the book. *A Ritual Basis for Heraclitus’ Theogony* illustrates Cornford’s speculations in the field of early Greek religion. In *The Harmony of the Spheres* the union of poet and historian is seen to perfection; it is a little masterpiece of art, scholarship and original thinking. Greek Natural Philosophy and Modern Science talks much sound sense in a small space about a subject not always treated very sensitively. The volume ends with a very courteous and balanced, but quite devastating, refutation of Marxist views of ancient philosophy in general and Plato in particular.

A. H. ARMSTRONG

**Bacchylidis carmina cum fragmentis, post Fr. Blasi et Guili. Suss, sextum edidit B. Snell.**

In the last decade Bacchylides has profited from the discovery of new material. Lobel has noted an Oxyrhynchus papyrus giving more fragments of 14; and the Florentine fragments discovered by Norsa have considerably improved our text of 4 and 12. These, together with the inclusion of Pindar fr. 341 Bower among the doubtful fragments, are the principal respects in which this sixth edition of the Teubner Bacchylides marks an advance on its predecessor, published in 1934. The earlier edition has deservedly become our standard text; and its successor is worthy of it. S. gives a very full and careful account of the papyrus readings, and his judgment is sound; one feels, however, that he might have been more hospitable to good restorations. For instance, at 1. 49 Bousan’s δέκατος gives so exactly the sense required that it deserved at least the mention accorded it in the apparatus of the earlier edition; and at 9. 13 R. A. (not R. F.) Neil’s ἠμαρτέωσι surely deserved to stand in the text. The apparatus is well constructed, though there are one or two doubtful points, as at 14. 10 where S. mentions the restoration he prefers last (unless there is a misprint in the text). Occasionally we should welcome more critical information than we are given, as at 17. 38 and 109. The attribution of emendations is well done, and there is an excellent bibliography; but in dealing with Jebb’s corrections S. should have distinguished those which he included in his edition of 1905 from those he contributed to Kenyon’s edition in 1891 and later abandoned, sometimes tacitly, as at 5. 67 and 11. 30, sometimes explicitly as at 13. 94. Sometimes the author of a correction is not named; the ‘Corrigenda’ tell us that this means the restoration is by Kenyon, but such a system involves a considerable loss of clarity for the sake of a negligible saving of space. One final point before we leave the text: S., like so many modern editors, confuses breathing with coroni and prints at 3. 22 ὑπολογίζεικα for ὑπολογίζεικα and at 9. 94 (following Jebb χώθ: see Housman’s review of Pearson’s Sophocles, C.R. 39. 80.

Perhaps the most valuable feature of this book is its treatment of metre. The section on metre in the preface is admirable, and careful metrical analyses are prefixed to each poem in the text. There are very occasional inaccuracies; for instance, the analysis of 11 should begin —D—E—E—, as it does in the preface, p. 21*; and in the preface p. 18*, 6 should be added to the list of poems not in dactylo-eptrites. The frequent marking of final anacrusis as long may cause some confusion, and there is some inconsistency in the admission of conjectures to the metrical analyses.

The preface begins with very full descriptions of the papyri, and the impression of completeness which this section and the apparatus convey is scarcely affected by the very occasional slips (e.g. p. 10* l. 12 5. 70 is inconsistent with the note ad loc. and seems to be a false reference). The next section ‘De Bacchylidis studiis quae inveniuntur ap. script. vet.’ and a section ‘De poetis quos B. imitavit est’ (two sections which one might have expected to be placed consecutively) are, however, highly questionable, because of S.’s over-keen eye for imitation; Brähms remarks on ‘plagiarism’ in music are not without their relevance for the classical scholar. Few readers will accept as significant the equation (p. 14*) ‘Plat. Plaed. 58 A = Bacch. 17. 2’ or the description of B. as ‘Pindari imitator’, especially when S.’s authority Wilamowitz contradicts him (Finkaros 316, 326–7). And is it true to say (p. 18*) ‘Minnermi verbis (fr. 7 D) B. usus est 3. 83’?

The sections on B.’s style, diction and prosody contain a wealth of valuable material, though now and then the arrangement leaves something to be desired; passages like 3. 64, 5. 92, 16. 5 should have been mentioned under ‘hiatus’ rather than under ‘digamma’, as indeed S. himself seems to feel.

There are occasional misprints e.g. p. 8* n. 9 for scripta read sciript; 3. 37 adnot. for fl. read fl.; and several page-references to the preface have not been adapted to the pagination of the new edition.

But all in all this is an excellent book; the sort of book whose mistakes a reviewer seizes on in order to help, not to carp.

D. MERVYN JONES.

**VOL. LXXI.**
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I.—GENERAL

A

Abdera, excavations, 245
Aegina: Corinthian vases, F68, 66 ff.; F48, 65; F49 +, 64; F50, 64; F51 a, 63; F104, 63; F113, 65; F121 +, 64; F142, 64; G31, 64; early coinage, 166
Aeschylus, Prometheus Solutus, 153 f.
Alexander, statues of, 15 f.
Alkibiades, Thucydides' estimate of, 72 ff.; 78 f.
Amsterdam: Corinthian fr. inv. 2082, 64; pelike Six No. 15, 42, 45 f.
Amulets, uses of, 170
Antheseria ceremony, 121 f.
Antithenes, Physiognomica, 82
Antonine portraiture, 52, 54
Apollodorus, Bibliotheca, MSS of, 150 f.
Archidamian War, Thucydides' account of, 71, 76
Aristotle, Physiognomica, 82
Arkhanes (Crete), excavations, 251
Armillas, as prizes for victory, 170 f.
Armillas, 168 ff.
Assymetrical design, in the Athenian Acropolis, 115 f.; at Persepolis, 116
Athens: Acropolis compared with Persepolis, 111 ff.; Erechtheum, 115 f.; Nike temple, 115; Propylaea, 114 f.; Agora excavations, 235 f.; Acropolis Museum: Inscr. 1, 229, 201; 'courtyard horse'; 220 f.; 'Epiktetos horseman' (no. 700), 220 f.; statue of mounted archer (no. 606), 220 f.; National Museum accessions, 233 f.; lekythos 581, 182; lekythos with cocks, 195; vase 902, 179
Auckland, War Memorial Museum, Attic Vases, 181, 184, 193
Australia, collections of Attic Vases in, 178 ff.

B

Babylon, Palace, 118 f.; glazed brick frieze, 159
Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery, pelike 48 1925, 43, 46
Basements, in Mycenaean houses, 207
Behistun, relief at, 111
Berlin: bronze fibula with lions, 87; Praenestein cista, 171; Glazomenian sarcophagus, 161; marble head 1631, 91; head from Athens K10, 20 n.; amphora F2159, 30 n., 31; amphora F2160, 34; aryballos with chimaera, 63; squat lekythos F3488, 226; oinochoe 3205, 67; olpe 1138, 68
Bologna: amphora 151, 30 f.; cup with musical scene, 61; oenochoai, 59, 60
Boston Museum of Fine Arts: chalcodon bust, 57; female head (cat. 59 no. 27), 20 n.; Head of Zeus (cat. 59 no. 25), 20 n.; aryballos 99 511, 63; Tyskiewicz krater, 60; pelike 76 53, 44, 45; stamnos of Blenheim Painter, 62
Bowdoin College, squat lekythos 15 48, 226 f.
Brauron, excavations, 237 f.
Bronzes: Alexander hunting, at Delphi, 16; colossus of Barletta, 54; Attic relief from Dodona, 87; from Abdera, 245; from Gortys, 241; from Maminousa, 242; from Old Smyrna, 249; from Pharsala (cerinary urn), 243; and see Stockholm
Brunswick, neck-pelike Pl, 46 f.
Brussels, Bocotian kantharos, 194 f.
Bryaxis, 17
Buffalo, lekythos with cocks, 195
Bullae, 168 f.

C

Cambridge: Corpus Christi College, cup (ARV 859, 1), 191; Fitzwilliam Museum, 'Gordon Cup' fragments, 143 ff.
Canterbury (N.Z.): Museum: Attic vases, 181, 183, 186, 191; cup by Douris, 186; University College, Attic vases, 179, 184, 193; Lip Cup 1, 179
Catania, neck-pelike, 47
Chicago, neck-pelike, 47
Chiron, 150 ff.
Chiusi, Tomba della Scimmia, 170
Cista of Novios Plautius, 168 f.
Citharist, crowning of, on vases, 60 f.
Cnidus: niches for statues, 14 n.; position of statue of Demeter, 14 n.; and see coins, inscriptions, sculpture, terracottas
Cocks, on vases, 195
Coins: from Abdera, 245; of Cnidus with Demeter or Kore, 27 f.; Mycenaean from Enkomai, 164; from Ephesians Artemision, 156 ff.; from Verria, 243; and see London
Cologne, Bocotian kantharos 22160, 194 f.
Constantinian portraits, 59, 54
Copenhagen: column krater, 227; kantharoi with lions, 87
Corecyra, as ally of Athens, 5
Corinth: excavations, 238 f.; in the Peloponnesian war, 5 f.
Crios the Aegeaner, 141 f.
Cup spiral ornament, 69 f., 93 f.
Curium (Cyprus), excavations, 259
Currency, early types of, 164 f.
Cylinder seals, from Pigadhes, 258; from Susa, 161

D

Daricis, European campaign of, 215
Delos: excavations, 251; Sarapiea dedications, 176; Thesmophorium, 111
Delphi: excavations, 242; hydria fr. (NC 328 no. 1450), 66
Demosthenes, connection with Thucydides, 76
Design and execution, in sculpture, 17 f.
Digamma, in Simonides, 138
Dionysus, origin of name, 121
Dioskouroi, as Saviours, 123, 127
Discrepancies in Thucydides, 70 ff.
Dias, see Sculpture
Dresden, lekythos with Athena and owl, 195
Dunedin, Otago Museum: Attic vases, 179, 181 f.; cup E39 107, 187; hydria E48 866, 191; neck-ampora E48 231, 181
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E

EARTH Mother, 122

Egyptian features at Persepolis, 112 f.

Einaid, Daimon, in Greek religion, 120 ff.

Enkomim (Cyprus), excavations, 238

Ephesus: coins from Artemision, 156 ff.; foundation-deposit from Basis, 85 ff.

Ephialcuros, excavations, 240 f.

Eros, baby, on vases, 228

Euripides, Ion, 125

Eyes, rendering of in sculpture, 107 f.

F

Fake symmetry, on the Athenian Acropolis, 115

Ferrara: amphora from Spina, 34; neck-pelike, 47; volute-krater with crowning of citharist, 60

Fibulae: from the Caucasus, 88; from Dodona, 88; from Basis at Ephesus, 85 f.; from Pherae, 88

Figurines, from Ephesus, 70 ff.

Florence: Aragon, krater, 169 f.; olpe 3722, 67; olpe 3725, 67; pelike (ARS 572, 13), 170

Foliated leaf decoration, 88 f.

Foundation deposits, 158

Frescoes, from Mycenae, 254, 256 f.

G

Génaos, squat lekythos (CV Italy 927/1), 227

Gold objects, from Ephesus, 85 ff.

Gortys, excavations, 241

Griffin's knobs, in art, 159

H

Harrogate, Kent Collection, amphora, 179

Hawks, representations of, 91 f.; at Ephesus, 163

Hellenicus, Athlos, 11

Heracleion, olpe from Knossos, 68 f.

Herakles, as Saviour, 123, 127; in vase paintings, 65 f.

Heracleæ, masks of, 231

Himation, in 4th century sculptures, 26

Hippias, relations with Miltiades, 218 f.

Holes, in feet of amphorae, 20 n.

Homerioc Houses, 203 ff.

House of Odysseus, 207 f.

Hyetmuss, excavations, 237

I

Ibros, Miltiades' action in, 217

Infabulation of athletes, 170 f.

Inscriptions: Delos 502, 175; Erechtheid Decree, 11; Parian Marble, 176; of Darius I at Susa, 111; CIG 1262, 179; CIG 2254, 176 f.; CIG 2536, 176; CIG 2759, 177; CIG 3087, 177 n.; CIG 3157, 177; CIG 3350, 177; CIG 6618, CIG 6618, 175 f.; CIG 6688, 177; CIG 6689, 174; CIG 6915, 175, 177; CIG 7023, 177; CIG 8910, 176; IG I 2, 374 f., 111 n.; IG II 2, 141, 147; IG II 1, 1202, 222 n.; IG II 2, 1367, 174 f.; IG II 1, 1967, 175; IG II 2, 1973, 175; IG II 2, 2037, 175; IG II 2, 2130, 175; IG II 2, 3765, 175; IG II 2, 8151, 175; IG II 2, 1394, 175; IG VII 11, 175; IG XII 1074, 175; IG XII 228, 251; IG XIV 1750, 176; IG XIV 1966, 1766;

From Amorgos, 251; from Athenian Agora, 236; from Epidaurus, 240 f.; from Itanos, 251; from Kynouria, 241; from Lesbos, 247; from Naxos, 250; from Old Smyrna, 249; from Paros, 249; from Thasos, 246; from Zographou, 237; and see Athens, London

Io, in Aeschylus Promethes and Supplices, 125 f.

Ianos (Crete), excavations, 251

Ivories, from Ephesus, 91 ff.

Ivy garlands, on vases, 59 f.; on Gnathia vases, 224 f.

K

Kabeiroi, 195 ff.

Kalavassos (Cyprus), excavations, 258

Kaphizi (Cyprus), excavations, 259

Kimon, quarrel with Peisistratus, 212 ff.

Kimonid family, 218 n.

King of the Universe, 121 f.

Kleon, in Thucydides, 74, 76 f.

Knossos, excavations, 251 f.

Koes, 194 ff.

Kore statues of, 25 ff.

Koukla (Cyprus), excavations, 258

Kozani, excavations, 241

Kynouria, excavations, 241

L

Lemnos, Miltiades' action in, 217

Leningrad: statue of Cybele, 24; krater with crowning of citharist, 60

Leochares, 15 ff.

Lesbos, excavations, 247

Lion: as badge of Lydian kings, 162; head of on electrum coins, 159, 161 ff.; head of with nose-wrinkles, 89; on Corinthian vases, 63, 65, 67; with victim, 87

London, British Museum: Cista (BMC Bronzes pl. 31), 160; statuette of Lykia with griffin, 161; archaic statuette (Cat. Sr. I no. 1301), 26 f.; head of Asklepios (Cat. Sr. no. 550), 20 n.; statue of Chares (Prype Cat. I 110, B. 278), 25 n.; statue from Cnidus (Cat. Sr. II no. 1301), 14 n.; statue of Dionysos (Cat. no. 132), 20 n., 24 n.; Kore head from Cnidus (Cat. Sr. II no. 1315), 27; Ram's head from Cnidus (Cat. Sr. II no. 1308), 224; archaic panels from Sardis (Cat. Sr. I B 269-70), 24 n.; inscription no. 813 (basis from Cnidus), 28; amphora B 193, 30 f.; amphora B 199, 34; amphora B 232, 181; amphora E 254, 34; amphora E 255, 34; amphora E II 263, 59; neck-amphora B 226, 37; aryballos 94, 7-18; 2, 63; bowl F 586, 229; Archikles cup B 418, 149; band-cup B 393, 179; 'Gordion Cup' fragments, 145 f.; hydria B 314, 36; hydria B 337, 36; hydria E 93, 36; Boeotian kantharos 1907 5-18, 194 f., bell krater F 54, 225; bell krater F 545, 226; kalyx krater F 543, 224 f.; krater E II 497, 60; lekythos D 22, 105 f.; lekythos D 45, 106; lekythos with Silenos, 40; oinochoe A 1006, 65; olpe fr. from Al Mina, 68; pelike W 40, 42, 46

Lozenges with 'Maeander hooks', 89 f.; 93 f.

Lydian origin of coinage, 165 ff.

Lyons: krater E 20, 58 f.; stamnos E 382, 58, 60 ff.

Lyssippus, 16

M

Madrid: amphora 11009, 39 f.; Herakles krater, 168 'Maeander hooks', 89 f.; 93 f.

Manchester, krater M.W.I. 9007, 252

Masks, on Gnathia vases, 221 ff.; noses on, 83

Melbourne: University, Attic Vases, 179, 161 f., 187, 191, 193; band cup V 13, 179; lekythos V 18, 187; National Gallery, Attic Vases, 184, 190 ff.

Melos, disc relief from, 96; school of art, 102 f.

Midas, legend of, 44

Milan, Ambrosian Gnathia vase, 230

Miltiades, 212 ff.
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Munich: Kore head, 27 ff.; amphora 1416, 34; amphora 2301, 30 f.; amphora 2905, 32; amphora 2307, 31, 34; amphora 2908, 32, 34; amphora 2909, 32; neck-amphora 1480, 37; neck-amphora 1486, 37; Pontic amphora, 305; cup 2185, 179; Penithesia kylix, 106; Eriachthonios stamnos, 10.

Musical scenes, on vases, 60 ff.

Mycenae: excavations, 239, 254 ff.; restorations, 239; granary, 205; House of Columns, 204 ff.

N

Naples: statue of Aeschines, 18; krater 3249, 224; Pronomo Vase 3240, 229.

Naucratys, Gordion cups, 143 ff.

Naxos, excavations, 250.

New York: Gallatin Collection, krater with satyrs, 59; Metropolitan Museum of Art: Roman republican portrait, 51; Panathenaic amphora, 20, 245, 187; ball aryballos, 202; pelike 49, 11 ff., 40 ff.

New Zealand, collections of Attic Vases, 178 ff.

Newton, G. T., excavations at Cnidus, 13.

Nicomedia, portrait medallion from, 49.

Nikias, in Thucydides, 75, 77, 79 ff.

Noses, 81 ff.

Nose-warts, on lions in art, 159 ff.

Old Smyrna, excavations, 248 ff.

Oinokos, in tragic masks, 229.

Optical corrections in, Demeter of Cnidus, 14 n.

Orvieto, amphora, 13, 30 ff.

Oziero, Roman portrait, 53.

Ostia, sarcophagus of Archilagus from Isola Sacra, 55 ff.


P

Palermo, lekythos GE 1862, 182.

Palermo, columna krater fr., 66.

Parian school of art, 103.

Paris, Cabinet des Medailles, lekythos with Hermes, 195; Louvre: lion-hunt relief of Ashurbanipal, 159; Assyrian seal, 169; amphora 204, 30 f.; amphora G 1, 31; amphora G 42, 35 f.; amphora G 44, 32; amphora G 45, 31, 34; Pontic amphora E 793, 199; ar balances E 612 bis, 66; ar balances (VS pl. 35 f.); 65; hydria F 294, 35 f.; Timagora hydriae, 35 f.; oinochoe E 420, 67.

Paris, excavations, 249 ff.

Patterns on pelikai, 45 f.

Payne, Humfry, drawings of Corinthian vases, 63 ff.

Pentekontaexia, 10 ff.

Pergamon, Acropolis, 118.

Pericles, in Thucydides, 70 ff.; political heirs, 74 ff.

Persepolis, 111 ff.; list of peoples, 215; sculpture, 116 ff.

Perseus, as Saviour, 127.

Persian sculpture, Hellenisation of, 111 f.

Phaistos, excavations, 252 ff.

Pharmacites, rite, 122.

Philip, statue of in Athens, 16.

Phidian, coinage of, 157, 166.

Philadelphia, amphora with maenad, 59.

Physiognomia, 82.

Pigadhes (Cyprus), excavations, 258.

Pins, from Ephesus, 86.

Portraits: Roman republican, 51 ff.; of Alexander Severus, 52; of Balbinus, 33; of Caracalla, 52, 54 ff.

of Commodus, 52; of Constantius Chlorus (Berlin cat. 32), 53; of Diocletian, 48 ff.; of Gallienus, 51 ff., 52, 55; of Gordian III, 52, 55; of Maximinus, 53; of Maximinus Daza, 54; of Philippus Arabs, 53, 55; of Septimius Severus, 52, 54; of Trajanus Decius, 54 ff.


Prometheus and Chiron, 150 ff.

R

Rams in art, 29 ff.

Reading University: Pontic amphora, 198 ff.; Boeotian kantharos 38 iv 9, 194 ff.

Ribbing, on Gnatha vases, 226 ff.

Rome: Capitoline Museum, portrait of an actor, Staza dei filosofi, 76, 53; Conservatori, relief from Via Statilia, 53; Lateran Museum, statue of Sophocles, 18.

Vatican: head of Athena, 197; grave-relief in Sala dei Busti, 53; Roman copy of archaistic Kore, 26; statue of tragic poet (Bracco Nuovo 53), 229; porphyry group, 54; amphora by Kleophrades Painter, 34; Pontic amphora, 199; r.f. cup, 168; oinochoe 66, 67; opele 86, 88; Museo Chiaromonti, Roman republican portrait, 51; Museo Gregoriano-Etrusco, fragment by Douris, 129 ff.

Villa Doria, head of Togatus, 48 ff.; Villa Giulia, kylix of Curtius Painter, 105; Laconian kylix, 49; neck-pelikai, 47; Corinthian olpai, 68.

Rosettes, on lions, 161.

S

Salonica, discoveries at, 244.

Saman Revlol, Thucydides’ account of, 12.

Samothrace, excavations, 246 ff.

San Simeon, Hearst pelike, 43, 46.

Satyrs and maenads, on vases, 59.

Scarcabs, from Basis at Ephesus, 88.

Scopas, 17.

Sculptors: Greek on Persian sites, 111 ff.; of Mausoleum at Halicarnassus, 16 ff.; Bryaxis, 17; Leochares, 15 ff.; Lyssippus, 16; Scopas, 17; Timotheus, 17.

Sculpture: piecing together of, 19 ff.; Acroterion figure from the Acropolis, 85; Head of Alexander from the Acropolis, 15 ff.; Erbach Head of Alexander, 15, 16 n.; Demeter of Cnidus, 13 ff.; double herm from Jericho, 49; statue of Isocrates, 15; lost statue of Kore at Cnidus, 25 ff.; Kore stauette from Cnidus, 14 n., 15; Kore statue from Cos, 26 n.; lion (Phrygian) from Arslan-Tash, 161; lion’s head (Assyrian), 159; lion from Siphnos, 65; chryselephantine group of Macedonian royal family at Olympia, 15 ff.; Mausoleum at Halicarnassus, slabs 1015–1016, 17 ff.; charioteer no. 1037, 18; colossal statue 1000, 20 n.; head 1052, 20 n.; head 1055, 20 n.; head 1056, 20 n.; head of Apollo 1058, 20 n.; rider 1045, 20 n.; at Persepolis, 116 ff.; Tegean, 17; veiled marble head from Rhodes, 13 n.; warrior from Capestrano, 168.

Reliefs: from Aixone with mask, 222 ff.; hunting reliefs of Ashurnasirpal (Assyrian), 159, 161; Corfu pediment, 65; disc, pinax of physician Aineios, 98;
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V


Vase-Painters: Acheloos, 42, 46, 181 ff.; Achradina, 67; Altamura, 58 ff.; Andokides, 45; Antimenes, 37, 181; Antiphanes, 186; Beldam, 184; Berlin, 37, 47; Blenheim, 62; Boreas, 106; Boston, 397, 64 ff.; Bowdoin, 105; Brygos, 186; Cerberus, 121; Chiari, 64, 66 ff.; Codrus, 191; Corinthian, 125; Douris, 128, 160; Ergotimos, 40; Eucharides, 46, 187; Eucheirios, 149; Ephronios, 47; Euthymides, 31, 45; Froehner, 66; Gela, 182; Glaukos, 105; Glaukytes, 179; Haimon, 183, 194; Head-in-Air, 60; Hermonax, 60, 106; Hound, 68; Kadmos, 195 ff.; Kleitias, 143 ff.; Kleophrades, 31; Leagros Group, 36, 42; Macmillan, 63 ff.; Myson, 47; Naples, 183; Nicias, 58, 62, 106; Nikoxenos, 37, 38, 45; Oinochoai, 192; Orchard, 187, Pan, 187; Paris, 199; Penthesilea, 166, 187; Perachora, 67; Phintias, 31 ff.; Phrynios, 149; Pig, 189; Polignoto Group, 189; Retorted, 192; Sacrifice, 64, 69; Satokes, 179; Sotades, 22 n.; Sphynx, 67; Splanchnopos, 187; Timonikas, 200; Titos, 199; Villa Giulia, 105; Whitworth, 184.

Venice, St. Mark's, porphyry statue, 54; Verria, discoveries at, 243; Vitera, funeral monument of Caucalis, 171; Vienna, clay missorium, 53; Kore statue, 27; krater (sputy and maenad), 59; kalix krater (reveller with torch), 225; Villa Albani, Roman copy of archastic Kore, 26; Virgin Birth, origin of doctrine of, 125 ff.; Volo, museum accessions, 243; Votive columns, from Melos, 99.

III.—INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

λάρνακας, 136
λαύρη, 209
λεπτῶν ῥιμάτων, 136
μαίνομαι, 137 n.
μεταφορλία, 136
μεταφορλία, 136
μεταφορλία, 81
μυχές, 209 f.
οὖσκοι, 96
ὁροσθόρη, 210
πίει, 179
πρόσωπων καλόν, 136
χειρός ὁπερδέν, 83
ῥόγες, 210 f.
Σίμη, 82 n.
Σωτήρ, 127
σωτηρία, 127
τὰς ἑκ αὐλάους, 138
τεννησίμιον, 136 f.
τεννησίμιον, 136 f.
τὸ γήγονον, 195 n.
κοινὲς καὶ κοινὲς, 196 f.
χείδεα (ἢ χείδεα), 83

IV.—BOOKS NOTICED

Argenti (P. P.) and Rose (H. J.), The Folklore of Chios, 269
Bossert (H. Th.), Alkim (V. B.), Cambel (H.), Ongunsu (N.) and Süzen (I.), Karatepe Kazıları (Birinci On-Rapor). Die Ausgrabungen auf dem Karatepe (Erster Verbericht), 263
Cornford (F. M.), The Unwritten Philosophy and other Essays, 272
Georgiev (V.), Inscriptions minoennes quasi-bilinguales, 269
Guthrie (W. K. C.), The Greeks and their Gods, 266
Hospers-Jansen (A. M. A.), Tacitus over de Joden, 264
Johnson (A. C.) and West (L. C.), Byzantine Egypt: Economic Studies, 271
Kakridis (J. Th.), Homeric Researches, 268
Méautès (G.), Platon Vivant, 267
Oliver (J. H.), The Athenian Expounders of the Sacred and Ancestral Law, 270
Pohlenz (M.), Die Stoa: Geschichte einer geistigen Bewegung, 262
Richter (G. M. A.), Archaic Greek Art against its Historical Background, 265
Roussel (L.), Pan ! Sur l'ion de Platon, 267
Stillwell (A. N.), Corinth: Results of Excavations conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens: vol. XV, Part I: The Potter's Quarter, 264
Thomson (J. O.), History of Ancient Geography, 261
Turyn (A.) (Ed.), Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis, 267
Wegner (M.), Das Musikleben der Griechen, 266
Demeter of Cnidus. (British Museum, no. 1306.)
DEMETER OF CNIDUS (back view, with head removed).
From temenos of Demeter, Cnidus. (British Museum, no. 1308.)

f. Ermitage, no. 248 (after Waldhauer).

d. Leg of throne, grave of Arippe (after AM XXVI, pl. XIV).

e. Right back leg of throne, Demeter of Cnidus. Ht. 63.5.

s. Persae vase (after FR pl. 88).
a. Alexander. (Acropolis, no. 1331.)

b. Alexander. (Acropolis, no. 1331.)

c. Demeter of Cnidus.
a. Alexander. (Acropolis, no. 1331.)
b. Demeter of Cnidos.
c. Alexander. (Acropolis, no. 1331.)
d. Demeter of Cnidos.
a. Mausoleum. (British Museum, no. 1016.)

b. Mausoleum. (British Museum, no. 1037.)
a. DEMETER OF Cnidus.

b. MAUSOLEUM 1015: AMAZON ON RIGHT.

c. MAUSOLEUM 1014: AMAZON IN CENTRE.

D. MAUSOLEUM 1014: AMAZON ON RIGHT.
a. Louvre G1 (Andokides).
b. Munich 2301 (Andokides).
c. Louvre G42 (Eukleio Group).
d. Munich 2305 (Eukleio Group).
PLATE XXI

5. Boston 76.53.

Attic Black-figured Pelikai.
Porträt der Tetrarchenzeit.
Porträt der Tetrarchenzeit.
Humfry Payne's Drawings.
a, b. Electrum reliefs from Ephesus.
c. From a late geometric Attic kantharos in Copenhagen.
d. Bronze fibula in Berlin.
e. Gold fibula from Ephesus.
f. Gold quatrefoils from Delphi.
a. Bronze head of a lion surmounted by a frog, from Samos.
b. Lion cubs in the Chessington Zoo.
a-f. Gold and electrum ornaments from Ephesus.

g. Electrum figurine from Ephesus.

h, i. Ivory figurine from Ephesus.

k, l. Electrum busts from Ephesus.
a. Hawk and pole of ivory ‘hawk-priestess’ from Ephesus (from a cast).
b. Ivory hawk and fragment of pole from Ephesus.
c. Ivory hawk from Ephesus.
d-e. Gold hawks from Ephesus.
f-h. Ivory statuette from Ephesus.
a-d. Ivory statuettes from Ephesus.
a-f. Ivory statuettes from Ephesus.
Early classical relief from Melos.
Coins from the Ephesian Artemision; Scale 2:1.
a-b. Kantharos in the British Museum.
c-d. Kantharos in Reading.
Masks on Gnathia Vases.
Minoan seal-stones from Epidauros.

Mycenaean stone head from Naxos.

Bronze mirror-cover in National Museum, Athens.
Plate XLVII

a
Mosaic in Paregoritissa, Arta.

b
Cyprus. Cylinder seals.

c
B.F. cup in Agora, Athens.
THE SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION
OF
HELLENIC STUDIES
50 BEDFORD SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.1.

REPORT FOR THE SESSION 1950–51.

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

Finance.

The accounts for 1950 reflect the change in the constitution of the Joint Library. It will be seen that for the first time the Library has its specific accounts set out separately from those of the Society, drawing block grants from the two Societies on the agreed basis. The Balance Sheet of the Hellenic Society is now confined to items arising from the administration of the Society and the issue of the Journal.

The disappearance of the deficit in our Expenditure Account was achieved only through the sale of £1,000 of our investments, the fortunate stroke of exceptionally large sales of back numbers of the Journal (£580 in 1950 against £90 in 1949), and the issue in one binding of volume 69 and 70. Clearly, the future solvency of the Society must now depend directly on the result of the new subscription rate. It will be recalled that, while new members entering the Society are required to subscribe at the new rate of £2, the Council left existing members free to accept the increase voluntarily. It was, however, expected that in the great majority members would recognise the fall in the value of the pound as reflected in the steadily rising costs of administration and printing and would accept the change as unwelcome but inevitable. It is disappointing to note that, of over 1,000 members, only some 250 have as yet met this appeal.

The Society cannot meet its obligations to members on this basis. Members are further reminded that they may help the Society by undertaking a Covenant on the Society's behalf. We now hold 255 Covenants.

In June last year members were invited to contribute to a Special Fund to provide for the extraordinary expenses to be met on the termination of our present lease in 1952. The Appeal was made by the Hellenic and Roman Societies jointly; as a result the Joint Fund which was set up has reached the figure of £1,700. Members have contributed with great generosity, and we have had the much appreciated support of several Universities and Colleges; but we estimate the need at £3,000.

Membership figures as at December 30th, 1950, are shown below, together with comparable figures for 1939, 1948, and 1949:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Life Members</th>
<th>Student Members</th>
<th>Associates</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>1003</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>1,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>1,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>1,684</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Journal exchanges 70

Obituary.

The Council record with great regret the death during the session of Miss M. Alford, who rendered generous services to the society for more than fifty years, of Miss C. M. Knight, a member of the Council, and also the deaths of: F. Poulsen, G. P. Oikonomos, and A. Wilhelm, who were Honorary members of the Society, and of Professor L. F. Anderson, Miss A. Bruce, C. O. M. Campbell, Rev. M. P. Charlesworth, Professor E. S. Forster, Hon. Mrs. Horsfield, Miss K. Jex-Blake, Miss N. C. Joliffe, Loizos Philippou, Montague Rendall, and Howard Slater.

The Joint Standing Committee of the Hellenic and Roman Societies.

Meetings have been concerned with the future of the Joint Library. There seems no chance of obtaining suitable premises in the British Museum area at a price which the Societies could contemplate when they have also to face greatly increased expenses in performing their primary task of publishing their Journals. It is hoped that it may be possible to enter into some form of association with the University of London, which would ensure the continuation of the Joint Library in Bedford Square and secure members their present rights in using it, while enabling the Societies to devote a large share of their resources to their other activities. Negotiations cannot be completed until the University's own position for the quinquennium 1952–7 is known, but it is understood that the University is willing to consider making a guarantee of up to £1,000 to safeguard the Societies against loss for the session 1952–3, if the Societies obtain an extension of their lease of 50 Bedford Square for that period.
Journal of Hellenic Studies.
Now that we have caught up with the arrears due to the war, the year 1951 sees the issue of volume 71. This is a special volume, as tribute to Sir John Beazley, and its production has been made possible by generous contributions from individuals and institutions. At the same time a Bibliography of his writings will be published by subscription.

International Federation of Societies for Classical Studies.
At the Meeting held in Paris in August 1950 the Society’s delegate was Professor A. W. Gomme.

Meetings.
The following communications have been made at Meetings of the Society during the session:
November 7th, 1950. J. S. Morrison on ‘Knowledge and the Community in Archaic Greece’.
May 1st, 1951. Dr. Rudolf Pfeiffer on ‘The Odyssey: some Problems of Structure’.
June 19th, 1951. Professor T. B. L. Webster, Presidential Address, ‘Art and Literature in Plato’s Athens’.

Provincial Meetings.
Meetings were arranged in collaboration with branches of the Classical Association at the following centres: Manchester, Sheffield, Reading, Durham, Nottingham, and papers were read by Mrs. A. M. Webster, Professors L. J. D. Richardson, T. B. L. Webster, and H. D. F. Kitto.

Administration.
The resignation of M. S. Thompson, who has served as Hon. Treasurer since 1934, was received early in the session. The Council’s very good wishes go with him for his future in Australia. The Council is fortunate in securing as his successor Sir Richard Norsworthy, K.C.M.G., M. S. Thompson is also one of the Society’s Trustees; in his place the Council have nominated B. Ashmole.

Two vacancies occurred in the Council and were filled for the remainder of the session by the co-option of W. Hamilton and M. S. Thompson. Eight members retire under rule 19: A. Andrewes, J. K. Brock, Professor R. J. H. Jenkins, J. S. Morrison, E. S. G. Robinson, Professor R. P. Winnington-Ingram, A. M. Woodward, and Professor E. A. Thompson.


Professor D. L. Page has been elected to the Standing Committee for the next triennial period; T. J. Dunbabin has been appointed Review Editor, and Professor H. D. F. Kitto, Professor J. Tate, and A. G. Woodhead have been appointed to the Editorial Committee.

The Council thank G. T. Edge, F.C.A., for acting as honorary auditor and have pleasure in nominating him for re-election.

The Joint Library.
Professor D. Tarrant has been elected a member of the Library Committee in place of Miss M. Alford, who had resigned after many years of valuable service.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1948-9</th>
<th>1949-50</th>
<th>1950-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books added</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books borrowed</td>
<td>4,395</td>
<td>4,905</td>
<td>4,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowers</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slides borrowed</td>
<td>6,118</td>
<td>5,593</td>
<td>5,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slides sold</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film strips borrowed</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the past session efforts to fill war-time gaps in foreign periodicals have been continued. In the last year, some or all of the missing parts of the following have been received: Die Antike, Archäologische Ephemeris, Archäologica Hungarica, Praktika of the Archaeological Society of Athens, Bursian’s Jahresbericht, Annales du Service d’Antiquité d’Égypte, Euboea, Epigraphica, Forschungen und Fortschritte, Gramm, Jahrbücher, Klio, Il Mundo Classico, Philologia, Philologische Wochenschrift, Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, Studi Etruschi. The Library now takes 159 periodicals, 111 of which are exchanges. A list of periodicals received each month is posted in the Library.

Limited resources still make large-scale purchases of books impossible, but nevertheless it will be seen that the number of books added to the Library shows an increase this year. A complete survey of the Library, with a view to filling in gaps, is being undertaken, organised by the Honorary Librarian, Professor E. G. Turner. At present the classical texts are being examined, and some gaps have already been filled. It is a great help to the Library Committee if members call attention to gaps in all subjects by recording them in the Library Suggestions Book.

The Library Committee is much disturbed at
the number of books which have disappeared from the Library recently. More than sixty books are known to be missing. Members are asked most earnestly not to take books away from the Library without entering them in the proper way.

Three new sets of lantern slides have been added to the Societies' collection during the past year—Greek Drama in Pictures, by Professor T. B. L. Webster, Greek and Roman Architecture by Professor R. E. Wycherley and Prehistoric Greece by Dr. F. H. Stubbings. These can be hired by members on the usual terms.

Additions to the Library during the year include:

- Texts: Aeschyus, Agamemnon, ed. Fraenkel; Aristotele, Physics ed. Ross; Caesar, Civil War ed. Klotz (Teubner); Cicero, Officiae, ed. Attert and De Virtutibus ed. Ax (Teubner); Cicero, Correspondence vol. IV (Budé); Diehl, Anthologia Lyrica Graeca, II (Teubner); Euripides, Helen and Phoemiase (Budé); Pausias, Institutions, ed. David; Herodotus, Book VII (Budé); Horace, ed. Klingner (Teubner); Tacitus, Histories, ed. Koestermann (Teubner); Theophratus, ed. Gow.
- Literature: Hadas, History of Greek Literature; Lucas, The Greek Tragic Poets; Nestle, Geschichte der griechischen Literatur; Schmid and Stählin, Geschichte der griechischen Literatur, I, 5 (Handbuch der Altertumskunde); Webster, Studies in Menander.
- Language: Ernout and Meillet, Dictionnaire étymologique de la Langue latine, 3rd ed., vol. 1; Schwyzzer, Griechischer Grammatik, II (Handbuch der Altertumskunde); Thesaurus Linguae Latinae, V, 2, fasc. XII and VIII, fasc. V.
- Philosophy: Nelson, Socratic Method and Critical Philosophy; Pohlenz: Die Stoer; Zatropoulou, L'École éléat.
- History: Bengtson, Griechische Geschichte von der Anfang bis in die römische Kaiserzeit (Handbuch der Altertumskunde); Bury, History of Greece, 3rd ed.; Chirrime, Ancient Sparta; Gagé, Huit Recherches sur les Origines italiennes et romaines; Kornmann, Weltgeschichte des Mittelmeer-Raumes; Magie, Roman Rule in Asia Minor; Scullard, Roman Politics; Vasiliev, Justin the First.
- Warfare: Launey, Recherches sur les Armées Hellénistiques, II.
- Modern Greek: Dawkins, Forty-five Stories from the Dodekanese.
- Archaeology: Blegen, Caskey, Rawson and Sperling, Troy; Goldman, Excavations at Gießla Kure, Tarsus, Vol. I; Fremersdorf, Neue Beiträge zur Topographie des römischen Köln; Kunze and Schleif, Olympische Forschungen, I; Lorimer, Homer and the Monuments; Otto and Herbig, Handbuch der Archäologie, IV and V; Robinson, Olympeus, XIII; Schaefer, Mission de Ras Shamra, V: Ugaritica II; Stewart, Vounous.
- Theatre: Beare, The Roman Stage; Bulle & Wirsing, Szenenbilder zum griechischen Theater des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.
- Art: Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum, Deutschland 5 and 6; France 11; Bandinelli, Storia dell'Arte classica; Frankfort, Arrest and Movement; García y Bellido, Esculturas romanas de España y Portugal; Kähler, Das griechische Metopenbild; Kraiker, Aigina. Die Vasen des 10. bis 7. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.; Richter, Archäe Greek Art; Wegner, Die Herrscherbildnisse in antiromischer Zeit.
- Papyri: Casson and Hettich, Excavations at Nessana II, Literary Papyri: David, Van Groningen and Van Oven, The Warren Papyri (Papyrologia Lugduno-Batava, 1); Papiri Greci delle Collezioni Italiane, 3; Roberts, The Antinoopolis Papyri, part 1; Schubart, Griechische literarische Papyri.

The following periodicals are now taken by the Library: Chronique d'Égypte, Doxa, Historia, Jahrbuch für Kleinasiatische Forschung, Korthage, Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Museum Helveticum.

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

Authors: E. Akurgal, B. Ashmole, F. Benoit, Freiherr F. W. von Bissing, D. T. D. Clarke,

Other Donors: Prof. F. E. Adcock, Prof. J. G. C. Anderson, Prof. N. H. Baynes, Prof. M. Cary, C. E. Ansell Clayton, D. Gillie, D. B. Harden, Dr. R. G. Hopper, Miss C. K. Jenkins, Prof. R. J. H. Jenkins, C. A. Raleigh Radford, E. S. G. Robinson, F. S. Salisbury, Dr. H. H. Scullard, H. S. Shield, Miss M. V. Taylor, M. S. Thompson, Prof. E. G. Turner, Prof. T. B. L. Webster, Dr. S. Weinstock, Ashmolean Museum, Bodleian Library, British School at Athens.

The two Councils wish to thank Mr. C. E. Ansell Clayton, Prof. R. E. Wycherley, and Prof. Clarence Young for gifts to the photographic collection, and also the following, who have helped in examining the classical texts in the library catalogue: Mr. R. Browning, Mr. A. J. Dunston, Mr. D. J. Furley, Mr. S. A. Handford, Miss E. M. Jenkinson, Dr. H. H. Scullard, Miss E. Thomas, Prof. T. B. L. Webster, Prof. R. P. Winnington-Ingram.
ACCOUNTS
### The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies

#### Balance Sheet, December 30, 1930.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liabilities</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debts Payable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,053 14 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions received in advance</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>11 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,779 12 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Compositions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,072 14 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total at January 1, 1930</td>
<td>2,072 14 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received during the year</td>
<td>182 15 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less carried to Income and Expenditure Account—Deceased Members</td>
<td>2,233 19 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions to Journal, Vol. LXXI and Bibliography</td>
<td>344 15 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry Credit Balances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>434 4 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance Account (C)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; (D)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>14 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; (E)</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>14 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Society</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>434</td>
<td>4 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£6,969 16 10</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following the change in constitution it has been decided to write off the former estimated capital value of the Library and Photographic Department, and accordingly the value of the Joint Library is not included as an Asset in the above Balance Sheet.

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, April 11, 1931.

CYRIL T. EDGE, Chartered Accountant.

#### INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 30, 1930.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Salaries, State Insurance and Travelling Expenses</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>18 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Pensions Insurance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Printing and Stationery</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>17 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Postage</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>17 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Sundry Expenses</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Grants</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Loss on Sale of Investment</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Adjustments re Rent from Sub-tenants</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>10 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Balance from ‘Journal of Hellenic Studies’ Account (A)</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Share of Premises Account (A)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>13 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Share of Library Maintenance Account (B)</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>19 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Grant for Books (C)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Grant for Slides (D)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Balance being Excess of Income over Expenditure</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>19 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td><strong>£2,197 6 9</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Receipts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Subscriptions received</td>
<td>1,883</td>
<td>6 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Income Tax recovered</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>0 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Life Compositions (Deceased Members) brought into Revenue</td>
<td>2,016</td>
<td>7 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Dividends on Investments</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>18 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Miscellaneous Receipts</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td><strong>£2,197 6 9</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Sales, including back Volumes</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>0 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Receipts from Advertisements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Balance to Income and Expenditure Account</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td><strong>£2,197 6 9</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Cost of Vols. LXIX and LXX—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,061 19 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and Paper</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>19 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawings and Engravings</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>10 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing and Reviews</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage and Packing, etc.</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>5 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less advance included in 1949</td>
<td>1,405</td>
<td>15 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts for Vol. LXIX</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>15 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The Joint Library of the Hellenic and Roman Societies

#### (A) Premises Account for the Year Ended December 30, 1950.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Rent</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Charges</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Rent from Sub-tenants                   | 799| 19 | 4  |
Rent from the British School at Athens     | 80 | 0  | 0  |
Hire of Council Chamber                    | 7  | 17 | 6  |
Balance transferred as follows—           |    |    |    |
Hellenic Society, 50%                      | 77 | 13 | 1  |
Roman Society, 50%                         | 77 | 13 | 0  |

**Total**                                  | 1,043| 2 | 11 |

#### (B) Library Maintenance Account for the Year Ended December 30, 1950.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Salaries and State Insurance</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting and Heating</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning and Caretakers Wages</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and Stationery</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage and Telephone</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry Expenses</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Receipts from Sales of Catalogues, Duplicate Books, etc. | 51| 14| 2 |
Balance transferred as follows—           |    |    |    |
Hellenic Society, 60%                      | 677| 19| 5  |
Roman Society, 40%                         | 451| 19| 8  |

**Total**                                  | 1,129| 19| 1  |

#### (C) Joint Library Books Account for the Year Ended December 30, 1950.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Purchases and Binding</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Grants—Hellenic Society                 | 100| 0 | 0  |
Roman Society                              | 100| 0 | 0  |

**Total**                                  | 400| 0 | 0  |

#### (D) Lantern Slides and Photographs Account for the Year Ended December 30, 1950.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Purchases</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Grants—Hellenic Society                 | 25 | 0 | 0  |
Roman Society                              | 25 | 0 | 0  |
Receipts from Sales and Hire               | 165| 18| 2  |

**Total**                                  | 215| 18| 2  |

#### (E) Special Fund (Joint Hellenic and Roman Societies) for the Year Ended December 30, 1950.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On Deposit Account with the London Trustee Savings Bank</td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance held by Hellenic Society</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Society</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Proceeds of Appeal                      | 1,506| 2 | 0  |

**Total**                                  | 1,506| 2 | 0  |
"A book that is shut is but a block"

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
GOVT. OF INDIA
Department of Archaeology
NEW DELHI.

Please help us to keep the book clean and moving.