# CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List of Officers and Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of New Members and Student Associates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEAUMONT (R. L.)</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burn (A. R.)</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARY (M.)</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOK (J. M.)</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAYNES (D. E. L.)</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEGAW (A. H. S.)</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYRES (J. L.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOD (M. N.)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes: Bean (G. E.)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton (S.)</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulas (K.)</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davison (J. A.)</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunbabin (T. J.)</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill (D. K.)</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose (H. J.)</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ure (A. D.)</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notices of Books</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indexes</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# LIST OF PLATES

I. Bronze Ploughing Teams from East Greece.  
   - a, British Museum 52.9-1.13;  
   - b, British Museum 75.3-13.11;  
   - c, Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum 32.4;  
   - d, Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum 32.5;  
   - e, Copenhagen, National Museum  
     ABa 708;  
   - f, Athens, British School.

II. Bronze Statuettes from East Greece.  
   - a, British Museum 75.3-13.10;  
   - b, British Museum 52.9-1.10;  
   - c, British Museum 1951.3-29.1;  
   - d, British Museum 75.3-13.12;  
   - e, British Museum 52.9-1.11.
CONTENTS

III. Bronze Statuettes from East Greece. a, Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum 04.15; b, British Museum 75.3-13.13; c, British Museum 75.3-13.14; d, Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum 04.11; e, Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum 04.9; f, Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum 04.10.

IV. Bronze Statuettes from East Greece. a, British Museum 1951.3-29.2; b, Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum 32.6; c, Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum 04.13; d, Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum 04.12; e, Athens, British School; f, Athens, British School.

V. Bronze Statuettes from East Greece. a, British Museum 1951.3-29.3; b, British Museum 1951.3-29.4; c, British Museum 1951.3-29.5; d, British Museum 1951.3-29.8; e, Athens, British School; f, British Museum 1951.3-29.6; g, Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum 04.14; h, British Museum W.148; i, British Museum 1951.3-29.7.


VII. 1–2, Athens. Sherds from Agora. 3, Knossos. Roman Mosaic.

VIII. Three Vases from the Dutuit Collection. Oenochoe, Inv. No. 2772; Lekythoi, Inv. No. 2756; Inv. No. 2478.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS IN THE TEXT

Corinth, Ambracia, Apollonia

Map of Albania: illustrating the southward communications of Apollonia facing p. 62

Fig. 1. Hill of Plloca: suggested site of Thronion ........................................ 67

" 2. Oldest Wall at Lissus (Lesh) ......................................................... 69

" 3. Lissus II ...................................................................................... 69

" 3(a). Lissus II .................................................................................. 69

" 4. Lissus III. Tower of Citadel .......................................................... 69

" 5. Terrace-Wall at Apollonia Illyrica (Pojani) ........................................ 70

" 6. Plloca. Oldest Wall ......................................................................... 70

" 7. Χίμαρα (Himára). Oldest Wall ......................................................... 70

" 8. Klos ............................................................................................... 70

" 9. Himára .......................................................................................... 70

" 10. Plloca ........................................................................................... 71

" 11. Gateway at Butrinto ..................................................................... 71

" 12. Byllis ............................................................................................ 71

" 13. Plloca. Gateway on S. side ............................................................ 71

" 14. Butrinto. Wall above Theatre ......................................................... 71

" 15. Kánina. Hellenic blocks in Byzantine (? Venetian) Wall .................... 71


" 17. Phoenice (Finik)... ........................................................................... 71
## CONTENTS

### A Group of East Greek Bronzes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Detail of No. 11</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Detail of No. 10</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Archaeology in Greece, 1951

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Artwork/Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>Acropolis Fragment</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>Agora from West</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>Plan of Agora</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>Vase from Tomb in Agora</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mycenae</td>
<td>Tomb of Clytemnestra</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Gortys</td>
<td>Multiple Bathroom</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pharsala</td>
<td>Head of Goddess</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Thasos</td>
<td>Unfinished Head</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Smyrna</td>
<td>a, Temple Platforms, b, Protogeometric Amphora</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Smyrna</td>
<td>Mycenaean Potsherds</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Smyrna</td>
<td>Temple Pylon</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Smyrna</td>
<td>Debris in Temple Pylon</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Knossos</td>
<td>Weapons from Shaft Grave</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Malia</td>
<td>Offering Table</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Archaeology in Cyprus, 1951

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Artwork/Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sotira</td>
<td>The Neolithic Settlement</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mycenaean</td>
<td>Rhyton from Pigadhes</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Koukla</td>
<td>Archaic Head</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bichrome IV</td>
<td>Jug from Arinadhi</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Curium</td>
<td>Limestone Apollo (?)</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Curium</td>
<td>The South-East Building</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Note on Spectacle Fibulae and Horses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Horse, said to be from Chauchitsa</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Two Oriental Bronzes. A Correction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Two Oriental Bronzes</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF NEW MEMBERS.

Elected during the session 1951-52.

MEMBERS.

Beattie, Prof. A. J., Old College, South Bridge, Edinburgh.
Benjamin, Miss Anna, 422 West Durham Street, Philadelphia 19, U.S.A.
Bertham, F. G., 55 Grandison Road, S.W. 11.
Boutros-Ghali, Miss L., 6 rue Didot, Athens, Greece.
Chapman, W. P., 317 23rd Street, Santa Monica, California, U.S.A.
Cholmondeley, A., 44 Northway, Morden, Surrey.
Dart, P. F. J., 198 York Road, Bury St. Edmunds.
Dietrich, B. C., 121 Cheam Road, Sutton, Surrey.
Farfor, J. A., c/o Gerlier, Route de Ges, Ferney-Voltaire, Ain, France.
Finnett, J. W., 73 Bedford Avenue, Barnet, Herts.
Fogarty, J. P., Killaree, Harland’s Avenue, Cork, Eire.
Germaney, R. W., Hensill, Haukurhurst, Kent.
Gwyn Griffiths, J., University College, Swansea, Wales.
Handlen, E. W., Dept. of Greek, University College, W.C. 1.
Harrison, Miss E., Dept. of Classics, University of Cincinnati, Ohio, U.S.A.
Hendtlass, C. M. C., West View, 171 Friern Barnet Lane, N. 20.
Horner, Rev. J. M. T., Ampleforth Abbey, York.
†Houlden, P. A. F., Little Shaw, Rockshaw Road, Mersham, Redhill, Surrey.
Johnson, P. W., 57 Overstrand Mansions, Prince of Wales Drive, S.W. 11.
Korwin-Lopuszanski, G., 601 Markham Street, Toronto, Canada.
Kyriakides, Prof. S., The University, Salonika, Greece.
Lagunillas, el Conde, Ministerio de Estado, Habana, Cuba.
Lang, Miss Mabel, Bryn Maur College, Penna., U.S.A.
McGown, J., Glenfield, Glasgow Road, Dumbarton.
Maunsell, Mrs. M. K., Hillside, Bassett Row, Southampton.
Meek, Miss M. S., 299 Hainault Road, E. 11.
Rider, Miss Charlotte, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, N.J., U.S.A.
Robinson, Ian, 5 Highfield Crescent, Northwood, Middx.
Smithson, Mrs. E. L., Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, N.J., U.S.A.
Stockton, D. L., 16 Spencer Road, Grove Park, W.4.
Thurlow, Rev. A. G. G., 3 Colegate, Norwich.
†Urdahl, Lloyd B., 4 Danville Street, West Roxbury 32, Mass., U.S.A.
Wilson, J. P., Oakden Cottage, Woodside Grange Road, N.12.
Woodbridge, F. H., 22 Torrington Road, Claygate, Esher, Surrey.
Worth, G., 53 Station Road, Teddington, Middx.

† = Life Members.

STUDENT ASSOCIATES.

Agryades, D., Davies’ Tutorial College, London.
Airey, D. G., Clare College, Cambridge.
Alexander, Miss S. M., 24 Deanfield, Londonderry.
Armstrong, H., University College, Durham.
Atkins, S. E., Birkbeck College, London.
Ayling, A. N. G., King’s College, Cambridge.
Bedford, P. C. L., King’s College, Cambridge.
Bevan, Miss D., Newnham College, Cambridge.
Brandt, R., Lincoln College, Oxford.
Brocklebank, Miss A., University College, London.
Cameron, P. S. G., New College, Oxford.
Carney, T. F., University College, Hull.
Davies, C. J., King's College, Cambridge.
Duncan, D., Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge.
Gee, Miss B. S., University College, Exeter.
Gosden, D. J., Downing College, Cambridge.
Hall, R., Keble College, Oxford.
Hancock, V. H., Keble College, Oxford.
Heawood, J. P., King's College, Cambridge.
Hell, M. G., Balliol College, Oxford.
Hinchcliffe, D. W., University College, London.
Hodge, A. T., Gonville & Caius College, Cambridge.
Isaac, A. J. G., King's College, Cambridge.
Kennedy-Skipton, Miss E. C., St. Hugh's College, Oxford.
Kerby, M. C., Keble College, Oxford.
MacDowall, D. M., Balliol College, Oxford.
Maniar, Miss M., Catholic Training College, London.
Mittwoch, Miss A., Belford College, London.
Moore, M. J., King's College, Cambridge.
Morland, M. R., King's College, Cambridge.
Oswald, P. H., King's College, Cambridge.
Pasteur, D., King's College, Cambridge.
Petasas, P., Jesus College, Cambridge.
Philip, H. L., Pembroke College, Cambridge.
Porchere, G. P. F., Faculté de philosophie & lettres, Brussels.
Ritchie, W., Pembroke College, Cambridge.
Seif, Miss F. S., University College, London.
Showell, Miss A. R., Westfield College, London.
Spence, K. G. F., Balliol College, Oxford.
Taylerson, P. E., King's College, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
Taylour, Lord W., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Townsend, M. W. B., Balliol College, Oxford.
Vermeule, C. C., University College, London.
White, D. P., Downing College, Cambridge.
Wilson, H. R., London University (external).

SUBSCRIBING LIBRARIES.

CAMBRIDGE, Girton College.
COPENHAGEN, Glyptothèque Ny Carlsberg.
EMORY, University Library of Emory, Georgia.
EXETER, City Library.
EXETER, University College of the South West.
GÖTTINGEN, Niedersächsische Staats u. Universitäts Bibliothek.
HULL, Public Library.
MADRID, Biblioteca Nacional.
MADRID, Real Academia de la Historia.
MARBURG/LAHN, Archäologisches Seminar der Universität.
MUNICH, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek.
NOTRE DAME, University of Notre Dame, Indiana.
OSHKOSH, State Teachers College, Oshkosh, Wisc.
ROME, Association for Classical Archaeology.
STOCKHOLM, Royal Academy of History & Antiquities.
THE PATTERN OF THE ODYSSEY

A generation ago (1922) in The Pattern of the 'Iliad', Dr. J. T. Sheppard proposed a fresh analysis of the contents of the poem, as a sequence of problems, rather than political, resulting from the Quarrel between Agamemnon and Achilles; (2) from Achilles' consent to the intervention of Patroclus, leading to the death of Patroclus and the loss of the divine armour; (3) from the vengeance of Achilles, the death of Hector, and eventually the demand for the surrender of his body to Priam. These major problems are separated by loosely connected episodes, the killing of Dolon and Rhesus, and the making of new armour for Achilles. Within them the course of events is presented in a series of connected episodes, the more important of which are supplemented by the lesser incidents, preceding and following in order of narration, as the side panels of a triptych or side groups of a pediment supplement and enhance the centrepiece.

Following these clues, I attempted a further analysis of the Iliad (JHS LIII, 265–96) and proposed some comparisons between its rhythms and those of Greek 'geometrical' art.

This feature of epic composition was appreciated in antiquity; Aristotle lays stress on it; the structure of Attic tragedies, and of great works of material art—the 'Chest of Kypselos' and the pediments of Aegina, Olympia, and the Parthenon, is founded on it; and it seems to be the clue to the originality and effectiveness of the prose composition of Herodotus.

It is obviously of interest to discover whether a similar principle and method of composition is to be found in the Odyssey. Here the texture is closer, the workmanship more delicate, and the materials more varied and independent. But enough can be established, even in a brief survey, to show that the structure and composition are essentially the same as in the Iliad.

The Odyssey combines independent Nostoi, or 'tales of return' from the Trojan War: the story of Telemachus, in search of his father, enframes the 'returns' of Nestor, Agamemnon, and Menelaus, with allusions to the destruction of Ajax and other heroes, and Odysseus poses, on every occasion, as a forsworn warrior. It depicts a world of disorder and wanderings, and in particular the intolerable anarchy in Ithaca, which drives Telemachus abroad in search of assurance that his father is still alive. It begins, and ends, in Olympus, where the detention of Odysseus by Calypso is known, and ended, in the absence of his persecutor, Poseidon. It introduces Athena as the protector of Odysseus, his wife, and his son; and develops the character of Penelope and of Telemachus, in preparation for their parts in the central Nostos, the return of Odysseus himself. Preceding and following the 'Journey of Telemachus' are scenes in the disordered palace in Ithaca; the earlier, much longer than the later, describes the political background of that disorder, and has its justification and counterpart in the Epilogue (XXIV) where justice is eventually completed, and peace restored, again by Athena's intervention.

The structure of this composition, then, is as on pp. 13 ff.

The Prologue, I–V

Zeus opens with a general complaint that men blame the gods for misfortunes brought on themselves: for example, Aegisthus was warned not to kill Agamemnon. The fate of Agamemnon, and by implication of Clytemnestra, is a recurring foil to the fortunes of Odysseus and Penelope. Athene pleads for Odysseus, Zeus promises his eventual return—the subject of the whole poem—and Athene has Hermes sent to warn Calypso: he does not, however, leave Olympus till V. 43 in the pendant Olympian epilogue. Here is a well-defined triplet—Ath-Z-Ath—with the promise of Zeus central: it is balanced in the Epilogue, V. 7–42 by a similar triplet—Ath-Z-Z to Hermes, with the 'Counsel of Zeus' again central, a safe return for Telemachus, anticipating XV. 1–493.

The New Regime in Ithaca is presented in four compositions: in the first and fourth, Athena, first as Mentor, then as Mentor, prepares Telemachus for his journey to Pylos and Sparta.
In the second (I. 324-444) Telemachus shows his new purpose to the suitors—a quintet, with Antinous contrasted with Eurymachus, and both enframed by three speeches from Telemachus, of which the second (central, 359-98) is crucial. This episode is preceded by Telemachus' new treatment of Penelope (couplet 357-59) and followed by his orders to Eurykleia (425-9): no speeches, but his confidence in her is direct counterpart of his reticence towards his mother; note that Eurykleia is introduced again in II. 345-7.

In the third (II. 1-255), the public meeting is opened by Aegyptius (25-34) and Telemachus (40-79) and closed by Mentor (229-31) and Leocritus (appeal to force: 243-55), the latter only reappears to be killed (XXII. 294-6): Antinous (85-128) and Eurymachus (178-207) are counterparts as before, but the centrepiece is the omen (146) interpreted by Halitherses (161-76): Odysseus is not far off, and will take his revenge: this refers back to the warning given to Aegisthus (I. 35-43): the Suitors are to have no excuse.

In the fourth episode, a brief conversation (Tel—Eurykleia—Tel, 345-76) is balanced by another ([Tel]—Mentor—Tel: 382-412) in which Athena, personating Telemachus (382-7), has no speech, but φάτο μοῦθον (383): ἡγεῖται νῆα δοῦν (387). There are also unspoken words from Eurykleia (her oath 377) and from Noemon (ὑπεδέκτω 387), so this whole episode is in outline only—Ath. Ath. Noemon Mentor Tel.

The Visit to Pylos is a single composition, centred on Nestor's five speeches, and culminating in his news of Odysseus (224). Telemachus' reply to this (226-8) is reinforced by Mentor's correction (230) which he accepts: he is still learning how to behave. The nostos of Nestor himself (103-200) is balanced by those of Agamemnon and Menelaus (254-312). Nestor's eventual advice (317-28) accepted by Mentor (371-6) is the counterpart of his welcome to Telemachus (69-74, 79-101).

All this is enframed between a prologue and an epilogue. The prologue has five speeches, Mentor—Telemachus—Mentor—Peisistratus—Mentor: central is Mentor's encouragement (25-7). But note that if we count Telemachus' silent ἤρπασα (64), there are two balanced triplets. For such 'silent' speeches, see below, p. 10. The epilogue also has five speeches, a triplet—Nestor—Mentor—Nestor (346-84); Nestor's speech the next day (418-29); and his farewell (475-6). At the sacrifice, εὐσέβειτο (447) is unspoken prayer, like 64. The two ritual acts are counterparts, opening and closing the visit.

The Visit to Sparta (IV. 1-601) has a prologue triplet—Eteoneus-Menelaus-Menelaus (20-64) followed by a meal. There is no epilogue in XV outside the main structure, which completes the episode by an elaborate third composition (XV. 1-164), balancing the first (IV. 65-295), which is introductory to the second and central one (IV. 312-610). All three compositions consist of centrepiece and 'side-pieces'—to borrow a phrase from archaic painting. In the first, the centrepiece 147-202 is between Menelaus and Peisistratus (M-P-M-P-M) only reaching the main issue in Menelaus' invitation to Odysseus to settle at Sparta (169-82). Before and after this are triplets: Telemachus-Menelaus-Helen (71-146) and Helen-Menelaus—Telemachus (255-291-5). The latter follows a meal, which, however, stands before the closing triplet, not after it, as strict balance with 65-8 would require: for Helen's potion, like some modern doses, was to be taken 'after food'; and in 291-5 Telemachus is ready for bed.

Next day, the third composition, of five speeches (M-T-M-T-M, IV. 312-610) centres on Menelaus' tale of Proteus, between Telemachus' account of the suitors (315-31) and his proposal to return home (594-608). This being agreed (611-19) the actual departure is postponed to XV, thus linking the two halves of the Odyssey together.

Contemporary events in Ithaca (IV. 623-847) are the counterpart and continuation of I. 106-II. 434, but differently constructed. Two stories are being told in alternate sections; (a) the plot of the Suitors (632-56 triplet: Antinous asks for a ship, 770-7 he prepares it, with grim comment from a suitor τῆς, 770-1, balanced only by the embarkation: 842-7 the Suitors sail to Asteris, silently, ἐν φωνήν ὀρμαίνοντες) as the occasion required. (b) The distress and consolation of Penelope make two balanced episodes. In 681-741 a triplet, P—Medon—P (681-710) announces Telemachus' departure; another P—Eurykleia—P (722-66) puts trust in Athena: between them, central, Medon has already hinted at divine help (712-5). In 804-37 five speeches—Athena—P—Athena—P—Athena—promise this: the third is central and crucial (825-9).
VI. The Epilogue in Olympus contains (1) the counterpart of the Prologue (I. 1–95), the triplet (V. 1–54) in which Athena persuades Zeus to send Hermes to release Odysseus from Calypso. But it forms also (2) the prologue to a double composition, to which Odysseus’ triplet (V. 408–93) is epilogue. (3) The story of Calypso is the more elaborate. It is essentially in three triplets, of which the second is central, culminating in Odysseus’ demand for an oath from Calypso (173–9). It is preceded by Hermes’ message to Ogygia (55–144) and followed by Odysseus’ confession (215–24) that he prefers Penelope to Calypso. There are two small anomalies; Calypso’s farewell is silent after that confession; but later she gives him sailing-directions (ἐνώπιος 276) again without a formal speech. And Hermes’ parting threat to Calypso (146–7) is uncompensated. Like her final silence, it stresses Calypso’s passion for Odysseus. (4) The other episode (283–379) is simpler. Within five speeches—Poseidon–Odysseus–Leucothea–Odysseus–Poseidon—that of Leucothea is central (339–50), like the prayer of Odysseus in the epilogue (445–50): these two speeches, indeed, make the rest of the story possible. Poseidon has done his worst, and only reappears (XIII. 128–64) to be told so by Zeus.

It must further be noted that the story of Calypso though so closely linked here with the Olympian Epilogue (V. 1–54) is at the same time the last outland adventure of Odysseus, the sequel to the Sun’s Cattle (XII. 222–373), and (as narrated) leads direct to the wrath of Poseidon (V. 202–382) whereby Odysseus is driven to Phaeacia. It will be seen later (p. 4) that the story of the Sun’s Cattle has no counterpart in the structure of the Wanderings (VI–XII), but receives this if the story of Calypso and Poseidon’s wrath are regarded as prologue, though separated by the whole Phaeacian visit. For convenience, however, they are discussed here as they stand in the text.

Phaeacia and the Wanderings, VI–XIII. 197

This major component of the Odyssey consists of two narratives: Odysseus’ visit to Phaeacia (V–VIII) and his own account of his Wanderings (IX–XII) included in it just before his departure. These narratives are quite distinct, though they are re-connected by Arete’s intervention in the Cimmerian story (XI. 352–84) and by the scene of departure from Phaeacia (XIII. 1–69).

The Visit to Phaeacia (VI–VIII) has three scenes: the meeting with Nausicaa, the arrival in the Palace, the Games, Dances, and Presents. What is central is Alcinous’ promise of escort (VII. 192–206 confirmed 317–28) enframing Odysseus’ story and request (208–25; 241–97) in reply to Arete’s question (237–9), though he does not give his name till IX. 19.

Nausicaa’s story is preceded by a prologue triplet (Athena–N–Alcinous, 25–70) with Odysseus’ waking cry (119–26), and is followed by his prayer (324–7) with a similar triplet (Od–Ath–Ath, VII. 22–77). Her meeting with Odysseus has six speeches (Od–N–N–Od–N–N): Odysseus’ second speech (218–22) and his transformation (229–31) are central, between her two orders to the maids. As Odysseus’ prayer (324–7) is the counterpart of 119–26, there is a lacuna (for Odysseus) after 315. Now Nausicaa’s long speech (255–315) includes an anonymous commentary (276–84): does this perhaps survive from another version of her return, in which such comment was incurred? Without it, Nausicaa’s speech is continuous from 275 to 289.

In the Palace (VII. 81–347) Odysseus’ opening request for escort (VII. 146–52) is balanced by his acceptance (331–3). Between these speeches are three triplets, Echeneus–Alcinous–Alcinous (159–206); Odysseus–Arete–Odysseus (208–97); Alc–Od–Alc (290–328). Arete’s promise of help is central (237–9) and is supported before and after by Alcinous (186–206, 307–28). The words of the maids at bed-time (331–3) are epilogue, outside this composition.

Games, Dances, and Presents (VIII. 1–585) fill a single long and elaborate composition, punctuated by the three lays of Demodocus (62–82; 266–366; 499–520). Of these the second, about Ares and Aphrodite, has clear structure: the centrepiece (Apollo and Hermes, 337–42) pointing the ribald moral, between the snare (triplet, Ares–Hephaestus–τίς: 292–332) and the amends (triplet, Poseidon–Hephaestus–Poseidon, 347–56): in both Hephaestus is central. The other two lays are narrative, and also interrupted.

After formal prologue (Athena (keryx)–Alcinous, 11–45) and Demodocus’ first lay I
(62–82), Alcinous announces games (97–113) and singing (236–55) followed by Demodocus II. Only the games are in full, with eight speeches. The first triplet of invitation, Laodamas–Euryalus–Laodamas (133–51) leads to Odysseus’ excuse (153–7); Laodamas’ retort (159–64) leads to the second triplet, Od–Athena–Od (166–202) in which Odysseus proves his skill. This construction is unusual, but takes account of the balanced pairs of speeches, L–E–L: O–A–O, and the counter-changed centre, O–E.

After Demodocus II Alcinous ἐκλείψε (270) dancing, not described, but applauded by Odysseus (382–5): this balances the undescribed singing after 236–55; for the lays of Demodocus are official, not competitive. Then Alcinous calls for presents (381–97), Euryalus offers his gift (401–5; 408–11), and Odysseus accepts it (413–15). In this ‘triplet’, the two speeches of Euryalus seem to count as one. This incident balances the discourtesy of Euryalus (VII. 159–64).

Alcinous then repeats his call for gifts (424–32); Arete and Nausicaa respond (443–5, 461–2) and Odysseus gives thanks (464–8) and gives his own present (477–81; 487–98); his thanks are central, and the composition is concluded (after Demodocus’ lay III) when Alcinous asks Odysseus for his story (576–86). His allusion to Poseidon (564–71) refers back to V. 252–382 and forward to XIII. 159–86, just outside the boundaries of this section of the poem.

The Wanderings of Odysseus, IX, X, XI, XII

After this Phaeacian prelude, Odysseus’ story forms a separate and differently constructed composition, IX–XII. The minor adventures are grouped before, between, and after those with the Cyclops and with Circe. Central is Odysseus’ first loss of a chance to return home, by forfeiting further help from Aeolus: the whole series of adventures is ended by his second offence, against the Sun’s Cattle (XII. 262–373), which sends him to Calypso (XII. 448); as it had been preceded by the shipwreck which had brought him to Phaeacia (V. 252–382), his third encounter with the gods, though it had been narrated before the other two, with the visit to Calypso which was the penalty.

As the visits to Circe are already enframed by the minor adventures with the Sirens (XII. 165–200) and with Scylla and Charybdis (XII. 201–61) the episode of the Sun’s Cattle (XII. 260–453) is supernumerary. It is balanced, however, by the visit to Calypso, and its penalty by the wrath of Poseidon in V. 282–352, which also fall outside the main composition, and have been considered above in connexion with the Olympian epilogue to Books I–V. Of the long years of banishment in Calypso’s island, there was nothing to be said. We are prepared for them already, by the eight years of Menelaus and Helen in Egypt (IV. 81), and by the growth to manhood of Telemachus, and of Orestes (I. 30, 40–1), as well as by the poet’s own announcement (I. 16).

The sojourn with Circe is interrupted—and its symmetry with the Cyclops-story—by the visit to Gimmeria and Hades; and this in turn by the break in the recital in Phaeacia (XI. 330–76), by which the whole of this long narrative is brought back into connexion with its content—not at the centre point of the whole, but of the most far-fetched episode of it. This incident has a normal five-speech structure—Arete–Echeneus–Alcinous–Odysseus–Alcinous—central is Alcinous’ request for more stories (XI. 345–53).

The Raid on the Cicones (IX. 39–61) has no speeches, but a triplet of significant words: ἡμῶνες . . . οὐκ ἐπίδετον 44. γεγονόν ἡμών περιορίστων 47. Λατοφαγί (IX. 53–104) offer only προσεπερίσθησαν 88: κλαδίστοις 98.

The Story of the Cyclops, by contrast, has elaborately grouped speeches, and in the first scene the isolated speech of Odysseus (IX. 172–6) is balanced by λισσόντος 224 and οὐ πέθομεν 228, the vestiges of a triplet. Most of the speeches are in regular triplets: Od–Cy–Od (259–56); but Odysseus’ crucial offer of wine (347–52) is isolated, between the two killings (257; 344): his preparation of the beam, in the same context, is silent; so too are the blinding (371) and the escape (420). In each triplet the middle speech is crucial. The final prayer of the Cyclops (328–35) stands alone, like the opening announcement of Odysseus (172–6). Central and crucial are Odysseus’ false name (364–7) and the Cyclops’ use of it (408) between which comes the blinding (375–97) and the Cyclops’ cries—ζυμωμέν (395), θυμέλε (399)—which are central but inarticulate.
In the first visit to Aeolus there are no speeches, but the words ἐξερέανεν (X. 13); κατέλεξα (16); οὐδὲ .. ἀνήνυστο (18) represent a normal triplet, with Odysseus' request central. The protest of the crew (38-48) is an isolated centrepiece; and the speeches at the second visit are a normal triplet (64-75).

The Laestrygonian episode has no speeches, but five are indicated — προσεκαφάνεον (109); ἐπέφραξεν (111); ἐκάλες (central) (114); τεῦχε βοήθη (118); ἔκλεισε αὐτή (128).

In Aeaea (excluding the CIMmerian episode) there are five compositions. In the first (X. 133-306), the triplets Od–Od–Polites (174-228) Eurylochus–Eur–Od (251-73) stand before and after Circe's magic, which is all the more impressive because speechless. In the second (X. 307-405) the triplets Hermes–Odysseus–Circe (281-335); Circe–Odysseus–Circe (378-405) support the centrepiece (337-47), where Odysseus forces Circe to swear not to harm her: her oath is silent ὤμον (346) and her hospitality confirms it (348-74). In the third (X. 406-60), the reluctance of Eurylochus (492-7) is central in a composition of five speeches, which completes the establishment of Odysseus and his men in Circe's halls. Preparations for departure begin in the fourth episode (X. 461-577); two triplets: Shipmates–Odysseus–Circe (472-95); Circe–Odysseus–Odysseus (504-65) support the central words of Odysseus (501-2) demanding guidance towards the Cimmeria. The request of the shipmates (472-4) is answered by Odysseus (562-5). The death of Elpenor is silent, and uncompensated; it serves to link this episode with his appearance in Hades (XI. 51-80) and the fifth episode (XII. 8-15) where Elpenor is buried, also silently. To a Greek audience, his unburied corpse was a pledge of Odysseus' return. The fifth episode (XII. 1-150) contains four speeches (21-141) and a double signal completing a quintet (ἐξερέανεν .. κατέλεξα 34-5) for Odysseus' story of his Cimmerian journey; superfluous here, because already told in XI. Central is Circe's prophecy of further adventures (XII. 37-110).

The Sirens (XII. 151-221) are described in a triplet (Od–Sirens–Od: 154-221) in which their song is central.

Scylla and Charybdis (XII. 222), already foretold twice, require no speeches; ὕθεγγοντο (240) and καταλάγουσε (256) are inarticulate.

The Sun's Cattle has two complete triplets, and a third is completed by Lampetia's message (ἡγελας ἦλε ηλε 374). Central in the middle triplet is the revolt of Eurylochus (340-51): he is also central in the first. Note that the first and third triplets are supplemented by signals, ἀπόφημον (303): νακεύον (392): the latter speech is precluded by the grim remark that 'the cattle were dead'.

The Visit to Cimmeria (XI) is a separate and elaborate composition, not quite symmetrical. The other heroines and heroes, silently paraded—except Heracles (615-26)—and separated by the Phaeacian interlude (333-76) are preceded—the heroines by Elpenor, Teiresias, and Anticlea, and the heroes by Agamemnon, Achilles, and the silent Ajax. The opening triplets—Od–Elpenor–Od: Teiresias–Od–Teiresias are separated (84-9) by Anticlea, but she is not allowed to speak till the sequence of five speeches (Ant–Od–Ant–Od–Ant: 155-214), in which news of Ithaca (180-203) is central. It thus balances the first two; and is exactly compensated by the five speeches of Odysseus and Agamemnon (376-465) culminating in Odysseus' comparison of Clytaemnestra with Penelope (436-9), another reference (like 180-203) to Ithaca. The interview with Achilles (466-537) is interrupted after Odysseus' news of Neoptolemus (504-37) by the apparition of Ajax (541-67); Odysseus' words (553-62) show that a dialogue was intended, but dramatically suppressed (565). Central among the older heroes, Heracles alone, being immortal, has a ghost that can speak (617-26), but this closing group is cut short (630-33), as though the Visit to Cimmeria was exceeding some limit within the general design. It is already a very long story (635 lines overall).

The Return of Odysseus to Ithaca, and Revelation to Telemachus, XIII, XIV, XV, XVI

The latter half of the Odyssey, dealing with events in Ithaca after Odysseus' return, is not one major composition but two. Only the latter is concerned with affairs in the Palace, with Penelope and the Suitors. The former has its scene mainly at the house of Eumaeus, and is concerned with the revelation of Odysseus, not to Eumaeus as yet, but to Telemachus (XVI.
Continuity between these two compositions is maintained by the abiding supervision of Athena. Poseidon's wrath is satisfied by his punishment of the Phaeacians, and he disappears from the story after XIII. 186; intruding thus into the second half of the *Odyssey* as we have it, only to bind the two halves together.

The traditional division into books thus cuts across the main structure of the story; and this fact becomes more significant with the present analysis of that structure. This kind of discrepancy is rare, but has been noted already at the end of Book V, where the Olympian Epilogue (V. 1–54) is counterpart to the Olympian Prologue (I. 1–105); the story of Calypso in Ogygia (V. 55–282) is an episode of the Wanderings, and the sequel to the *Sun's Cattle* (XII. 262–447) which is otherwise without counterpart; and the encounter of Odysseus with Poseidon off Phaeacia (V. 283–493) is formal Prologue to the whole Phaeacian Visit (VI–XII, including the Wanderings), to which, at long last, the counterpart epilogue is here (XIII. 125–86), in the departure from Phaeacia, the last intervention of Poseidon and the appeasement of his wrath.

The two parts of this latter half of the *Odyssey* are further bound together by the longer converse of Odysseus with Athena (XIII. 96–440) in which his home-coming and vengeance are devised. The recurrent motif of successive recognitions by his helpers begins in this overture, with Odysseus' own recognition of Ithaca, as the home-land, of which he is to recover dominion. Only with this recognition assured by Athena (XIII. 345–51), can he take the next step, his own recognition of Eumaeus (XIV)—who does not recognise him till XXI. 188—and the mutual recognition with Telemachus (XVI. 192–320). It is important to appreciate this overture-quality of XIII–XIV, as it is essential to the analysis of XVI.

The structure of XIII after Odysseus' waking words (200–16) is in pendant schemes of five speeches each (Od–Ath (disguised)–Od–Ath (revealed)–Od: 228–328; Ath–Od–Ath–Od–Ath: 375–430). Central in the first is Odysseus' feigned story (256–86); in the second, Athena's intention to disguise him from Eumaeus, who is thus brought into the story (404). Between these the triplet: Ath–Od–Ath (330–65) culminates in Odysseus' prayer (356–60) on recognising Ithaca, to its nymphs, in whose care he now leaves his treasures (366–71).

The Welcome of Eumaeus (XIV) consists of a centerpiece (85–408) between prologue (triplet 37–70) and epilogue (414–517) enlarged to five speeches by the story of the cloak (462–517) appended to Eumaeus' welcome (443–5) which has thus become central instead of final. The centerpiece is a triptych of three triplets (85–147: 149–330: 361–408) in each of which Odysseus offers news; twice in the central triplet Eumaeus describes in succession the anxieties of Penelope (122–30), of Telemachus (166–90), and of Penelope again (320). The central reference to Telemachus points forward to the story of his return (XV), and his enquiry (185), who Odysseus is? reminds the audience that Telemachus is on the wrong trail. This composition, and the briefer counterpart (XV. 301–495) which follows the *Return of Telemachus* and forms the first episode of the *Recognition* story (XV–XVI), develops the circumstances and character of Eumaeus, and encloses two sidelights on that of Odysseus before his travels (XIV. 192–358: 458–517). That Eumaeus, like Eurycleia (I. 430–5), a relic of the 'good old days', needs this elaborate characterisation, suggests that neither of them was 'in the story': both are Homeric creations. Theoclymenus is another.

The Return of Telemachus (XV), like his outward journey, is in two sections, Sparta and Pylos, in reverse order to the outward journey (III–IV) and much shorter. At Sparta, Menelaus' blessing and gifts are central (111–19) between the triplets, Tel–Men–Tel (desire to return: 64–91): Helen–Men–Tel (gifts and farewell, 125–59). Before this, Athena directs Telemachus, and he Peisistratus, to return (10–55); after it, the omen is observed by Peisistratus (167–8) interpreted by Helen (172–8) and accepted by Telemachus (180–1); the whole episode is thus enframed in divine sanctions. At Pylos, one triplet, Tel–Peis–Tel (195–219) suffices; for the occasion is taken to introduce Theoclymenus, another 'Homer creation', who is to reappear (XV. 496–556; XVII. 152–61; XX. 351–63). There are four speeches (260–81), and as Telemachus' reception of him is crucial (266–78) it looks as if the long silent history of him (223–53) stands for an introductory speech. But note that Telemachus had already prayed for fair journey (δώς ξέγκαται 222). This incident connects the Return Journey with the next composition (XV. 496–556).

The Recognition by Telemachus (XV. 591–XVI. 481) is one elaborate composition. The
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centrepiece, the transformation of Odysseus (XVI. 161–89), is preceded and followed by no less than four pairs of side-scenes. First and last, enframing the whole, are (a) the further talk of Odysseus with Eumaeus (XV. 301–495)—seven speeches, eliciting the imminent arrival of Telemachus (325–39), news of Laertes and Penelope (352–79) and (a') Eumaeus' own history (390–484); and the return of Eumaeus from the Palace (XVI. 452–81) to report the suitors' plot to Telemachus and the re-disguised Odysseus. Within these stand (b) the arrival of Telemachus and Theoclymenus in Ithaca (seven speeches, 505–34): central is Theoclymenus' interpretation of an omen (525–34); and (b') affairs in the Palace (XVI. 321–451): seven speeches, 357–447, of which the plot of Antinous is central (364–92): between the two warnings of Amphimenes (355–7; 400–5): before and after stands Eumaeus (341–50; 435–47) with the Herald's message to Penelope (337) and her reaction to it (417–33): note, however, that Eumaeus εἴπερ (338) to supplant the Herald's news. Next towards the centre stand (c) the arrival of Telemachus; five speeches: Od–Eum–Telemachus–Eum–Tel (XVI. 8–45): Telemachus' request for news of Ithaca is central; Odysseus is barely noticed (44–5); and (c') the triplet in which Telemachus and Odysseus make their plan (263–320). Then next to the centrepiece (d)—though the two triplets Tel–Eum–Tel, 57–89; 113–33, are giving important information, and Eumaeus is sent to the Palace (113–34) but not to Laertes (136–41)—it is the outburst of Odysseus (91–111) on hearing of the disorders in Ithaca, that makes inevitable Athena's revelation (centrepiece (e) 161–89). After this, (d') in six alternate speeches, Odysseus and Telemachus exchange necessary information about Phaeacia (216–19) and the Suitors (241–7), and Odysseus reveals Athena's promise of help (259–61). All is thus in order for planning the vengeance (c' above) and the guilt of the Suitors is demonstrated (b' a') on Eumaeus' return (465–75); Odysseus having been re-disguised silently at 456–7. The whole sequence is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XV</th>
<th>301-495</th>
<th>XVI</th>
<th>1-54</th>
<th>55-150</th>
<th>161-79</th>
<th>180-261</th>
<th>262-320</th>
<th>321-431</th>
<th>452-81</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| XV | 301-495 | XVI | 1-54 | 55-150 | 161-79 | 180-261 | 262-320 | 321-431 | 452-81 |

The Vengeance of Odysseus, XVII–XXIV

This section, longer even than the Phaeacian (VI–XII), is composed of many incidents. Though these are narrated in order of time, with some alternate overlap, and though they are punctuated with a succession of omens and other hints to the progressive revelation of Odysseus, they are composed about a centrepiece, with a general balance and symmetry, and contribute to its significance. This centrepiece, however, is not the Massacre, as a modern reader would expect, nor Penelope's recognition of Odysseus, but her decision to abide by the test of the Bow, and the divine sanction which follows it. This is the αἴτιον (φόνου άρχην XXIV. 169)—as the Bow itself had been άρχη ζέωνωσις long before (XXI. 35). Odysseus recognises this (XIX. 583–7) and his soliloquy (XXI. 35, 21), central and uncompensated, marks the crisis. Penelope recognises it (XX. 61–90), and despair, for she has not yet recognised Odysseus; and the divine sanction of Athena and Zeus (XX. 35–103) is confirmed by the voice of the common folk, in the corn-grinder's wish (XX. 112–19), central among the whole sequence of signs. From this new factor in the situation, the revelation of Odysseus to the Suitors follows, and his vengeance; to this, the earlier events accumulate and converge, from the prophecy of Theoclymenus (XVII. 132–61) to Eurycleia's discovery of the Scar (XIX. 363–475). The evidence for this construction is cumulative.

First, the revelation and recognition of Odysseus by tokens and omens, is in thirteen stages, discounting the recognition by Telemachus in XVI and by Laertes in XXV which is the pendant to it—prologue and epilogue respectively to the main composition. Of these, six precede the sanction of Zeus in the centrepiece: (1) the prophecy of Theoclymenus (XVII. 151), (2) the recognition by the dog Argus (XVII. 291), (3) the sneeze of Telemachus (XVII. 541), (4) Odysseus' description of the brooch (XIX. 126–35, with his prophecy (270–307), (5) Eurycleia's discovery of the scar, (6) Penelope's dream of her geese (XX. 509–33). Six follow it: (1) Odysseus' prophecy to Philoetius (XX. 230–4), (2) the bird-omen of Amphimenes (XX. 240–6), (3) the darkness interpreted by Theoclymenus (XX. 395), (4) the recognition by Eumaeus and Philoetius, again through the scar (XXI. 207–20), (5) Odysseus' mastery of the bow, revealing to the Suitors and again sanctioned by thunder (XXI. 402), and
(6) the token of the bed (XXIII. 166–72), which at last convinces Penelope. The proof by the scar recurs again for Laertes (with that by the fruit-trees, XXIV. 331–44), but this is not reckoned here, as it is the counterpart of the earlier recognition by Telemachus (XVI. 190). Thus Penelope’s decision, confirmed by the sanction of Zeus and the corn-grinder’s words, is centred in a large composition, with several counterparts; Theoclymenus intervening before and after; the token of the brooch balancing that of the bed; the maze of Telemachus and the second thunder of Zeus; recognition by Argus, and by faithful retainers; beside the double use of the scar, already noted; and the birds of Amphinomus, pendant to Penelope’s geese, before and after the thunder of Zeus in the centrepiece. In the same relation to the centrepiece, Penelope’s appearances are instructive, four before and three after it. Before it:

A. She greets Telemachus and Theoclymenus (XVII. 1–173) and hears Telemachus’ tale of his journey (108–61): eight speeches, in pairs; but Penelope’s εὐχέτο (59) and Menelaus’ speech reported by Telemachus, must be noted. The structure seems to be: P–T–(P): P.T(M)Th.P, for Theoclymenus corrects and supplements Telemachus (152–61).


C. Penelope appears to the suitors and receives their gifts (XVIII. 158–345): central is the speech of Eurymachus (245–9) within the quintet P–T: E–P–A (215–49): after this she receives the gifts, silently (290–303): before it, she has been herself beautified (293–303). All this is enframed between triplets, P–Eurynome–P (164–80) and Odysseus–Melantho–Odysseus: contrasting the good maid with the bad.

D. Penelope meets Odysseus (XIX. 53–308), questions him about his brooch (221–48) in a regular sequence of nine speeches, with Penelope’s weaving central (309–34)—then bids Eurycleia to bathe him (380–507); ten speeches, the scar being revealed between nos. 5 and 6. Note that Melantho (XIX. 66–9) is counterfoil to Eurycleia (97–9), who is active both before and after the centrepiece (XIX. 363–498: XX. 135–56). Melantho is also involved, though not named, in the escape of the bad women, which is the ‘last straw’ before Odysseus’ central challenge to his troubles (XX. 5–15).

Then follows the centrepiece, as above (XIX. 508–XX. 119). After it, Penelope appears in the action thrice, and not before XXI. There is therefore no appearance immediately after the centrepiece, like D before it. The action, however, goes on till XX. 240 within the Palace, between Telemachus, Eurycleia and Eumaeus, and Philoctets is introduced at XX. 160. —Odysseus’ assurance to him balances his assurance to Penelope (XIX. 585–7)—and at 242–3 the bird-omen of Amphinomus is the counterpart of Penelope’s geese (XIX. 599–83).

After the centrepiece, then, Penelope takes part in the action thrice:

E. She comes forth to propose the test of the Bow (XXI. 1–79): it is her reply, in kind, to the gifts of the Suitors. Though she only retires after granting Odysseus’ request, she does not speak between 79 and 362.

F. Penelope’s concession to Odysseus (XXI. 275–342), carrying one step further her invitation to him to visit her (B), is the more significant, because, though she does not know who he is, she is bound to accept him if he succeeds in the test of the Bow. This may therefore rank as a distinct intervention, though she does not apparently leave the Hall between XXI. 79 and 312.

G. Penelope’s recognition of Odysseus (XXIII. 1–299) is the counterpart to the prediction of Theoclymenus (XVII. 152–65) which it fulfils.

In view of the correspondences between GFE respectively and ABC, we may re-number them provisionally as C’, B’, A’, and reckon the scenes which follow the centrepiece (XX. 122–240) as the counterpart of D. This experiment may now be tested—and will be confirmed—by the distribution of the intercalated scenes in which the Suitors collectively, or individual suitors, take part. These are as follows:

(a) This stands between A and B (XVII. 178–491): it introduces Melanthius (XVII. 212–258) as an agent of the Suitors; brings Odysseus into the presence of the Suitors (XVII. 256) with a false story (415–44); and recounts Antinous’ insult to him (369–491).
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(b) Between B and C stands Odysseus’ encounter with Irus (XVIII. 1–157) provoked by Antinous (36–9; 43–9; 79–87).
(c) Between C and D the insult of Eurymachus (XVIII. 351–421) leads to the removal of the arms from the Hall (XIX. 1–52). Note that Athena’s silent presence (33–4) does not interrupt the sequence of two triplets: Od–T–Eurycl. (4–25) : T–T–Od (27–46).

After the centrepiece are three counterpart episodes:

(c*) = (d) Following the centrepiece and its framing episodes (D) the insult of Ctesippus (XX. 292–302) exactly balances that of Eurymachus (XVIII. 331–421) in (c) and the comment of Agelaus (XX. 322–34) verbally repeats phrases of Amphinomus (XVIII. 414–17 : 418).

(b* = (e) Between Penelope’s speeches (XVI. 68–79 : 312–19) the Suitors try to bend the Bow (XXI. 140–268). Their failure balances the defeat of Irus (b) which follows Penelope’s invitation to Odysseus (B), as this episode precedes her permission to him to compete (B’).

(a*) = (f) The Massacre (XXII.) opens with the death of Antinous (1–30), avenging (with much else) his insult to Odysseus in (a) (XVII. 460–1). Melanthius’ earlier insult (XVII. 217–32) is also avenged (474–7).

These pendant incidents certainly stand where they should in the historical development of the narrative; but their number is too great to be due to coincidence. The whole structure of this great composition may therefore be displayed thus:

A. Penelope–Theoclymenus, XVII. 1–177.
(a) Argus: Melanthius–Antinous, XVII. 178–491.
B. Penelope invites Odysseus, XVII. 492–588.
(b) Irus, XVIII. 1–157.
C. Penelope receives Suitor’s gifts, XVIII. 158–345.
(c) Insult of Eurymachus, XVIII. 346–425; XIX. 1–52.
D. Penelope receives Odysses, XIX. 53–597.

A’. Penelope recognises Odysseus, XXIII. 1–343.
(a') The Massacre. Antinous and Melanthius, XXII. 501.
B’. Penelope allows Odysseus’ claim, XXI. 270–319.
(b’) The failure of the Suitors, XXI. 140–260.
C’. Penelope proposes the test of the Bow, XXI. 1–79.
(c’) Insult of Ctesippus, XX. 240–394.


Minor counterparts are the appearances of Phemius (a link with I. 154–33) in XVI. 252 (not named), XVII. 263, and again in XXII. 331, though he is little more than palace furniture; and of Medon (first in IV), then with Phemius (XVI. 252) and alone (XVI. 412; XVII. 172): he appears again with him in XXII. 357–80, and is active in XXIV. 439–42, as in IV.

The Epilogue (XXIV) is a triptych, as carefully wrought as any of the previous sections. The recognition of Odysseus by Laertes (205–411) has been delayed, as for the need earlier in the story—indeed care was taken to keep him out of it (XVI. 135–150) except by news through Penelope. Between a single speech to the servants (214–18) and a final triplet (394–407) introducing Dolius and his son, there are ten speeches: Odysseus reveals himself in the fourth (221–6), and gives tokens in the sixth (331–44). Laertes’ doubts are thus nearly central. Laertes’ despair (315–17) is silent: if ἀδίδωσιν στεφάνα represents a speech, it separates adjacent speeches of Odysseus, and completes the symmetry.

This centrepiece is preceded by the Descent of the Suitors to Hades (1–204) in which, as in I and IV, the fortunes of Odysseus are contrasted with those of Agamemnon, and Nestor appears once more. Achilles makes no reply to Agamemnon (but 98 ἀγώναν), so Agamemnon’s second speech (106–19) is central, and Amphimemdon’s narrative is counterpart to Agamemnon’s account of the burial of Achilles: honourable and dishonourable ends are contrasted. Amphimemdon’s version excuses little; superior wit, and divine help, have won: there is no hint of retribution after death: like Elenor he only claims decent burial (189–90). Agamemnon reverts to the old contrast between Penelope and Clytaemnesteria (197–202).

The counterpart to this is the End of the Feud (XXIV. 412–544), which had troubled Laertes (351–5). The suitors’ clans are represented in a triplet: Eueithes–Medon–Hali-therses (426–62): but note 470 ἐπὶ δ’ Ὑς Eueithes): the House of Arcesius has a quintet:
Odysseus—Dolius—Odysseus—Telemachus—Laertes (506–515): central is Odysseus' confidence (506–9) that Telemachus is worthy of his forebears. He has already received the loyalty of Dolius and his sons (491–95); Telemachus and Laertes respond (311–15). These scenes in Ithaca enframe the appeal of Athena to Zeus, and his decision that the Fead shall end (473–86). They are followed by Athena's solution of the problem (between two speeches from Athena); Laertes, head of Odysseus' clan, kills Eupitheus, father of Antinous; Zeus thunders; Athena closes this final triplet (542–4); and Odysseus makes peace with his neighbours.

The significance of this elaborate and sustained mode of composition is not easy to estimate. It dominates the structure and general arrangement of episodes, but does not prescribe or limit their scale or contents: long speeches may be balanced by short; long scenes also by short, especially in the latter half of a balanced composition. The effect of this is to quicken the movement and relieve fatigue.

Occasionally an episode has no speeches; but sometimes, both in these 'silent' passages, and also within groups of speeches, words occur describing or implying speeches. Examples are:


II. 384–5. Athena, disguised, φασὶν ὑπὸ... ἄνωγε; followed by two speeches (402–12), and completing a triplet: Ath—Ath—T. But note that Noemon also ὑπὲρέκτιο (387).

III. 377–8. Euryycleia's oath is silent, and stands outside the triplet Tel—Eur—Tel (349–76).

III. 64. Telemanchus ἄμωμο, completing the triplet Peis—Men—[Tel] (43–61).

V. 225–7. Calypso is silent, after Odysseus has compared her to Penelope: there was indeed nothing to say: but the structure (203–27) is Cal—Od—[Cal]. If these speeches were not separated by a meal-time from the preceding triplet (161–191), they might form a quintet with Calypso's promise central (182–90), but she begins quite aresh in 203. Later, Calypso μὴ δέ τις πομπήν (233) and later still gave sailing directions ἀνώγε (276), but again she bids no farewell (268).

VI. 235–315. Nausicaa's speech is not followed by any counterpart to Odysseus (143–85): but see p. 3.

IX. The Cicones and Lotophagi are speechless; but Odysseus ἤδηγε... οὐκ ἐπεθυμον (44), and the Cicones γεγόνεν (4): Compare κλαίοντος (98), προείνει πεῦθος (88).

IX. 244–8. A triplet with Odysseus (172–6) is completed by λίσσοντο... οὐ πιθόνη.

IX. 395–9. The Cyclops' cries, φωνη καὶ... ἔλεος are central but inarticulate.

X. 19–18. In the first visit to Aeolus ἄφεσαν (13), κατέλαξα (16), σώθη... ἄνθιστο (18) mark a silent triplet: counterpart to the later triplet 64–75.

X. 109–228. In the Laestrygonian episode are five speech-words: προερεύνων (109), ἐπιστρέφον (111), κάκως (central 114), τεῦχε βοήν (118), ἐδέσμον (128).

X. 345–7. Circe's oath is silent: compare the circumstances of Calypso's silence: but it does not affect the structure unless it be as centrepiece standing between two triplets (320–344: 378–405).

X. 551–60. Elpenor is silent; so also his burial (XII. 8–15).

XII. 34–35. Circe ἀφετείν : Odysseus κατέλαξα (35), but the story has already been told.

XII. Scylla and Charybdis: no speeches, but ἰαρέων (249), κακάλογοντος (256).


XII. 392. The sailors νεκρον: the counterpart to 303 above.

XV. 233–81. The sequence —Theoclymenos—Tel—Theoclit Tel is unbalanced, for Telemachus' account of himself is central (266–72) between Theoclymenus' two speeches; but Telemachus ἀφίκοντο (222, cf. 258), and the long introduction of Theoclymenus anticipates enquiry.

XVI. 338–40. Eumaeus speaks as already directed, supplementing the Herald's news, and Penelope is silent. The Herald's speech is in the triplet Her—Euryym—Amphinomus (346–357, balancing 400–447).
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XVI. 456–7. Athena disguises Odysseus silently, but completes the final triplet [Ath]-Tel-Eumaeus (461–75). She had described her magic already (161–71).

XVII. 59. Penelope ἐκτεταμένη completing a triplet P-T-[P] (41–59).

XVII. 291–303. The dog Argus has the leading place in a triplet [A]-O-Eum. He could not speak, but he raised his head. The speech of Achilles’ horse, Xanthus, is the centre of a triplet ll XIX. 400–23.

XVII. 362–8. Here a whole triplet is speechless: Athena ἐγκυβεῖται (362): Odysseus goes begging ἀγητήσων (365), and the Suitors ἔκροντο (368). This stands between two larger compositions, the triptych of triplets (256–355, including Argus as above) and a composition of thirteen speeches (399–491) for the insult of Antinous.

XIX. 393–466. In the episode of the scar, the centrepiece is a sequence of nine speeches: central is Odysseus’ admission of the likeness seen by Eurykleia (383–5) followed immediately by her discovery, which has to be silent, but is explained by the long story of the boar hunt (392–466) between the two halves of the dialogue.

XX. 5–15. The escape of the bad women (5–15) is deliberately silent till Odysseus’ soliloquy (18–21).

XX. 240–3. The suitors (13) plot (ἱπτυκτον) without speeches, and are checked by the omen of Amphimomus (243–6): compare the end of the same scene, where they propose, as alternative, to drive Odysseus away (376–83) after the warning of Theoclymenus (337–75).

XXI. 11–41. The Bow is introduced without speeches, like Theoclymenus in XV. above.

XXI. 203. Eumaeus ἐπικινδύνετο in the same words as Philoctetus and does not affect the structure of the triplet: O-Ph[E]-O (193–241); but their wordless weeping (220–7) completes the quintet.

XXII. 408. Eurykleia’s ἄλογος is inarticulate; and in 498 ἐπιλείποντο ἐπιλείπον μῆθος, and no place is left for her to speak.

XXIII. 286–7. After Penelope’s last speech, Odysseus’ story of his wanderings is silent; it has already been told: compare V. 225–7 (Calypso); XII. 34–5 (Circe).

XXIV. 317. Laertes ἐπικεῖται ἐπικεῖται (350) is inarticulate; so also his transformation (370, ἐξωμοζέω) till Odysseus speaks (373–4).

These correspondences are too numerous to be accidental. They show that the balanced arrangement of the speeches throughout is also not accidental, but a structure upon which the narrative and descriptive passages are built up. The rare ‘speechless triplets’—Cicones (X. 44–7), Odysseus’ begging (XVII. 362–8)—give a glimpse of the way the poet worked, expanding or leaving in outline, as the poem grew. Like the conventional lines and half-lines, such a structure made it easier both to compose, and to remember, a long and elaborate story. That it has remained undetected so long, shows how completely the poet was master of his art. It is for each reader to judge how much of the literary charm of the Odyssey is due to this recurrent rhythm, like the recurrence of phrases and themes in a piece of music.

It is a further question, how far this rhythmical structure correlates the Odyssey with a cultural and historical setting. That it remained in use in the fifth century, is clear from its survival in the Histories of Herodotus—on which I hope to say something elsewhere—and in the stichomythiai of Aeschylus. In the same way, the ‘heraldic’ grouping of figures in earlier vase-decoration developed into the subtler rhythms of fifth-century painting and sculpture: the triptych-composition of the Marathon fresco in the Stoa Poikile, the pediments of Aegina, Olympia, and the Parthenon. And conversely, those earlier constructions in nascent Greek art are inherited from the abstract ‘geometric’ decoration of the Early Iron Age, which achieves balanced compositions even more elaborate than the five-fold and seven-fold schemes of speeches in the Odyssey. In a phase of culture where every banquet was furnished with geometrically decorated cups and bowls, there was no incongruity in a narrative-lay constructed with centrepieces and counterpart side-panels. Just so, there was no incongruity, but mutual harmony and inspiration between the engraved metal bowls of a rather later period, and the carved and inlaid Chest of Cypselus, the Hesiodic Shield of Heracles, the Homeric belt of Heracles in Hades (Od. XI. 604–605), or the Shield of Achilles itself (II. XVIII. 476–603).

[For these, see JHS LXVI. 122 (Cypselus); LXXI. 17–38 (Hesiodic Shield); Who were the Greeks (Berkeley 1930), 517–23 (Shield of Achilles); and for similar rhythms in the Iliad JHS]

It will be seen that the approximate date thus indicated for the *Odyssey* is rather earlier than those recently suggested by Rhys-Carpenter, *Folktale Fiction, and Saga in the Homeric Epics*, Berkeley 1946, and Mireaux *Les Poèmes homériques et l’histoire grecque*, I. 1948, on historical and archaeological grounds. But the survival of the rhythmical technique into the literature of the early fifth century makes the initial similarity between epic and geometric art an upper limit only. Graphic as the Homeric descriptions are, and close as some of the subjects are to those of Minoan frescoes and seal-engraving,—a topic with which I have dealt on another occasion (*BSA* XLV. 229–260)—a poem constructed like our *Odyssey* would have been quite incongruous at a Minoan festival, and could hardly have been conceived as a work of art before the climax of the geometric style, somewhere between the tenth and the eighth century. We are thus brought back once more, by a quite fresh route, to the traditional ‘date for Homer’ four hundred years before Herodotus.
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THE STRUCTURE OF THE ODYSSEY: MAIN COMPOSITION

A. TELEMACHUS SEEKING ODYSSEUS, I-V

A. Olympus: Zeus, prologue 32-43: Cf. epilogue XXIV. 472-87
  Athena 45-62: Zeus 64-79: Athena 81-95

B. Ithaca: Mentes: Telemachus (to Mentes) 123-4: Telemachus 157-77:
  Mentes (news) 179-212
  Telemachus 214-20: Mentes 222-9: Telemachus 231-51:
  Mentes (news) 253-305: Telemachus 307-13: Mentes 315-17
  The New Regime: Penelope 337-44: Telemachus 346-59
  Telemachus 368-80: Antinous 384-7: Tel 389-98: Eurymachus 400-11:
  Telemachus 413-19

  ∑[Telemachus 425: Eurycleia 429]

The Debate.
  Ἁγιπτίας 25-34: Telemachus 49-79
  Antinous 85-128: Telemachus 130-45
  ὁμην 146: Halitheres 161-76
  Eurymachus 178-207: Telemachus 209-23
  Mentor 229-41: Leocritus 243-55
  Tel 262-6: Ath (Mentor) 270-95
  Antinous 303-8
  Tel 310-20: τις 325-30: τις 332-6

The Departure for Pylos.
  Tel 346-60: Eurycleia 363-70: Tel 372-6
  [Eur: oath 377-8] 
  [Tel (Ath)] 382-87: Mentor (Ath) 402-4: Tel 410-12

  Peisistratus 43-50: Mentor 55-6: libration ⟨Tel⟩ 61
  Nestor 69-74: Telemachus 79-101
  Nestor (nostos) 103-200: Telemachus 202-9
  Nestor (Odysseus) 224: Tel 266-8: M 230: T 240
  Nestor (Agam. Men.) 254-312: continued
  Nestor (advice) 313-28: Mentor 331-6
  Nestor 346-56: Mentor 353-70: Nestor 375-84

Epilogue.
  Nestor 418-28: sacrifice: συκώντα 447, 450-70: Nestor (farewell) 475-6

  Telemachus 71-5: Menelaus (travels) 78-112: Helen 138-46
  Menelaus 147-54 (travels): Peisistratus 158-167
  Menelaus (invitation to Od) 169-82
  Menelaus 204-15 ← Peisistratus 190-202: food
  Telemachus 291-5 ← Menelaus 266-89 ← Helen 255-64 [bed-time]

  Menelaus (312-4): Tel 315-31 (troubles in Ithaca)
  Menelaus 333-92 (Proteus: news of Odysseus)
  Menelaus 611-19 (presents) ← Tel 594-605 (departure)

B'. Ithaca 623-847
  Prologue. Noemnon 632-7: Antinous 642-7: Noemnon 649-56
  [Antinous 663-56 (proposes ship)]
  Penelope 681-95: Medon 697-702: Penelope 707-10
  Medon 712-13 (hints at divine help)
  Penelope 762-6 ← Eurycleia 749-57 ← Pen 722-41
  [τις 770-1: Antinous 774-7 (prepares ship)]
  Athena 804-7: Penelope 814-23
  Athena 825-9 (promises help)

  Athena 836-7 ← Penelope 831-4
  [Suitors sail to Asteris 842]

A'. Olympus–Ogygia–Phaeacia:
  Olympus: Athena 7-20: Zeus 22-8: Zeus 29-42 (to Hermes)
  Ogygia. Calypso 87-91: Hermes 97-115: Calypso 117-44
  Hermes 146-7
  Phaeacia. Poseidon 286-90: Odysseus 299-312
  Leucothea 339-54
  Odysseus 356-64: Poseidon 377-9


  Bk. Vv.

  I 1-105
  II 106-323
  III 324-444
  II 260-434
  IV 1-295
  IV 312-610
  V 804-37
  V 1-54
  V 55-282
  V 283-379
  V 408-93
B. PHAEOACIA AND THE WANDERINGS, VI–XIII 197

Odysseus in Phaeacia VI, VII, VIII


| Odysseus 119–26 |


| Odysseus 218–22 |

N to maids 239–46: Nausicaa 235–315, τις 276–84

| Odysseus 324–7 (prayer) |


Palace. Odysseus (to Arete) 146–52 (asks escort)


Odysseus 331–3 (accepts escort) [maids 342 (bedtime)]

Games, Dances and Presents

Athena (Keryx) 11–14

Alcinous 26–45 (calls Demodocus)

Demodocus I 62–82

| Alcinous 97–113 (games) |

| Laodamas 133–9: Euryalus 141–2: Laodamas 145–51: |

| Odysseus 153–7: Euryalus 159–64 |

| Odysseus 166–85: Athena 195–8: Odysseus 202–33 |

Alcinous 236–55 (singing)

Demodocus II 266–366


| Apollo 335–7: Hermes 339–42 |


Alcinous ἐκθέεις 370 (dancing)

| Od 382–5 |

| Alcinous 387–97 (present)

Euryalus 401–5: Od 413–15

| Alcinous 424–32 (present) |


Demodocus III 499–520

| Alcinous 576–86 (asks for Od's story) [Wanderings of Odysseus IX–XII (v. below C)]

Departure: arrival in Ithaca XIII 1–164


Odysseus 59–61 (departure)

Olympus: Athena 128–38: Zeus 140–5

Poseidon 146–52: Ζεύς 154–8

Phaeacia: τις 168–9: Alcinous 172–83

C. THE WANDERINGS OF ODYSSEUS, IX–XII

Odysseus' story begins 1–38 (Ithaca, Troy, Circe, Calypso)

Cicones 39–61

To Cythera 62–81

Lotophagi 83–104

Cyclops: arrival 105: island 116: hunting 152:

| Odysseus (to shipmates) 172–6: wine 192–215: Cyclops comes 235–49 |

| shipmates: λάθος 224: Od οὐ πεπόθη 228 |

| Cyclops 252–5: Odysseus 259–71 (boasting) |

| Cyclops (no gods) 273–80: Odysseus 283–6 |

| Odysseus (wine) 347–52 |

| Cyclops 355–9: Od οὐπήκου 364–7: Cyclops 369–70 |

| Cyclopes 402–6: Cyclopes 408: Cyclopes 410–12 |

| Cyclops (ram) 447–60: Odysseus 475–9: Companion 494–9 |

| Odysseus (name) 502–5: Cyclops 501–2: Od 503–5 |

| Cyclops (to Poseidon) 527–35. |
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Æolus: arrival X. 1. 〈ἐξερέανεν 13: Od κατέλεξα 16〉
Æ. od. 6... ἀνήγκατο 18
Æolus 64–6: Odysseus 68–79: Æolus 71–5

Laestrygones: 〈composition in five speeches〉
〈προσέφωνεν 109: ἐπέφρασεν 111: ἔκλεις 114: τεῦχε βοήν 118: ἔκλειεσα 128〉

Æaea: Odysseus 174–7
Od 189: Polites 226–8: 〈Circe’s Magic〉 Eurylochus 251–60,
266–9: Od 271–3
Hermes 281–304: Circe 320: Circe 325–35
Od 337–44: 〈Circe’s oath〉 345–7
Cir 378–81: Od 383–7: Circe 401–5
Shipmates 419: Od 412–17: Eurylochus 432–7
shipmates 443–5: Circe 456–65
Shipmates 472–4
Od 483–6: Circe 488–95
Circe 504–40: Od 548–9 (to shipmates) 〈Elpenor 551–60〉
Odysseus to shipmates 562–5

Cimmeria: Odysseus 57–8: Elpenor 60–78: Od 80
Teiresias 92–6, 100–37: Od 139–44: Teir 146–9
Od 210–14: Ant 216–24: Od 239
〈Heroines〉 Enipeus (Tyro) 248–52
Od 355–61: Alc 369–76]

Cimmeria (continued) XI. 376–640
Odysseus 397–403: Agamemnon 405–34
Odysseus 436–9 (compares Helen and Clytaemnestra)
Agamemnon 441–61: Odysseus 464–5
Odysseus 553–62 (Aias)
〈Older Heroes 566–600〉 Heracles 615–26 〈Heroes 630–5〉

Æaea (continued) XII 1–453
Circe 21–7 〈Odysseus〉 ἐξερέανε 34–5: κατελέξα: Circe 37–110
Od 112–14: Circe 116–41

〈Scylla and Charybdis: no speeches〉 222–59: 〈249 ἔθεγγοντι 256: κελλήνωνται 21〉

〈έπορμάνον 303〉
〈νεκτοῦ 392〉
[Calypso] V 55–282

X 1–79
X 80–132
X 133–306
X 307–405
X 406–466
X 467–574

XI 1–351
XI 333–376
XI 376–465
XI 466–565

XII 1–150
XII 151–221
XII 222–373
D. ODYSSEUS RETURNS TO ITHACA AND MEETS EU MAEUS AND TELEMACHUS XIII-XVI

Phaeacia: epilogue and departure [see above B]
Odysses 228-35 (question): Athena (disguised) 237-49
Odysses (story) 256-86
(a) Odysses (repeats question) 312-28: Ath revealed 291-310
Athena (answer) 330-51: Od (prayer) 356-60: Ath 362-5
Athena 375-81: Odysses 383-9
Athena 393-415 (intention to disguise)
Odysses 417-9: Athena 421-8 (disguises Od)
Eumaeus 37-47: Odysses 53-4: Eumaeus 56-70
Eumaeus 85-108: Od 115-120 (offers news): Eumaeus (Penelope) 122-47
(b) Odysses (news) 149-64: Eum (Tele machus) 166-90: Od (story)
192-359
Eumaeus (rumours) 361-89: Od (wages) 391-400: Eum 402-8
Eumaeus 414-7: Odysses (grateful) 441-2
Eum (welcome) 443-5
Od (cloak) 462-506: Eumaeus 508-17
XIII 1-164

SPARTA AND PYLOS XV 1-300

Telemachus 54-6: Menelaus 68-85: Telemachus 89-91
Menelaus (blessing and gifts) 111-19
Helen 125-9: Menelaus 151-3: Telemachus 155-9
Omen 160-5: Omen 167-8: Helen 172-8: Telemachus 180-1
PYLOS. Telemachus 195-201: Peisistratus 209-14: Telemachus 218-19
Omen 233-55: Telemachus (enquiry) 260-4
Telemachus 266-70
Telemachus (request) 272-8: Telemachus 280-1
XV 1-300

THE RETURN OF TELEMACHUS; XV 301-XVI 481

(a) Odysses 307-24: Eumaeus 325-9: Odysses 341-50
Eumaeus (news of Laertes and Penelope)
Odysses 381-8: Eumaeus (his story) 390-484: Odysses 486-92
(b) Telemachus 503-7: Theoclymenus 509-21: Telemachus 513-24
Omen 525-8: Theoclymenus (interprets) 531-4
Telemachus 536-9: Telemachus (to P) 540-3: Peiraeus 545-6
(c) Odysses 8-10: Eumaeus 23-9: Tel 31-5: Eum 37-9: Tel 44-5
(d) Telemachus 57-9: Eumaeus 61-7: Telemachus 69-89
Odysses (indignant at the state of Ithaca) 91-111
Telemachus 113-34: Eumaeus 136-41: Telemachus 146-53
(e) Athena (transforms Od) 161-71, 173-6: Telemachus 181-5: Odysses (revealed) 187-9
Telemachus 194-200 (doubts): Odysses (convinces) 202-4: Telemachus 222-4
(f) Odysses (Phaeacia): Telem (suitors) 241-7: Odysses (Athena's help)
359-61
(e) Telemachus 263-5: Odysses (plan) 267-307: Tel 309-20
Herald (Medon) 337 (Eumaeus extens 338-40) (Penelope silent)
Eurymachus (plot) 346-50: Amphinomus (warning) 355-7
(β) Antinous 364-92 (plot)
Eurymachus 435-47 Penelope 417-33 Amphinomus (warning)
400-5
(d) Athena disguises Od 456-7: Telemachus 461-3: Eumaeus 465-75
XV 301-495

XV 56-159
XV 160-184
XV 185-210
XV 220-300
XVI 1-39
XVI 40-155
XVI 156-189
XVI 321-451
XVI 321-451
XVI 452-481
E. THE VENGEANCE OF ODYSSEUS XVII–XXIV

A. Telemachus 6–15: Odysseus 17–25 (arranging journey to Palace)
   Penelope 41–4: Telemachus 46–56 <Penelope prays 59> ἐνχείτο
   Peiraeus 75–6: Telemachus 78–83
   Penelope 101–6: Telemachus 108–49 (journey: reported speech of Menelaus 124–46)
   Theoclymenus 152–61 (prophecy): Penelope 163–5
   Medon (to suitors) 174–6
   (337)
   <Athena tells Odysseus to beg 360–68: suitors reply 365–7>
   δημος 362: εἶποντο 368
   (a) Melanthius 370–3
   Antinous 375–8: Eumaeus protest 381–91: Telemachus 793–5
   Telemachus 397–404: Antinous 406–8 (stool), 409
   Odysseus 415–44 (story)
   Antinous 446–52: Odysseus 454–7
   Suitors τις 483–7

B. Penelope 494: Eurynome 496–7: Penelope 499–504
   Penelope (invites Od) 508–11: Eumaeus 513–27: Tel 529–40
   Telemachus sneezes 541
   Penelope 544–50 (invites again): Eumaeus 553–9: Od 561–73
   Penelope 576–8: Eumaeus 580–4: Penelope 586–8
   [[wait]]
   Eumaeus 593–7: Telemachus 599–601: Eum (back home) 602–7

   Antinous 36–9
   (b) Antinous 43–9: Odysseus 82–7: Telemachus 61–5
   Amphinomus 122–3: Odysseus 125–50

   <Penelope 187–285 (after sleep) 201–5: she is beautiful herself (compensated) 290–303>
   Penelope 215–25: Telemachus 227–41
   Eurymachus 245–9
   Penelope 251–80: Antinous 284–9
   <gifts? (balancing 187–205), 290–303 (no speeches)>
   Odysseus 313–9: Melanthio 327–36: Odysseus 338–9

   Eurymachus (insult) 389–93
   (c) Suitors τις 401–4: Telemachus 406–9: Amphinomus 414–21

XVII 1–60
XVII 61–177
XVII 178–255
XVII 256–355
XVII 360–367
XVII 369–491
XVII 492–588
XVIII 1–65
XVIII 66–157
XVIII 158–345
XVIII 346–428
The Scar XIX

   Telemachus 27–8 (arms removed): Telemachus 36–40: Od 42–6
   (Athena present 33–4)
   Melantho 66–9: Odysseus 71–88: Penelope 91–5

D. Penelope (to Euryciea) 97–9: Odysseus 107–32: Penelope 124–63
   (shroud) Odysseus 165–202 (Cretan story)
   Odysseus 262–307 (news: prophecy of return)

   Eurycleia 363–81
   Odysseus 382–5 (scar) story 393–466
   Eurycleia 474–5 (recognises him)
   Odysseus 382–90: Eurycleia 493–8: Odysseus 500–2
   Penelope 509–33 (geese): Odysseus 535–8
   Penelope (bow) 560–81
   Odysseus 583–7: Penelope 589–99
   (maids XX 5–15)
   Odysseus (solioloquy) 18–21 (balanced by 376–83 Suitor)

Athena 33–5: Odysseus 37–43: Athena 45–53
   Penelope (prayer) 61–90: Odysseus 98–101 (thunder) 103: Woman
   112–19
   Telemachus 129–33: Euryciea 135–43: Eurycl (to maids) 149–56
   Eumaeus 166–7: Odysseus 169–71: Melanthius 176–82

   (Eumaeus ἔνοχος) 238–40
   (omen) 240–3: Amphinomus 245–6
   Telemachus 262–7: Antinous 271–4: Ctesippus 292–8
   (insult 299–302)

   (omen 345–50)
   Theoclymenus 351–7: Eurymachus 360–2: Theoclymenus 364–70
   Suitor τῆς 376–83 (send Od away) (balances Od 18–21)

The Bow XXI. <Description of the Bow 11–41> balances 404–24
   Penelope 48–79: Antinous 85–95: Telemachus 102–17 <Od
   ἀνίνες> (axes 120–3): Telemachus 131–5
   Antinous 141–2: Leipides 152–63: Antinous 168–75
   Antinous (to Melanthius) 176–80 <other suitors try the bow>
   Odysseus 193–8: Philoctetes 200–2 <Eumaeus 203>
   Odysseus 207–20 <Eum and Phil weep>
   Odysseus 275–84: Antinous 288–310: Penelope 312–19
   Eurymachus 344–57: Penelope 331–42
   Telemachus 344–53
   Suitor τῆς 362–5: Telemachus 369–75
   Eumaeus 381: τῆς 397–400: ἔλλος τῆς 402–30

<Zeus 413> Odysseus 420–30
THE KILLING OF THE SuitORS XXII

Odysses 5-7: Suitors τίς 27-30: Odysses 35-41
Eurymachus 43-59: Odysses 61-6: Eurymachus 70-8

Telemaeus 101-4: Odysses 106-7: Agelaus 132-4: Melanthius 136-41
Odysses 151-2
Telemaeus 154-9: Eumaeus 164-8: Odysses 170-7: Eumaeus 195-9
Odysses 262-4
Philocteus 287-91 | Leiothes 312-19: Odysses 221-5
Odysses (calls for Eurykleia) 341-2: Telemaeus 395-7
Odysses 411-18
Eurykleia 420-9: Odysses 431-2 <calls the women 465-73>
Od 437-48: Telemaeus 462-4 <women's death> 465-73 <Melanthius>
Odysses 481-4 (calls for Penelope): Eurykleia 486-9: Od 474-7, 491

XXII 1-88
XXII 189-200
XXII 201-271
XXII 272-380
XXII 381-477
XXII 478-501

PENELope recognises ODYsseeS XXIII

Eurykleia 5-9 (news): Penelope 11-24 (doubts): Eurykleia 26-31 (news)
Penelope (asks for more news) 35-8
Eurykleia 41-7 (news): Penelope 59-68 (doubts): Eurykleia (scar) 70-9
Penelope 80-4 (to hall): Tel 97-103: Pen 105-10 (tests): Od 113-22
(AGrees)
Telemachus 123-8 (forecast): Odysses 130-40: τίς 149-51
Odysses 166-72 (bed-test)
Penelope 174-80: Odysses 183-204: Penelope (accepts) 209-30
Odysses 248-55: Penelope 257-63: Odysses 264-84: Penelope 286-7
<Penelope; story of his Wanderings 300-43>
<Next day: Odysses and Telemaehus go out 343-72>

XXIII 1-79
XXIII 80-276

THe Suitors in HadeS XXIV 1-204

Achilles 24-34: Agamemnon 96-97 [ref. to Nestor 54-6]
Agamemnon 106-19: Amphimedon 121-90: Agamemnon 192-202
[ref. to Penelope 131-7]

XXIV 1-204

LaereTS XXIV 205-411

(a) Odysses (to servants) 214-18
(b) Odysses (to L) 224-79: Laertes 281-301: Odysses (story) 303-14
(c) Odysses (revealed) 321-6
Laertes 328-9
Odysses (scar, trees) 301-44
(b) Laertes (forecast) 351-5: Odysses 373-4: Laertes 376-82
(a) Odysses (to Dolius) 394-5: Dolius 400-5: Odysses 407

XXIV 214-218
XXIV 224-382
XXIV 386-411

The EnD oF the Feud XXIV 412-548

Odysses 491: Dolius 495: Od 506-9: Tel 511-12: Laertes 513-15
Athena 519 <Laertes kills Eupeithes 522-3> Ath 531-2:
<Zeus thunders 539-40> Athena 542-4

XXIV 412-515
XXIV 516-548

N.B.—In these tables each pedimental group of speeches has a separate line. The central item is in italics. Longer compositions are grouped under brackets before the reference to book and lines.

JOHN L. MYRES
THE PROGRESS OF GREEK EPIGRAPHY, 1948-9

The present bibliography, which relates to the years 1948 and 1949, follows the same general lines as its predecessors. Books and articles not accessible to me are marked by an asterisk. Once again I ask all scholars who have facilitated my task by sending me copies of their works to accept this expression of my heartfelt thanks.


I. GENERAL

My summary for 1945-7 appeared in JHS LXVII. 90 ff., and, so far as Egypt and Nubia are concerned, in JEA XXXIV. 109 ff. J. and L. Robert have issued two further invaluable 'Bulletins Épigraphiques', covering the period from 1946 to the early part of 1949, and two volumes of the Année Philologique of J. Marouzeau and J. Ernst deal with the publications of 1945-6 and 1947 respectively, while the Année Épigraphique, edited by A. Merlin, a further instalment has appeared in RA, aimed chiefly at overtaking arrears caused by the war. Of the Archäologische Bibliographie the volume for 1943, edited by P. Geissler, was issued in 1947, and a large number of epigraphical discoveries are reported in the Fasti Archaeologici for 1946 and 1947. Among bibliographies of the works of individual scholars I note those of C. Blinkenberg, C. Picard, J. Sundwall, M. N. Tod and W. Vollgraf.

No further instalments of the IG or the ICret have appeared, but J. Stroux gives a welcome assurance of the continuation of IG under the auspices of the Berlin Academy and the expert direction of G. Kleftchenbach. To L. Robert's Hellenica no fewer than four volumes have been added, the main contents of which will be briefly noticed in their appropriate places, and J. J. E. Hondius has edited vol. X of SEG (see below, p. 26).

The Oxford Classical Dictionary contains a short article on Greek Epigraphy by M. N. Tod, and one on the Greek Alphabet by J. W. Pirie; I do not know C. Ricci's essay on how to interpret an inscription. B. D. Meritt gives an account of the inscriptions copied by Francis Vernon in Greek lands in 1675-6. P. Amandry summarizes the damage sustained in the war by the epigraphical collections in Athens and Thessaly.

In the field of language and literature I note G. V. Vitucci's discussion of the Country Dionysia in Attica (below, p. 29). P. Friedländer, with the collaboration of H. B. Hoffleit, edits a collection of 250 Greek inscriptions in verse (of which forty-one, though once inscribed, have survived only in the literary tradition), arranged according to their metrical form, with a commentary which deals primarily with form, metre and literary affinities: the present volume covers the period prior to the Persian Wars and will be followed by three more, dealing with epigrams of the classical, Hellenistic and Roman Imperial periods. Vol. IV of Robert's Hellenica bears the sub-title 'Épigrammes du Bas-Empire'. M. Guarducci examines a couplet (Kaibel, Epigr. Graeca, 198) dwelling on the sadness of an early death, which occurs

---

1 Ob. 20.9.42; Бюллетен, XVIII, 466.
2 Ob. 25.1.43; REG LXII, 94.
3 Ob. 18.10.43; CRAL 1948, 539 ff., Num Chron 1949, Proc. 7.
4 Chron. d'Ég. XVII, 375, AJA LXIV, 194.
5 Ob. 15.6.44; Gronow, XXI, 277 ff.
6 Gronow, XVII, 214 f.
7 Bromme, Suppl. VIII, 213 ff.
8 Hist. Gl. CLXIX, 665 ff.
9 REG LXI, 137 ff., LXII, 92 ff.
11 RA XXVII, 180 ff.
13 C. Högg, C. Blinkenberg, 16 ff.; cf. REG LXII, 34.
14 Mil. Picard, ix ff.
15 Acta At., Ab. XV, 1 ff.
17 Studia varia C. G. Vollgraf obiata (Amsterdam, 1949), 179 ff.
21 Ibid. 39.
23 Historia, Suppl. VIII, 213 ff.
25 Dionysius, VII, 210 ff., 312 ff.
27 AJP LXXI, 118 ff.
with slight variations in many epigrams, and traces its origin to a certain Κεραλλάς μαντιέρης, probably a Cyprian. A. Wilhelm adduces epigraphical examples of the word ὑμαστί, which he substitutes for the unintelligible ἐν διωςκαρίᾳ of Lycurgus, Locor. 9, collects numerous illustrations of the use of a prepositional phrase in place of a simple genitive, and adds to Greek lexicography a number of words found in inscriptions. G. Risch surveys the scope and value of dialect-geography with reference to ancient Greece. G. Bjoerk, investigating the meaning of εἰς ἀπ' ἀλόνος, quotes the phrase πρῶτος τῶν ἀπ' ἀλόνος γυμνασιοργαντων from a dedication at Pachneunis (Sammelb. 176), and similar phrases are collected by M. N. Tod. Epigraphical evidence also enters into H. W. Parke's examination of the word ἔκκεντρος, and K. Latte's discussion of the political terms δημευνι, παραστατησία and δήσσασθαι is based almost wholly on their use in inscriptions.

Even more valuable are the contributions made by epigraphical studies to the political, military, social and economic history of the Greek and Greco-Roman world. Here I mention only works of a general character, leaving those which deal with specific localities to later sections of this review. H. Bengtson's admirable Einführung in die alte Geschichte contains a brief account of inscriptions as sources for ancient history (pp. 115 ff.) and a useful bibliography (pp. 123 ff.). Vol. II of M. N. Tod's Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions (GHI) comprises 108 texts, with historical commentary, ranging from 409 to 323 B.C., as well as the relevant portion of the Parian Marble. A. Aymard devotes two careful studies to the titulature of the Macedonian kings, whose official title, Βασιλεύς Μακεδόνων, implies a national royalty and is used to enhance the prestige of their position; he stresses the profound effect on Greek political ideas and speech caused by Alexander, who, though he did not create the idea of personal monarchy, carried it to its highest pitch. A third edition has appeared of H. Malcovati's collection of Augustus' works, and V. Ehrenberg and A. H. M. Jones have rendered a valuable service to students of ancient history by their selection of Documents illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius, excluding those relating to the administration of Egypt; of the 366 documents (inscriptions, coins, papyri, and a few passages from literature) here presented eighty-one are Greek or bilingual inscriptions. I call attention to J. H. Oliver's review of E. Groag's two works on the Imperial officials of Achaea (cf. JHS LXII. 53, LXVII. 92), which offers some addenda to Groag's lists, as well as valuable historical notes, based on inscriptions, on some of the officials in question. M. Launey's Recherches sur les armes hellénistiques draws largely on epigraphical materials. M. N. Tod contributes to the Oxford Classical Dictionary brief accounts of Greek interstate arbitration (pp. 77 ff.) and of Greek clubs and societies (pp. 204 ff.), both derived mainly from epigraphical sources, as is also an article in which he considers the record-breaking spirit of the Greeks and its clear verbal expression. G. Fohlen studies some professions (including those of professors, students, doctors, poets, actors, musicians and priests) recorded in Greek metrical epitaphs, and W. L. Westermann investigates the παρακλητη of munifications, which he regards as a 'general service contract'. H. I. Marrou's important work on ancient education draws largely on Greek inscriptions in its account of the Hellenistic period. L. Robert makes considerable additions to his collection of monumental evidence for gladiatorial contests in the Greek world. Many inscriptions, too, are cited in the third edition of J. J. Bachofen's Das Mutterrecht (see index, pp. 1168 ff.). In the field of economics I note S. J. de Laet's exhaustive work entitled Portorum, which pays special attention (pp. 336 ff.) to the customs-tariff of Palmyra (OGL 629), I. A. Meletopoulos' discussion of the transaction of πρῶτος ἐν ἀλοί, attested both by literature and by inscriptions, and M. N. Tod's article on the obol, following his previous discussions of the kollybos and the chalkous (cf. JHS LXVII. 92). In the sphere of chronology two notable contributions relate primarily to Attica and are mentioned.
below (p. 25). Greek inscriptions play a very minor part in F. de Visscher’s *Le régime romain de la noxalité*, 84 and a somewhat larger one in vol. II of R. Taubenschlag’s *The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri*, 85 which deals with political and administrative law.

Religion is an omnipresent element in Greek life, public and private, and our knowledge of the ancient world is immeasurably enriched by the light thrown by inscriptions on the religious beliefs and practices of the Greeks, as is illustrated on almost every page of this survey. F. Sokolowski examines 86 the nature of the Hellenistic ruler-cult, which, he argues, is not essentially an aberration of the religious sense due to Oriental influence, but a purely Hellenic recognition of the services rendered by the kings to the welfare of their subjects. In his posthumous work, *Lux perpetua*, 87 F. Cumont (to whom a tribute is paid 88 on pp. vii ff.) examines the Greek and Roman conceptions of ‘le grand mystère de l’au-delà’. R. Dussaud deals 89 with new occurrences in Phoenician texts of the god Hauron, identified in Egypt with Harmakhis, and comments on G. Posener’s view 90 that Hauron was the name given by Syrians under the New Empire to the Sphinx. J. Gray also discusses 61 this Semitic divinity, who makes his last appearance in Delian inscriptions as the god Aurora of Jamnia, seeing in him primarily a healing god akin to Asclepius and Eshmun. O. Eissfeldt compares 92 the monogram of Christ with a Phoenician emblem of Hermes.

From religion we pass to art and architecture. Inscriptions play a minor role 93 in G. Bovini’s account of Roman portraiture from Trebonianus Gallus to Probus, and an all-important one in J. Marcade’s fruitful investigations on various sites, undertaken in the preparation of a comprehensive work on Greek sculptors’ signatures; he deals 94 fully with the traces at Delos, Tánaagra and Oropus of the third-century Athenian bronze-caster Parthenocles, and publishes some results of his researches at Epidaurus and Delos (below, pp. 35, 43). R. Martin discusses the evidence for the fourth-century Athenian sculptor Praxias (below, p. 45), and M. Squarciapino’s work on the school of Aphrodisias opens 95 with a collection of the signatures of that city’s sculptors, found there or elsewhere. Epigraphical as well as architectural evidence, notably that from Delos, is reviewed in O. A. W. Dilke’s article 66 on the cavea of the Greek theatre, in which some technical terms are interpreted (pp. 150 ff.) and special attention is paid to the use of wooden seating (pp. 148 ff.) and to the provision of seats of honour (pp. 156 ff.). O. Weinreich’s detailed study of ‘Epigramm und Pantomimus’ includes 96 re-editions of three Greek epigrams, from Rome, Delphi and Cotiaeum respectively, of which the last two are of doubtful relevance. G. Townsend publishes 97 two fragments of tapestry of the fifth century A.D., now in the Boston Museum, bearing the names Δείανεις and Ἀρισίδης.

Following my usual practice, I refer briefly here to inscriptions on earthenware, excluding those appearing in works primarily concerned with ceramics and those mentioned below in their geographical context. K. Peters publishes 98 two Panathenaic amphorae in the Pelieus-Museum at Hildesheim, and D. Calabi calls attention 70 to another, discovered at Labranda. J. D. Beazley publishes 71 an Attic lekythos of ca. 470, showing a boy reading a scroll inscribed Ἐπιγρ. Ξέδος and discusses eight other representations on vases of inscribed scrolls; he also gives the first publication 72 of seven Panaetian fragments, of which all but one bear inscriptions, and discusses 73 the ‘Rosi krater’, an Attic r.f. bell-krater, once in Rome but now lost. A lost r.f. cup by Duris is the subject of a note 74 by M. Robertson, and the ‘Amasis potter’ of a brief comment 75 by R. M. Cook, while O. A. W. Dilke examines 76 a b.f. vase signed by Soplius, portraying a sixth-century stadium. To D. von Bothmer we owe a new account 77 of an Attic b.f. neck-amphora of 575–50 B.C., now in Boston, representing the armring of Achilles, to T. B. L. Webster a discussion 78 of an inscribed kalix-krater in New York, dating from the early fourth century and representing a scene from Attic comedy, and to P. E. Corbett an examination 79 of a r.f. bell-krater of the same period inscribed with the name Leonidas.
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84 Brussels, 1947. 
85 Warsaw, 1948; see index, 116. 
86 Ens. XLI. 180 ff. 
87 Paris, 1919. 
89 Syrinx, XXV. 168. 
90 JNE Studies, IV. 240 ff. 
91 JNE Studies, VIII. 87 ff. 
92 Id. XXIX. 312, 320. 
93 Milt. Picard, 688 ff. 
94 *La scuola di Afrodisia* (Rome, 1943), 1 ff.; cf. REG LXI. 194. 
95 BSA XLIII. 125 ff. 
96 SB Heidelberg, 1944–6 (1), 73 ff., 121 ff. 
98 JELXVII. 143 ff. 
100 JHS XXIV. 336 ff. 
101 Hesperia, Suppl. VIII. 3 ff. 
102 HS LXVI. 1 ff. 
103 HS LXVIII. 123 ff. 
104 BSA XXII. 131. 
106 CQ XI. 152. 
107 Hesperia, XVIII. 104 ff.
V. Grace devotes an interesting article 89 to standard pottery containers, their form and their stamps, estimating the number of stamped handles now in collections as approaching 100,000; she also describes 90 fourteen whole Rhodian jars, the largest collection known, once in the Metropolitan Museum, New York, now in the Ringling Museum of Art at Sarasota, Florida. A new amphora in the Museum of Fine Arts, Budapest, is published 88 by Z. Oroszlán. D. M. Robinson’s collection of Greek gems includes 83 three inscribed objects—a bronze ring from Boeotia (p. 316), a red sard gem from Athens (p. 322) and a gnostic amulet, also from Athens (pp. 322 ff.). C. Bonner publishes 84 a jasper pendant in the Brummer Gallery bearing an eight-lined inscription of the Ophite Gnostics, comments 85 on a magical amulet from the Athenian Agora (Hesperia, II. 475 ff.), and supplements 86 J. Keil’s recent publication (cf. JHS LXVII. 93) of a remarkable copper amulet, probably from S. Russia, now in Vienna. In an article on tomb-groups, probably of the fourth century a.d., from Tyre and Galilee, D. B. Harden publishes 87 a Roman glass bowl from Syria or Palestine, now in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.

The second, greatly enlarged, edition 88 of A. D. Trendall’s Handbook to the Nicholson Museum in Sydney (cf. JHS LXVII. 95) remains practically unchanged so far as Greek inscriptions are concerned.

Two works of outstanding importance deal with the origin and development of the alphabet. D. Diringer’s The Alphabet, 89 of which a second edition has already been called for, has an even wider scope than the title suggests, for its first eleven chapters deal with non-alphabetic systems of writing, including among others the cuneiform, hieroglyphic, Minoan, Hittite, syllabic and quasi-alphabetic scripts, while the last ten chapters discuss, inter alia, the origin of the alphabet, the South Semitic and Canaanite alphabets, the Greek alphabet with its offshoots, the Etruscan, Italic and Latin alphabets. G. R. Driver’s invaluable Semitic Writing from Pictograph to Alphabet 90 deals in its three main sections with (a) the cuneiform scripts, (b) alphabetic writing, and (c) the origin of the alphabet, with special reference to Phoenicia, Sinai and Egypt, the South Semitic and Ugaritic alphabets, the Greek alphabet (pp. 171 ff.), the names, forms and order of the letters, and the time and place of the invention of alphabetic writing. A. C. Moorhouse’s Writing and the Alphabet (London, 1946) I have not seen.

R. Dussaud criticizes 91 M. Dunand’s views, expressed in his Byblica Grammata, 92 on the history of the Phoenician script, claiming that ‘les scribes gibeltes méritent certainement qu’on leur attribue l’invention de l’alphabet’ (p. 59), and is answered 93 by Dunand. Other valuable work has been done in the study of the Greek alphabet in particular. M. Falkner deals 94 with the early history of the Greek script, a subject discussed 95 also by R. Harder, who regards the Phoenician alphabet as having been taken over as a whole by the Greeks about the beginning of the first millennium B.C., and R. M. Cook’s account of Ionia and Greece from 800 to 600 B.C. deals 96 briefly with the Ionian alphabet. R. Carpenter restates, 97 summarily but forcefully, his view of the derivation of the Greek alphabet from the Phoenician in the second half of the eighth century B.C. Harder also examines 98 in detail Greek stoichedon writing, which he renames ‘Rottenschrift’, and C. Wendel makes some use of inscriptions in his work Die griechisch-römische Buchbeschriftung, 99 which has a long note (p. 133) on the origin of the Phoenician alphabet and a description (pp. 18 ff.) of the earliest Greek libraries.

L. H. Jeffery has made careful studies of the Corinthian iota 100 and the Cretan letter φ. 101

In the forefront of those who have contributed to the study of the Minoan scripts are J. L. Myres and J. Sundwall. The former criticizes 102 the method and conclusions of B. Hrozny’s two articles (cf. JHS LXVII. 95), 103 and himself suggests 104 an arrangement of

88 Hesperia, Suppl. VIII. 175 ff.; cf. AJA LII. 381.
89 Hesperia, XVII. 144 ff.; cf. REG LXII. 94.
90 Arch. Études, VII-IX. 133 ff.
91 Hesperia, Suppl. VIII. 305 ff.; cf. Ibid. 43 ff.
92 Ibid., 43 ff.
93 Ibid. LIII. 270 ff.
94 Trau, XVI. 156 ff.
95 Sydney, 1948.
98 Syria, XXV. 36 ff.
99 Beyrouth, 1945.
100 Syria, XXVI. 127 ff.
102 H. Berve, Das neue Bild der Antike, I (1942), 91 ff.
103 JHS LXVI. 89 ff.
104 Folk Tale, Fiction, and Saga in the Homeric Epics, 9 ff.
105 JdL LXVIII. 93 ff.
106 Hale, 1949.
107 BSA XLIII. 201 ff.
108 Kopt. Xrop. III. 143 ff.
109 AJA LII. 104 ff.
110 For a French translation see AJA LIV. 81 ff.
111 JHS LXVI. 1 ff., 129; cf. AJA LIV. 77.
the signs of the linear scripts A and B based on their forms and origins in place of Hrozný’s system, which follows the alphabetical order of the phonetic equivalents which he attributes to the several signs; Myres also publishes a boustrophedon hieroglyphic inscription on an eight-sided Minoan sealstone in the Ashmolean Museum. Sundwall discusses further the tablets by Hagia Triada and the ‘throne- and sceptre-sign’ on the Cnosian and Pylian tablets, and attempts to determine the sounds of certain signs of Linear B. A noteworthy article by A. E. Kober summarizes the present state of our knowledge of the Minoan scripts (pictographic, linear, mainland and Cypro-Minoan), indicating necessary corrections and supplements and briefly stating the chief theories advanced; the conclusion reached is that any discussion of the possibility of ultimate decipherment is premature. T. B. Jones assigns sound-values to a number of signs on the basis of his belief that the characters of Linear B which agree in form with characters of the Cypriote syllabary have the same phonetic values in both, and suggests a method of determining the sounds of other Minoan signs. N. Platon reviews G. P. Carratelli’s work (cf. JHS LXVII. 95) and also two contributions of Kristopoulos to the solution of the problem, and S. Marinatos discusses at some length Hrozný’s theories and results. E. Peruzzi deals with some incomplete groups from Hagia Triada, and examines the phonetic values of certain Minoan linear signs in an article in which he refers to a fuller treatment in his Aportaciones a la interpretacion de los textos minoicos. W. T. M. Forbes reads, on the basis of the Cyprian syllabary, the Cretan linear inscription on a vase from Eleusis dating from the thirteenth century B.C., in which he discovers a Greek text. E. Scherbel attempts to solve the fascinating riddle of the Phaestos disk, F. Chapouthier publishes a clay ‘roundel’ from Mallia inscribed in Linear A, A. Xenaki draws attention to sixteen tablets, probably from Cnosus, in the Giamalakis Collection, inscribed in Linear B, and surveys of a more general nature and wider scope are contributed by G. D. Kristopoulos on L’énigme minoenne, G. Klaffenbach on Schriftprobleme der Ägäis, and G. E. Mylonas on Prehistoric Greek Scripts. Two articles, entitled ‘O δίόκος τῆς Φαιστοῦ καὶ Παραμερίσεως τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς μυκηνικῆς γλώσσας, have been submitted in 1947 and 1948 by Kristopoulos to the Athenian Academy, but are not yet, so far as I know, published.

A new interpretation of the early alphabetic inscriptions from Serabit in the Sinaiic peninsula is proposed by W. F. Albright in the light of the researches of the American expedition which recently investigated the site.

II. ATTICA

H. A. Thompson reports on the epigraphical results of the American excavation of the Agora in 1947 and 1948; in the former year 120 new inscriptions were unearthed, bringing the grand total to 6079, in the latter 35, including some of especial interest. The work of publication proceeds with commendable promptitude and consummate ability, notably in B. D. Meritt’s article comprising sixty-four texts, which, with one added by A. G. Woodhead, are usefully indexed (pp. 61 ff.). D. M. Robinson publishes a summary of a lecture dealing with some recently discovered Attic sculptures and inscriptions. B. D. Theophanides gives a brief account of numerous inscribed objects of marble, bronze and earthenware, mostly from Attica, added to the National Museum at Athens in 1930–32, some of which had already been reported, and elsewhere also we learn of recent acquisitions of the National, Epigraphical, Acropolis and Piraeus Museums. In a welcome second edition of J. Kirchner’s Imagines Inscriptionum Atticarum G. Klaffenbach leaves the selection practically...
unadulterated (no. 11 is added and the former no. 123 omitted), but adjusts the order in accordance with chronological requirements and makes important bibliographical additions. To H. Pope we owe a useful, though admittedly incomplete, list of foreigners named in Attic inscriptions, arranged under 241 ethnic; each entry is accompanied by reference and, so far as possible, by date. In an article on the Altar of the Twelve Gods M. Crosby examines the epigraphical evidence for their cult,—IG I 3. 310. 64, II 3. 2640 (which she assigns to the fifth century), II 3. 30, 112, 114, 2790, 4564, 5065. N. I. Pantazopoulos deals in the light of recent discoveries, with the sources for the Attic law of corporations, summing up his findings in the political, social and religious spheres, and W. S. Ferguson adds three supplements to his essay on the Attic orche (Hvov. Theol. Rev. XXXVII. 51 ff.). A work of outstanding importance for chronology is that of W. K. Pritchett and O. Neugebauer, The Calendars of Athens, in which, starting from the investigation of double dates, the authors maintain the correctness of Aristotle's statement (Athv. XLIII. 2) about the rigidity of the pyrany-calendar, and that not only for his own day, but throughout the fifth, fourth and third centuries; after stating the facts and problems of the Attic calendar (ch. I), they deal successively with the periods of the ten, twelve and thirteen tribes (ch. II-V), ending with an examination of the fifth-century pyrany-calendar (ch. VI). A list of inscriptions cited (pp. 111 ff.) indicates by an asterisk those in which a new reading or restoration is proposed. Pritchett also discusses the evidence for dates preserved in terms of the Athenian calendar and of some other local calendar, and studies the history of the particular schematic lunar calendar which has come to be associated with the Athenian civil calendar (p. 235), referring to W. B. Dinsmoor's tables (*PAPS LXXX. 95 ff.) for equating Julian dates with days in the Athenian civil calendar from the time of Solon to 100 B.C.

[IG I 3.] The number of ostraca used in fifth-century διατηροποιεί youth rapidly; all will be published shortly by E. Vanderpool, A. E. Raubitschek and R. S. Young. In an interesting survey Raubitschek gives their total number as 1502, of which 1280 are from American excavations; no fewer than 535 bear the name of Themistocles. Vanderpool devotes an article to some ostraca naming twenty-two men almost or wholly unknown, examines (pp. 405 ff.) a group of sherds bearing names but probably not of the same nature, and gives (pp. 408 ff.) a list of the names and numbers of political ostraca known by the close of 1946. In 1947 further 524 came to light in the valley between the Acropolis and the Hill of the Nymphs, including a single group of 491. Special interest is evoked by the abusive metrical inscription on a sherd given against Xanthippus, Pericles' father; this is discussed by Raubitschek, O. Bronner, E. Schweigert, each of whom seeks to determine the sense of the puzzling terms ὀλειτυς and πρώτανευ or πρώτανευ. Among recent ceramic finds H. R. Immerwahr publishes a r.f. cup by Duris showing a wine-cellar and inscribed πρικόλος (referring to price rather than to capacity) together with the inscriptions on a small r.f. kylix attributed to Duris, now in the Fogg Museum, and M. T. Mitsos two sixth-century sherds found near the Olympieum, one of which records the visit of a Cyzicene.

New inscriptions are few in number and mostly of moderate interest. L. H. Jeffery publishes thirty-two fragments belonging probably to two closely related documents of ca. 510-480 B.C., regulating offerings made in the City Eleusinion; twenty-eight of these, all very fragmentary, were found in the Agora excavations, and three others are IG I 3. 838-9 (here re-edited on pp. 95 ff.) and I 512. The history of Athenian sacred law is traced back (pp. 106 ff.) from 399 to the time before the Persian sack of Athens, through three periods represented respectively by (a) IG I 3. 845, II 3. 13576, b, and Agora fragments, (b) IG I 3. 843-4 and Agora fragments, and (c) IG I 3. 849, 842. B. D. Meritt edits three fragments, one of a sixth-century metrical epithet, the second of a fifth-century votive, the third of a sculptor's signature of ca. 493 B.C., and M. Lang a drum-shaped t.c. well-head, also from the Agora, with a
sixth-century graffito ις[θ]μουν πρεατς[τ]ς[05] and the name Εὐκλέας. D. M. Robinson publishes 149 two inscriptions of ca. 525 B.C. found in the deme Icaria, one a grave-epigram and the other a dedication to Dionysus and Pythian Apollo. A late fifth-century grave-stele from Athens bears 149 the name Ἡφαιστίς Χῖσ.

Vol. X of the SEG,184 edited by J. J. E. Hondius with the collaboration of A. E. Raubitschek, deals with 493 Attic inscriptions prior to 403 B.C., recording fresh discoveries made since 1928, together with additions and corrections (some of them otherwise unpublished) to previously known texts. From it are excluded votive inscriptions from the Acropolis, which, to the number of 393, receive an exhaustive and superbly illustrated publication 148 from Raubitschek with the assistance of L. H. Jeffery. Another work of the first importance is Athenian Tribute Lists, II,153 by B. D. Meritt, H. T. Wade-Gery and M. F. McGregor, who bring up to date the materials comprised in vol. I, published in 1939, re-editing the texts of the quota- and assessment-lists, together with twenty-five relevant decrees (D 1–25), including five (D 12, 13, 20, 24, 25) derived from literature or papyri, and greatly increasing the testimonia. Special attention is paid (pp. 61 ff.) to the decree (D 14) imposing upon the Athenian allies a uniform system of weights, measures and coinage, the terms of which are carefully scrutinized in an article 154 by E. S. G. Robinson, who approaches the question from the numismatic standpoint. In an interesting note 155 on the prokrenia as an instrument of Athenian imperialism and the corporate responsibility of allied cities for the death of Athenian citizens or πρόξενου, R. Meiggs examines IG I2, 27, 28 and 56, proposing a new restoration of 27. 16 f.

Besides the inscriptions already mentioned, the following have received special notice; I denote them by the numbers they bear in IG I2, adding in brackets those of SEG X.

1 (SEG 1). M. Guarducci accepts 156 in general Meritt’s text of the Salaminian Decree (cf. JHS LXV. 66), but restores [κεραίσσον] in l. 1, and [καὶ τε]θανεν, καθάπερ in l. 2; she dates the decree between 508 and 500 B.C.

19, 20 (SEG 7, 68). A. G. Woodhead gives 157 a revised text of the Athenian alliance with Egesta, accepting Raubitschek’s assignment to 458–7 B.C. (cf. JHS LXVII. 97), and re-edits 20, in which he sees a treaty of ca. 433–2 between Athens and Halicarnassus on the same terms as that concluded with Egesta.

26 (SEG 18). B. D. Meritt offers 158 a new reading and restoration of this alliance with [τοῖς μετέχοις τῆς] Πυλαῖος ἤπαινει, dating it ca. 458 B.C.

54 (SEG 47). A. Wilhelm restores 159 ll. 6–12 of this decree relative to public works.

66 (SEG 31). W. P. Wallace, arguing that Athens had no public seal until just before the middle of the fourth century, examines 160 the evidence of ll. 11–18 of the Decree of Clinias.

70 (SEG 84). Meritt defends 161 his treatment of this proxeny-decree against the criticism 162 of J. and L. Robert.

76 (SEG 110). E. Will seeks 163 to show that ll. 1–46 of the Eleusinian Decree were passed in 448 as part of Pericles’ plan for the maintenance of the League, that after the Peace of Nicias Athens took steps, on Lampon’s motion, to restore the status quo ante and settle the calendar, and that the old text about ἄρχων was added to this ensemble and published in full.

92 (SEG 45). Wilhelm suggests 164 new restorations in ll. 3–11 of the second Decree of Callias in place of those adopted by Wade-Gery and Meritt (Hesperia, XVI. 283 f).

95. A. G. Woodhead proposes 165 a restoration of this decree which, if correct, rules out any date prior to the spring of 416 for the ostracism of Hyperbolus.

113 (SEG 127). E. Gjerstad comments 166 on this decree in his account of the history of Cyprus in the classical period.

120 (SEG 133). Meritt re-edits 167 this fragmentary decree of 408–7 B.C.

---

149 *Hesperia*, XVII. 143 f.
150 BCH LXXI–II. 389.
151 Leyden, 1949.
154 *Hesperia*, Suppl. VIII. 320 ff.
155 CR LXIII. 9 ff.
157 *Hesperia*, XVII. 58 ff.; cf. REG LXIII. 103 f.
158 AJP LXIX. 312 ff.; cf. CR LXII. 102.
159 JHS LXVII. 128 f.
160 Phoenix, III. 70 ff.
161 AJP LXIX. 71 f.
162 REG LXVII. 186, 192; cf. LXII. 105.
163 REG LXII. 1 ff.; cf. LXII. 102 f.
164 JHS LXVIII. 124 f.
165 *Hesperia*, XVIII. 78 ff.
166 *SCE IV* (2). 491.
167 AJP LXIX. 70 f.; cf. REG LXII. 104 f.
146. Woodhead revises 168 the text of this proxeny-decree, dating it ca. 411–10 B.C. and referring it to a citizen of Chalcis rather than of Chaleum.

166 (SEG 96). Meritt calls attention 169 to the chronological implications of Wilhelm’s revision of this fragment (cf. JHS LXV. 68).

191 ff. (SEG 146 ff.). He adds 170 a fragment to quota-list 33 (now known to be really 37) of 418–7 B.C.

313 (SEG 213). He reaffirms 171 his restoration of ll. 173–9, but now regards Dorotheus as secretary of the σουλή, not of the ταυκία.

324 (SEG 227). Pritchett and Neugebauer examine 172 these accounts as evidence for the fifth-century ptyany-calendar, revising the text of ll. 21–2, 24, 27–46, 58–9.

330 (SEG 241). Meritt adds 173 a new fragment to Hesperia, III. 47 f., which forms part of this sale-list of the property of the Hermocopiade.

372 (SEG 268, 270). In a posthumous article, edited by L. B. Holland, P. H. Davis discusses 174 the Erechtheum building-record and proposes a restoration of 372 F.

761 (SEG 318). In an article on the Altar of the Twelve Gods M. Crosby comments 175 on the votive epigram on the altar of the younger Pisistratus, which figures 176 also among T. J. Cadoux’s testimonia for the early Attic archons (see below, SEG 352).

838–40, 842–5 (SEG 346–8). For L. H. Jeffery’s treatment of these fasti sacri see above (p. 25), as also for IG I1, 529, omitted from IG I2.

879 (SEG 368a), 880. These stones are discussed 177 by O. A. W. Dilke in his essay on the cavea of the Greek theatre.

923 (SEG 400a). A. A. Papagiannopoulos-Palaios deals 178 with this text in connexion with the sanctuary of Μήτηρ (below, p. 31).

941 (SEG 412). Meritt re-edits 179 this casualty-list of ca. 450 B.C.

SEG 38. F. Sokolowski discusses 180 the lex sacra from Panaea, agreeing with Peek’s interpretation of τεῖδε as a local adverb, explaining the appearance of the priestess of Hecate, and claiming that the festivals named in the lex were public and of special interest to the authorities of the dene.

SEG 64. In a supplement to his essay on the Attic orgeons (cf. JHS LXV. 61) W. S. Ferguson deals 181 in detail with the decree relative to the cult of Bendis, of which he offers a restored text.

SEG 319. M. Crosby’s article on the Altar of the Twelve Gods includes 182 an examination of Leagros’ dedication to them.

SEG 352. She also deals 183 with the archon-list, assigning 522–1 to Pisistratus: the list is also carefully considered 184 in T. J. Cadoux’s valuable work on the archons from 682 to 481 B.C.

SEG 461. E. Vanderpool, G. P. Stevens and D. M. Robinson re-edit 185 the epigram of the warrior Croesus (cf. JHS LXVII. 96), found at Keratea, date it ca. 540, and discuss its connexion with the Anavysos kouros and that in the Metropolitan Museum, New York.

SEG 493. G. D. Androudiopoulos reports 186 the discovery at Marathon of this archaic epitaph.

[IG II2.] Of new inscriptions from the Agora later than 403 B.C. several call for special mention. A. G. Woodhead edits 187 a mutilated decree of ca. 394 granting ἀριστεία and ἀνεξασκεία to some Ialysians and referring to a stele destroyed ἐν τούτῳ τρίκοκκος. W. S. Ferguson deals 188 fully with a fragmentary decree of the tribe Acadimis, which he restores, dates in the spring of 302 and interprets as relating to Demetrius Poliorcetes, the σινεμαδρόν of the Hellenic League, and the discharge of Athenian soldiers who had fought in the Peloponnesian campaign; J. and L. Robert, while accepting the reference to Demetrius (whose name is not preserved)
and the date, criticize 189 Ferguson's method and conclusions, and propose a different restoration, especially in l. 9–13, which gets rid of the συνέδριον and the release of Greek troops by special concession of the ruler. B. D. Meritt edicts 190 a decree of the year of Cydenor (244–3), honouring the στέφανος of Diomedon's archonship (247–6), which is chronologically valuable as giving the name and deme of the secretary of Cydenor’s year, and so leading to a revision (p. 13) of the archon-list for 247–6 to 242–1 B.C. In the light of this discovery Meritt restores (p. 4) the preamble of a decree 191 passed on the same day, dates Hesperia, VII. 115, in 244–3, not in 232–1, and shows that this is the preamble of IG II2, 766, to which he also assigns Hesperia, XVI. 158 f., and an unpublished fragment; we thus get (pp. 5 ff.) a far fuller text of this ephic decree. Two alternative restorations of a mutilated decree 192 of Philonous’ year (246–5) are offered (pp. 7 ff.), and an apparent confusion in the secretary-cycle is avoided by reading ἀνευκρίνεισ in place of ἀνευκρίνεισ as the secretary's demotic. W. K. Pritchett publishes 193 a list of the εφημεριν of the tribe Oineis, which he dates ca. 330 B.C., H. A. Thompson 194 the inscribed base of a statue of the philosopher Carneades erected in the Stoa of Attalus by two of his pupils, Attalus and Ariarathes, subsequently Kings of Pergamum and Cappadocia respectively, who call themselves simply demesmen of Sypaletus, and A. E. Rauhetschek 195 the base of a herm from the Eleusinion by which Apollus Saphoëed honoured the Epicurean Phaedrus, τοῦ καυτοῦ [καταφεγγήσαν]. Meritt also publishes 196 for the first time portions of eleven decrees (nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, 7–10, 12–14; no. 9 is specially noteworthy), a mutilated treasure-list (no. 16), three boundary-stones (nos. 18, 20, 21; 18, of ca. 400 B.C.), reads [ἱερόν] Καρπίδιος Γεωργιάκης [φραίστας], a sculptor's signature (no. 27), nine honorary or votive inscriptions (nos. 29–34, 31–35, in 29 197 οἱ εὐπρέπειοι honour Antipater, στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἐφημερίου οὗτος ἐπιτέλεσε καὶ προσκοπήκατο τα τής τῶν ἐμπρόσθεν ἀσφαλείας καὶ κολικάς], and twenty-six epitaphs (nos. 38–49, 51–64); he also corrects or restores known texts in the light of new evidence and adds fresh fragments to several published stones (see below), and edits 198 a tomb-epigram copied at Athens by Sir George Wheler.

N. M. Verdelis publishes 199 two interesting documents found in 1942 in the Roman Agora,—a letter written after July, A.D. 201, by Septimius Severus and Caracalla to the Πανελλήνιον on learning from the archon that some athletes τοῦ ἀγώνος καταφεγγόμενος πάρκετέλεσαν τὰς Ἀθήνας, and the title on a statue-base of Trajan, erected between 97 and 102 by Claudius Atticus as high-priest. E. Vanderpool, tracing Pausanias' route in the Agora, gives 200 the edition princeps of an inscription, cut on a bastion of the Acropolis, which helps to identify the Panathenaic Road. To M. T. Mitsos 201 we owe our knowledge of a number of ceramic inscriptions, a grave-stele, a columnella, a fragment of a fourth-century inventory, and a leaden weight, all found in excavations S. of the Olympicum, as also of two epitaphs (nos. 15, 21) and a tantalizing fragment (no. 22) of a stele inscribed ἀπανθρώπῳ την - - - - ὑπὸ τοῦ (cf. IG II2, 4215) in the Epigraphical Museum; he also publishes 202 for the first time an honorary inscription (no. 26) and two epitaphs (nos. 25, 30) in the same Museum, and ten epitaphs from various Athenian sites, T. A. Arvanitopoulos 203 three metrical epitaphs engraved on one stele and a grave-columnella, and A. A. Papagianopoulos-Palaios 204 a similar columnella and a bronze juror's ticket in the Stathatou collection. From Attica come also a tomb-relief in the possession of the Marquess of Londonderry, described 205 by H. Clifford Smith, and a marble throne at Broomhall, Scotland, which, G. Seltman suggests, 206 may have been made for Demetrius Poliorcetes on the occasion of the Pythia of 290 B.C. D. M. Robinson publishes several discoveries made in various parts of Attica,—a relief 207 of 400–350 B.C., found at Cynosarges and now in the Agora Museum, bearing a dedication to Heracles, two fourth-century grave-stones 208 from Paeania (Liopisi), a decree 209 of the deme Icaria honouring its demarch, a fourth-century epitaph 210 from Keratea, confirming the location of Cephalia, and three

---

189 Hesperia, XVII. 105 ff.
190 Hesperia, XVIII. 3 ff.; cf. REG LXII. 105 f., JHS LXVII. 36, BCH LXIII-IV. 432.
191 Pritchett-Meritt, Chronology of Hellenistic Athens, 33 ff.
192 Ibid. 32.
193 Hesperia, Suppl. VIII. 273 ff.
194 Archaeologia, II. 190.
195 Hesperia, XIX. 101 f.
196 Hesperia, XVII. 11 ff.; cf. REG LXII. 105 ff.
197 Ibid. 289.
198 BCH LXII-III. 39 f.; cf. REG LXII. 114.
199 Hesperia, XVIII. 133 ff.
200 Hesperia, XVI. 262 ff.; cf. REG LXII. 107 f., AJAL III. 380.
201 Ibid. 76 ff.
203 Ibid. 4215.
204 Hesperia, XVII. 137 ff.; cf. P.M. III. F, IV. 32 f.
205 AJAL LI. 386 ff., LII. 452 f., cf. REG LXII. 115.
206 Hesperia, XVII. 144 ff.; cf. REG LXII. 116.
207 Hesperia, Suppl. VIII. 363 n. 4.
mortgage-stones of the same century found near Sunium, at Anavyssos and at Vari respectively, of which two are in the Agora Museum. N. C. Kotzias edits the latter part of an honorary decree set up in the precinct of Dionysus at Gargratus and a fourth-century dedication and a grave-stele from Lamptrae (Koropi). D. Pallas reports a fragmentary Christian inscription from Salamis, M. T. Mitsos an epitaph from Brauron, and G. D. Androuiosopoulos a mortgage-record from Marathon, while at Rhamnus new discoveries have been made which still await publication.

B. D. Meritt reports on the copies of Attic inscriptions made by F. Vernon in 1675 and 1676; these include nine new texts (pp. 216 ff.), of which no. 8 is an epigram on the base of a kourotrophos erected by his sons, and better copies of IG II². 1967, 3136, 3507, 3531, 6239, and, above all, 1100, which Meritt re-edits in full (pp. 221 ff.). J. Hevelius' copies of Athenian inscriptions (p. 227), one of which is apparently new, are of little value.

Marked progress has been made in the reading, restoration and interpretation of texts previously known, to some of which new fragments have been added. M. T. Mitsos joins 2101 + 2105, 2014 + 2144, 2212 + 2134, 2206 + 2146 ( = 2266), and adds one or more fresh fragments to 2120 (from which he excludes frs. g and n), 2177, 2206 + 2146, and corrects or annotates 5325, 5736, 5787, 5099, 6132, 6154, 6513, 7365, 8137, 8826, 9528a, 9552, 10161a, 10612, 10867, 11167a, 12404, and 12912. As evidence for the cult of the Twelve Gods M. Crosby cites IG II². 30, 112, 114, 2790 and 4564, all of the first half of the fourth century, and 2640, which probably dates from the fifth; a seat in the Theatre was reserved for the teirpeis dôskexa themô. A. Wilhelm examines the evidence for Dionysus 'Eleusinês in II². 3182, 5022, and restores the epigraph in 223. 7 and 410. 39. G. V. Vitucci discusses the evidence, archaeological, literary and epigraphical, for the Country Dionysia, arguing that dramatic contests flourished in the demes independently of the City festivals; he studies the relevant inscriptions for the ten demes where such contests are attested, especially II². 1008, 1011, 1186, 1198, 1200, 1210, 1227, 3024, 3092-3, 3095-8, 3100-1, 3103-4 and 3106-9. In a discussion of the prooëmia in the Athenian Theatre O. A. W. Dilke deals with inscriptions of the fifth and later centuries indicating the occupants of certain seats or blocks. J. H. Oliver reconstructs the stemma of two interrelated Athenian families, the Statii of Chollidae (for whom our main evidence is II². 3704) and the Flavii Glauci of Marathon, paying special attention to two poets, Sarapion (a Stoiic friend of Plutarch) and T. Flavius Glaucus III, philosopher, rhetor and poet, who flourished a.d. 235-65; the former was the author of the carmen de officiis medici moralibus, here (pp. 245 ff.) re-edited with an added fragment, and the inscription on the front of the Sarapion Monument (II². 3796 + 3631), here (p. 243) revised, while to the latter Oliver assigns (pp. 248 ff.) II². 3632, 3661-2, 3709, and perhaps 3816.

J. Travlos discusses the topography of Eleusis, and in particular of its gates, in the light of a fourth-century inscription (Kourouniotes, 'Eleusinês, I. 189 ff.). O. W. Reinmuth's detailed study of the relationship of ephebate to citizenship in Attica rests almost wholly on the evidence supplied by ephbic inscriptions. J. H. Oliver examines the appearance in inscriptions of patrons who in the Roman period gave financial aid to Athenian tribes: the earliest case is that of Tiberius Claudius Atticus and Vibullia Alcina ca. a.d. 120 (II². 1073-4 = Dow, Prytanis, 121), and II². 3597 gives further examples. Oliver draws up a list (p. 304) of tribal epônômas known from a.d. 138 to ca. 240. J. A. Notopoulos publishes epigraphical notes on (a) tribal affiliations of foreigners in ephbic lists, (b) names ending in -tôs and -tê, (c) the rarity of alphabetical order in name-lists, and (d) alphabetic numeral signs; the first of these is criticized by Reinmuth. In a valuable review of E. Groog's two works (cf. JHS LXII. 53, LXVII. 92) on Roman Imperial officials in Achaea J. H. Oliver corrects, restores and annotates a number of epigraphical records, the most important of which are noted below.

211 **AJP** LXIX. 201 ff.; cf. **REG** LXII. 119, Πολιόμων Πολιούμων, IV. 10 ff.
212 **PAE** 1941-4, 55.
213 **Hesperia**, XVI. 264; cf. **AJA** LIII. 371.
214 Πολιόμων, III. 133 no. 10.
215 **CHA** 1948, 298 ff., **AJA** LIII. 528, **JHS** LXVII. 36, Πολιόμων, III. 10.
216 **Hesperia**, Suppl. VIII. 213 ff.
217 **Hesperia**, Suppl. VIII. 313 ff.
218 **Hesperia**, Suppl. VIII. 245 ff.
219 **Hesperia**, XVIII. 143 ff.
220 **APA** LXXVIII. 433 ff., LXXIX. 211 ff.
221 **APA** LXXIX. 434 ff.; cf. **REG** LXII. 114.
To A. E. Raubitschek we owe three specially noteworthy articles. Discussing 231 the family and career of T. Flavius Sophocles of Sunium, he restores, by the aid of II.2 3952–4, the dedication of his statue (II.2 3552), erected at Eleusis ca. A.D. 75, dates 4749 between A.D. 75 and 100, and 1992 about A.D. 20, restores 4487 and 3274, comments on 3540 and 4457, and traces back the family to the second half of the fourth century B.C. He also adds 232 from epigraphical evidence to our knowledge of Phaedrus (ca. 138–70 B.C.), head of the Epicurean School at Athens in Cicero's time, whose family can be traced at Athens to the end of the third century B.C.; he restores II.2 1008. 125, showing that Phaedrus was an ephebe in 119–8, and 3899 (pp. 98 f.), engraved beneath a statue of Phaedrus erected probably by T. Pomponius Atticus, Cicero's alter ego, and 3897 (to which a fragment is added), erected by Cicero's friend L. Saeueius, and publishes (pp. 101 f.) a fragment, found in the Agora, of the base of a herm of Phaedrus set up by Appius Saeueius, and 3513, a statue-inscription which describes Q. Caecilius Pomponianus Atticus as ἀγοραστήν [τοῦ Φαδροῦ]. In an essay 233 on 'Commodus and Athens' Raubitschek unites II.2 1796, 1800 and a new fragment, and re-edits ll. 1–12 of this pryntany-list of A.D. 186–7 (of which he restores ll. 39, 41) with an opening reference to Commodus naming a hitherto unknown archon; he re-examines (pp. 280 ff.) and improves the texts of the other lists of the same group, viz. IG II.2 1792 (dated 187–8 and restored by Oliver in Hesperia, XI. 61), Hesperia, XI. 58 ff. nos. 25 (dated 188–9) and 27 (of the same date), to which he adds Hesperia, IV. 49 f., XI. 57 f. no. 23, IG II.2 1807, and a new fragment; nos. 24 and 26 probably belong to the same date. These name Commodus as archon in 188–9 and perhaps as παντεύρηβριχ in 187; later he was archon of the Eumolpidae (II.2 1110 = SIG 873, to which a new fragment is added on p. 265), and addressed two letters to the Athenian γερουσία ca. 180–4 (II.2 1112), in which Raubitschek restores (pp. 285 f.) the Emperor's title. Of a further letter, written in 187, the prescript is restored (p. 287) from II.2 1109, 3412 and three unpublished fragments, while 2771, EM 10006–7 and an Agora fragment belong to a text which mentions a number of high officials, probably envoys to Athens.

In the field of chronology substantial progress can be reported. To the work of Pritchett and Neugebauer I refer above (p. 25). E. Manni re-examines 234 the evidence for the archons of the third century B.C. and draws up tables (pp. 75, 79 f.) of those who held office from 292–1 to 200–199. S. Dow discusses 235 the post-Sullan archons on the basis of II.2 1716 (q.v.). J. A. Notopoulos dates 236 the creation of the tribe Hadrianis in A.D. 126–7, connecting it with Hadrian's visit to Athens in autumn 124 and spring 125, and its incorporation in the tribal cycle in 127–8, and the same scholar devotes a detailed article 237 to the operation of Ferguson's Law under the Empire (pp. 2 ff.), the secretaries of the tribal cycles (pp. 9 ff.), the chronology of archons in and after Commodus' reign (pp. 19 ff.) and of other archons (pp. 24 ff.), that of the pryntany-lists of 165–6 to 209–10 (pp. 22 ff.), and of other inscriptions (pp. 41 ff.), ending with impressive tables showing the tribal cycles, changes proposed in the dates of inscriptions, and new readings and restorations proposed in no fewer than thirty inscriptions. A note of caution is sounded 238 by J. H. Oliver, who also deals 239 with two Athenian archons, Domitius Aristaeus (Hesperia, XI. 65) and -ius Arabianus of Marathon (II.2 1824; cf. 1078, 1830, Hesperia, XI. 67).

In addition to those already mentioned, the following inscriptions in IG II.2 call for notice. 10 (GHI 100). A new fragment of this important historical document, found 240 in Aegina, is in the Epigraphical Museum at Athens.

20 (GHI 109). E. Gjerstad discusses 241 this decree in his account of Cyprus. 32, 38. In his inquiry into the corporate responsibility of allied cities for the death of Athenian citizens and προδοσον R. Meiggs examines 242 32, 9–14 and 38. 1–5 (SEG X. 99). 133 (SIG 199). In l. 23 of this decree for a Sestian Wilhelm substitutes 243 τὸν αὐτοτιμοφυστα for τὸν λιμενοφυσοντα; (?)

141 (GHI 139). Wilhelm comments 244 on ll. 30 ff. of the decree for Strato of Sidon (cf. JHS LXVII. 101), A. Aymard 245 on the unusual phrase τῶν Σταδίων βασιλεία (I. 11), and

---

231 Ὄη ΙΙ.37, Beibl. 35 ff.
232 Hesperia, XVIII. 96 ff.
233 Hesperia, Suppl. VIII. 279 ff.; cf. XVIII. 21.
234 Reuter, Linke, IV. (1960), 67 ff.
235 Hesperia, Suppl. VIII. 116 ff.
236 TAPA LXXVII. 53 ff.; cf. REG LXII. 113.
237 Hesperia, XVIII. 1 ff.
238 AJP LX. 305 ff. n. 15.
239 Robinson, III. F.
240 SEG IV (2). 499.
241 SEG LXIII. 16, 12.
244 REA L. 236 f.
THE PROGRESS OF GREEK EPIGRAPHY, 1948-9

W. P. Wallace on the σύμβολα (l. 19) designed to facilitate diplomatic relations between Athens and the Sidonian king.

204 (SIG 204). Wallace claims that this decree de cippis terminalibus contains (l. 40) the earliest indubitable reference to the public seal of Athens.


236 (GHI 177). I. Calabi discusses the nature of this pact with Philip II, restoring in ll. 3 f. ἐν τοῖς δρόμοις in place of ἐν τῇ εἰρήνῃ or τῇ συμμαχίᾳ.

304, 604. M. Mitsos unites two of these two fragments.

410 (SIG 289). Wilhelm restores καὶ οἱ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν καὶ οἱ δικά σεπτότοι, and in ll. 39-40 Διονύσου τοῦ Ἐλευθερώς, where the epithet was deliberately erased, probably on the decision of Eleutheræae.

604. See 304.

766. For Meritt's re-edition of this ephebic decree see above (p. 28).

915. See under Prytaneis, 40.

941. Wilhelm assigns this to a Cean inscription (IG XII (5). 596).

977. See below, p. 33.

978. A newly found prytane-decree helps to restore this honorary decree.

989. See below, p. 33.

1004. See below, p. 33.

1006. A new fragment from the Agora enables Meritt to re-edit II. 88-117 of this ephebic decree and list.

1013. M. Crosby publishes a fruit measure from the Agora such as is described in ll. 18-29, 63-7 of this regulation de mensuris et ponderibus.

1973-4. J. H. Oliver revises the text of ll. 2-26 of this decree (Dow, Prytaneis, 121) for Tiberius Claudius Atticus and Vibullia Alcia, and thinks that ll. 12 ff. record the earliest endowment to relieve a tribe of the expenses of its prytaneia.

1100. See above, p. 29.

1126 (SIG 145). G. Daux calls attention to his corrections in ll. 4, 14 of this Amphictionic law, and in ll. 9-10 restores ἀποκαταστήσαντος and ἄλλο ἦ.

1130. On this Cretan decree (ICret. II. xxx. 3*) see the comments of H. van Effenterre.

1134 (SIG 704). Wilhelm discusses the text, especially ll. 16 ff., of the Amphictionic decree honouring the Athenian κοινὰ τῶν τεχνίτων, of which copies survive from Athens (1134) and Delphi (below, p. 38), and dissent from Daux's strictures on it.

1277 (SIG 1099). A. A. Papagianopoulos-Palaios tentatively assigns this decree to the temple of Μήτηρ παρὰ τὸ βαραθρὸν.

1632. J. S. Morrison discusses three passages (ll. 25 ff., 233 ff., 336 ff.) in this navy-list, and examines the meaning of several naval technical terms.

1633-53. In J. Tréhéux's essay on Delos under the protectorate of the Amphictions (403-314 B.C.) these tabulae Amphictionium Deliacorum supply an important part of the available evidence. J. Couprie points to the mention of a ὑπογραμματέας of the Athenian Amphictions at Delos in 1635, 175, restores ὑπογραμματέας ὁ Νεκταμής in 1653, 4, and maintains the existence of this official in the middle and second half of the fourth century B.C.

1672. L. Deubner examines the meaning of ἀνάκτορον and Ἐλευσίνων, dealing especially with the Eleusinian accounts of 329-8 B.C.

1706. Meritt reads Ἀπιης for Ἀπιης in l. 73 of this archon-list.

1716. S. Dow combines 1716, re-edited by him in AJA XXXVII. 578 ff., with a new fragment from the Agora (cf. Hesperia, V. 42), which is of importance for the names and dates of archons from 87-6 to 53-2 B.C.

1766, 1771. Meritt re-edits the heading of the Prytaneis-list 1771, of which fragment a
has been rediscovered in the Agora, and calls attention to Raubitschek's suggested assignment of 1771 to 1766 (Hesperia, XII. 62).

2017. A. W. Parsons restores 269 [ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Τ. Φλ. Πιοντάνου] in l. 5 of this ephebic list; for this archon see Notopoulos, Hesperia, XVIII. 26 f.

2037. O. W. Reinmuth traces 270 the relationship between ephebia and citizenship in Attica with special reference to this list.


2327. L. Robert explains 272 the phrase ἔσαραν τὸ κοκ[νοῦ].

2581. Meritt publishes 273 an early fourth-century ὁρος σήμερος, companion-piece of Hesperia, VIII. 79, and thinks that these are probably 2581a, b; a third identical text, hitherto assumed to be 2581b, is in Berlin.

2640. M. Crosby dates 274 this epigram in the fifth century.

2686, 2689, 2693, 2723, 2735, 2747. I. A. Meletopoulos' essay on πράξις ἐπὶ οὐσίᾳ includes 275 an examination of these records and references to other relevant documents, and also of Hesperia, X. 54.

28336. Meritt re-edits 276 this prytany-dedication with an added fragment.

2947. W. S. Ferguson comments 277 on this honorary inscription in the supplement to his work on Attic orgaomenes.

3194, 4210. J. H. Oliver, discussing the career of Aemilius Juncus, restores 278 ll. 4, 5 of the archaistic dedication 3194, and refers to 4210 as our main source.

3223. Meritt has rediscovered 279 this stone, copied by Fournet.

3275. A new fragment of this Claudian inscription has been found 280 at Rhamnus.

3539. In l. 1 of this honorary inscription Meritt suggests 281 'Ἀντιπατρον' instead of Αλεξάνδρον.

3597. J. H. Oliver examines 282 the services rendered to four Attic tribes by Tiberius Claudius Atticus.

3606. G. D. Androuitopoulos reports 283 the discovery at Marathon of this hymn celebrating Herodes Atticus' return from exile.

3695. J. H. Oliver gives 284 a fuller stemma of Ulpius Eubiotus Leurus.

3793, 3819. A. E. Raubitschek comments 285 on these memorials of the καθηγητής Alexander of Phalerum.

3818. L. Robert deals 286 with the career of the fifth-century Athenian sophist Plutarchus, called in one epigram (4224) μῦδον ταυτής σοφίστης, in another (3818) βασιλεὺς λόγων, distinguishing him from the homonymous proconsul praised in IG VII. 94–5 and named in an Attic Christian epitaph (IG III. 3513).

4059. In l. 6 Oliver restores 287 Κεστίου Ληγγ[ενων].

4106. In l. 2 he suggests 288 'Αστος- or Πακέκιων.

4157. Raubitschek restores 289 καθηγητήν in l. 3 of this inscription on a statue-base of C. Sulpicius Galba.

4176. Oliver interprets 290 MM- (l. 5) as Μ(υσίων) Μ(ακαδονίας) [Ἀ(χια)]

4196. He comments 291 on this honorary inscription, to which Meritt has added 292 two new fragments.

4210. See 3194.

4223. L. Robert quotes 293 the epigram in praise of the proconsul Theodorus, who in the reign of Theodosius εὐθήνης ὑγανμίση σῶος Πανελλήνων σώματι καὶ πόλεις.

4224. See 3818.

4226. Robert sees 294 in the Probus honoured in this couplet the proconsul Anatolius Petronius Probus, praetorian prefect of Illyria in A.D. 367–75.

---

269 T. A. P. LXXVIII. 433 f., LXXIX. 211 ff.
270 REG. LXI. 146.
271 REH Phil XVIII. 21 ff. Hesperia, XVII. 33 f.
272 Hesperia, Suppl. VIII. 100 n. 55.
273 T. A. P. LXXIX. 434 ff.
274 Hesperia, XVII. 39.
275 Hesperia, Suppl. VIII. 162 f.
276 A.P. LXIX. 436 ff.; cf. REG LXIX. 114.
277 Hesperia, XVII. 41 f.; cf. Oliver, AJP LXIX. 436.
278 REG. LXIV. 36.
279 AJP. LXIX. 440 f.
280 Hellenica. IV. 95 ff.; cf. 55 ff.
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287 Ibid. 53 ff. 447.
4321. Meritt gives fuller text of this votive epigram, based on Wheler’s copy.
4471, 4472 + 4495. M. T. Mitos joins 298 4472 and 4495, and so is enabled to complete 4471.
4546. G. Bakalakis discusses this basis as a work of art.
4962 (SIG 1046). S. Eitrem illustrates this lex sacra from papyri and from inscriptions of Epidaurus (IG IV2, 424–5) and of Gythium (IG V (1). 1179).
5659, 9941. Mitos unites these portions of an epiphath.
7466, 11119. Androustopoulos records the finding of these epiphata at Marathon.
9531. Meritt revises this text, rediscovered in the Agora.
9941. See 5659.
10097. Papagiannopoulos-Palaioi corrects the reading of this epiphath.
10258. M. N. Tod substitutes Ἐγ(υ)ς/ἰς οἰκονομίας for Σελενοῦς in this epiphath of an Athenian citizen.
11119. See 7466.
11120. L. Robert discusses the four epiphrata on the grave of a proconsul, Democrats, stressing his δικαιοσύνη, and Oliver points out that he was not a native Athenian.
12268, 12376. Mitos unites these fragments of an epiphath.
12449. Robert re-edits this gladiator’s epiphath, which is really Eretrian (IG XII (g). 860).
13196. G. Bakalakis examines this tombstone as a work of art.
IG III. 3513. See IG II. 3818.
Some other inscriptions, not included in IG II, call for mention. M. Guarducci studies the history of the Salaminian γέφος on the basis of the documents published by W. S. Ferguson in Hesperia, VII. 1 ff. Meritt dates Hesperia, VII. 115, a fragment of IG II. 766 (q.v.), in 244–3 B.C. A. Wilhelm, discussing an Athenian outpost in the Hellespont, studies the inscribed base of a statue of Chabrias (Hesperia, IX. 314 ff.) and his campaign in the spring of 375, restores in the second crown [ἐν Ἡφαστίᾳ] and in the third [οἱ στρατηγοὶ ἐξελέγησαν οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἀθήνῃ τῶν ἐπεχείρησαν στρατευόμενοι]. Robert examines the decree for Adimantus of Lampscus (Hesperia, IX. 348 ff.), and in l. 12 substitutes ἐν ἱστομανίᾳ for ἐν ἱστομα, and the same decree is discussed by W. S. Ferguson. For Hesperia, X. 54 see IG II. 2666. A. Aymard, dealing with Toulouse in Roman times, treats Hesperia, X. 72 ff. (cf. JHS LXV. 71), a dossier relating to Q. Trebellius Rufus of Tolosa. In the light of a newly found decree Meritt restores a formula in ll. 27–8 of Hesperia, X. 282 ff. (= IG II. 977, Dow, Pyraneis, 88). Ferguson accepts a restoration proposed by Meritt in the sacrificial regulation of two cult groups (Hesperia, XI. 282 ff.). Meritt substitutes οὗ ἐκκαρποῦ for ἐν τοῖς προστασίοις in Hesperia, XIII. 258, Pyraneis, 91, 93 (= IG II. 1004. 17) and 96. A. W. Parsons discusses the dedication of the Library of T. Flavius Pantaenus (Hesperia, XV. 233), a member of a philosophic family, and dates it between A.D. 98 and 102. Meritt assigns to IG II. 766 (q.v.) a fragment published in Hesperia, XVI. 158 ff.; he also adds a new fragment to a pyrtata decree (Pyraneis, 40), of which IG II. 915 forms part, and re-edits the whole text, restores ll. 19–20 of Pyraneis, 88, and alters the restoration of 95, ll. 8–9, and 96, ll. 38–9 (= IG II. 989. 20–1). He further revises the preamble of a decree published by Pritchett and himself (Chronology of Hellenistic Athens, 25), suggests alternative restorations of a decree of 246–5 B.C. (ibid. 22), and modifies the restoration of ll. 7–9 of a decree published by W. Peck (Kerameikos, III. 4). W. S. Ferguson doubts Wilhem’s restoration (cf. JHS LXVII. 105) of a decree (AM LXVI. 221 ff.) for Demetrius σφαλως and his
interpretation of μέγας as 'big', not 'great', and comments on an orgeonic decree (ibid. 228 ff.). H. W. Parke discusses the terms of the oath purporting to have been sworn by the Athenians on the eve of Platea, and G. Daux and J. and L. Robert draw attention to the fact that in editing this text (GHI 204) M. N. Tod overlooked Daux's correction of ταξίλοχον to ταξιλαρχον in I. 25.

III. The Peloponnesian

[IG IV.] L. Robert discusses fully an epigram of Aegina (IG IV. 53), inscribed beneath a statue of Pan which adorned the Μουσείον of Ampelius, proconsul of Achaea in A.D. 359, and compares other epigrams claiming that certain gods or animals had deserted their normal haunts for buildings or extolling the justice of high officials.

M. T. Mitsos publishes a new epitaph from the Isthmus. At Corinth several inscribed theatre-seats have come to light. A. N. Stillwell's account of the Potters' Quarter includes a bronze bowl dedicated to Aphrodite (pp. 23, 115), an inscribed strigil (p. 119) and a number of inscribed moulds (pp. 84, 94, 98 ff., 102, 104 ff.) and vases (pp. 12, 21, 23, 29). O. Broneer and S. S. Weinberg publish some pottery with incised or painted texts and four stamped amphora-handles from the S. Stoa, and Weinberg describes four loom-weights of the fourth and third centuries B.C., while elsewhere finds of pre-Roman tiles stamped ζευάλτας and of inscribed vases are reported. L. Robert throws light on the puzzling abbreviations used in a Corinthian name-list (Corinth, VIII (1). 11), and L. H. Jeffery examines the use of the straight iota in Corinthian local inscriptions found in Corinth itself or elsewhere (Calydon, Delphi, Dodona), and suggests that whereas the straight iota was undoubtedly used during the sixth century by various states whose alphabets were kindred to that of Corinth, it did not appear in Corinthian epichoric until the beginning of the fifth century B.C. (p. 208). M. Guarducci appeals to the famous archaic drachma-dedication from Perachora (SEG XI. 223) in her article on the tripods, lebetes and obols of Gortynian inscriptions.

A. K. Orlandos reports the finding of a series of masons' marks on stones of the θευλατηρίων at Sicyon. The sole extant decree of Philius I mention below (p. 42). Near Nemea G. D. Androutsopoulos has discovered an archaic statue-base with a boustrophedon inscription in the Corinthian script, including the sculptor's signature [Μίκων]ίδος. M. T. Mitsos edits five new inscriptions of Cleone,—three epitaphs, two contiguous stones from an exedra bearing the names of the Emperors L. Septimius Severus and his son M. Aurelius Antoninus, and a fragment of an Argive honorary decree; he also unites IG IV. 532 and 537 from the Heraeum, restores the decree IG IV. 498, which he assigns not to Mycenae but to Argos, and publishes a dedication by Συμμάχος to Artemis Ωραία from the Artemision between Nemea and Argos, and an interesting agonistic record from Argos of victories won in the latter part of the third century B.C. by a runner who was, inter alia, five times victorious in the δίσελος at the Isthmia. B. D. Meritt extracts from Vernon's diary a dedication copied at Argos in 1675. W. Vollgraf makes a notable contribution to Argive epigraphy in his revision and exhaustive discussion of the famous document (SIG 56 = GHI 33) recording the intervention of Argos between her two Cretan colonies, Cnosus and Tylissus; he also examines the fragment of the same document found at Tylissus (ICret I, pp. 307 ff.). L. Robert corrects and interprets a late Argive epigram praising the justice of Callippinus, a fourth-century governor of Achaea, and S. Estrem independently suggests a similar change of punctuation and sense, while R. Paribeni proposes a new restoration of an inscription found in the Argive theatre and relating the reconstruction of some building
destroyed by fire (BCH LXVIII–IX. 397 ff.). At Oenoe, on the road from Argos to Mantinea, Mitsos has found a fifth-century boundary-stone. H. van Effenterre comments on the historical value of a decree of Mycenae for Protimus of Gortyn (IG IV. 497) and of a list, found at Hermione, of soldiers from western Crete sent to aid the Achaeans (ibid. 729). Wilhelm examines and restores the two copies—one from Hermione (AM LIX. 47 ff.), the other from Epidaurus (IG IV. 75)—of the frontier-arbitration between those states; his main conclusion is summarized and challenged by L. Robert, who will discuss this and other boundary-demarcations in a forthcoming work. Robert also interprets a late epigram of Trozen (IG IV. 787) as relating not to the governor of Achaia in A.D. 380, but to a citizen benefactor otherwise unknown. M. Launey gives a greatly improved reading and restoration of a second-century dedication (IG IV. 854 = OGI 115) set up at Methana in honour of Ptolemy VI Philometor by an eminent Ptolemaic officer, Eirenaeus of Alexandria, known also from inscriptions of Thera and Delos. J. Marcadé, investigating the sculptors' signatures found at the Asclepieum of Epidaurus, discusses (1) a group of Argive sculptors of the Hellenistic age, viz. ΘΕΟΣΕΟΡΟΣ ΠΟΡΟΥ (whose name replaces the [π]ΕΘΕΟΣΕΟΡΟΣ ΠΟΡΟΥ of IG IV. 699), Ariston son of Ariston (following an honorary dedication, defaced and previously unread), Toron son of Apellion (whose date and career are fully examined in connexion with a new example of his signature), and Xenophilus son of Strato (on an unpublished base); (2) Timodamus son of Demetrius of Athens (whose name occurs, though hitherto unobserved, in IG IV. 690, and must be substituted for Timochares in 232); (3) the πανούργος Timagoras, now first known, and (4) the inscribed base of a funerary statue, probably of the second century B.C. W. Vollgraf examines and restores an Argive proxeny-decree of the fourth or third century B.C., probably for a doctor (IG IV. 69), recently re-edited by M. T. Mitsos (cf. JHS LXVII. 106). To Wilhelm's treatment of IV. 75 I refer above; he also makes a fresh suggestion for solving a problem raised by one of Isyllus' poems (IV. 128. 41 ff).

[IG V.] A. M. Woodward makes a contribution of the utmost value to the epigraphy of Locria in an article in which, as the result of further study and of the new discoveries of 1924–8, he corrects, restores, dates, or annotates more than a hundred Spartan texts, chiefly of the Imperial period, in IG V (1); specially noteworthy is his treatment of 3 (pp. 209 ff.), 22 (pp. 211 ff.), 44 (pp. 219 ff.), 75A + 78 + 81 (pp. 228 ff.), 105 + 106 (pp. 233 ff.), 111 (pp. 235 ff.), 121 (pp. 239 ff.), 164 (pp. 244 ff.), 172–5 (pp. 246 ff.), 239 + 253 (pp. 250 ff.) and 519 + 582 (pp. 253 ff.); in an appendix (pp. 257 ff.) he deals with foreigners as eponymi at Sparta in the second century A.D. B. D. Meritt finds in the diary of Francis Vernon, who travelled in the Peloponnese in 1675, two unpublished inscriptions of Sparta, one of them honouring the Emperor Claudius II, and better copies of IG V (1). 151 and 452. The list of contributions to the Peloponnesian War in relation to Cretan history (IG V (1). 1 = GHI 62) and the possible reference of a Spartan epitaph (IG V (1). 723) to the Cretan League of "Oepoi is discussed by H. van Effenterre, and H. I. Marrou's essay on the age-classes of the Spartiate youth makes full use of the abundant epigraphical evidence. In connexion with the prosconsulship of Ampelius L. Robert examines epigrams from Amyclaee and Sparta (ibid. 455, 729) and an edict (BSA XXVI. 225 ff.), while J. H. Oliver remarks on the date of Paulinus' corectorship recorded in V (1). 538. 13 ff. Two dedications to Demeter and Kore, discovered at Kalyvia Sokhas, S.W. of Sparta, are provisionally published by J. M. Cook. T. R. S. Broughton identifies the C. Julius of an inscription from Gythium (IG V (1). 1146. 22 = SIG 748. 22) with the subsequent dictator, and dates his visit to Gythium as legate of M. Antonius Creticus in 73–2 B.C. S. Eitrem, discussing the oracular function of the Sun, appeals to an inscription of the same city (IG V (1). 1179), and O. A. W. Dilke examines the sense of ἐκπολισμὸς in the regulations of the Caesarea and Euryclea (E. Kornmann, Neut Dokumente, 10). An archaic bronze disk dedicated to Ἁρμινιαῖος at Thorax in Cynuria is
editions by T. A. Arvanitopoulos, and a small votive altar from the same region by K. A. Rhomas. F. de Visscher comments on a passage in the regulations of the mystery-cult at Andania (IG V (1), 1390. 75 ff. = SIG 736. 75 ff.).

Passing to Arcadia I note Dilke’s use of inscriptions in his discussion of the προσδοξία in the theatres at Tegea, Orchomenus and Megalopolis. M. Guarducci publishes a well preserved and interesting Argive decree of the late fourth or early third century B.C., renewing friendship between Argos and Pallantium, recording a successful Argive mission to Polyperchon to request the release of Pallantine prisoners of war, and granting to the Pallantines the titles of πρέσβεων, ἐνεργητῶν, and θεαρξάδων of Nemeth Zeus and Argive Hera; in the commentary the Argive dialect, constitution and calendar receive special attention, as well as the history of Pallantium. No less valuable is a decree of Euteleia in Phoci, discovered at Stymphalus and edited by M. T. Mitsos, thanking and honouring the Stymphalians for the hospitality shown to the Euteleia in exile, for their effective intervention with the Achaean League and the Romans to secure the return of the Euteleians to their home, and for the aid given them in overcoming the difficulties encountered in their re-establishment there. The document, dated about 190–187 B.C., contains important historical information about both Stymphalus and Euteleia; the contemporary history of the latter city as here reflected is examined by A. Passerini. H. van Effenterre has a note on the date of a Tegean list (IG V (2), 34), probably of mercenaries. Tiles stamped Αὐκαλαμνοῦ have come to light in the French excavation at Gortys.

[IG VI.] T. J. Dunbabin deals with an early fifth-century document from Olympia (IoI 22) relating to Megarian exiles settled at Selinus, J. H. Oliver re-edits the distich (IoI 457) inscribed, with the consent of the Olympic Council, on the monument erected at Olympia by the Athenian poet T. Flavius Glaucus, and L. Robert comments on an epigram of the third or fourth century A.D., in which the Phigaleans celebrate the justice of a provincial governor (IoI 481). A. C. Chatzes gives a revised copy of, and additional notes on, an archaic lex sacra found near Patra (AE 1908, 95 ff.).

IV. CENTRAL AND NORTHERN GREECE

[IG VII.] Among the inscriptions copied by F. Vernon in 1675 at Megara are IG VII. 77, 94 and 95; these last two, laudatory epigrams for a certain Plutarchus, are examined by L. Robert, who distinguishes their hero from the Athenian sophist of that name (IG II. 3818, 4224) and sees in him a Roman proconsul (perhaps mentioned in IG III. 3513) of the reign of Constantius. J. Marcade publishes the signature of Parthenocles, hitherto unobserved on the base of a portrait group at the Orobian Amphicuron (AE 1925, 42 no. 153). O. A. W. Dilke examines the evidence for the προσδοξία in the Orobian theatre, and B. D. Theopaneides records the accession to the Athens Museum of a bronze weight from the Amphicuron and of a late grave-relief from Delium.

From Boeotia there is more to report. W. K. Pritchett examines the double dating of a proxeny decree of Tanagra (IG VII. 517), J. Marcade re-edits the inscription on a Tanagranesque statue-base (ibid. 503) signed by Ἐκεβραῖος, and W. M. Calder revises the text of the Christian poem from that site (cf. JHS LXVII. 107), which he dates ca. A.D. 400 or a little later and ranks among the major inscriptive sources for the early history of the Eucharist; H. G. Blomfield adds some further comments. A. Plassart edits nine proxeny-decrees, weak or fragmentary, found by P. Jamot at Thespiae, together with two honorary inscriptions, one of them for Q. Bractius Sura (cf. IG IX (2), 613), who in 87 B.C. fought the Pontic army in Boeotia. L. Robert cites two Thespian epigrams, one praising
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the culture and rectitude of Vettius Agorius Praetextatus, proconsul of Achaea between 362 and 364, the other (IG VII. 1855) erected in the Vale of the Muses in honour of a proconsul whose name is lost. To a Thespian metrical epitaph (ibid. 1881) A. A. Papagiannopoulos-Palaios adds a new fragment and re-edits396 the whole. In her article on tripods, lebeses and obols at Gortyn M. Guarducci discusses397 some items in an inventory from Chorsiae (cf. JHS LIX. 259). Meritt publishes397 a fragmentary text copied by F. Vernon, probably near Thebes, Wilhelms discusses 398 the erasure of the name of King Demetrius in IG VII. 2419 ii 14 (= SIG 337. 30), and L. Robert restores 399. 2 of a Theban grave-epigram (IG VII. 2537). G. Klaftenbach offers400 a new restoration of the opening lines of an amphictionic decree from the Ptoôn near Acraephia (SIG 635.4), and L. Wenger comments401 on the kanôn of the great building-inscription of Lebadea (IG VII. 3073 = SIG 972; cf. JHS LXVII. 108).

[IG VIII.] Steady progress is maintained in preparation for the projected Delphian Corpus by the publication of new inscriptions from Delphi and the restoration and interpretation of those already known.402 Of new texts two are of especial interest. J. Pouilloux edits 403 a further fragment of the list of contributions for the rebuilding of Apollo's temple, in which several words or formulae occur for the first time and the phrase τοῦ ἐπικεφαλός ὁ βολός indicates that the gifts of states comprised in the Amphictionic League were proportionate to their population; Pouilloux examines the meaning of πρῶτος ὁ βολός and δευτέρος ὁ βολός (paid only by League members) and ἐπαρχή (paid by individuals and foreign states), and dates the new fragment in 356 b.c. G. Daux publishes 404 an unhappily mutilated and worn lex sacra regulating sacrifices and the duties of θεαρόν, which he dates ca. 425 b.c. and assigns to Andros on the ground of its dialect and the occurrence of 'Ἀνδριο- in the text. In a long article 405 on Delphian inscriptions Daux includes a number of inedita, chiefly records of the bestowal of προσέφων or other honours, among which the most interesting are a fragmentary statue-base of Philip of Macedon erected by the Amphissians (no. 5), a third-century proxeny-grant containing a new archon's name (no. 24; cf. 32), the signatures of two Theban sculptors (no. 26) and an honorary decree for a κεραμῶν from Rhexium (no. 27; cf. 35), adds new fragments to Fouilles, III (3), 218, 221, (6), 129, 138, and other published inscriptions, and offers a number of addenda and corrigenda to Fouilles, III (6).406 his own article, BCH LXVIII-IX. 94 ff., that of Jannoy, BCH LXX. 247 ff., that of C. Callmer (see below) and other publications. Daux also devotes an important article 407 to a survey of the status and duties of the θεαρόνoς appointed by Delphi in many Greek cities, and discusses the three geographical lists of these functionaries inscribed at Delphi, (a) the fifth-century list (SIG 90), here (pp. 4 ff.) re-edited, (b) the 'great list', the text of which is emended, supplemented by the addition of a new fragment, and tentatively dated ca. 235-21 b.c. (pp. 12 ff.), and (c) a new list, here first edited in full (pp. 27 ff.), dating from the second century and continuing the 'great list'. P. de La Coste-Messelière examines 408 in detail the amphictionic lists given by eighteen inscriptions in Fouilles, III (5), sets out their chronological implications (pp. 229 ff.), draws up a new table of archons from 343 to 323 b.c. (pp. 235 f.), and discusses some questions raised by the fourth-century Delphian accounts (pp. 243 ff.); to the study of Delphian coinage at this period E. J. P. Raven also makes a contribution.409 M. Segre's inquiry into the Pergamene Nikephoria includes 410 a brief discussion of the Delphic Soteria, M. Guarducci investigates 411 the relations between Crete and Delphi, especially in the archaic period, W. L. Westermann appeals 412 to Delphian munimissions in support of his interpretation of παρακολούθω as a 'general service contract', and C. Callmer's account 413 of A. F. Sturtzenbeck's visit to Delphi in 1784 contains texts of seven Delphian inscriptions copied by the Swedish traveller. Recent epigraphical discoveries at Delphi are reported 414 by P. Amandry.

Other previously published inscriptions have been restudied. G. Klaftenbach uses 415
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the Amphictionic decree relative to the Theban cult of Dionysus Cadmeus (Fouilles, III (1). 351) to restore the text of a similar decree from the Ptole in Bocotia (SIG 6354A), and by means of the latter corrects II. 17-20 of the Delphian document. A. Wilhelm interprets 418 the παναταλίκα mentioned in the arbitration between Bumelita and Halae (Fouilles, III (1). 362. 29) as slaves rather than sons, a view anticipated 417 by A. M. Woodward; he also examines 418 the Athenian (IG II 1134) and Delphian (Fouilles, III (2). 69 = SIG 704E) copies of the Delphian decree in honour of the Athenian κώνον τῶν τευχητῶν, interpreting the references to Athens as the mother of civilization and defending the language of the decree against Daux's criticisms. 419 O. Weinreich re-edits 420 an epigram (Fouilles, III (2). 106) which may refer to a pantomime, L. Robert explains 421 the ethnic Πειραιας borne by a Delphian πασατός (Fouilles, III (3). 207. 2), M. T. Mitostes bases his discussion 422 of 'Thermikia and Panaitolika' partly on a decree of the Aetolian League (ibid. 214. 38, 40), and I. I. Russi restores 423 'Αθηναία to a πασατό of BCH LXV. 181. 84. In a posthumous article 424 L. Deubner seeks to solve a problem raised by a passage near the close of the Labyad inscription (GDI 256) and comments on the cult of Bouzyga, P. de La Coste-Messeliere suggests 425 possible restorations of the votive inscription accompanying the offering of the Tarentines after their defeat of the Messapians, F. Sokolowski comments 426 on the sacrificial tariff of the pact between Delphi and Scithus and explains the phrase ἐπὶ κοινῷ, and M. Guarducci restores 427 an archaic inscription (BCH LXIII. 216 ff.) on a statue-base as πασατός Πειραιας (στάτικα) (probably the Pierians of Olympus), followed by a sum expressed in minas and drachmas; the offering, perhaps dating from the early fifth century B.C., was a statue dedicated in lieu of a sacrificial tax (πασατός), which word she doubtfully restores on Hiero's base (SIG 357C). She also restores 428 another Delphian inscription (Philol LXI. 56), M. Gigante proposes 429 emendations in II. 8, 11, 14-16 of the anonymous paean to Apollo (Fouilles, III (2). 137), J. H. Oliver discusses 430 the identity of the Longinus of SIG 827A, and L. H. Jeffery examines 431 the script of a sixth-century architectural block from the Corinthian Treasury (Fouilles, III (3). 153), pointing out that its alphabet is not Corinthian.

[IG IX.] The travels of L. Lerat and F. Chamoux in W. Locrian have borne good fruit, epigraphical and topographical, including 432 two fragments of a dedication to Artemis Tauropelos from Penteoria, the epitaph of an ἀγγέλας from Glypha and an archaic epitaph from Kolopotinis; many inscriptions already known (among them IG IX (1). 336, 341, 344) have been rediscovered and recopied. Recent finds include 433 the beginning of a decree of the W. Locrian κώνον from Malandino. L. Robert studies and emends 434 a puzzling epigram from Naupactus (ibid. 390) for an official who is described as ἐνσαίρος Ἰάουρη. A bronze plate from Molycreum has been added 435 to the Athens Museum. In her article on the Corinthian iota L. H. Jeffery deals 436 with the clay sima-fragments from the sixth-century temple at Calydon in Aetolia, and these, together with the other inscriptions from that site, are reviewed 437 by E. Dyggev in his final report on the Danish excavation of the Laphron, to which F. Poulsen contributes an appendix on the history and nature of the cult. The excavations at Aetós in Ithaca have brought to light 438 an epitaph of the second century B.C., two puzzling inscriptions, one of them apparently metrical, on oinochoai, and the maker's signature on a t.c. candlestick. I. K. Papademetriou discusses 439 the identity of the Jovianus of a Corcyraean inscription (IG IX (1). 721) in the light of a recently discovered mosaic referring to a bishop of that name.

P. Amandry reports 440 on the damage done during the War to inscriptions at Larissa, Tymavo and Elasonna in Thessaly. At Gomus a dedication to Pythian Apollo has been
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found, and A. Chatzes comments on the word ἄγγελον, used in the record of a frontier-dispute found there (AE 1913, 25 ff.). A. S. Arvanitopoulos continues his description of the painted stelae from Demetrias-Pagasae collected in the Volo Museum; of the fifteen items in question ten are inscribed and include the names of a Cretan from Rhacius (no. 236), a Pellaean (no. 238) and a woman from Theangelia (no. 248). L. Robert discusses the oracle of Apollo Coropaeus, interpreting the two relevant decrees of Demetrias passed soon after 116 B.C. (IG IX 2. 1109 = SIG 1157); the measures there prescribed are, he argues, purely disciplinary, aimed at securing ἱκανοτητα and not at the revival or reform of the cult.

V. MACEDONIA, THRACE AND SCYTHIA

[IG X.] A relief inscribed ἱερὸς τῷ Διός βεροέντος Ἐποίησε τῷ Ἐποίησε (cf. Eur. Suppl. 860) has been added to the Museum at Jannina in Epirus, and A. Wilhelm reads παντοστοι τε ἐν ὅλης τῷ Διὸν ἐν ὅλης τῷ Οὐρόλακας, in two oracular tablets from Dodona (Ἡπειρ. χρον. X. 253 ff.) instead of the proper names Παντοστοι and Οὐρόλακας. L. H. Jeffery examines the script on a votive statue from the same temple.

V. Beshelevitch discusses two Christian texts (Vulići, Spomenik, LXXI. 29, LXXV. 175) from Heraclea (Bilitj) and Achris (Ohrid) in N.W. Macedonia. A dedication of ἐπιτρέπουν τῷ δῷ ῥάγοι τῶν τεκιλαρίων by a vine-dresser to Zeus Υμπηρος, discovered at Aeanes (Kalliani), is now at Kozani, and a fragmentary votive relief of Zeus Keraunios from Kozani has been added to the National Museum at Athens. Robert adds a late epitaph from Dium to his collection of gladiatorial monuments. J. A. O. Larsen, questioning Feyel's view (JHS LXVII. 111) of the organization of Macedonia by Aemilius Paulus in 167 B.C., examines the Beroean inscriptions which refer to σύνδρομοι or συνδρομοι, and gives a revised text of one (RA XXXVII. 1900, 489) which, though tantalizingly incomplete, is of especial interest for this question; the problem is further discussed by A. Aymard. Robert identifies the consular Licinius Rufus honoured at Beroea (AA 1942, 176 no. 9) as συνεργασίων τῷ ἐπερχόμενῳ περὶ τῆς συρμελίας τῶν Θητελον with a well-known jurist, probably a native of Thyatira, and comments on other Beroean honours in the same series (ibid. 177 no. 12, 183 no. 24). Further finds from Beroea are reported.

C. F. Edson, locating the tomb of Olympeia at Pydna (Makryialos), publishes an epitaph of the infant Alcimaus, son of Nepotelemus, τοῦ σπουδὼν Ὀλυμπίδος, and an epitaph from Kitros (the new Pydna, founded in 410 B.C. by Archelaus) relating to the same family, and offers a new restoration of an epitaph mentioning τὸ μπεσφ Ολυμπίδος. He also devotes a long and valuable article based almost wholly on inscriptions, to the public cults of Roman Thessalonica—those of Dionysus, Isis and Serapis, and Cabirus—re-editing (pp. 154 ff.) an epitaph set up by a τιθρασυκτος and priest of Dionysus, dated A.D. 132 (Rev Phil XIII. 1939, 128 ff.), and the famous τετράγαμμον of a Thessalonian priestess (pp. 165 ff.), summarizing the inscriptions relative to the cult of the Egyptian gods (pp. 181 ff.) and that of Cabirus (pp. 188 ff.), and giving a new reading and restoration (pp. 192 ff.) of the one inscription which specifically refers to that cult; he also publishes a text from Velvendos of a Macedonianarch and ἄρχοντας and πρεσβυτεράρχης τῶν Ὀλυμπιῶν and an honorary inscription from Branias, N.E. of Beroea (pp. 195 ff.). C. I. Makaronas edits two texts, found in or near the church of St. Demetrios, a decree of the νεος, passed in 95 B.C., in honour of a gymnasiarch, and an ephebic list of A.D. 266 referring to ὁ Θωβάρας, and B. G. Kallipolites the two sarcophagus-inscriptions, of which the first, though found at Salonika, seems to belong to Philippi, prescribing penalties for
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tomb-violation. L. Robert comments 462 on an epigram (AM LXVI. 65) praising the integrity (γυνής γνώμη) of a governor, and on the Thessalian inscription in honour of the jurist Licinicus Rufinus. 463 H. G. Pflaum discuses 464 an inscription (AM XXV. 117) for a tribus Βεστόνων καὶ δείκτου τά μέρη τῆς ἡγεμονίας, and S. Eitem calls attention 465 to the palindrome νίφων ἁνυμήματα μὴ μόνον ἄφω, which originally, he thinks, had the singular ἄφωμα.

A bilingual building-record has come to light 466 at Potidaea, and J. Papastavrou’s article 467 on the Chalcidian League and the Olynthians examines the use of the term κοινόν in the fifth and fourth centuries and the treaty between Amyntas of Macedon and the Chalcidians (SIG 135 = GHI 111). Robert adds 468 to his gladiatorial corpus an epigram from Amphipolis, and I. I. Russu recognizes 469 in a relief from that site 470 a dedication [διὸ Σύμφωνος]. I omit, as falling outside my present scope, a group of late Christian inscriptions from Thessalonica, Mount Athos and the Prodromos Monastery near Serres, for which I refer to J. and L. Robert’s ‘Bulletin’. 471 Philippi may claim a sarcophagus found at Salonica (see above), and Russu emends 472 the reading of an epitaph from the same region (SEG II. 429).

V. Beschevliev and G. Mihailov publish 473 forty-nine Greek and eight Latin inscriptions from Amphipolis, Serres, Drama, Kavala and other sites in E. Macedonia, the Thracic border and Thasos; of the Greek texts, mostly epitaphs or dedications, thirty-one were unpublished, and new readings are given of several already known. D. Detchev edits 474 an interesting record of an endowment for the provision of oil, found at Sveti Vrač on the middle Strymon, at or near which J. and L. Robert suggest 475 that Parthicopolis may have lain. D. P. Dimitrov examines 476 the portraiture of the gravestones of the Roman period from N.E. Macedonia, adding (pp. 109 ff.) a list of the monuments in question and (pp. 123 ff.) a brief and faulty German summary; the chief emphasis falls on art, but the inscriptions (of which nos. 15, 18, 31 are new) are also recorded, and those which are dated afford a chronologically basis of the inquiry, which takes into account (pp. 60 ff.) inscribed gravestones with portraits from the rest of Macedonia and other areas.

The S. coast of Thrace is poorly represented. C. M. Danov examines 477 a statement in Polybius about Thrace in the light of a well-known honorary decree of Sestos (OGI 339), K. M. Apostolides discusses 478 a metrical epitaph of Perinthus (Ἀθηνά, VIII. 345 f.), L. Robert presents 479 the epigraphical and other evidence for Bisanthos, Heraionteichos and other cities of the Chersonese and Thrace, and publishes 480 a votive relief [H]πος ἂγαθότητα, now in Istanbul, which he assigns to a sanctuary at Kadikevi, some five miles N.E. of Selymbria, and A. M. Schneider deals 481 with some Byzantine inscriptions from Istanbul. The Greek cities on the E. coast of Thrace and Moesia are specially prolific. A. Kocevalov calls attention to some recent discoveries made in this region in his ‘Contributions to the Euxine Inscriptions’ 482 and his survey 483 of recent progress in the epigraphy of the Euxine colonies. C. M. Danov makes free use of epigraphical sources for his work 484 on the west coast of the Pontus, in which he traces the Greek colonization and devotes a chapter to the history of each of the cities in question, and in his detailed article 485 (to which a German summary is added) on the economic history of that region down to the Roman settlement. G. Mihailov edits 486 fourteen inscriptions found at Apollonia (Sozopol), including ten grave-stelae of the fifth and fourth centuries b.c., a decree (no. 13) thanking Antiochus II Theos for aiding Apollonia and Mesambria against the Celts, and part of a Vespasianic milestone (no. 14), while Danov’s examination 487 (in Bulgarian, with German summary) of the early history of Apollonia, the west coast of the Pontus and the S.E. Thrace discusses the fourth-century treaties of Iostrorōtte.
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between Miletus and Olbia (SIG 286) and between Miletus and Histria (Dacia, III–IV. 398).

K. Skorpiol publishes, mostly for the first time, fifty-three monuments of the Thracian heroic cult, fifteen of them inscribed, from Odessus and the neighbourhood, now housed in the Varna Museum, and elsewhere a part of the archaeological material collected by that scholar in the course of about fifty years is made accessible, consisting of 176 unpublished monuments, the great majority inscribed, found at, or in the vicinity of, Odessus; one of these (no. 28), a fragment relating to a gladiatorial show, probably in the second century A.D., is re-edited by L. Robert. In his eighth preliminary report on the excavation of Callatis (Mangalia) T. Sauicu-Sâveanu includes twenty-two inscriptions, most of them fragmentary, among which are two honorary decrees (pp. 287 f., 292 ff.) and a dedication ηρωί κτιστή (p. 298), and J. H. Oliver corrects a false reading and interpretation of the inscription (IGR I. 654) in which Callatis honours the propraetor P. Vinicius. S. Lambrino publishes a document from Histria, set up in the reign of Septimius Severus by οἰ ἐκ τοῦ λαγο[μένου λα[κο]νίου πύργου] and H. 1. Marrou appeals to boundary-stones from this district in locating the birthplace of the theologian Johannes Cassianus. D. Tudor studies a mutilated inscription of uncertain provenance, now in the Bucharest Museum, engraved on the back of a marble head, and G. Ştefan points out that an epitaph hitherto assigned to Poiana (SEG I. 331) really comes from Bărbosă, near the confluence of Sereth and Danube.

The numerous inscriptions from the interior of Thrace, nearly all dedications or epitaphs, come from find-spots widely dispersed and often hard to locate, and are for the most part published in Bulgarian, of which I regret my ignorance, and in periodicals some of which are not widely accessible in Britain; all the more valuable are the copious summaries of J. and L. Robert. B. Gerov’s essay on the office and title of Θρακολόγος is based on nine Greek inscriptions from Thrace (together with two in Latin from Philippi) ranging from the middle of the second to the late third or early fourth century A.D., and E. Condurachi shows by reference to inscriptions and coins the wide extent and peculiar nature of the Asclepius-cult in Lower Moesia and Thrace. G. Mihailov collects and annotates the published Greek epigrams of the Bulgarian lands (in which he includes Macedonia and Thasos), with useful indexes and tables and a brief German summary; of the 173 items in this corpus 150 are from the mainland and the rest from Thasos. K. M. Apostolidis continues his series of ἀρχαιογράφων, collecting those found at or near Serdica (Sofia), eighty-one in number, and the seventy-two discovered in, or in the vicinity of, Pautalia. L. Robert interprets a fragmentary inscription of Serdica, containing an invitation to a festival in the reign of Antoninus Pius, S. N. Bobchev publishes an inscribed architrave-block from the temple of Serapis, and T. D. Gerasimov an honorary text on a statue-base and a fragmentary epitaph, both from Serdica. An altar of Claudius’ reign, dedicated by thirty-three στρατηγοὶ, is reported from Paradosis in the Nestus Valley, and L. Robert corrects the restoration of an honorary inscription from that region (IGR I. 829). V. Beshchevdis disinters from a local journal of 1911 an interesting dedication to κύρια Αρτέμις, found at Nicopolis ad Nestum (Nevrokop) but now apparently lost, which names six or seven new Thracian στρατηγοί.

At Braniopol, near Philippopolis (Plovdiv), D. Tsontchev has discovered a thankoffering of a Roman citizen, and L. Botoucharova forty-five votive reliefs, mostly to Hera, in a shrine near the village of Dulevo. G. Kazarov offers a new reading of 1. i of a metrical epitaph (SEG III. 543). D. Detchev publishes four inscriptions from Augusta.
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Traiana (Stara Zagora) and the vicinity; in one of them, a poem celebrating the restoration of internal peace, A. M. Woodward proposes 514 improved restorations, while another, relating to gladiatorial combats, is re-edited 515 by Robert. A. Wilhelm suggests 516 δεικνύως [τὸ δῶρον] for δεικνύσως [τὸν δικτύον] in ll. 79-80 of the foundation-charter of Pizus (SIG 880), and L. Robert unites 517 two fragments of an epigram of Nicopoli ad Istrum in praise of the uprightness of a governor, while I. I. Russu comments 518 on a dedication from the same site and on other Thracian texts. Among the remaining new finds I note a boundary-stone 519 from Peristasis bearing the names of the Augusti Dicletianus and Maximianus and the Caesars Constantius and Maximianus, a votive and the epitaph of a gladiator Ἐπιτάρτης ποιοτάτωρ from Tataraev, edited 520 by I. Velkov, of which the latter is discussed 521 by Robert, two puzzling fragments 522 from Pliska, the old Bulgarian capital, and an inscription 523 from Marcianopolis (Markovo) honouring Valerian and Gallienus. A valuable article 524 by D. Detchev contains twenty-three inscriptions from the provinces of Sveti Vrač (nos. 1, 7-15, 22), Petrić (nos. 2-5), Anchialo (nos. 16-19), and elsewhere (nos. 6, 20, 23, 25); among them are two interesting grave-monuments (nos. 1, 7) and altars dedicated θεῷ μεγάλῳ Πυρμηπώλῳ and θεῷ οὐρανίῳ ὑποτήρῳ Νείκῃ (nos. 10, 14), 525 all from the region of Sveti Vrač and three of them bearing date-formulae. Other finds, mostly fragmentary, are reported 526 from various provenances. G. Ștefan publishes 527 a Byzantine lead seal from Noviodumum, D. Tudor 528 two inscribed mirrors and many dipinti, some Christian, on amphorae and sherds from Sucedava, and G. Florescu 529 fragments of a marble cornice and lintel from Capidava.

Wilhelm interprets 530 an Olbian epigram (IOSPE 12. 175), misunderstood 531 by Peek, and G. Bakalakis examines 532 as a work of art the grave-relief of Leoxos from Chersonesus (SEG III. 594).

VI. ISLANDS OF THE AEGEAN

[IG XI.] Among recent discoveries at Delos three call for special notice, (a) a fragment of a fourth-century bronze tablet on which is engraved a decree of προσαγωγία, edited 533 by H. Gallet de Santerre and J. Tréheux, (b) a Dorian decree containing several interesting technical terms, passed, probably after 166 B.C., in honour of two Athenian benefactors, which L. Robert assigns 534 with probability to Phlius, and (c) the opening lines of a Delian decree honouring the Ptolemaic general Eirenaeus of Alexandria in the early second century B.C., which M. Launey associates 535 with other epigraphical evidence for the same man (above, p. 35). Other finds are reported, 536 but not yet published, notably 537 the upper part of the stele bearing the Spartan decree liberating Delos at the close of the Peloponnesian War (SIG 1192 = GHI 99), found on an islet in the Rhenea Channel. J. Tréheux deals 538 in a valuable article with Delian history from 403 to the liberation of the island in autumn 314, tracing the fluctuations in the rents of temple-properties, and establishing the dates, from 326 to 315, of the twelve 539 archons named in IG XI. 1067a by reference to XI. 138B, here slightly amended; thanks to this and Tréheux's other chronological studies, 540 the Delian archon-list is now practically complete from 326 to 168 B.C. A. Aymard's discussion of the royal title (above, p. 21) starts 541 from an examination of inscriptions of Philip V at Delos, where he is styled 'King of the Macedonians', not 'King of Macedon'. To J. H. Kent we owe a detailed study 542 of the Delian temple-estates on Delos, Rhenea and Myconus, their location,
history, terms of tenancy, and rentals, ending with a list (pp. 320 ff.) of 268 lessees known to us in the period 314–166 B.C. W. Deonna uses epigraphical as well as other evidence in his essay 844 on the vegetation of Delos and in his book La vie privée des Délouis. 844 J. Delorme’s article 845 which seeks by epigraphical and archaeological evidence to identify and date the Delian παλαιστρα includes nine amphora-stamps (one of them non-Hellenic) and three fragments of inscribed earthenware braziers (pp. 256 ff.); he also concludes 846 from the fifteen references to a γαλαξιζω used for the Delian palaistra in the period of independence that the word denotes a wooden bucket, and interprets the phrase ἡ κάτω παλαιστρα as meaning the ground floor of the palaistra and not a second building. O. A. W. Dilke examines 847 inscriptions which bear on the auditorium of the theatre and on the question of wooden seating. 848 To J. Coupri’s article on the assistant secretary of the Athenian Amphichthons of Delos I refer above (p. 31). Other inscriptions calling for notice are the following:

503. J. H. Kent studies 849 the ιερὸς συγγραφή, which he dates in 290 B.C.

588. P. M. Fraser shows 850 by reference to this decree that in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus the Delians regarded Alexandria as lying in Egypt.


1533. A. Wilhelm emends 852 two restorations proposed by Peek (cf. JHS LXV. 86) in the epigram of Antisthenes of Paphos honouring a Salaminian.

1931, 1644, 1720, 1770. In an article 853 on sculptors’ signatures at Delos, J. Marcadé administers a severe, if salutary, shock to epigraphical confidence by showing that 1720, hitherto read as Νικανόρος ἐπικόιησαν | Ἀντιπόρος is really a lex sacra ‘Ὑπὲρ γῆς ὑπὸ θεοῦ ἡμῶν’ of[γ]ει[ν]. He also corrects the readings of 1644 and 1770, and suggests that 1631 may have been a signature.

2240–1. R. Dussaud interprets 854 the ναομαραὶ of these dedications as the mitre of Atargatis.

2308. J. Gray discusses 855 the nature of the god Hauron named in this dedication.

[IG XII.] From the remaining islands, with the exception of Rhodes and Thasos, there is little to report.

M. Segre publishes 856 a late third-century inscription of Rhodes, dedicated by priests of various cults, including those of Alexander, Ptolemy I, and Ptolemy and Berenice θεοὶ ἐν οῖνει, providing the first clear epigraphical evidence for the cult of Alexander and the Ptolemies there; he also gives 857 a revised text of SEG III, 674, 42–44, a photograph and discussion of IG XII (1) 25 and a correction of XII (1) 37. Elsewhere 858 he edits an honorary inscription from the temple of Apollo Pythaeus, probably after 65 B.C., referring to priests of Ρώμας, Ῥητὸς and the Κύρμαν, five ἱεροθύται, a προφάτος, and a γραμματεὺς ἱερὸς Ἀθλοῦ καὶ ἱεροθύτα, confirming Blinkenberg’s conjecture of the founding, not before the first century B.C., of an oracle of Apollo Pythaeus under the auspices of Delphi or Didyma; he also publishes 859 three new fragments relating to this cult, honouring κοιναὶ ἄρμαται. J. and L. Robert edit 860 from a photo (JHS LXV. 102) a Rhodian decree regulating the dedication of statues and votive offerings in the Asclepeum. Wilhelm offers 861 a revised version of an epigram (IG XII (1) 145), found at Rhodes but originating probably from Halicarnassus, honouring Herodotus and Panyassis, re-edited by F. Hiller von Gaertringen and W. Peek in Hermes, LXXVI. 220 ff., and L. Robert points out 862 that the ὁ δῶδε κλαύτως οἰκιστής of Clara Rhodos, II. 208, is a local benefactor rather than the Emperor Anastasius. P. Amadry reports 863 the recent discovery of Christian inscriptions at Rhodes. To G. P. Carratelli we owe a valuable review 864 of Lindos, II (cf. JHS LXV. 87), including some unpublished materials. To no. 1 (a list of priests of Athena Lindia) Segre adds 865 a new fragment bearing thirty-two names, prosopographical notes on the priests (71 ff.) and a chronological survey of the list, now complete from 170 to 47 B.C. F. Chamoux comments 866.

844 BCH LX. 154 ff.
845 Paris, 1948; cf. REG LXII. 129.
846 Mit. Picard, 252 ff.
847 BCH LXII-II, 255 ff.; cf. REG LXII. 129.
848 Mus. Helv. V. 60 ff.
849 BSA XLIII. 139, 131.
850 Hesperia, XVII. 267 ff.
851 JRS XXXIX. 36.
852 Mit. Picard, 688 ff.
853 Wim Anz 1947, 60; cf. REG LXII. 129.
854 BCH LXIII. 155 ff.
855 Syr. XXV. 161 ff.
856 JNES Studier, VIII. 30 f.
857 BSA Alex XXXIV. 29 ff.; cf. REG LXII. 129.
858 Ibid., 33, 37 ff.
859 Ibid., 80 ff.
860 BCH LXI. 183 ff.
861 Wim Anz 1947, 73 ff.; cf. REG LXII. 142.
862 Hellenica, IV. 117 f.
863 BCH LXII-II, 442, 444.
864 Porcelli del passato, I. 138 ff.; 399 f.; cf. REG LXII. 130.
865 Porcelli del passato, II. 64 ff.
866 CRAI 1948, 293.
on no. 2 (the 'Lindian Chronicle'), ch. xvii, and Wilhelm discusses, interprets and emends 567 five Lindian epigrams, nos. 291, 494, 496, 621 (= IG XII 1. 866), and 698. L. Robert rejects 568 Blinkenberg's restoration 569 έτι ταύτα [τρισθεῖς] in a Rhodian epitaph (SIG 1225, 6-7), and T. R. S. Broughton comments 570 on a Rhodian record (IGR IV 1116) in which Gabinius is mentioned as serving in Cilicia in 102 B.C. under the orator M. Antonius.

S. Accame gives an account, 571 based largely on inscriptions, of the constitution and history of the Lesbian κοινόν down to the reign of Commodus, and of the Roman policy of tolerance towards such leagues, which were innocuous and died out owing to internal weakness and apathy. J. Boüaërt's Brussels thesis Tituli Aerolici I have not seen; in an article 572 entitled 'Aerolica' he shows that IG XII Suppl. 129 is part of XII 2. 549, and restores XII 2. 228 and 229 and Suppl. 112. C. F. Edson discusses 573 Wilhelm's restoration (Djh III. 53) of an interesting record of a guild of Sarapiastes at Methymna (IG XII 2. 511).

G. Bovini's account of Roman portraiture from Trebонианус Gallus to Probus includes 574 a Melian bust dedicated by the περιβολαῖοι (XII 3. 1128); O. A. W. Dilke considers 575 the evidence for προδείπτης in the theatre at Melos, where also an archaic stele has come to light. 576 A. Ferrua's examination 577 of the διάγραμμα of Thera (cf. JHS LXII, 71) I have not seen. In a posthumous article on the foundation of the pergamenum Nichephora M. Segre edits 578 a new fragment of the letter of Eumene II to Cos (Welles, Royal Correspondence, 50), restores the text and shows its importance for the successive phases of the institution of the Nichepora, founded after the naval victory of Chios in 201 B.C. Robert adds 579 comments on and photographs of a Coan gladiatorial mosaic previously described in his Gladiateurs dans l'Orient grec, 191 f. I call attention to the valuable summaries 580 by J. and L. Robert of the Coan and Calymnian articles by Herzog, Segre and Laurenzi mentioned in my previous bibliography (JHS LXVII 115).

At Naxos a fifth-century stele inscribed 'Αριστεύς Σευμήνις has been found. 581 The 'Parian Marble' (IG XII 5. 444), of which M. N. Tod gives 582 a brief account, affords evidence to T. J. Cadoux 583 in his study of the earlier Attic archons and to V. Beshevliev 584 in his essay on Greek colonization in the North, while O. Rubensohn's article on Paros in RE XVIII 1781 ff. makes full use of the relevant epigraphical sources. The excavation of Siphnos, described by J. K. Brock and G. M. Young, unearthed 585 nine stamped amphora-handles, some graffiti on pottery, two glass beakers and a bone counter bearing the Greek and Roman signs for 8. Among the texts copied by F. Vernon in 1675 are two 586 from Cythnos (Therma), one of them a dedication to θεός όφυστος, G. Klaffenbach offers 587 a revised version of II. 14-18 of the fifth-century lex de funeribus from Iulis on Ceos (IG XII 5. 593), and A. Wilhelms adds 588 a fragment to another inscription from the same site (ibid. 596). A. J. de Visscher comments 589 on a fragment from Syros (ibid. 654) relative to the punishment of slaves, I. I. Russu calls attention 590 to the Thracian name [Δσιά]λησιμ in an Andrian epitaph (ibid. 774), and H. van Essefeterre studies 591 the decrees of Cretan cities recognizing the τάξις of the Poseidon temple at Tenos (ibid. 867-9), assigning the latter part of 868 A to Axos and that of 868 B to Aptara.

N. M. Kontoleon re-edits 592 the Chian decree recently published by D. W. S. Hunt (cf. JHS LXVII 115) and deals 593 with what remains of a metrical epitaph on the 'Dancers' Stele' in the Chios Museum. L. Robert discusses 594 three votive epigrams from the Samian Heraeum, two of which (SEG I. 405; cf. W. Peck, AM LXVI. 78) he assigns to two governors in the reign of Julian, Acacesius and Plutarchus (who may be the son of the like-named proconsul of Asia), while the third (Peck, ibid. 76 f.), dating from the same period,
commemorates the justice of another governor, Gregorius. He also examines an epigram (IGR IV. 967) relating to the construction of an aqueduct and fountain, denies the Christian character of a late Samian inscription (AM LIV. 137) set up by of πρεσβυτέρους, and discusses a third-century decree of Heraclea (IG XII (7). 509) banning the introduction of goats to the islet, on economic rather than religious grounds, in which he substitutes in l. 1 Ηρακλῆς for Δίας.

M. Segre emphasizes the lamentable dispersion of the inscriptions of Lemnos, draws up a list of published texts now in Lemnos and Mytilene, and edits nineteen for the first time, five from Myrina, eleven from Hephaestia and three of uncertain origin, among them a sixth-century δρος of the precinct of Artemis, the earliest extant inscription of the island (no. 4), a metrical epithet of the late fifth century (no. 7), and an archaic mortgage-deed, the earliest surviving example of a τράπεζα ἐπὶ λύσει (no. 11); the other Lemnian members of this class (IG XII (8). 18-22) are examined by I. A. Meletopoulos. M. Falkner studies archaeologically and epigraphically the non-Hellenic 'Lemnian Stele' (ibid. 1). J. Pouilloux publishes three inscriptions from Thasos, the dedication, dating from the fourth or third century b.c., by an Olymphonian πρόξενος of a 'tower', exedra and statue, the record of a gift to the city of a συνοίκια καὶ τὰ ἔργαστηρια between 150 and 100 b.c., and an epitaph on a relief portraying a λαξαπαθής σδρος, examining the epigraphical references to a torch-race at the Thasian festival of the Heraclia. R. Martin edits the inscription on the base of a citizen victorious with the συνωρίη at the Pythia, signed by the Athenian sculptor Praxias, which illustrates the Thasian devotion to horses and the importance of the συνωρίη at the Pythia, where it was introduced in 398. Other finds are reported and await publication, while IG XII Suppl. 355 has been rediscovered. G. Mihailov's collection of epigrams 'aus bulgarischen Ländern' includes twenty-three poems from Thasos (nos. 149-71), all of them in IG XII (8), while an article by V. Beshelev and Mihailov deals with fourteen Thasian reliefs (nos. 54-67), five of which bear Greek inscriptions, one (no. 60) previously unpublished. G. Daux re-examines two Thasian laws regulating the wine-trade (IG XII Suppl. 347), dating them in the last quarter of the fifth or the beginning of the fourth century; he also discusses the dates of the Heraclia-reliefs (ibid. 414) and the Louvre reliefs (IG XII (8). 358), commenting (pp. 249 ff.) on the text of the former and of other Thasian inscriptions. L. Robert starts from the epitaph (IG XII Suppl. 453) of a [πο]μον (so he emends the μον of l. 4) in his inquiry into the epigraphical evidence for Greek shepherds and goatherds, and through him I learn of F. Sokolowski's article on the Heraclia-cult. I. I. Russ read σαπήνος in an epitaph of Roman times (A Delt II, περ. 11), an emendation already suggested by H. Nesselhauf (IG XII Suppl. 500). For an Eretrian epitaph, IG XII (9). 860, see above (p. 33).

[IG XIII.] In La Crête et le monde grec de Platon à Polybe H. van Effenterre freely uses epigraphical sources (indexed on pp. 236 ff.), notably those from Tenos (see above) and Olus (see below). M. Guarducci examines the relations between Crete and Delphi, especially in early times, and K. Latte pays close attention to inscriptions from Dreros (ICret I. ix. 1. 123 ff.) and Gortyn (SGDI 4985, 4993, Riv Fil LVIII. 471 ff.) in discussing collective property and state treasure in Greece. L. H. Jeffeys deals with the letter Χ, Eteocretan rather than Dorian, in Cretan inscriptions, recurring in an archaic epitaph of Sicinus (IG XII Suppl. 178) and in the Lemnian and Phrygian alphabets. B. D. Theophaneides publishes nine epitaphs of the fourth or fifth century A.D., most or all from Καστέλι Κρήτης in W. Crete, a medieval Christian epitaph from Polyrrhenia (p. 30), a fragment of a statue-base of Septimius Severus from Cantaurus (pp. 32 ff.), and a mutilated dedication from Hyrtacina (p. 38).
N. Platon traces 618 the modern name Χανιά back to the ancient *Αλχαβία, found in one copy of a document from Cydonia (I.Cret. II. x. 1. 23 = SIG 940. 23). For the fifth-century pact between Cnosus and Tyrissee see above, p. 34. Platon edits 619 a long and puzzling lex sacra of the second or first century B.C., found in the outskirts of Cnosus; it begins with οἱ ἑπιλικοὶ, followed by six names and patronymics, and bars from the temple precincts τὸς ἁρταῖος καὶ Ἀσσυρίας, ending with an enigmatic passage in which the phrase τὸ καταλοίπον ἄινος μέλος occurs twice, a καθαρτιός is named, and the due performance of duties is urged. M. Guarducci examines 620 the references in archaic inscriptions of Gortyn to payment, reckoned in tripods, lebedes and obols, which she regards as utensils used as money, comparing, inter alia, the bundles of spits from the Argive Heraeum, Rhodopis' dedication at Delphi (Hdt. II. 135) and the Perachora drachma-inscription. L. Robert interprets 621 epitaphs of Gortyn commemorating Leontius, praetorian prefect of Illyricum in A.D. 412-3 (Riv. Ist. Arch. I. 176), and Marcellinus, a fourth-century governor of Crete praised for his εὐδίκη καὶ ὀρφη (ibid. 175; cf. 175), as also 622 the prose inscription on the statue-base of yet another governor, Oecumenius Dositheus Asclepiadotus, erected παρὰ τὴν Δίκην (ibid. 169). V. Georgiev claims 623 that the archaic text from Drures regarded by H. van Effenterre as Eteocretan (cf. JHS LXVII. 117) is a Greek dedication of a goatherd and cheesemaker in honour of Hermes, but his reasoning is criticized and his conclusion rejected 624 by M. Lejeune. H. van Effenterre publishes 625 a fragmentary treaty between Olus and Rhodes, which he dates near the close of 201 B.C., a decree of Olus relative to the withdrawal of a Rhodian garrison, and another, engraved on the same base, granting the titles of ἅρμα τοῦ και ἐνεργεῖτος to a Chian. Robert connects 626 the phrase Νίκη Ρομαίων in an epitaph from Olus (I.Cret. I. xxiii. 13) for Asclepiadotus, governor of Crete between A.D. 382 and 384, with Gratian's removal of the altar of Victory from the Senate House in 382 and the deep resentment caused thereby, and M. Guarducci dates 627 in 114 B.C. at the earliest the war between Olus and Lato referred to in documents found near the latter city (REA XLIV. 32 ff.). H. van Effenterre supports 628 against Guarducci (cf. JHS LXV. 90), the view of F. Chapouthier that the graffiti on the rocks of Prasonisi islet, to which he adds an early Christian example, were not the idle amusements of flaneurs, but expressions of gratitude to heaven for escape from the perils of the sea; J. and L. Robert point out 629 the difficulties of such a view. G. Björck suggests 630 restorations of epitaphs from Itanos (I.Cret. III. iv. 39) and Hierapytan (ibid. iii. 50), and Robert claims 631 another mutilated epitaph from the latter site (ibid. iii. 51) as commemorating a gladiator. To the Eteocretan inscriptions of Praesus (ibid. vi. 1-5) P. Kretschmer devotes 632 two important articles.

VII. Western Europe

T. J. Dunbavin's important work 633 on the Western Greeks down to 480 B.C. utilizes the available epigraphical materials, disappointing meagre, among them the dedication of the Syracusan Apollonion (IG XIV. 1) on p. 59, the sixth-century homicide law of a Chalcidian colony near Leontini (Arangio-Ruiz and Olivieri, Insct. gr. Sic. ad ius pert. 171 ff.) on p. 128, the famous fifth-century victory-memorial of Selinus (IG XIV. 268 = Gli 37) on p. 304, the bronze double axe from S. Agata (IG XIV. 643) on p. 157, an archaic t.c. pyramid with Achaean script from S. Mauro Forte (ibid. 552) on p. 151, and a still unpublished dedication of the athlete Phylus to Zeus Melichios at Croton on p. 85.

In his ' Anthology of early Christian inscriptions of Sicily ' 634 A. Ferrua deals with a large number of Greek and a few Latin texts, almost all of them epitaphs now in the Syracuse Museum. The great majority were previously unknown, but many inscriptions edited by Orsi, Barreca, Strazzulla and others are here more fully or more correctly presented; the eleven Greek inscriptions dated by the names of consuls range from A.D. 349 to 447. Other-
wise Syracuse is represented by the merical epitaph of a doctor of the second century A.D., edited 635 by M. Guarducci, a group of texts 636 found by L. Brea in pagan and Christian catacombs, including a pagan epitaph of a certain 'Υσπανθης, a votive to Zeus and Tyche, and some tituli memoriales from the catacombs of S. Giovanni, and graffiti on a amphora and a b.f. crater published 637 by G. Cultrera. Guarducci offers 638 a new reading of the dedication of the temple of Apollo (IG XIV. 1), which, she holds, refers to the whole building, not to some part of it, and distinguishes the work of two sculptors; temple and inscription she dates in the first half of the sixth century B.C. P. Griffio publishes 639 an inscribed lekythos from Leontini, A. Vogliano gives 640 a revised text of an interesting amulet from Acrae (IG XIV. 2413 (17)) with a German commentary by K. Preisendanz, G. P. Carratelli edits 641 an archaic epigram from Comiso, on the borders of the territory of Camarina, and G. V. Gentilli 642 a graffito from Gela, which he assigns to the sixth century B.C. C. Mercurelli's account of the early Christian period at Acragas includes 643 some minor epigraphical texts from that site, and also a fragment (ibid. 261) from Licata-Phintias. A. Vogliano discusses 644 an inscribed leaden tablet of doubtful authenticity, said to have been found at Selinus, and L. B. Brea reports 645 the discovery at Centuripa of eight Rhodian amphora-stamps, and at Lipara of nine epitaphs, 646 most of them engraved on blocks of lava, and gives 647 photographs of two epitaphs from the island of Salina.

I pass now to Italy. P. C. Sestieri comments 648 on a previously known vase from Metapontum inscribed τῆς Ἡρας ἠμίλην, and two lamps unearthed at Tarentum bear 649 the maker's name. M. Della Corte publishes 650 416 'inscriptions' from Pompeii, of which fifty-eight are Greek; fifty-five of these are painted or stamped on amphorae or other vases, two are graffiti, and one is on a lamp (p. 110) representing an old man reading a scroll inscribed ἈΒΓΑ. Three fragments (one agonistic, two Christian of the sixth or seventh century) have been found 651 in the church of S. Lorenzo Maggiore at Naples. C. C. Torrey discusses 652 an inscription of A.D. 79 from Puteoli (OGI 594) referring to a party of Phoenicians who had come from Tyre, and seeks to restore and interpret it by aid of a new find from Phoenicia (below, p. 53). The mysterious poem relating to Veleda, found at Ardea but now lost (cf. JHS LXVII. 118), has evoked much interest and comment. J. Keil sees 653 in it a satirical composition directed against the captive prophetess and protesting against her mild treatment. A. Wilamowitz accepts 654 in the main Keil's restoration and interpretation of the poem as a Sprügedicht, but reads in l. 1 τι σε δει for τίς δει, restores in l. 2 [Μάρκε] or some such name, in l. 3 (ξανθής), and in the last line [σοι] instead of [vous], regarding it as a reference not to Veleda's punishment but to the discovery of some useful task to occupy her time. J. and L. Robert reject 655 these explanations, holding that 'on ne peut expliquer cette inscription qu'en y voyant un oracle relatif à Veleda, à la suite duquel sans doute elle aurait vécu dans le sanctuaire d'Ardée comme une sorte de hérodulée'. Finally, E. Des Places, aided by L. Robert and others, gives 656 a restored text and a translation, regarding the metre as Hipponactean rather than dactylic hexameter (as Guarducci) or Sapphic hendecasyllable (as Keil), and denying that the oracle, if oracle it be, can be Delphic. C. Picard's article 657 on the iconography of Hippocrates takes account of the inscribed herm found in a grave on the Isola Sacra, near Ostia, and the portrait bust assigned to it by Becatti (cf. JHS LXVII. 118). R. Paribeni publishes 658 a grave-cippus of a sophist, Νικομηδεύς καὶ Ἑράτος and Roman citizen, erected at Ostia by a μουσικὸς who was his client and ἄρσιτος, and G. Jacopi 659 eight Greek or bilingual epitaphs from Pietra Papa, near Porto, while S. Estrem comments 660 on the ΔΟΣ Πολυτελος of a mosaic found 661 in a tomb in the same neighbourhood. W. Seston repeats 662 the text of the tomb-epigram of Eutyches from Domitian's Alban Villa (cf. JHS
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LXVII. 118) and discusses the view of heroization there presented. D. M. Robinson describes a fragment of a new Orpheus-relief in the Robinson Collection, University of Mississippi, acquired in Rome, but said to have been found near Tarquinii, a copy, made in the first or second century A.D., of a fifth-century Greek original, and A. Degrassi reports the discovery in the Forum Boarium of a bone tessera inscribed III ITTEPA Γ. E. Will and others
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awed with the δευτερος of the Gaionas-inscription (CIL VI, 36804; cf. IG XIV, 1512) supporting Gauckler's interpretation against that of Cumont (cf. JHS LXV, 91), A. Wilhelm substitutes the τυχερα ταις of a metrical epitaph (IG XIV, 1977), L. Robert comments on another epitaph (Bull. Comm. Arch. LXVII, 20) with special reference to the title επιτροπος λουθον Αηνας, O. Weinreich republishes, with translation and commentary, the Roman epitaph (IG XIV, 2124) on an unknown pantomime, and G. Bovini discusses a painted epitaph from the Cemetery of Pamphilus. M. M. Vianello publishes a grave-epigram from Cures in the Sabine territory, L. D. Marcon's account of the inscriptions in the Museo Moscardo at Verona includes IG XIV, 2306, 2308, P. L. Zovatto examines four Christian epitaphs of νεφωτοισι from Concordia (ibid. 2325–6, 2328, 2334), C. Corbato discusses the epitaph of a mima at Aquileia (ibid. 2342), and J. Guey, in his account of the 'miraculous rainfall' which rescued M. Aurelius in 172, deals with the person and career of Harnophis, priest and wonder-worker, of whom an epigraphical memento survives at Aquileia (cf. JHS LXVII, 119).

From the western provinces of the Empire I have little to note. W. Vollgraff defends the genuineness of an inscription from Dijon (IG XIV, 370*), claiming as Iranian the suspected name Chyndonax, and H. Rolland calls attention to a series of masons' marks at Massilia. R. P. Wright announces the discovery of a gold ring with inscribed sardonyx at Keynsham and of a graffito on silver platters from Mildenhall, Suffolk, giving the owner's name as Eōdrīpses, possibly the Armenian eunuch who was praeceptor sacri cubiculi under Julian in Gaul, a.d. 355–61. M. K. Kubinyi describes a silver amulet, now in the Budapest Museum, found in a grave in the Roman cemetery of Ságvár, bearing Latin and Greek words and various magical symbols.

VIII. Asia Minor

The foremost contributor to Anatolian epigraphy has been L. Robert; it is significant that of the forty-nine items in the relevant section of the 1949 'Bulletin' no fewer than thirty-five deal wholly or mainly with Hellenica, IV, V, VI, 679 I indicate briefly the contents of these volumes relative to Asia Minor, referring to the 'Bulletin' for a more adequate summary. Hellenica IV deals almost exclusively, mainly from the standpoint of paleography and prosopography, with epigrams of the third and later centuries A.D., especially (pp. 35 ff.) those commemorating the characters and achievements of provincial governors. These include epigrams from Aphrodisias honouring Flavius Eutolmios Tatianus, praetorian prefect A.D. 388–92 (pp. 23, 42, 47 ff.; unpublished), Asclepiodotus, father-in-law of the like-named philosopher of Alexandria (pp. 115 ff.; on CIG 2851), Rhodopaeus, Hermias, Eugenius and Menander, who in different ways had been generous benefactors of the state (pp. 127 ff.; unpublished); 681 from Tralles, extolling Montius, proconsul of Asia, builder of an aqueduct (pp. 112 f.; on REA XI, 296 ff.); from Miletus, relative to the Thermae (pp. 129 ff., 134; on Milet, I (9), 339, 341); from Ephesus, in honour of the proconsuls Andreas, likened to 'Menos or Lycurgus or Solon', an Egyptian native, and Nonnus, apostatesιν τοιλινον σφων Ηγγυμνη (pp. 21, 43 f., 98; on Wien Anz 1942, 193 ff.) and Messalinus, νεφωτος Αηνας μεγαν θυνταρη (pp. 87 ff.; on Ephesos, II, 43, 44); 682 from Sardis, lauding the integrity of Acholius, vicarius of the diocese of Asia (pp. 34 ff., 149 ff.; on Sardis, VII (1), 83); 683 from Hypaepa,
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commemorating the justice of Flavius Anthemides Isidorus, ἀνθρωπίτευτον μέγ. ἁλίκανον (pp. 18 ff.; on Kaibel, Ἐπιγρ. 903a); from the Thermae of Phazimon in Pontus, relative to Jovinus’ embellishment of the baths (pp. 75 ff.; on SEG IV. 729); from Laodicea ad Lycum praising Constantinus, ὑποταξάτων καὶ ὕπαρξαν ὑγιῶν (pp. 45 ff.; on MAMA VI. 15) and Severus (pp. 88 ff.; on AM XXI. 470 f.), the latter for hydraulic services; and from Pisidian Antioch for similar benefits (pp. 64 ff.; on SEG VI. 560 f.). Robert also examines prose inscriptions from Clazomenae in honour of Caelius Montius (pp. 110 ff.; on IGR IV. 1554) and from Side for the aforementioned Tattianus (pp. 51 f.; on CIG 4350). In Hellenica VI Robert comments (pp. 31 ff.) on the persons honoured in a group of inscriptions from Thyatira (IGR IV. 1214–18), offers (p. 31) a solution of a puzzle in a text from Nysa (BCH XIV. 224), interprets (pp. 59 ff.) the title Ἑλληνικᾶς in an inscription of Ephesus (Ὀρθ. XXXVII. Beibl. 13 f.) as referring to Ephesian officials and examines the epigraphic evidence for Ἑλληνικᾶς at Ephesus and in places other than Olympia, comments on texts from Side (pp. 74 ff.), dating from the third century A.D., mentioning an ἐπισκεύων (CIG 4352–7, BSA XVII. 242), of which he gives a new interpretation, and adds to his list of gladiatorial monuments inscriptions of Satala, Casaba and Smyrna (pp. 78 ff.). In Hellenica VI J. and L. Robert jointly publish the results of a visit paid in 1946 to Manisa Museum, in which are collected antiquities from the whole vilayet, including Sardis, Philadelphia, Maecenia, Julia Gordus, Thyatira, and the Upper Caicus Valley. Among its contents are two inscriptions of Magnesia sub Sipylo (pp. 9 ff.), a Hellenistic dedication to Isis and Sarapis with a later list of ἀριστοκρατῶν, and a revised text of an epitaph bearing a curse (REG XIII. 498); a new honorary inscription, dating from the second century B.C., of a Macedonian colony at Hymenes, and a late votive Μετρή τὸν καὶ Διὸ Ἀδελφόν 684 ἐπιτάφιον, with remarks on previously published inscriptions of the site (pp. 16 ff.); a full account of Hieroclesarea and an edition or re-edition of fourteen inscriptions (pp. 27 ff.), viz. a δόρος ἱερός ἄρτουδος [Ἀ]ργείας [μῖδος] (pp. 33 ff.), eight agonistic records (pp. 43 ff.), honorary and votive inscriptions (pp. 49 ff.), including one for τὸν Συνοπτομένον Ἐπιφανή [vθν], altars of Ζωος κτήσισας and Dionysus, and a sarcophagus portraying a cock-fight; a description (pp. 56 ff.) of the ancient sites of Sariqam (N. of Magnesia sub Sipylo) and the vicinity with comments on their inscriptions and two new and valuable documents, the closing words of an Imperial letter of Claudius’ reign, and an honorary inscription erected by the villagers of Μοσχάκον, four inscriptions of Thyatira (pp. 70 ff.), including two ἐπέμβατα, a dedication to Augustus by his priest and a record honouring an agonothete of the Σεβάστων καὶ Τυφωνίνης παναγάριν, which demands a revision of texts previously known relative to this festival, notably CIG 3493: seven stones in the Manisa Museum from the Upper Caicus Valley (pp. 80 ff.), including three letters sent by Hadrian in 127 to Hadrianopolis-Stratoniceae (IGR IV. 1156) and an unpublished dedication to Asclepius Σωτήρ; nine inscriptions of Julia Gordus and N.E. Lydia (pp. 89 ff.), four of which are new, including an interesting honorary text and epitaphs dated A.D. 203–4 (prose, but with poetic echoes), 47–8 (containing the new term of relationship τὸ κάμψεως) and 232 or 286 (from Daldis); four votives from Kula in Maecenia, of which a dedication Διὸ Τεμπείων, a confession Μετρή Ταλαμηνή and a dedication to Artemis Ανατίνης ἐπηκοόν καὶ βοῦθιον πάλατος γεγονός is new (in this connexion Robert re-edits SEG IV. 652), and a Sabazios-relief is reinterpreted (pp. 105 ff.); a new epitaph from Sardis 685 and a new edition of a decree of a guild, now known to be of Διαστάτων, at Parsada (pp. 114 ff.) and an epitaph, perhaps from Daldis or Julia Gordus (pp. 117 ff.), dated in April, A.D. 263, of one who for six months had been a prisoner of ‘the barbarians’, no doubt the Gothic invaders of Anatolia. An index (pp. 123 ff.) of provenances of published inscriptions in the Manisa Museum is followed by three texts (pp. 126 ff.) copied by G. Radet in 1887, an epitaph and honorary inscription from the district of Magnesia sub Sipylo, of which the latter records the lavish provision of oil by a gymnasiarch ἐξ ἥλιουτος τοῖς νείοις καὶ γέρους καὶ ἁπαλοπάντοις, and the epitaph, copied near Tepikos, of one who was ἱεραρχός, ἀποφαντήρος, εὐφαντήριος and ἀγοραστός.

Hellenica VII, 686 the largest volume of the series, covers a wide and varied field, but the main emphasis falls on Asia Minor. The discovery at Nehavend of a letter from Antiochus III (see below, p. 54) calls for a reconsideration (pp. 5 ff.) of the much discussed ‘Edict of Eriza’.

681 Cf. P. M. Fraser, CR LXIII. 98 ff.
682 For Sardis see also p. 18.
683 Paris, 1949; the contents will be analysed in the Bulletin for 1950.
found in 1884 at Dodurga in Phrygia (Welles, Royal Correspondence, 36, 37), the restoration of which is now practically complete and its date fixed as 193 B.C. Three new inscriptions are published (pp. 30 ff.) from the region of Yalova in Bithynia, a dedication Δαι Βρονταστα και Δημητρίας, an honorary decree of a guild of Brontasitai, and an interesting, if fragmentary, inscription honouring a priest who served as agonothetes and gymnasiarch, and a group of stelae erected by the members, male and female, of a θεος of Zeus at Trigl, near Mudania, is re-examined (pp. 41 ff.), as also a dedication το θεος Σαραθυρος Παυσαγονος from Gbze in Bithynia (pp. 45 f.). The study of Anatolian deities, such as Κακακος (cf. JHS LXVII. 120), the three σεληνοειδεις theoi, Apollo Пεριποικωνταν, Αρδων, Κρόνος and Pluto, is continued (pp. 50 ff.), a fourth-century decree of the Πελεκώδης κεκενεσ from the temple of Sinuri, near Mylasa, is reconsidered in view of Wilkinson's suggestions (cf. JHS LXVII. 121), and comments are made on other texts from that site (pp. 55 ff.). The title τροφης, found on a coin of Synnada, is elucidated by inscriptions from Anatolia and elsewhere (pp. 74 ff.); an interesting agonistic record from Smyrna, dated ca. A.D. 160–80, receives its first edition and throws light on a fragment from Ephesus (BM 613) and on several technical terms of athletics (pp. 105 ff.), and the festival of the Hyacinthophoria, named in a fragment from Dydima, is assigned to Cnidan rather than to Miletus or Didyma, while an epigram of the second century B.C., engraved on the same stone, is published (pp. 114 ff.); an important victory-record of a Milesian runner (Milet, I (9). 369) is re-edited by the aid of another inscription of Dydima, here first published, relative to the same athlete, whose whole career, though not his name, we now know (pp. 117 ff.). Addenda to Robert's gladiatorial monuments include a fragmentary relief from Laodicea ad Lycaum (p. 140), and it is shown (pp. 141 ff.) that a relief from Phrygian Hierapolis, now in Berlin, represents condemned men led to the circus. An admirably preserved dossier, found by G. E. Bean at Caunus and published by Robert (pp. 171 ff.), relates to the dispatch of Caunian judges to Smyrna and renders possible the restoration of Smyrnaen decrees for judges from Thasos and Astypalaea. Two inscriptions from Caunus refer to Ptolemis in Caria (Lebedus) and justify the restoration Καίλατος in Iov Magn. 59b 30 (pp. 180 ff.), and a bronze of Smyrna is explained (pp. 194 ff.) as 'une sorte de médaille d'identité'. An honorary inscription of Tarsus (IGR III. 883), recently republished by Ramsay (Social Basis of Roman Power, 298 ff.), is discussed (pp. 197 ff.), and a new edition of a Milesian document relating to the cult of Caligula (Siebenter vorl. Bericht über Milet, 65 ff.) leads to an examination of the worship of that Emperor in Asia and of the conventus (conventus) of the province (pp. 206 ff.). Attention is called to two epigraphical references from Cibyra to the transportation of statues (pp. 241 ff.), and Robert shows that the errors noted by Wilhelm (CR XLVIII. 210 f.) in a decree of Mylassa (RA II (1933). 38 ff.) are due to the editor, not to the engraver (pp. 244 f.). Several chapters (VII–XI), though primarily numismatic, contain valuable epigraphical elements.

A. M. Mansel has compiled a full bibliography 639 of works published before 1940 relating to the archaeology, epigraphy and historical geography of Turkey, section IV of which deals with Greek and Latin inscriptions. C. Picard protests 640 against a passage 641 in which J. and L. Robert criticize his treatment of a Halicarnassan epigram; another epigram (IG XII (1). 145), which may well belong to Halicarnassus, see above, p. 43. D. Calabi and A. Vogliano give an account, 642 based on the report and photographs published 643 by A. W. Persson, of the discoveries made by the Swedish excavators at Labranda, ten miles N. of Mylasa; these include a dedication of οἰκείον by Idrius, the Carian dynasty, and part of a letter from Olympichus, followed by one addressed to Olympichus by Philip V of Macedon. G. Jacopi's epigraphical finds 644 at Aphrodisias I know only through the summary by J. and L. Robert. In his essay 645 on the history of Apollonia and S.E. Thrace C. M. Danov examines the fourth-century pact of ισοπολιτεία between Miletus and Olbia (SIG 286 = GHI 195); T. J. Cadoux cites 646 the Milesian eponym-list among the testimonia in his article on the early Athenian archons. J. Keil shows, 647 by the aid of two unpublished texts, that the
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building S.W. of the Agora at Ephesus unearthed in 1913 and 1926 is a temple of the Egyptian gods, O. A. W. Dilke deals with the inscriptions indicating the occupants of certain blocks in the Ephesian theatre, and L. Robert adds to his gladiatorial collection an honorary inscription from that city (Ephesos, II. 61 ii). D. W. S. Hunt examines the nature of the τυρώγοι which figure in some inscriptions of Teos (CIG 3064, 3061, BCH IV. 174), and G. Klaffenbach suggests new restorations in Antigonus' letter to the Teans (Welles, Royal Correspondence, 3). In an article on Θεοκρίτου R. Herbig restores the inscription on a base at Erythrae and discusses two others (AM XVII. 17 ff. nos. 1, 2, 9). B. D. Meritt edits three texts copied by F. Vernon at Smyrna in 1676, on one of which G. A. Stamires comments.

L. Robert discusses and illustrates a confession-stele dedicated to Apollo Bορνυτός, found at Kula in Macedonia and now in Berlin, and A. Wilhelm interprets two passages in the Ilian lex de tyrannis (ogi 218. 52 ff., 140 ff.), translating Επιγραφή (l. 56) by 'Auftrag zu irgendeiner Leistung!', and substituting δρόμοι for δρόμοι (l. 140). In an addendum to Rev Phil XIII (1939). 190 Robert traces the origin of a votive ΔΤΩΛΟΒΙΟΣ not to Kavak but to a second shrine of that god in Mysia, while in the dedication of an Asiarach at Adramyttium (IGR IV. 263) he restores τός της φιλ[στημισάμιν]ος and explains the phrase. C. B. Welles comments on Feyel's treatment (REA XLII. 137 ff.) of a letter of Attalus found at Soma in the Upper Caicus Valley (Welles, Royal Correspondence, 47) and questions his restoration of l. 4. M. Segre discusses the founding of the Nicephoria at Pergamum in the light of documents from Iasus and Cos, dating between 197 and 191 two celebrations of the local Nicephoria and the foundation of the pentetic festival, probably held more than once. E. V. Hansen uses some of the available epigraphical sources in her work The Aithalids of Pergamum. M. N. Tod reads Δεσποινής, not Δεσπότους, in a Cyzicene dedication, now in Oxford (CIG 3665).

F. K. Dörner's preliminary report on a journey undertaken in 1948 in E. Bithynia includes, inter alia, an honorary inscription of a.d. 255-6 from Pompeipolis for Salonina, Gallienus' wife, a base inscribed νεότι φιλο[στημισάμιν]ος from Byzantium-Claudioplis, a list of gymnasiarchs and agonothetae dedicated Δι' Καυσαντηρού, and many finds from the district of Prusias ad Hypium, among them an honorary inscription for a 'first archon', giving the names of Φυλαυ and Φυλαρχός, honours bestowed by two tribes on a δι' τετμημένον, δίς τρόων δρόμοι, an epitaph commemorating a συγγενής συνδεκτικός καὶ ύπατος ἡμών δημοσίως τετειμένον εἰς ένοικοτητίων. M. N. Tod discusses a donation-list from Nicomedia (Dörner, Inschriften und Denkmäler, 54 f.), but wrongly retains the editor's Ολόροφος, which should be Ολόφορος. J. and L. Robert comment further on the epitaph of a doctor, copied by Covel at Nicea, and E. Bosch devotes an article (in Turkish) to the festivals of that city, based mainly on its coins. Robert re-edits the gravestone of a gladiator from Amasia (CIG 4175), and A. M. Schneider reports from Sivas in Pontus a memorial inscription and a metrical epitaph.

The Monumentum Ancyranum continues to evoke discussion, mainly historical and juristic rather than textual. E. Schönauer deals with 'Die Res gestae Divi Augusti in rechtsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung'; E. Gabrius issues volume I of his 'Acta Divi Augusti'; G. P. Carratelli examines the auctoritas of Augustus in the light of ch. 34, 3, and edits the whole record; M. A. Levi analyses the composition of the Res gestae, the model of which must, he argues, be sought in the great monumental inscriptions of the oriental monarchs, and concludes (p. 209) that we have here 'not the foundation of a dynasty, but the record of an exceptional personality'. F. Gottanka's article on the Ancyran and Anthiocheia texts deals in detail with Markowski's restoration (Eos, XXXII. 347 ff.) and comments on other works relating to the Res gestae. O. Weinreich discusses an epigram of Cotaeum (CIG 38275) on a
certain Leonidas, possibly a pantomime, while a photograph 727 of another metrical epitaph of that city (Kaibel, Epigr. 363) shows that the text needs careful revision. J. Heurton identifies 728 the [Ἀ]νολίῃ α]ν] ην τον Γαλλή, from which Tiberius sent a letter to Aezani (Dessau, ILS 9463), with Boulogne-sur-mer, and rejects the view that Boulogne was not called Bononia until the close of the third century A.D. R. Aigrain treats 729 a late record of the gift of a church and vegetable-garden at Sebaste (SEG VI. 180), and L. Robert describes and illustrates 730 a votive stele of Μεν Ἀκανθός from the same site (JHS IV. 417). G. M. Berasnetti discusses 731 the appointment of an equestrian governor of Lycia and Pamphylia, Terentius Marcianus, known from inscriptions of Termessus (TAM III 1. 89), Sagalassus (IGR III. 358) and Trebenna (MA XXII. 214). E. Bosch and S. Atlan publish 732 thirty-four inscriptions found at or near Attalea (no. 5 is from Phaselis, no. 31 from Andeda), adding a general account of Roman Pamphylia. The texts comprise three dedications (nos. 1–3), honours paid to Emperors, high officials and benefactors (nos. 4–24), a building-inscription (no. 25) and nine epitaphs (nos. 26–34), among which nos. 13, 16, 19, 21, 22 are of special interest; they should be read in conjunction with the summary and comments 733 of J. and L. Robert, who point out that nos. 5, 15, 17, 18, 32 and 34 were already published. J. H. Oliver, 734 independently of G. Pflaum, 735 restores ἀγαπητής Αἰχαμίας in no. 21, and draws up the stemma of the family of the Calpurnii of Attalea, of which the person honoured is a member.

G. E. Bean publishes 736 sixteen inscriptions copied in September, 1946, in the Xanthus Valley, at Arsada (nos. 1–10), Araxa (nos. 11–15) and Cadyanda (no. 16); all are epitaphs or fragments except a sacrificial regulation (no. 3) and a long and historically valuable decree (no. 11) of the δήμος απὸ τῆς Ἀρακής, honouring Orthogoras, an eminent citizen, for military, diplomatic, political and religious services rendered to his city and the Lycian League, and giving interesting details of conditions in Lycia in the late second or early first century B.C. A. Wilhelm examines 737 II. 6–7 of an epitaph from Olympia (TAM II. 1937), substituting δρυς for δρυς and τὸ εἰρήνης for τὸ ἔρημου, and rejecting the ἀγαπητής inserted by the editor. For the Greek votive and epitaphs found by H. Bossert and Bahadir Alkim at or near Karatepe in Cilicia I refer to the critical summary 738 of J. and L. Robert. L. Robert also transcribes and annotates 739 a Christian epitaph from a Cappadocian village, the ancient Limnae, ending with the formula τῶν Θεῶν ἡμῶν ἢ ἡ ἀνάγνωσιν ἐσποντέω ὑπὲρ ἑμῶν, and an apsidal mosaic from Erzinian in Armenia Minor, reported 740 by A. M. Schneider, bears the legend Κύριε, ἐλπίδος Οὐρανουδόκτο, an Iranian name.

T. B. Mitford edits 741 sixteen new religious documents from Roman Cyprus—the metrical dedication of a statue of Nemesis-Dikaiosyne (no. 1), eight votives to Zeus λαβράνος (nos. 2–9) or Ζεὺς Ὀλυμπίτιος (no. 10), three to the θεὸς ὑψιστος (nos. 11–13), one to Ὀρτάκων Μέλανθιος (no. 14), one perhaps to the Dioscuri (no. 15), and one (no. 16) recording the dedication, in A.D. 79 or 80, to Cyprian Aphrodite and the Emperor Titus of τὸ [ἰ]ερὸς τῶν ἑτῶς [τῆς] ἐτηρίδος. The inscribed pottery from Kafizis (some four miles S. of Nicosia, and nine N. of Idalium), whence came, as has recently been established, the bowl and twenty-eight sherds now in the University Museum of Philadelphia, published by E. H. Dohan and R. G. Kent in 1926 (AJA XXX. 249 ff.; SEG VI. 838–40). These Mitford discusses, correcting the texts and dating them not in the first but in the third century B.C., as well as subsequently discovered inscriptions, both syllabic and alphabetic, now in the Cyprus Museum; he concludes that the latest datable example of the syllabic script in Cyprus Museum; and that the puzzling word στροφις, frequently used on the sherds,
means a ‘pointed hill’. Two new short syllabic inscriptions are recorded by E. Gjerstad, who also discusses the famous Idalion inscription (GDI 60) in his account of classical Cyprus. M. T. Mitsos holds that a Paphian stone bearing the names Ἐρμύνη and Ζαγη (JHS IX. 245) was part of an exedra built by Polycrates of Argos (cf. JHS LXV. 94), and J. and L. Robert add valuable comments on this and other Paphian inscriptions. L. Philippou publishes a ‘metrical’ epitaph from Hieroctopia (Yeroskipou), of which D. S. Robertson offers a drastic revision, M. Guarducci uses an inscription of Palaepaphos (LeBas-Wadd. 279) to claim for Cyprus Κέραλλας μαντιάρχης, the reputed author of a distich recurrent in Greek epitaphs, A. R. Bellinger comments on the letters of Antiochus written in 109 b.c. to Ptolemy Alexander and to Seleucia Pieria, found at Kouklia (Welles, Royal Correspondence, 71–2), and A. Rehm examines the letter of 144 b.c. from Ptolemy VII Euergetes II to his troops in Cyprus (cf. JHS LIX. 277, LXVII. 124), making important changes of reading and restoration and eliminating Ptolemy’s alleged ‘son’ (l. 27).

IX. SYRIA AND PALESTINE

J. Lassus’s work on the Christian churches of Syria deals with a number of late inscriptions from Gerasa, Brad, Babisqa and elsewhere. D. Levi’s exhaustive publication of the mosaic pavements unearthed at Antioch, of which some thirty-six are inscribed, includes an epigraphical table and remarks on the development of the script, as well as references to noteworthy inscriptions of Apamea, Gerasa, Beit Jibrin, Beisan and other sites. J. Obermann studies a Christian inscription from the church of St. Simeon Stylites, J. Laufray and R. Mouterde publish two fourth-century epitaphs from Zebed, and L. Robert contributes to the study of four metrical inscriptions from N. Syria—a tower-epigram from Temek (PUAES III. 829), bath-epigrams from Serdjilla and el-Anderin (ibid. 318, 418, Syria, III. 217), and the dedication of a church of the Martyrs at Anasartha (JGL Syrie, 297). G. Klaissenbach discusses the decree of Laodicea-ad-mare passed by the Πανάγως in January, 174 b.c., emending its text and date and giving a new interpretation of ll. 22–5, and L. Robert deals with some points of interest in an agonistic record from the same site (IGR III. 1012).

J. Starcky’s account of recent discoveries at Palmyra includes a discussion of a second-century votive (OGI 634), and elsewhere, describing the Palmyrenian monuments of Baalshamin, he examines the word σωμάτων, found in four texts of Palmyra, two of which are here first published, and gives what is practically the first edition of an altar-dedication from Ma’add τὸ κυριῶν ἡγὼ καὶ κυρίων δαυὶ τῷ κοσμόν τῶν Σωμάτων. A. Alt publishes an acclamation from S.W. of Palmyra, the first epigraphical mention of the Ghassanid prince Aretas, who from about a.d. 529 to 569 ruled the Arabian tribes on the limits between the Euphrates and the Red Sea. The customs-tariffs of Palmyra (OGI 629 = IGR III. 1053) and Soada (IGR III. 1283) furnish valuable materials for S. J. de Laet’s study of portoria. V. Arango-Ruiz re-edits, with juristic and historical comments, the procès-verbal, found at Dmeir (cf. JHS LXVII. 125), of a trial conducted at Antioch by Caracalla.

R. G. Goodchild’s careful study of the coastal road of Phoenicia from Antioch to Ptolemais, with special reference to the twenty-five extant milestones, mostly found near Berytos and Sidon, emphasizes and explains the value of this type of evidence and includes in its inventory (pp. 117 ff.) several Greek or bilingual inscriptions. C. C. Torrey publishes a bronze tabula ansata, now in Yale University, found in Syria, perhaps near Sarepta, inscribed θεός ἀγίῳ Σαραπετίμην Συνέγησιμος (not συνέγησιμος, ‘fellow-exile’, as the editor writes)
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A. Beaulieu and R. Mouterde describe the grotto of Wasta, between Sidon and Tyre, with its Hellenistic cult, attested by a dedication Βασιλεὺς Σιδώνιος (so they restore as referring to Ptolemy IV) and Αποστάσις τιμήσκω, and a later cult, to which numerous Greek and Semitic graffiti relate. Mouterde reports the discovery at Tyre of four Greek inscriptions, in one of which Σενταμίος Ἀπόλλων ὁ μεντρόπος honours Odaenathus I of Palmyra ca. A.D. 198, and L. Wenger examines the Depart κατανομή of a sixth-century text from el-Bassa, between Tyre and Ptolemais (SEG VIII. 14. 5). J. Starcky cites an inscription from the temple of Aphlad at Dura (Dura Report, V. 112 ff.), and H. N. Porter edits an interesting Bacchic graffito, now at Yale, probably of A.D. 225–50, from the Dolicheum built by Roman troops about A.D. 211, which casts a flood of light on the important mystery-cult of Dionysos, here seemingly assimilated to the Semitic religion of Jupiter Dolichenus. To Gerasa I have referred twice, and I note also L. Harding's discovery of the record of the gift of a fountain (?) to the city in the time of Julia Domna and Starcky's remarks on the Gerasene cult of the god θεὸς Σεραφέως (Welles, Gerasa, 17, 18) as offering the key to the riddle of the Palmyrene worship of Du'anan.

PALESTINE has been less productive than usual, owing, at least in part, to political conditions. M. P. Colombo discusses the metre and meaning of the Hellenistic love-poem found in 1902 at Marissa (Tell Sandahanna), between Jerusalem and Gaza. P. Benoit publishes a Palestinian jug, now in the collection of the White Fathers of St. Anne at Jerusalem, bearing the text of Psalm XXXVI. 8–10 in the LXX version. E. L. Sukenik deals in an article, also issued as a book entitled The Earliest Records of Christianity, with the ossuary-inscriptions from a chamber-tomb near Jerusalem, dated not later than A.D. 50, one of which he interprets as a cry of woe called forth by the crucifixion of Jesus Christ (cf. JHS LXVII. 126). E. J. Bickerman explains two phrases in the notices barring the access of ὀλλογενεῖς to the inner courts of Herod's Temple (SEG VIII. 169, OGI 598). Among recent finds made in Palestine are inscribed lintels from Khirbet ed-Deir and 'Ein el-Ma'mudiya, near Taffuh, in the Hebron sub-district, and a fragmentary bilingual text from Khirbet Karak, N. of the outlet of the Jordan from the Sea of Galilee.

The trilingual inscription of Sapor I from the 'Kaaba of Zoroaster' (cf. JHS LXV. 98, LXVII. 126) is studied by G. P. Carratelli, who provides a Greek text with apparatus criticus and historical commentary, and by W. Ensslin, who discusses in detail, in the light of this new evidence, Sapor's wars. L. Robert edits two inscriptions from Nehavend in Iran, the ancient Laodicea, now preserved in the Teheran Museum. One of these, independently published by C. Clairmont, bears a πρόταγγειον of Antiochus III relative to the cult of Queen Laodice, dated in the spring of 193 B.C., with a covering letter to Laodicea from Menodemus, governor of the satrapy, ordering its publication; this valuable historical document enables us to restore the text of the 'Erita decree' and to date it correctly (above, p. 49). The second (pp. 22 ff.) is a fragmentary inscription of 183–2 B.C., in which Laodicea honours a high official under Seleucus IV; the discussion of the Seleucid queens involves a fresh scrutiny of a Susan manumission of 177–6 B.C. (SEG VII. 2).

X. NORTH AFRICA

The Egyptian and Nubian sections of this survey appear in JEA XXXVI. 106 ff. Otherwise there is little to report from North Africa. C. Leriche's dissertation on the Ptolemaic constitution of Cyrene (SEG IX. 1) I have not seen. H. van Effenterre comments on the supplies of corn sent by Cyrene in 330 B.C. to various Cretan cities (ibid. 2). J. H. Oliver examines from the palaeographical standpoint the second edict and the
senatus consultum included in the famous Augustan dossier (ibid. 8), solving the syntactical
problem of l. 50 and discussing the new procedure envisaged by the senatorial resolution.
G. Bakalakis deals 785 with the artistic aspect of the relief bearing the epigram of A.D. 2 relative
to the close of the Marmaric War (ibid. 63), and H. Jeanmaire’s article on σοιξ as a religious
technical term includes 786 an interpretation of § 5 of the ‘Decretals’ (ibid. 72. 21 ff.).
F. Chamoux adds 787 a supplementary note to his article (cf. JHS LXVII. 127) on the
Cyrenean sculptor Zenion.

The unimportant inscriptions found at Carthage and Tebessa are known to me only from
references 788 in J. and L. Robert’s bibliography.

Oriel College, Oxford.

Marcus N. Tod.

785 Ἑλληνικά χρυσόλυμα, 83 ff.
787 BCH LXXI–II. 371 f.
788 REG LXI. 210 f.
NOTES ON THE REVOLUTION OF THE FOUR HUNDRED AT ATHENS

(A) The ἐξυγγραφεῖς

What was the number of the ἐξυγγραφεῖς who were appointed at Athens in 411 B.C. to introduce modifications into the democratic constitution? Thucydides says ten, and Aristotle thirty (Thuc. VIII. 67. 1; Ἄθνων Πολειτείας 29 § 2). It is now generally assumed that the only way to resolve this discrepancy is to reject one of the two conflicting numbers as a mere mistake, and that the error is on the part of Thucydides.

Another solution has recently been put forward by Miss Mabel Lang, who concludes that Thucydides' ten ἐξυγγραφεῖς and Aristotle's thirty ἐξυγγραφεῖς were two distinct bodies, and that both authors after all were in the right. She points out that the Ten and the Thirty differed not only in their numbers, but in their attributes and achievements, and that they probably functioned on different occasions. Whereas the Ten were συντεκτονεῖς (i.e. had authority to by-pass the Council and present their report direct to the Popular Assembly), the Thirty lacked 'autocratic' power. Whereas the Thirty in due course submitted a scheme of reforms which was duly ratified by the Assembly (Ἀθ. Πολ. 29 §§ 5-30 § 1), the Ten never produced their programme (Thuc. VIII. 67. 2). Furthermore, the Ten, as we know from Thucydides (VIII. 67. 1) were appointed after Peisander's return from his mission to Tissaphernes in quest of a Persian war-subsidy. On the other hand, Aristotle implies that the Thirty received their commission before Peisander's departure from Athens, when the Assembly, taking him at his word, and believing that 'Tissaphernes aid' would be forthcoming, but with a string attached—i.e. on condition that the Athenians should remodel their constitution—proceeded to fulfil their part of the bargain (Ἀθ. Πολ. 29 §§ 1-5).

Support may be found for Lang's theory in a clause of the Thirty's report which authorised the new citizen body of the Five Thousand 'συντεκτονεῖς συντεκτονεῖων πρὸς οὓς ἐν ιδέως' (Ἀθ. Πολ. 29 § 5). This article was presumably not a blank form, but envisaged a definite second party in the transaction. But at the time in question there were only two powers with which the Athenians could have contemplated a deal, Sparta and Persia. The Spartans can be ruled out, for an arrangement to cease hostilities against them would have been described in an official act as εἰπόντα, or 'ἀρκήν', not as 'συντεκτονοῦ' (which usually denotes a business pact). The negotiations which the Thirty had in mind could therefore only have been with Persia; and this is tantamount to saying that when the Thirty drew up their report the hope of a profitable bargain with Tissaphernes still burned bright, and that Peisander had not yet returned to Athens with his message of failure. The task of Aristotle's Thirty had therefore been completed before the appointment of Thucydides' Ten.

The importance of Lang's theory lies not so much in its removal of an arithmetical dilemma—in itself a matter of no moment—but in that it provides a suitable occasion on which to reform the programme of Ἀθ. Πολ. 29 § 5, which could have been enacted and the Five Thousand could have been voted into the constitution. So long as we identify the Thirty and the Ten, we are bound to assume that the constitution of Ἀθ. Πολ. 29 § 5 was carried at the Colonus Assembly to which the Ten presented their report (Thuc. VIII. 67. 2). But we cannot do this, unless we are prepared to assume that Thucydides falsely misrepresented the proceedings at this Assembly—the most important one in the history of the Revolution. The historian is clear and emphatic in his statement that the only scheme of reform to be proposed and enacted at Colonus was the three-point programme of Peisander (Thuc. VIII. 67. 2-3), and this differed from the constitution of Aristotle's Thirty at almost every point. The constitution of Ἀθ. Πολ. 29 § 5 will therefore remain on our hands, unless we hold the Thirty separate from the Ten; but if we make this distinction, we can easily find an occasion for an Assembly, previous to that of Colonus, at which the constitution of the Thirty could have been made into law.

The constitution of Ἀθ. Πολ. 29 § 5, though duly enacted, was superseded by Peisander's three-point act before it could be put into operation, and the Five Thousand whom it called into being remained for the time being a disembodied wraith. But the wraith haunted the Four Hundred, and by its eventual self-incorporation it got rid of them. The work of the Thirty was therefore not wholly abortive.

1 ἈΠ ΛΞΙΝ (1948), pp. 272-289.
2 In detriment to her own case, Lang dismisses this clause as 'meaningless'! But who would insert a tag of lawyer's 'common form' into a programme for a popular assembly?
3 The Athenian oligarchs probably did not contemplate overtures to Sparta until a later stage. Peisander's adherents at Samos met Tissaphernes' rebuff with a resolution to carry on the war and dip deeper into their own pockets (Thuc. VIII. 63. 4).
4 There is no evidence that Peisander intended to mend the broken thread of the Persian negotiations. In any case, he would not have used the Five Thousand for this purpose.
5 On the proceedings at Colonus, see also pp. 58-9.
No part of the Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία presents greater difficulties than chs. 30 and 31, containing the so-called ‘Definitive’ and ‘Provisional’ Constitutions of the revolutionary emergency (to be referred to henceforth as ‘DC’ and ‘PC’). The texts of the constitutions are seemingly incomplete, and their wording is often ambiguous. Worse still, PC includes several clauses that are suitable to a permanent constitution, but out of place in an interim act. Most difficult of all is the problem of fitting the two acts into their historic context. According to Aristotle, both of them were drawn up by 100 ἀναγγέλων who had been appointed ad hoc by the Five Thousand, and were in due course ratified by the Five Thousand; and the whole of this procedure was completed before the coup d’état by which the Four Hundred assumed power (30 § 1; 32 § 1): in other words, the two constitutions belonged to an early stage of the Revolution. Yet according to Thucydides, who is insistent and emphatic on this point (VIII. 86. 6, 89. 2, 92. 11, 93. 2), the Five Thousand were never embodied and never became operative under the Four Hundred; and Aristotle himself admits as much (32 § 2: οἱ δὲ πεντακόσιοί λόγοι μόνον ἔρισαν).

Some scholars accordingly have condemned the two constitutions as forgeries, like the admittedly spurious ‘Constitution of Draco’ in Ἀθ. Πολ. ch. 4. But this comparison is delusive, for Draco’s constitution belonged to a dim past, and no documents survived from that remote age to serve as a check on it. On the other hand the constitutional acts of the Revolution should all have been available at the Record Office; and in 403 B.C. a commission of νομοθέτη was purged in the archives of any unauthorized pieces that might have crept in. A falsified constitutional history of the Revolution could therefore scarcely have escaped detection. Moreover, the very untidiness of the two constitutions is an argument in their favour. A forger of Athenian documents might at least have been expected to be correct in matters of form, for under the democracy there was no lack of citizens possessing first-hand acquaintance with public acts, whose suspicions must have been aroused by any startling deviation from the habitually neat style of Athenian official documents.

On the other hand it need cause no surprise if two documents thrown together hurriedly in the storm and stress of a revolution show sundry defects in composition and drafting.

Furthermore, a renewed study of the impugned texts may show that some of their incongruities are due to faulty transmission and therefore may be remedied by emendation, and that other difficulties may be resolved by a different interpretation.

1 In the last sentence of ch. 31 we read ‘εἰς δὲ τὸν ἄλλον χρόνον, ἵνα νευμήσων διὰ τετράκοσίας εἰς τὰς τετράρχες λήξεις ... διανεμοῦντος αὐτῶς οἱ ἐκατόν ἄνδρες’. This clause is manifestly an intruder in a provisional constitution; and in its present position it is also an anachronism, for its references to the ‘Hundred’ and the ‘four allotted sections’ (which are mentioned nowhere else in ch. 31) remain suspended in mid-air. On the other hand it makes a perfect join with the end of ch. 30, 3, which reads as follows: τοὺς δὲ ἐκατόν ἄνδρες διανεμεῖται σφέν τοὺς ἄλλους τετράρχας μέρη ὡς ἰσαπόστατα καὶ διακλῆρασι’. The concluding sentence of ch. 31 should therefore be transferred to this point in ch. 30.

2 The preceding sentence in ch. 31 (‘τῶν δὲ ἄλλων ἀρχῶν, πλῆν τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τῶν στρατηγῶν, μὴ ἔξελθοι ... πλέον ἡ ἀτάκες τῆς αὐτῆς ἀρχῆς’) invites similar treatment. A ban on iteration of annual offices is out of place in an emergency act; but this clause follows well on 30 § 2, which lays down similar rules for the appointment of executive officials.

3 Other passages in ch. 31 which have caused offence may be interpreted so as to yield a satisfactory sense. In 31 § 2 the text runs as follows: τῶν δὲ στρατηγῶν τὸ νῦν ἔνεις τῆς αὐτῆς ἀρχῆς ἡ ἄρχουσα καθεσθείς τῶν πεντακόσιων, τὴν δὲ βουλῆν, ἐτέκιναν κατάσθασι ... ἠλευθέρω ἄρδες κ.τ.λ.’. The two clauses here quoted are usually construed as though they expressed two contrasted operations in successive order of time. On this rendering, the second clause (‘τὴν δὲ βουλῆν, κ.τ.λ.’) would certainly be otiose in an interim act and, if genuine, must be accommodated somewhere in ch. 30. But a clause introduced by δὲ is not necessarily antithetic, least of all if the preceding clause is not introduced by μὲν. The words ‘τὴν δὲ βουλῆν, κ.τ.λ.’ may therefore be taken in a supplementary and explanatory sense: their purpose presumably was to set forth in greater detail the procedure to be followed in the election of strategi as laid down in general terms in the previous clause. Both the clauses are therefore conditioned in point of time by the phrase ‘τὸ νῦν ἐνα’, and both are appropriate to a provisional constitution.

4 At the end of 31 § 2 (‘τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν τὴν αὐτῆς ποιεῖσθαι τοῖς τῆς βουλῆς κατὰ τὰ γεγραμμένα’) the phrase ‘κατὰ τὰ γεγραμμένα’ is usually taken to mean ‘according to what has

---

6 It has often been observed that neither constitution makes provision for a judiciary, and that in 30 § 3, and again in 31 § 1, the method of appointing to the Council is not set forth in full.
7 For a long but not exhaustive list of these ambiguities, see L. van der Ploeg, Themarines en zijn tijd, pp. 70-1.
9 Andocides II. 84; Lysias XXX. 2—a forgery detected.
10 The pseudepigraphs in Demosthenes’ De Corona are products of a later age which knew not the democracy.
11 Certain passages in Cicero’s Epistulae ad Brutum, which long defied explanation and were therefore offered as proof that the Letters were forgeries, have been made to yield good sense by a similar operation. It is now generally accepted that some MS. sheets had become displaced—See esp. W. Sternkopf, Hermes XLVI (1911), pp. 355-75.
been laid down’. Seeing that ‘τὰ γεγραμμένα’, thus construed, can only refer to DC, we are driven to infer that the definitive constitution was completed before the interim—a self-refuting supposition. But ‘γεγραμμένα’ may also carry a proleptic sense (= ‘γραφήσομενα’), especially after the preceding ‘τὸ δεξίον’ (‘in future the elections shall be held according to the rules which shall by then have been laid down’). On this construction the seeming hysteron proteron will be reversed, and the two constitutions will be reinstated in their proper order.

Even so, it must be admitted that this clause, with its forward reference to a future constitution, is strictly superfluous in an emergency act; and the same applies to a clause in 31 § 1 (‘τοῖς δὲ νόμοις οἱ τῆς τεθείσιν πείρας πολιτείας χίλιοι’). And other residual difficulties are to be found both in ch. 30 and in ch. 31. But the difficulties are no greater than one should expect in two hurriedly drafted acts of a revolutionary committee. It is therefore preferable to accept PC and DC as historical, and to persist in seeking the right niche for them in the history of the Revolution.

(C) The Definitive Constitution

The dates of DC and PC demand separate consideration. The problem of DC has been considerably furthered by the observation, first recorded by Ehrenberg, and confirmed by Ferguson in the light of documentary evidence, that DC bore considerable resemblance to the constitution which was actually in force at Athens between the Fall of the Four Hundred and the restoration of the full democracy (the so-called ‘constitution of Thamenes’, or ‘CT’ for short). To be sure, Ferguson’s conclusion, that DC = CT, has been called into question. CT was described by Thucydides as ‘the best in his experience and a major cause of the Athenian recovery’. On the other hand DC, though not a mere piece of utopian nonsense, as some scholars have described it, had at least two serious defects for a war-time scheme of government: the Council was too unwieldy for prompt decisions, and the strategi were debared by a system of rotation in office from holding command for more than one year in four. But even if we accept these objections and refuse to identify the two constitutions directly, we may still take the view that CT was an amended and matured form of DC.

In any case, we can hardly resist the conclusion that DC came into force at some time after the fall of the Four Hundred.

Even so, the enactment of DC might belong to an earlier occasion. Some scholars would still date it back to an early phase of the Revolution. Thus (a) Busolt and Wilcken have maintained that it was formally carried at the Colonus Assembly by some moderate oligarchs, only to be blanketed by Peisander, who overruled it by way of amendment with his more radical programme. By this manoeuvre Peisander rendered DC nugatory; but as a concession to the moderates he allowed it to remain on the statute book, so that after the fall of the Four Hundred it could be taken out of cold storage and put into operation. Wilcken made the further suggestion that after the Revolution DC was re-drafted by the anagrapheis and re-enacted by the Five Thousand.

This ingenious compromise explains more satisfactorily than any other theory how a constitution which was formally enacted before the oligarchic coup d’état could nevertheless have been in some sense the handiwork of the anagrapheis and the Five Thousand. But the theory of Busolt and Wilcken can ill be reconciled with Thucydides’ account of the Colonus Assembly. Any unprejudiced reader of this would assume that after the formal vote of ἔσθη (full freedom of discussion) the initiative was at once seized by Peisander, so that he might rush through his three-point programme, while his clique drowned all discussion (VIII. 67. 2–3). Moreover, if Peisander’s constitution had really been carried in the form of an amendment, it would according to the established Athenian practice have been indited at the foot of the substantive motion which it formally modified (and superseded in effect). But in that case, how could Aristotle have passed over this constitution without a word? His ignorance of it is strange in any case; but if its text stood on the record in the next paragraph after DC, his failure to refer to it eludes all understanding.

(b) Busolt’s original date for the enactment of DC, which has recently been re-adopted by Lang, was on a day soon after the oligarchic coup d’état, when, ex hypothesi, the four Hundred convened another Assembly and there DC and PC in succession. On this view both the constitutions were mere ‘eyewash’ for disgruntled democrats or moderates, and were never intended to come into effect;

---

12 It may be objected to the transpositions suggested above that they reduce PC to very little. But (1) Aristotle’s text of PC may be incomplete; (2) brevity in a provisional constitution is a virtue.
14 Classical Philology XXI. (1916), pp. 22–5. Ferguson’s chief piece of evidence is the bill for the impeachment of Antiphon (J.G. II. 12), in which the usual formula ‘ἴδος τόν βουλή καὶ τόν δημό’ is replaced by ‘ἴδος τόν βουλή’. The absorption of the Assembly’s functions by the Council, as here indicated, was a leading feature of DC.
15 VIII. 97. 2.
17 After the fall of the Four Hundred the Athenians held τινὸς διαλογία, in which they re-fashioned their constitution (Thuc. VIII. 97. 2). DC may have received a grooming in one of these.
18 Griechische Staatskunde, p. 77.
19 SB Berlin Akademie 1935, p. 35 ff.
20 ἄρα ὁ δὲ λαμπρός διάγραμα, κ.τ.λ. As Wilcken has pointed out, the imperfect ‘διάγραμα’ implies that Peisander’s adherents repeated their slogans in refrain. ‘λαμπρός’, which is usually translated into ‘openly’, ‘unverhüllt’ (i.e. as a synonym of ἄρας or ἀπερικός), should rather be taken to mean ‘flashily’ or ‘with fireworks’. Thucydides, who picked his words carefully in this passage, surely meant to convey that Peisander dazzled the Assembly with a coup de théâtre.
21 Such is the communis opinio. For the possibility that Aristotle did mention Peisander’s constitution, see p. 59.
it was therefore only to be expected that Thucydides should pass them over in silence. This scheme avoids a clash with Thucydides, but it contradicts Aristotle all along the line, for it dates DC both too late (after the coup d'état) and too early (before the Five Thousand assumed power). Besides, why should the victorious extremists have been at the trouble of providing two additional constitutions ad captandum? They had carried their Colonus programme οὐδένας ἀντιτίθεσιν; similarly they had evicted the democratic Council οὐδένας ἀντιτίθεσιν;25 and the ill tidings from the fleet at Samos which eventually forced them to compromise had not yet come in.24 No adequate motive can therefore be assigned for such supererogatory legislation, and Beloch's comment holds good: 'man entwirt doch keine Verfassung auf Vorrat'.25

(c) A priori, the most likely occasion on which the Four Hundred would have enacted DC was in the waning phase of the Revolution, when they were driven to offer concessions to the fleet at Samos. It is tempting, therefore, to see in the main provision of DC, the passing of the entire body of active citizens through the Council by rotation, a fulfilment of the promise to the fleet, 'τῶν πειρατοσκύλων ὑπὸ πάντως ἐν τῷ μέρει μεθεξουσία'.26 But this dating does as much violence to Aristotle as the one previously considered.

(d) We are therefore driven back upon the conclusion, first put forward by Beloch, but long held in neglect, that DC was enacted as well as implemented after the fall of the Four Hundred.27 This dating, to be sure, conflicts with that of Aristotle, but it is the only one that allows us to accept without qualification his all-important statement that it was drafted by the ἄναγκας under authority from the Five Thousand, and was ratified by the Five Thousand themselves.28 Moreover, it fits well into Thucydides' account of the counter-revolution—the hoplites forces which had overthrown the Four Hundred proceeded to constitute themselves as the Five Thousand and to appoint a board of νομοθέταν, in whom we may recognise Aristotle's ἄναγκας.29 Beloch's hypothesis therefore deviates least from the sources and from historical probabilities.

(D) The Provisional Constitution

PC prescribed a more exclusive and autocratic form of government than DC. This renders it doubly unlikely that it should have been intended by the extremist oligarchs as a sop to the moderates or democrats after the coup d'état. For the same reason it could not have been introduced by the moderates at Colonos in opposition to Peisander. But could it nevertheless have been moved and carried at Colonos—by Peisander himself? It has a striking point of resemblance with Peisander's constitution, as outlined by Thucydides, in that it sets up a similar Council of Four Hundred and invests it with 'autocratic' power. Like Peisander's act, it also assumes the existence of the Five Thousand but leaves them functionless. Moreover, we might reasonably believe, though Thucydides does not say so, that Peisander proceeded to be legislating 'ἐν τῷ παροντι καθή': it was by a similar pretenct that the Thirty Tyrants inducant sese republiae.

It has therefore been suggested by Ehrenberg30 that PC and Peisander's constitution are identical. True, PC contains some details which are apparently missing in the Colonos constitution, and vice versa. But Ehrenberg explains this discrepancy by assuming that neither Thucydides nor Aristotle gave more than an extract from the act, and that each author picked out different details to suit his purpose. Again, the procedure for the election of the Council is not the same in Thucydides and in Aristotle. Yet neither author gives a complete account of the method of appointment; and it has been shown by van der Ploog that by tying the loose ends together the two procedures can be combined into a single operation.31

Of all the theories which date PC back to an early stage of the Revolution, Ehrenberg's is the one which puts the least strain on our sources and the probabilities of the case. But, like all the rest, it cannot be fully harmonised with Aristotle's statement that PC was the product of the ἄναγκας and the Five Thousand. And there remains a doubt whether Aristotle's and Thucydides' details could have inter-digitated as neatly as the theory requires. We must therefore consider the remaining alternative—was PC enacted, together with DC, after the Fall of the Four Hundred?

A priori, this is the time at which one would most expect the Athenians to have set up an extemporised form of government. The counter-revolution which overthrew the oligarchy was not, like the preceding revolution, a premeditated coup; it was carried out on the spur of the moment by the Home Defence forces, who deposed the Four Hundred in a tumultuary convention, so as leave Athens without any constituted authority. It was to fill the gap thus created that they

22 Thuc. VIII. 69, 1, 70, 1.
24 On the authority of Thuc. VIII. 74. 1 Lang and van der Ploog have independently established this point.
26 Thuc. VIII. 86, 1. On the interpretation of this formula, see Stevenson, p. 59.
27 Op. cit. ch. 23. The overlaps in the unamed texts of chs. 36 and 31 misled Beloch into amalgamating DC and PC into a single act. This untenable conclusion prejudiced the whole of his case. On Beloch, see also Stevenson, p. 54.
28 Granted that Aristotle was at fault somewhere, it seems more likely that he erred in his chronology than in making a double mistake as to the authorship of DC and PC. The documents containing these acts could hardly have failed to indicate their authors in an unequivocal manner; but it is not so certain that their date-marks were unmistakable for the Revolution no doubt disturbed the normal prytany-sequence. (In 411-410 the Treasurers of Athena abandoned the usual prytany-by-prytany dating and reckoned continuously from a fixed point.—IG. I. 184-5.)
29 Thuc. VIII. 97. 1-2.
30 Hermes LVII (1922), pp. 613-20.
vested themselves with sovereign power under the title of the hitherto disembodied Five Thousand and appointed the νομοθέται σιδηρογραφίς.32 These in due course produced their draft of DC; but even if, under the mentorship of Theramenes or some other moderate, they had been able to throw together DC at short notice, the task of compiling the lists of the four citizen-sections, which were an essential ingredient of that constitution,33 must have required time. At this stage, therefore, an interim constitution became a downright necessity.

From one detail of PC we may derive a further clue to its date. In 31 § 2 we read: τὸν δὲ στρατηγὸν τὸν νῦν εἶναι τὴν αἵρεσιν ἡς ἀπόταυν τοῖς περικοικισμοῖς, τὴν δὲ βουλὴν, ἐπιθήκαν κατάστη, ποιήσασθαι ἐξέτασιν ἐν διπλαίς, ἔλεγον δὲκα ἰδώρας, κ.τ.λ. It is a peculiar feature of this procedure that the Council is instructed to hold a muster of the eligibles (i.e. the entire body of the Five Thousand) under arms. Why this parade under arms? The explanation is to be found in the resolution which the Home Defence forces passed when they conferred sovereign power upon the Five Thousand: εἶναι δὲ συντόπως (sc. τῶν περικοικισμῶν) ὑπότος καὶ διπλὰ παρέχονται.34 At this juncture the only way of proving membership of the Five Thousand was to show a suit of armour. Hence the εξέτασις ἐν ὑπότοις, which for the time being was a necessary part of the procedure at elections, though on any other occasion it would have been an idle display of militarism.

The Council set up by PC had a membership of four hundred, like that of the Revolution. If it was the immediate successor of the oligarchic Four Hundred, it may seem strange that the pleader in the Lysianic speech Pro Polystrate (Or. XX), who was charged after the Revolution with treasonable practices, should have spoken of 'the Four Hundred' without qualification, as though only one council of that number were known to him.35 But need he have stated expressly to which of the Four Hundred he had belonged? All the jurors would know from the plain facts of the case that it was the wicked oligarchic council. In this instance, therefore, the argumentum e silentiio is without force.

Another objection to Beloch's dating has been advanced by Wilcken.36 Describing the coup d'état by which the Four Hundred assumed power, Aristotle states that 'οἱ περικοικίσμοι μετὰ τὸν δὲκα τῶν αὐτοκράτόρος εἰς εἰσδύναι εἰς τὸ βουλευτήριον ἥρχον τὴν πόλεως '.37 These 'ten autocrats' are identified by Wilcken with the δέκα αὐρής αὐτοκράτορος of PC (' τὴν δὲκα βουλήν, ἐπιθήκαν κατάστη . . . . ἔλεγον δὲκα ἰδώρας, . . . τοὺς δὲ αἰρεθήναι ἀρχεῖν τῶν εἰσιοντα ἐνυστὸν αὐτοκράτορος ').38 If this identification is correct, the elections held under the terms of PC must have taken place before the coup d'état, and PC will therefore belong to an early stage of the Revolution. But, as van der Ploeg has shown,39 the Ten Autocrats of ch. 32 must be held distinct from the δέκα αὖρας αὐτοκράτορος of ch. 31, for the appointment of these latter was not due to be made until after the installation of the Council in office. In the former demurevicar, as van der Ploeg has aptly suggested, we may recognize the ten ἐγγυραφεῖς αὐτοκράτορος of Thucydides, who gave a free field to Piseander at the Colonos Assembly and no doubt were in collusion with him all the time.40

A third difficulty, which has been raised by Ferguson,41 arises out of a phrase in 31 § 2: τοὺς δὲ αἰρεθήναι (δέκα αὖρας) ἀρχεῖν τῶν εἰσιοντα ἐνυστὸν αὐτοκράτορος. The régime of the Four Hundred fell astride of two archon-terms, the first two months of it being included in the archonship of Callias (early summer 411), and the remaining two months in that of Mnesilochus (late summer 411).42 Now if, as Ferguson assumes, 'ἐνυστὸς' here denotes the full twelve-month term of a normal archonship, the date of entry of the counter-revolutionary δέκα αὖρας into the στρατηγία must have fallen near midsummer day. But midsummer 411 was already past when, according to Beloch, PC became law (not till August or September). Consequently the ἐνυστὸν αὐτοκράτορος could only refer to midsummer 410: in other words, the elections were to be held after a delay of ten months. Which, in an emergency government, is absurd. Ergo, the ἐνυστὸν αὐτοκράτορος must be midsummer 411 after all, and PC must be put back to a still earlier date, i.e. towards the beginning of the Revolution.

But the archon-year 411-410 was far from normal, for it was split into two archon-terms. Mnesilochus, a nominee of the Four Hundred, quitted office with them, and a new eponymus, Theopompus, replaced him by subrogatio (presumably in a convention of the newly embodied Five Thousand).43 A new archon-term therefore began with his appointment, and although it fell two months short of the usual duration, it could nevertheless with perfect propriety be styled ἐνυστὸς, for this word does not invariably denote an exact or approximate solar year, but may

32 Thuc. VIII. 97. 1-2.
33 Athen. 33 § 1-2.
34 Thuc. VIII. 97. 1.
35 Stevenson, p. 59 (on a suggestion by Wade-Geary).
37 Athen. 32 § 3.
38 Athen. 32 § 1.
39 Thuc. VIII. 97. 1.
40 Could it be that: Aristotle, not knowing about Thucydides' Ten, or having lost them out of mind, anticipated Wilcken in concluding that the δέκα αὐτοκρατόρος of PC, and so was misled into dating PC (and consequently also DC) before the coup d'état?
41 Classical Philology XXI (1926). p. 73.
42 Athen. 33 § 1.
43 Athen. 33 § 1. Under the restored democracy the archonship of Theopompus was officially dated as from midsummer 411 (the two-month office of Mnesilochus being deemed an ἐνυστὸς). But his actual entry into office could only have taken place after the departure of Mnesilochus.
signify any considerable period. Consequently the ἐνῴον ἐνομάτος of PC may, without any strain on Greek semantics, be fixed at the entry into office of the Ersatz-archon Theopompus (August or September 411), so that the term of the new strategi would almost coincide with that of the new eponymus. On this reckoning, Beloch’s dating fits nicely into the calendar of 411–410 B.C.

On the balance of evidence, therefore, it may be concluded that both DC and PC were products of the counter-revolution which drove the Four Hundred from office, and that these had no part in making either constitution.

M. Cary

Postscript.—Most of the problems raised in this article have received further discussion in a recent book by Franco Sartori, La Crisi Del 411 A.C. Nell’ Athenaion Politeia di Aristotele (Padua, 1951). The views of the present author on this book will be stated in a forthcoming number of Gnomon.

---

44 Liddell and Scott, s.v. In Thuc. III. 68, 3 ἐνομάτος measures the interval between the temporary occupation of Plataea by Megarian refugees and its eventual destruction by the Thebans. In Hesiod, *Herm. Scut.* I. 87, it denotes the period of gestation of a child—approximately the same as that of Theopompus’ archonship.
CORINTH, AMBRACIA, APOLLOIA

This paper is an amplification of that much quoted passage of Thucydides ἐπορεύθησαν δὲ πεζῶν ἐς Ἀπολλονίαν. Of this land route, which enabled the Corinthians to get troops up to Epidamnus in despite of Corcyra, we know something and can guess more, and in view of the undoubted importance of this part of the Greek world to Corinth, it may be worth while to try to fit the isolated facts together and reconstruct a picture of a short phase of Epirotic and Arcadian history in the latter half of the fifth century. It is certain that the north-west ranked as one of Corinth's vital interests. There is no need to quote other evidence when there is the specific statement of the Corinthian ambassador before the Athenian demos that it was a necessity for Corinth to sail to Corcyra. It is beyond the scope of this paper to enquire why this was so; all that is here attempted is a correlation of the facts about the land route, how Corinth and Apollonia contrived to open it, how Corinth and Ambracia tried to keep it open, and how by the end of the Archadian War Athens had succeeded in closing it. The evidence is not copious, but of good quality; Thucydides is contemporary, Pausanias quotes contemporary sources, and the mountains, rivers, and valleys of the north-west are silent witnesses.

The route falls naturally into three parts, the Acarnanian, the Epirote, and the Illyrian. It will be convenient to consider the Acarnanian section first, and the other two sections in the order mentioned.

Acarnania is not a difficult country. When Antony had an army of some 60,000 legionaries, 12,000 horse and perhaps 10,000–15,000 light armed, as well as a fleet of over 500 warships, on the Actium cape, and Agrippa cut him off from his supply bases in Egypt and Peloponnese, he managed to have food carried over from Aetolia. It is not surprising, then, to find that Eurylochus could march his men through a hostile countryside as far as the Gulf of Ambracia. Of the details of the route through Acarnania nothing need be said; if the garrison, sent out by Corinth to reinforce Ambracia after the disastrous punishment with which the city had met at the hands of Demosthenes and the Acarnanians in 426, had a difficult march, it was probably because it was winter time or spring, when the low ground around Oeniadae and the plain of Stratus was flooded, a not infrequent occurrence. But if Acarnania itself was easy, the eastern end of the gulf, which had to be passed on the way to Ambracia, presented a problem. There were at least two fortified cities hostile to Corinth and Ambracia: Olpae, the Acarnanian thing, and Amphilochoian Argos, which, though largely hellenised by the Corinthian colonies which had been its neighbours for centuries, was on bad terms with them. Ambracia made at least two attempts to master Amphilochoian Argos. Thucydides gives no exact date for the first. It was merely 'many generations after the Trojan War . . . and some time after this' that Argos was occupied by the Ambraciotae, and the Athenians then sent out Phormio, who turned the tables and enslaved the Ambraciotes. It has been generally said that this incident must be dated after 440, to explain the decision of the Corinthians in the Samian crisis, and before 435, after which year Thucydides' account of the events in the north-west which led to the war is alleged to be exhaustive. The latter argument is e silentio and for Thucydides extremely dangerous. It has recently been argued by H. T. Wade-Gery with great cogency that the tone of the Corinthian ambassadors at Athens in 433 cannot possibly be explained on the supposition that Phormio's Acarnanian expedition was earlier than that year; had not Phormio enslaved Corinthian colonists? The argument that Phormio's expedition is later than 433 is irreputable. No Athenian could have acted as he did if war was not certain. There is perhaps an indication of the exact time of the expedition. In 433 the Corinthian fleet of 150 ships which met the Corcyraeans and the Athenians at Sybota contained one ship from Anactorion, but later in the same year, when the retiring fleet put into the gulf, Anactorion had apparently gone over to the other side. The Corinthians recovered it by treachery from within. It is hard to see why the Anactorionians, who, in the face of the attacks of Athens from the sea and the Amphilochoians on land, remained steadfastly true to Corinth until the Athenians and Acarnanians took their city in 425, should choose to revolt at the moment when a

[Readers will remember that R. L. Beaumont died in 1938. In a previous article 'Greek Influence in the Adriatic', which appeared as long ago as 1936 (JHS LVI), he alluded (p. 184, n. 179) to the present paper, which he left completed save for final revision. The Editors are much indebted to Mr. N. G. L. Hammond and Mr. T. J. Dunbabin for their assistance in preparing it for publication.]

1 Thuc. I, 26, 2. The importance of this passage has been emphasised before, first, I believe, by Grundy, Thucydides and the History of his Age, 347 B; and Cornford, Thucydides Mythistorian, p. 47, deals with Acarnania. But the Epirote and Illyrian sections of the route have not been considered, which is some justification of this article.

2 Thuc. I, 37, 3. The Corinthians were presumably speaking for themselves.

3 CATH X, p. 103.

4 Thuc. III, 114, 4.

5 Thuc. III, 105, 1: ὁ οἰκος, τιμή τοῦ ἐπάρχοντος ἀτομοῦ, ὑπάρχει καθὼς τῇ ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἐκείνῃ, διὸ ἐπὶ τῶν ἔργων τῶν ἁγιασμένων καὶ ἀοιδαὶ ἀγαθοὶ ἀργαὶ ἐχθροῦ. For its position see N. G. L. Hammond in BSA XXXVII, 133.

6 Thuc. II, 50.

7 E.g. CATH V, pp. 474-5.

8 JHS 1934, 216.

9 Thuc. I, 46, 1.

10 Thuc. I, 55, 1.
THE ROUTES NORTHWARDS FROM EPIRUS TO APOLLONIA

Miles

0  5  10  15  20

Kilometres

0  5  10  15  20  25  30

Main Roads
Secondary Roads
∆ 1500
Heights in Metres

Modern names of towns in heavy type thus:— Tepeleoni
strong Corinthian fleet had gone north to meet a weaker Corcyraean. The simplest explanation
is that Phormio brought it over by display or use of force at the same time as he restored Argos to
the Amphilochians. Thucydides, who set himself a high standard of relevance even in his digressions,
did not bother to mention the incident.

The help which the Athenians sent to the Amphilochians, and the alliance which they con-
cluded with them at the same time, show the awakening interest of Athens in the north-west. This
alliance may have been concluded in the hope of blocking the overland route, though there were,
no doubt, other motives; a desire to break Ambracia, which must be ranked as only just not a great
Greek power,13 accounts for a great deal. But that the land route was the most important single
interest which Athens had in Acarnania is indicated by the attention which was paid to Oeniadae,
a city, which, so far as is known, did not furnish contingents to Corinthian fleets or armies. The
taking of Oeniadae cannot have been an end in itself; and it is unthinkable that in the critical
year 454, when he abandoned the attempt to cut Corinth off from Sparta and sailed to Acarnania,14
Pericles was engaged in an operation of minor importance.

In the Archidamian war Athenian treatment of the captured Corinthian posts on the coast
of Acarnania varied. When they took Astacus in the first year of the war, they turned out the pro-
Corinthian tyrant and made the place a member of the empire; but Sollion they handed over to the
Acarnarians.15 The case of Anactorion is even more instructive. Although the Acarnians had
made a treaty with the Ambraciotes, which contained a mutual defensive alliance and was in
all likelihood a violation of the Phormio treaty, the Athenians allowed the Acarnians to hold
Anactorion.16 The offence which the Athenians must have taken at a treaty which could lead to
the Acarnarians fighting for Ambracia if Ambracia was attacked by an Athenian force, was out-
weighed by the desire to retain the goodwill of Acarnania. It also shows that the Athenians did
not want the Acarnanian ports for themselves, but were anxious that Corinth should not control
them, though they made an exception in the case of Oeniadae,17 perhaps because its position near
the entry to the Gulf of Corinth made it of vital importance.

The Corinthians for their part made vigorous efforts to secure their hold on the Acarnanian
coast and to extend their influence in the interior. In 431 when the Athenians expelled Euander
the tyrant of Astacus, they sailed with 40 ships and 1500 hoplites to restore him.18 Two years
later, when the Ambraciotes were meditating revenge on the Argives, it was Corinth which encour-
eged them to go forward, while Sparta had to be urged on by representations which were
largely false.19 The Athenian hold on Cephallenia and Zacynthus was likely to last as long as the
Athenian command of the sea, not as long as the independence of Acarnania only. Again, when
Demosthenes had crippled Ambracia, Corinth sent a garrison of 300 citizens, under Xenoclidias,
son of Euthycles, who had been entrusted in 432 with the supreme command of the fleet of 150
sail, the city's great effort.20 Leucas was also garrisoned with citizens.21 Corinthians freely
acknowledged that they could not accept the Peace of Nicias because it deprived them of Sollion
and Anactorion.22

If we had only the evidence for the Acarnanian section of the land route, there would be little
reason to connect these facts with the desire to keep communications with the north-west open.
It can be said with truth that Astacus, Sollion, and Leucas were of value on the voyage to Sicily;
that Anactorion was a useful port on the way to Ambracia; and that the latter might one day be
a power again. Indeed, sentiment and anxiety for prestige alone could amply account for Corinth's
attitude. There must have been others in Corinth who felt, as Aristeas felt of Potidaea, that cost
what it might Corinthian colonies must never be left in the lurch to face Athens alone. In short,
Corinth would have acted as she did in Acarnania, whether or no there had been a land route to
the north. But the same cannot be said of Athens; and the interest of Corinth further north is
ample proof of the importance of the land route.

As has been said, Corinth was free of the land route in 435, and she used it with some frequency
for whatever purpose.23 Opposition in the Epirote section of the route would have been a serious
matter, for the number of practicable paths is limited. But Corinthians met with no difficulty
here. How far back the friendship of the Epirote tribes for Corinth went is not known. Periander
had connections among the Thesprotians,24 who were in all probability the tribe which occupied
in his day the dominant position enjoyed by the Chaonians in the latter half of the fifth century,
and by the Molossians in Pindar's time and in the fourth century.25 There were two factors which,
in the early years of the Peloponnesian War, smoothed the path of Corinthians in Epirus. Their
bad relations with Corcyra may have made the natives feel that Corinthians were a natural friend,26
for Corcyra had occupied part of the coast 27 and may have been an imperfect neighbour; and in

12 See below, note 29. 14 Thuc. I, 111, 3. 16 Thuc. IV, 49.
17 Thuc. IV, 77, 2. 18 Thuc. V, 30, 2. 20 Thuc. III, 114, 4.
21 Thuc. II, 80, 3. 22 Thuc. IV, 42, 3. 21 Thuc. I, 50, 3; cf. Thuc. I, 47, 3; they must have been fairly well known.
Ambracia Corinth had a very powerful ally. Before the disaster of 429, Ambracia held Amphiphalian hostages, and could dispose of a fleet of at least 27 ships and something less than 5000 hoplites. The latter figure is the same as that which Herodotus gives for Corinth herself in the Plataea campaign, and larger, in the ratio of 5:3, than that for Sicyon. Furthermore, the most influential Epirote tribe, the Chaonians, was in alliance with the city. The Chaonians exercised some form of suzerainty over the Thesprotians, who lived north of the gulf of Ambracia and south of the Thyamis, now the Kalamas. For the big invasion of 429 the Molossians and the more northerly tribes also furnished contingents, but they looked to the Chaonians for example, and did not continue the struggle when the 'most warlike nation' had been defeated. The Chaonian alliance would be enough to ensure that Corinthians were not molested in their journeys across Epirus.

There are several other points of interest and relevance to the land route about this invasion of Acarnania. Perdiccas of Macedon sent 1000 men to join the expedition; this is the earliest recorded instance of the movement of troops over the Kastoria-Korça route from Macedon to Epirus; for, as the contingent was sent without the knowledge of the Athenians, it cannot well have been sent over the Thessalian passes. It must be assumed too that Perdiccas, who was an astute man, did not send his troops down to Epirus without some good reason. He had plenty to do at home, for in the winter of 430 Potidaea had been taken by the Athenians; and after their support of Philip and Dardas two years previously he had little confidence in them, nor they in him. But it is easy to see how Perdiccas came to believe that the subjection of Acarnania to Corinth and Ambracia was worth the risk of losing a thousand men and an immediate rupture with Athens; for that Perdiccas knew the Athenians would not tolerate his invasion of Acarnania is proved by the fact that he sent the troops secretly. His aim must have been to demonstrate conclusively to the Corinthians, that, if they wished, they could get troops into the Thracian area without going through Thessaly. It was taken as axiomatic that they could not do this, though the march of Brasidas proved that the belief was not altogether true. In any case the march of Brasidas was merely a gallant 'tour de force', was felt to be such, and could not be repeated. If Acarnania was subdued, there was nothing to stop a Peloponnesian force, once over the gulf, from marching to the support of the Chalcidian revolt; and to his own support, which no doubt appealed more strongly to Perdiccas. The failure of the invasion of 429, the defeat of the Ambraciotae in 427 and the capture of Oeniadae in 424, and finally the revolt of the Lyncestae from Perdiccas and the orientation of Molossia towards Athens meant that the route was never used in the Peloponnesian war. It is evident that the two first factors mentioned were enough to make the route dangerous; Brasidas chose to risk the march through Thessaly even before the capture of Oeniadae.

Something can be deduced about the route by which the Corinthians used to traverse Epirus. It is obvious that they would follow the Louros valley towards the plain of Hellopia, now the Janina district, leaving the inhospitable hills of Thesprotia on their left. The hills fall steeply down to the sea, and there is no good coast route. For another reason too this way was to be avoided. North of the Kalamas lay Cestrine, which was not, apparently, part of the Chaonian-Ambraciotae alliance; it sent no contingent to Acarnania in 429. This part of the mainland was no doubt under Corcyrean influence; some of it was definitely in Corcyrean hands, and there may have been a number of fortresses dotted up and down the coast south of the Acrocorinian mountains. There were certainly two settlements of great natural strength, probably in origin Corcyrean. Butheus commanded the entrance to Lake Butrinto and a route going inland to the Dryno valley, and thence to the plain of Janina. From Himara, presumably the ancient Chimaera, one route, followed by the modern road, rises over the Logara pass and drops down to the valley of the Dukatit river, which it follows to the south end of the Bay of Valona. This route is merely hard work, the Logara being a steep and exhausting grass slope on the south side and wooded on the northern. It presented, for instance, few problems to Caesar, who, landing at Palaesthe, marched over the pass and came down to the sea at Oricus on the same day.

The other route which starts from the Himara neighbourhood is a difficult hill track leading inland over the southern end of the Acrocorinian mountains to the valley of the Shushicë, entailing one rough traverse of the slopes of Mount Cipit at about 700 metres. From the Shushicë valley
a route leads over the watershed to Ploca overlooking the Vijošć (Aous) valley and, though not too easy in its early stages, is a fairly obvious line of communication.46

But it is clear that the Corinthians did not use either of these routes, which start from the mainland opposite and under the influence of Corcyra 47 and would so have put the Corinthians at their enemies’ mercy.48 In times of peace the routes might have been used, but the sea would be a more attractive alternative, so that it is not likely that they were. The Corinthians probably used the Dryno valley route, which led through the Chaonian country to the Vijošć valley and the Illyrians. Between the Dryno, one of the pleasantest and most obvious lines of communication in all Epirus, and the plain of Janina, there is no serious obstacle.49

By whatever route the Corinthians reached Apollonia, by whatever route Perdiccas reached Ambracia, Molossia, the plain of Janina, was a key position, the point where the routes from Thessaly, from Illyria, from Macedonia, from the Gulf of Ambracia, and from the Corcyra channel, converged.50 It was here that Attic diplomacy got to work to discomfit the Peloponnesians and Macedonians. When the Molossians invaded Acarnania in 429, they were commanded by one Babylithus, the regent of their king, Tharyps, who was still a boy.51 It must have been shortly after this that Tharyps went to Athens to be educated, a sure sign of a change in Molossia’s foreign policy. After the failure of the invasion it must have been felt that a new orientation was required. It is probable that it was at this time that Tharyps was made an Athenian citizen,52 and it was certainly during the Archadian war or the Peace of Nicias that Euripides wrote that powerful piece of anti-Spartan and pro-Molossian propaganda, the Andromache.53 This was not produced at Athens, and may well have been staged at Dodona to the delight of a Molossian audience. In any case Tharyps quickened the pace of the march of civilisation in his kingdom, which meant that he was under Attic influence and was bringing his people up in the same way of thinking. The friendship lasted longer than the Archadian war, for the oracle at Dodona 54 gave Athens what she badly needed, a moral justification for the Sicilian expedition. The Athenians were bidden to colonise Sicily, and if, after the disaster, the oracle excused itself by saying that Sicily was a place in Attica, it only goes to show that it could not deny that it had been on the side of Athens after the Peace of Nicias.

The connexion of Corinth and her colony at Apollonia seems to have been close in the fifth century. Like most other Corinthian colonies, Apollonia was dutiful towards the mother city,54 but there are indications that the community of interest found a more concrete expression. There are two recorded incidents in the history of Apollonia in the fifth century, and in both of them she features as the friend of Corinth. In 435 she risked the hatred of the Corcyraeans by receiving the Corinthian expedition to Epidamus; and about the same time, probably a few years previously, she shared with Corinth the spoils which she won from the Abantis and the town Thronion.55 Of the reality of this campaign there can be no doubt at all, for the remains of the dedication have been discovered at Olympia; 56 and Corinth’s part in it is a natural conclusion from the tradition that Corinth shared the spoils, which is itself hardly likely to be pure invention.

It is argued in the following pages that when Corinth and Apollonia combined to reduce Thronion and the Abantis, they were probably trying to open or secure the land route south which the Corinthians used in 435. The interest which Apollonia had in doing this is perfectly obvious; if she could be reached overland from the south, there was the less risk of her falling under the exclusive influence of Corcyra. It was equally the policy of Corinth to support her colony, especially if it meant easier communication with the north-west. The date of the Apolloniate campaign against Thronion can be determined within certain limits. The statues which the Apolloniates dedicated at Olympia were cut by Lycius, son of Myron, which indicates a date in the second half of the fifth century. He was working as early as 446, though probably not very

46 There was, however, no Roman road that we know of down this valley. Leake’s map marks one, but is quite unreliable (see note 72 below).

47 Thuc. III, 85, 2. Grundy, Thucydides, p. 347, speaks vaguely of a “road running near the coast to Apollonia and Dryrachium” (from Ambracia). But it certainly not the ‘great natural route’ of which he speaks (the Arta-Dryno route is far more obvious and less exacting); there is today no decent coast route from Prevesa to the Forty Saints, and a coast route from Apollonia to Dryrachium meant crossing two large and floating rivers at their widest, probably with marshland between them. So his view is to be rejected.

48 Thuc. I, 26, 2.

49 This is the route followed by the modern road from Janina to Argyrocastro and Tepeleni. It was also used by Lord Byron in 1809. The route following the upper Vijošć valley is somewhat longer and more difficult.

50 Cf. the accompanying map.

51 Thuc. II, 80, 6.

52 Ditt. Syll. 226 shows that Tharyps was made an Athenian citizen, but leaves the date uncertain. It is, however, clear that Tharyps was educated at Athens during the Archadian war. Nilsson, Studien zur Geschichte des alten Epirus, 45-5, rejects the tradition (Plut. Pyrrhus i; Justin XVIII, 3, 11), but his arguments are not very cogent. The tradition is accepted by Cross, op. cit. p. 12, and D. S. Robertson, Class. Rev. 1923, 58 ff., to which article I am indebted for its connexion of the Andromache with Molossia and Tharyps. D. L. Page’s arguments that the play was performed at Argos, not Dodona, as Robertson suggests, does not affect Robertson’s identification of Molossus and Tharyps (see Greek Poetry and Life, pp. 227-8, and note 2 on p. 227).

53 Paus. VIII, 11, 12.

54 Cf. Thuc. I, 38, 3; 25, 4.

55 Paus. V, 22, 3. Σταύρωσαν τό ατριχον αυτοί μὲ τὸν Αμβρασίον, Απαλλομεντο δὲ ανέστησαν οἱ ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον καὶ δὴ καὶ ἄδειον γραμμάτωσαν ἵστων ἀρχαίων ὑπὸ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ πάντως: μὴ δὲ Απαλλομεντον ἀνασκόλουθητο, τίνι ὑπὸ τοῦ καθολικοῦ ἡμών φθορᾶς ἐκείνος ἀποκρύπτει; τες τίνι τόποι θυσίαν γενέσθαι καί τε θυσίαν θυσίαν εὐθυς εἴπαιεν ἐν τι θεοῦ ἐκ θρόνου ἔσκεπτον.

56 Inscriptions von Olympia, no. 692.

F
much before this, if his father's floruit is the first half of the century. The inscription on the base of the group at Olympia, only one word of which, MÉMON, has survived, points to a date some time before 400. The lettering is not likely to be Attic, but could be Corinthian, as one would expect in an Apolloianic dedication in which Corinth had an interest. The letters do not look to be by any means the most developed type; they tell in favour of a date early, rather than late, in the career of the son of Myron. It is highly improbable that an Athenian would be given an Apolloianic contract when Athens and Corinth were at war, nor is it likely that, after 435, Corinth was in a position to send troops to the north-west to help Apollonia. Again, as the route was open in 435, there is some reason for putting the reduction of the Abantis before that. Tentatively, then, one may date the Apolloianic campaign against Thronion between 450 and 435.

The Abantis district can be identified with some certainty. It is clear from a number of sources, e.g. from Pausanias and from Stephanus of Byzantium, sub Αμαντία, that the district Abantis can be safely connected with the later town Amanitia, which was presumably situated in it. The contemporary epigram does not mention a city Amanitia; the fourth-century Scylax 39 says that the Oricians lived in the territory of Amanitia; Stephanus calls Amanitia 60 not a city, but 'a district of the Illyrians', which seems to be the early tradition. But there was in the fourth century a city Amanitia, 320 stades south of Apollonia, with 60 stades of seaboard. The Peutinger Table put it 30 miles south of Apollonia on the road to Hadrianopolis, which is not very helpful, as we do not know where Hadrianopolis was. It must have been somewhere in the Dryno valley, but many villages between Argyrocastro and the frontier have ancient remains near or in them, and we cannot say for certain which should be taken as the site of Hadrianopolis. Ptolemy 62 put Amanitia north of Oricus and south of Byllis. Of the cities above mentioned, the sites of Apollonia and Byllis are absolutely certain on epigraphic evidence, and no one who has seen Palaeocastro, the hill at the south end of the Bay of Valona, can have any doubt that there is the site of the city, which, in Pliny's words, 'has ceased to be an island'. So the identification of the Abantis is not disputable. It was the district south of Byllis and east of the gulf of Valona, the lower Shushicë valley and the hills which separate it from the sea and from the Viposë valley. But the exact site of Thronion is uncertain. Pausanias says that it was in the Abantis. Within this limit we have to choose between three sites. The Byzantine fortress on the hill of Kanina, 8 kilometres south-east of Valona, stands on or near the site of a Hellenic fortress, as the ancient blocks are still visible in the medieaval wall of rubble and mortar (fig. 15). These are in general smooth and four-sided, square or rectangular or trapezoidal or approximately so, and have nothing in common with the most characteristic type of Greek masonry found on Epirote and Illyrian soil, the most marked feature of which is the huge size of the stones, as large, in the extreme case of Phoenice, as three metres square. At Kanina 1-25 metres is an outside length. Furthermore, some of the stones in a tower on the northern side show signs of corner drafting, a refinement which indicates that the existing Greek remains are more likely to be of Hellenistic than of classical date. However, there is some reason to believe that the site was occupied earlier, as, among the many sherds to be picked up off the surface, I discovered one which might well be seventh century and cannot be much later than the sixth.

Another possible site is Klos, a village on a hill which rises east of the Viposë where it turns west towards the sea. The Greek fortification has a number of early features and is probably pre-fourth century (fig. 8). It has been argued by Praschniker that Klos cannot be Amanitia, as has been suggested. The mere statement that it is too near Byllis (1400 metres) to be a possible site for an independent city does not really do justice to the strength of the case against this identification. Byllis towers above Klos and commands the best lines of approach, which climb up the saddle joining the two hills, the lower of which can never have been a free city when Byllis was fortified and inhabited. The latter site is late; Amanitia, and not Byllis, is mentioned by the fourth-century Scylax, and the walls are of Hellenistic date (fig. 12). It is possible, then, that Klos was Thronion.

57 References in Richter, The Sculpture and Sculptors of the Greeks, ed. 2, p. 205. 58 The above remarks are based on the letter chart in Larfeld's Handbuch der griechischen Epigraphik I. Cf. especially the and the ν. 59 Pseudo-Scylax 26. 60 Stephanus of Byzantium, sub Αμαντία. 61 Pseudo-Scylax, loc. cit. 62 Ptolemy III, 12 and 13. 63 Pliny, NH II, 204. The identification was first suggested by Raczy-Danuse, Mém. archéologique de Macédoine, 404 ff. since the visit of Patsch (Sandwicher Berat in Albanien, figs. 53, 54) there can be no doubt about the matter. Casson, Macedon, Thrace and Illyria, p. 389, says that there are no epigraphic or other records from the site; but I saw ancient blocks in the walls of the Kila i Marmarite, a few kilometres S.E. across the lagoon, though the police post on Palaeocastro itself prevented me from finding the originals of Patsch's figures. There are some late Attic b.f. lecythi of inferior artistic value in the Vibre collection in Valona. Ugolini, Atlante Antico I, plate LXI, p. 96, suggests that most of them were found on the Pasha Liman (Oricus), but none of the proveniences are certain; there is an equal probability that the pots came from Pojani (Apollonia), though I do not doubt that Oricus was an early settlement. I owe this information, and much other help and encouragement, to the kindness of His Excellency Senator Ekrem Bey Vlore.

64 The clay of the sherd is between orange and yellow in colour, and nearly fine enough to be Attic. The pattern was geometric (orange stripe, separated from a brown band by a stripe of unpainted clay, followed by an orange stripe, a brown stripe, and another orange stripe).

65 I try to justify this dating in the Appendix. Unpleasant as it is to use the Roman name Byllis and the Albanian name Klos in conjunction, it is perhaps the lesser of evils, since the modern Albanian (Slav) name sometimes used of Byllis, Gradiste, is used by the inhabitants of Klos of both hills.

66 E.g. by G. Veit, quoted by Praschniker in Jilajegovic 1923 Beblati I, 91, to which admirable discussion of the ancient and modern topography of such part of the Muzakha and Malakastra as was held by the Austro-Hungarian troops during the War of 1914-18 I am very deeply indebted.

67 See Appendix.
and after the Apolloniate campaign, the city lost importance and its place was taken by Byllis.

But I doubt if the combined probability that Thronion was on either of the above-mentioned sites is as great as the probability that it is to be looked for somewhat farther south. Pausanias says that it was a city of Thesprotian Epirus. This has a peculiar interest, and fills one with confidence in Pausanias, for it must go back ultimately to a source of the age when the Thesprotians were the dominant tribe in Epirus; that is, before the fifth century, when the northern limit of Thesprotia was the Kalamas, and the shrine of Thesprotian Zeus of Dodona was in Molossia. It also indicates that Thronion should be sought in the south, rather than the north, of the Abantis, an idea which is confirmed by the remark that it was near the Ceraunian mountains. It is on the whole most likely that Thronion should be identified with Ploca. This very impressive site was first discovered by Patsch, who argued with great cogency for its identification with Amanita. His conclusion met with wide acceptance, e.g. from Praschniker and Pace. His arguments appear decisive, though as the site of Amanita is not of direct importance for the identification of Thronion, there is no need to restate his arguments.

The case for Thronion is as follows. Ploca is on the southern fringe of the Illyrian country, being not more than 6 hours north-west of the Dryno valley, and separated from it by the Vijoš and some ridges which, if steep, are not precipitous. It thus fits what Pausanias says about Thesprotian Epirus. Since it is on a spur of the mountains which form the Vijoš–Shushicë water-shed, his remark 'among the Ceraunian mountains' is intelligible, without being strictly accurate. Pausanias or his source can be pardoned when it is remembered that even Col. Leake blundered badly on the geography of the Shushicë region, putting towns in the valley which lay more than a full day's march east of it and having no idea of the distance to which it extended southward.

The site is magnificent, fully deserving the name Thronion (fig. 1), and of great natural strength. The south-west side falls sheer away, and the other sides are uncomfortably steep. The fortifications present several problems, but I think that the walls of the sheer side must be pre-fourth century in parts. Finally, the place has great importance on the land route south. Today the two roads from Valona to Argyrocastro converge exactly at the hill of Ploca, which lies in the angle between them.

The men who founded Thronion, wherever was the site, may well have been Greeks, though the inhabitants of the later city Amanita were almost certainly Hellenised Illyrians. Their coins, said to be Hellenistic, with the head of Zeus of Dodona, show that they did absorb Greek culture; nor Leake could go to Nivica, as it was not under the control of the Pasha of Janina (Voyage de la Grèce I, 337 and Travels in Northern Greece I, 89); they both went wrong over the position of this insignificant village, putting it in the Shushicë valley, while actually it is very well on the Vijoš side of the watershed; and they were both told about its wealth in ancient remains. Leake was even told details, viz. that the walls resembled those of Himara. Yet, though one hesitates to make such a statement categorically, there are no such remains at Nivica. This was pointed out by Von Hahn in the middle of last century (Albanische Studien, p. 33, note 66). He visited the place, found nothing, and despite his excellent command of the language, heard of nothing. Nothing is to be seen there today. The idea that Nivica was Amanita is in any case fantastic, as there was a Roman road from Apollonia to Nicopolis passing through Amanita, and Nivica is one of the more inaccessible places; one can say at once that there was never a road to it.

68 Thuc. I, 46, 4.
69 Cross, op. cit., p. 6, note 2, pointing out the significance of Homer Od. XIV, 315, Strabo VII, 328 (Thesprotian control of Dodona before rise of Molossia); cf. Aeschylus P. 697–698: ἐν γαρ ἐσθε Ἡλεῖα Μὸλοσσοῦ γέμεσθα, ὥς ἀκροθάνατος ἰδρύσας Θεσπρωτίαν, ἐν μαχαιρίς θεοῖς ἐκεῖ Θεσπρωτίου Δίας . . .
70 Op. cit., pp. 33 ff. If Thronion was destroyed in the fifth century, it is possible that the later city Amanita was built on the same site. Ploca may be both Thronion and Amanita. There has, so far as I know, been no discussion of the site of Thronion.
71 Annuario III, 287. Casson, op. cit., 323, does not consider the suggestion.
72 This is clear from his map, as well as from his discussion of the site of Amanita (Travels in Northern Greece I, 376). In view of the fact that his suggestion that Amanita should be identified with Nivica on the Bences is still sometimes repeated (e.g. by Casson, op. cit., 925), it may be worth while to say something about the history of this identification, which is also not without its own interest. Neither de Pouqueville nor Leake could go to Nivica, as it was not under the control of the Pasha of Janina (Voyage de la Grèce I, 337 and Travels in Northern Greece I, 89); they both went wrong over the position of this insignificant village, putting it in the Shushicë valley, while actually it is very well on the Vijoš side of the watershed; and they were both told about its wealth in ancient remains. Leake was even told details, viz. that the walls resembled those of Himara. Yet, though one hesitates to make such a statement categorically, there are no such remains at Nivica. This was pointed out by Von Hahn in the middle of last century (Albanische Studien, p. 33, note 66). He visited the place, found nothing, and despite his excellent command of the language, heard of nothing. Nothing is to be seen there today. The idea that Nivica was Amanita is in any case fantastic, as there was a Roman road from Apollonia to Nicopolis passing through Amanita, and Nivica is one of the more inaccessible places; one can say at once that there was never a road to it.
73 Head, Historia Numorum ed. 9, p. 313.
but that they were barbarians is stated by Pliny,74 and, implicitly, by Stephanus of Byzantium.75 But this does not alter the case for the Greek origin of the inhabitants of Thronion, for Pausanias calls it a city in, not a city of, the Abantis.

It must be admitted that at first sight the idea of Locrians and Abantes founding a city called Thronion in a district called Abantis 76 sounds very suspicious; the onus of proof certainly falls on those who wish to maintain that the whole tradition is not based on the coincidence of the similarity of name. It should, however, be emphasised that the name Abantis was given to the district by the Apolloniaci in the fifth century, and the name used on the coins is the Am-form, which appears in all later authors. It looks rather, then, as if the real name of the district was Amantis, or Amauntia or some such form. The first of these never occurs, so that it is not immediately obvious why, if there were no Euboeans in the neighbourhood, anyone should invent the word Abantis and the mythical connexion with Euboea. Amauntia and Abantis are not very similar words. It is at least as likely that there were really Euboeans in the neighbourhood and that this caused the invention of the by-form Abantis which appears in the Apolloniate epigram, as that the by-form, which, as has been said, is not used later, gave rise to the story that there were Euboeans near by.

It is very likely that Oricus was a Euboean settlement; 77 the island had apparently given its name to the bay of Valona by the end of the sixth century, 78 which ought to mean that the city was founded some time earlier. However, it could be objected that Oricus was in the Amauntian neighbourhood and so should not be used as independent evidence. The Euboean settlement on Corcyra 79 and the mainland opposite 80 is, however, good independent evidence of Euboean activity in the north-west, which inclines one to accept the tradition of the origin of Oricus.

There is nothing intrinsically improbable in the idea that there were also eastern Locrians at Thronion; that there was a city of this name near the Acroceraunian mountains in the fifth century cannot be doubted, and it is more likely that it owed its name to Locrians, than that its name give rise to a Locrian tradition. The latter hypothesis is most improbable, because in historic times Locrian Thronion was not at all an important place. There is certainly nothing surprising in the idea of a joint colony of Euboeans and Locrians, for the eastern Locrians, who colonised Epirote Thronion and, if we follow Ephorus,81 Italian Locri, were inevitably in close contact with the islanders. There is no ground for doubting the substantial accuracy of the Eusebian dating of the foundation of the Epizephyrian Locri, 82 the Locrian origin of which is not seriously disputed, so that it is reasonable to accept the tradition of Locrian colonists in the north-west at a date sufficiently early in the first wave of colonisation to be connected with the fall of Troy.

The reduction of the Abantis cannot have been easy. It abounds in good defensive positions such as Klos, Kaina, and Plloca. During the War of 1914–18 the Italians contrived to maintain themselves there against the Austro-Hungarian troops, who held the Apolloniac territory, as far south as Klos. This is an indication of the defensive strength of the district. It is also poor land compared to the Muzakia and the smilling Gjancica valley. It would be illegitimate to assume on this evidence alone that the Apolloniates fought the Thronion campaign to open the land route rather than for spoil or out of pure neighbourliness. But the enlistment of Corinthian help in the forties or the thirties does imply that Apollonia was fighting for something in which Corinth was interested; so there is some probability that it was partly, at least, its position on the land route which led to the reduction of Thronion.

Apollonia does not seem to have maintained herself in the hills of the Abantis for very long. Amauntia was apparently independent and important enough in the fourth century to be mentioned by Pseudo-Sclayx (26). Molossia, the next stage in the route, fell under Attic influence and the Corinthian failure in Acarnania made the initial section hazardous. By 423 the Lyncestae had come out against Perdiccas and endangered the variation route to Macedon. Under these circumstances it is understandable that there is no mention of the land route in connexion with, for instance, the attempt to reinforce Brasidas in 423, when the expedition had to turn back without even trying to cross Thessaly. The closing of the route was one of the solid gains to Athens which resulted from the Archidamian war, and conversely one of Corinth's losses which Sparta decided to overlook.

APPENDIX

ON THE CHRONOLOGY OF SOME GREEK FORTIFICATIONS IN EPIRUS AND ILLYRIA

The study of Greek walls is still in an infancy in which approved methods and assured results are very few. On the negative side, however, it is clear that Epirote and Illyrian walls cannot be dated purely by comparison with Attic, since even within so close a cultural unity as Attica the time-lag between technique in town and country is apparent (Wrede, Attische Mauern, p. 43). Yet I would be willing to maintain the truth of two principles, which can be used to establish a relative relation to Epizephyrian Locri, and of Locrians in general, is Oldfather's article in R.E. XIII sub Locri; his conclusion is that the Italian colony was probably a mixed city, with elements from both eastern and western Locri. He accepts the Epirote Thronion tradition, though naturally tentatively.83

74 Nf III, 145.
75 Steph. Byz., sub 'Amauntia.
76 Paus. loc. cit.
77 Pseudo-Sclayx 441–3.
78 Hecataeus fr. 106.
79 A. A. Blakeaway, BSA XXXIII, p. 205, note 4.
80 Schol. on Apollonius Rhodius IV, 1175.
81 The best discussion of the eastern Locrians and their
chronology for the walls under consideration. I. Fortifications in the same style in the same area are likely to be approximately contemporary, when there are examples of a number of styles in the said area. 2. If in any area there are walls of different styles, a b c d, and in any other area walls of these styles occur and can be dated, a earlier than b, b than c, etc., then in any one area it is likely that examples of a will be earlier than examples of b. Put concretely, this means that if there was a development from Cyclopean to worked polygonal to ashlar in Attica, it is likely that polygonal walls in Illyria are earlier than ashlar.

An 'area' might be defined as a cultural unity, or a district exposed to the same cultural influences. Illyria and Epirus fall into the latter category, as the most important Greek cultural influences in the district here under consideration, the mainland north of the Gulf of Arta, where in the fifth century Greece proper ended (Herod. VIII, 47), as far as the barrier of the Albanian Alps and the Durmitor chain, came from Corinthian colonies, Corecyra, Apollonia, and Epidamnus. The chronological scheme outlined below is frankly tentative, if for no other reason than that it is impossible to prove the truth of either of the assumptions mentioned above. In so far as they are susceptible of analysis, they look to be in part inductions from dated wall series, and in part wholly a priori, though the assumption which they entail is common to nearly all archaeological dating, viz. that there are no casual reversions to the style of a previous generation.

I think that the basis of an absolute chronology of Albanian and Epirote walls must rest on

Lissus (Albanian 'Lesh', Italian 'Alessio'), the city on the Drin which was colonised by Dionysius of Syracuse (Diod. Sic. XV, 13, 4; 14, 2; I have tried to show in JHS 1936, 202-3, that there should be no doubt about this). Excellent plans of both Lissus and Acroliuss are to be seen in Praschniker's and Schober's Archäologische Forschungen in Albanien und Montenegro, pp. 15, 24. Though Praschniker was hurried and did not concern himself primarily with the masonry, he did not fail to notice that the walls were not similar in style. He accounted for this by referring to the slope of the ground and the supposed care with which the towers had been built. I do not think that this view is tenable. The wall illustrated in Fig. 2 is patently different in style (and earlier) than that in Fig. 3, and is not on sloping ground at all, but on a flat shoulder half-way down the hill of Lissus on the sea side. Again, I know of no assured parallel for the construction of towers in an altogether different style from that of the curtain (cf. Figs. 3 and 4). At Oeniadæ, where polygonal walls
Fig. 5.—Terrace-Wall at Apollonia Illyrica (Pojani).

Fig. 6.—Piloca. Oldest Wall.

Fig. 7.—Xympia (Himāra). Oldest Wall.

Fig. 8.—Klos.

Fig. 9.—Himāra.
have been opened to receive ashlar towers, there is some reason to believe that the latter are later. (This point will, I hope, shortly be dealt with by Mr. R. L. Scranton of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, to whose help and encouragement and generosity in allowing me to see his work on Greek fortifications before its publication I am very deeply indebted.)

There are, then, traces of several refortifications at Lissus. Most of the surviving walls there, and, so far as I could judge, all the walls on Acroliissus, are as Fig. 3, a type of coursed polygonal, the most marked characteristic of which is the avoidance of joints which run very far from the vertical or the horizontal (cf. in contrast Fig. 2); blocks may have six sides, but that is because a corner has been cut out, so $\square$, and regular hexagons do not occur. Many blocks are trapezoidal, some rectangular. In fact, this type of rough coursed rectilinear polygonal is approximating to coursed trapezoidal, which, indeed, occurs in one of the towers on the S.E. side of the citadel (Fig. 4). The chiselled surface of the blocks is, so far as I know, unique in Illyria and Epirus. It will be convenient to refer to the uncoursed polygonal style as Lissus I, and the coursed style as Lissus II.

The problem is to decide which wall was built by Dionysius. It seems certain that he must have either found fortifications there in very good repair, or fortified the place himself, as his aim in colonising the place was to extend his influence on the mainland. We are, then, justified in attributing one wall to the late fifth or early fourth century. I incline to believe that Lissus II, the style in which both Acroliissus and Lissus have been systematically fortified, is most likely to be the work of Dionysius. Lissus I looks earlier than the fourth century. In view of the discovery of 6th and 5th century Greek imports up the Drin (see JHS 1936, 184-5), and the probable Corinthian exploitation of the iris which thrived in the valley, there is no difficulty in supposing that there was a Greek trading post at Lissus, which has left traces in Lissus I. Every consideration of history and geography demands it. The argument that Lissus I must be pre-fourth century from its resemblance to early walls in Greece has a certain validity, because there is no reason why we should suppose that there was a very great time-lag between Illyrian and Greek walls. Lissus was only a day's sail north of Epidamnus, which was by no means cut off from Greece (cf. Paus. VI, 1, 2; Herod. VI, 127, 2). Furthermore, the beautiful terrace wall at Apollonia (fig. 5) and the very large number of Hellenic fortifications in middle Albania would lead one to suppose that wall building was not an art neglected by the Greek colonists in the north-west. The view that walls in far-away colonial areas must necessarily be later than walls of similar style in Greece is as fallacious as the opposite contention that they must be nearly contemporary; it is interesting to note that the remote colony of Paestum has one of the earliest examples of the use of headers and stretchers in a fortification wall, if, as is a priori probable, the wall to be seen there is sixth century.

There are many walls in Epirus and Illyria in a style which is manifestly similar to Lissus II, but most of them are far rougher in construction. The edges of the stones at Lissus fit very neatly and the centre bulges out from them in a way that suggests the evolution of rustication. But at Klos, Plloca, and Medun the joins are rougher, the proportion of stones more than 1:50 m. in length is far higher, and the shapely bulge is missing.

The suggestion that the fortification of the three latter sites is earlier than that of Lissus II is confirmed by the fact that the towers in the Lissus II system are more developed; they are in some sense independent entities, so $\square$, and once so $\bigtriangledown$, not mere modifications of the curtain, as at Medun, so $\square$, and as at Klos, where the only suspicion of a tower is at the northern corner, so $\square$, while the south side goes à crémaillère. The N.E. and S.E. walls are entirely devoid of refinements. (See the sketch in Praschniker, Jahresthfe 1922, cols. 83, 84; I am under many obligations to this article, which brought to my notice the fact that the lower Vjigose valley and the adjacent Malakastra were liberally dotted with Greek fortifications. I see no reason why the Shushci valley should not also repay exploration, though I have, as yet, been able to give it only the most cursory inspection.) The walls of Plloca have never been systematically studied. At present I can only say with confidence that there are examples of several styles there, and that there are no towers along the south side, except at the gates, which are built in a later style than the wall itself. It is hard to say whether the occasional à crémaillère effect is intentional or not, but I incline to think that the wall merely follows the crag at its sheerest. It is a rougher variety of the Lissus II style.

There is a polygonal wall on the N.W. side which resembles Lissus I, and another which constitutes a problem, as there is a rubble core behind the unmortared parament. If Plloca is Amantha, this might be the Byzantine wall mentioned in Procopius de aedificiis IV, 4. But I take it that it is likely enough that Justinian's masons built the core behind the Hellenic parament, which they left unmortared, though, if they did this, they must have modified their core-building technique to suit the circumstances.
I append a list of walls which I have inspected in a suggested chronological sequence.

Lissus I (before c. 400?):
- Plloca (Fig. 6).
- Himára (Fig. 7).
- Terrace wall at Butrinto.

Lissus II (most frequent Epirote-Illyrian style, probably mostly earlier than Lissus II, i.e. fifth century):
- Klos (Fig. 8).
- Himára (Fig. 9).
- Plloca (Fig. 10).
- Medun (cf. Praschniker und Schober, Archäologische Forschungen in Albanien und Montenegro, 3 ff.).
- Scutari (op. cit. 9–10).
- Margellec (op. cit. 75 ff.).

In the full Lissus II style:
- Doorway at Butrinto (Fig. 11).
- Apollonia.

Hellenistic styles:
- Lissus III (Fig. 4), trapezoidal style.
- Byllis (Fig. 12).
- Gates at Plloca (Fig. 13).

Ashlar:
- Byllis (Fig. 14).
- Apollonia (Fig. 5).
- Kána (Fig. 15).

The blocks in the Kisa i Marmireit are smoothed rectangular, i.e. not likely to have been from any pre-hellenistic building at Oricus (Fig. 16).

Phoenice is a problem. Walls made with these colossal nearly unshaped stones (Fig. 17) are in themselves quite undatable.

R. L. Beaumont

Note by N. G. L. Hammond

Further illustrations and references will be found in R. L. Scranton, Greek Walls (1941), pp. 84, 162, 167 and 173 (Lissus); L. M. Ugolini, Albania Antica I, p. 113 (Plloca), II, pp. 60 f. (Phoenice), III (Butrotus): idem, ‘l’Acropoli di Amantia’ in Rendiconti d. R. acc. naz. d. Lincei XI (1935), pp. 10–41 (Plloca); idem, Butrinto (1937), pp. 87, 117 f., 182 (Butrotus and Phoenice); ibid. p. 186 (photograph of Logarà pass).
A GROUP OF EAST GREEK BRONZES *

[Plates I–V]

The six bronzes which it is convenient to take as our starting point have already attracted a certain amount of attention, partly because of their enigmatic subject and partly because they provide a good illustration of an early type of plough. All six bronzes are substantially identical (Plate I). Each represents a naked ploughman standing with feet apart, his left hand on the plough handle, his right behind his back. All are bearded and give the appearance of being bald, though this may not be intended. The ploughs consist of stock, tail with handle, beam, pole, and double yoke. No joints are shown between stock, tail, and beam, which are perhaps all three to be thought of as formed from a single piece of wood. The joint between beam and pole is carefully indicated by a slanting incision or by making them overlap each other. On all but one plough the yoke joins the pole without any suggestion of how it would be attached in real life. On the exception (no. 2) it is fastened by a rivet which allows a small turning movement checked by a lug on the pole. Like the ploughmen the two oxen of each team are standing still. They are yoked by their horns, one (sometimes the right, sometimes the left) facing forwards, the other reversed to face the ploughman. No satisfactory explanation of the reversed ox has been suggested. As Drachmann points out, it can hardly represent the turning of the plough at the end of the furrow; this is usually done by lifting the plough up by the tail and carrying it round. Possibly the reversed ox symbolises in a more general way the boustepon process of ploughing. But ploughing is so often part of fertility cult that an explanation is perhaps more likely to be found in ritual or magic.1

1. Ploughman with Team. Pl. 12. British Museum 52.0-1.13. Acquired in 1852 from the Borrell Coll. H. 5-6 cm. L. 12-8 cm. Cast solid in one piece. Medium green patina. The right-hand ox is reversed. Sotheby’s Cat. 25 Aug. 1852, lot 5453; Kemble, Horae Fereales 244, pl. XXXIII, 16 = Archaeologia XXXVI, pl. 26, 16; Walters, BMC Bronzes 13, no. 180; Gow, JHS XXXIV, 253 n.; Lamb, Gk. and Rom. Bronzes 43; Drachmann in RE XXXVIII Halbband, xix. 1 Plug 1461.

2. Ploughman with Team. Pl. 1b. British Museum 75.3-13.11. Purnell coll. H. 5-6 cm. L. 13-7 cm. Cast solid in two pieces, the yoke being attached to the pole by a rivet. Dark green patina. The stock of the plough has been broken between tail and beam, and both oxen with sections of the yoke are detached. These parts have been reassembled in modern times, but they belong together. The rivet appears to be modern, but the lug on the pole behind the yoke proves that the yoke was similarly attached in antiquity. The left-hand ox is reversed. Walters, op. cit. 14, no. 182; Gow, op. cit. 253, pl. XIX, 1; Lamb, op. cit. 43; Drachmann, op. cit. 1461.


4. Ploughman with Team. Pl. Id. Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum 32.5. Duncan bequest. H. 5-7 cm. L. 13 cm. Cast solid in one piece. Dark green patina. The left-hand ox has been broken off, but the join is certain; part of its tail is missing. The right-hand ox is reversed.

5. Ploughman with Team. Pl. Ir. Copenhagen, National Museum ABA 708; acquired 1855-56. H. 5 cm. L. 9 cm. Cast solid in one piece. Green patina. The right-hand ox, which was reversed, is missing; a detached ox in Cambridge (Fitzwilliam Museum 16.04; McClean bequest) appears to fit the break.6

6. Ploughman with Team. Pl. If. Athens, British School.7 Final coll.; said to have been found at Tchésné in Asia Minor. H. 6 cm. L. 13 cm. Cast solid in one piece. The bronze has been cleaned and is now dark brown. The left-hand ox is reversed. On the right side of the plough tail, close under the handle, are inscribed vertically two letters which Mrs. Wade-Gery, to whom I owe this information, reads as Δα, or Θα, or Δα, the first letter being the lower.

Understandably the primitive style of these six bronzes has received less attention than their other aspects. Yet their workmanship is sufficiently uniform and distinctive to enable a number of other bronzes to be grouped round them. Typical features are the large noses of the men, their spade beards, the small impressed circles that form the eyes of man and beast, the arching tails of

* The substance of this article was read as a paper to the Hellenic Society on 8 February, 1949. I am very grateful to Mr. Bernard Ashmole, Professor Marius Robertson and Mr. R. A. Higgins for constant help in its preparation; if their contributions are not individually noted, that is only because there are so many. Plates Id and Vz h, i are from photographs kindly taken for me by Mr. Ashmole.

1 For the early Greek plough see Gow, JHS XXXIV, 249-75; Drachmann, RE XXXVIII Halbband, i. 1 Plug.

2 See von Sallmann, Cat vulva Curtius, 162 f.


4 For ceremonial ploughing in Greece cf. the arati hieroi (Harrison and Verrall, Mythology and Monuments of Ancient Athens, 166 ff.; Kern, RE III Halbband 1215 ff.; Ashmole, JHS LXVI, 19 f.). Drachmann (op. cit. 1471 f.) suggests the possibility of a ritual significance in ploughing naked.

6 My thanks are due to the Syndics of the Fitzwilliam Museum for permission to publish this and the other Cambridge bronzes.

7 A cast of the fractured yoke of Copenhagen Abb 708, which Professor J. Riis was good enough to send me, appeared to fit the break on the Fitzwilliam ox exactly. On the other hand Dr. Niels Breitenstein, to whom I sent a cast of the Fitzwilliam ox kindly provided by Dr. W. Lamb, is less certain of the joint. He tells me that he believes the ox belongs, but that a small part of the yoke appears to be missing. My thanks are due to Dr. Breitenstein and Professor Riis for their help, and to the authorities of the National Museum for permission to publish the Copenhagen bronze.

7 I am indebted to Mr. J. M. Cook and Mr. Sinclair Hood for information about the bronzes in the British School at Athens. It was Mr. Cook who first drew my attention to Nos. 23, 25, and 32 in my list.
the animals, the simple device of forming feet by pinching forward the bottom of the legs. Characteristic, too, is the lumpy, composite modelling of the wax originals, which the bronze, only roughly and partially cleaned up by filing, faithfully reproduces.

Most of the bronzes are figures of animals and mythological creatures, but there are three more representations of human beings which I take first.


These two groups, of equal size and identically composed, go together. Each of the four combatants repeats the same position: left leg forward, left hand round the other's neck, right hand thrusting a weapon into the other's ribs. A comparable scheme is used for the duel of Gilgamesh and Engidu on an orthostat from the temple-palace of Tell-Halaf.8 In the bronze groups both men and women are naked. The men's bearded heads closely resemble those of the ploughmen. The long hair of the women, swept back from the brow, falls behind in a tongue-shaped mass, the separate strands marked by incised lines. The pommels on the men's weapons show that they are swords, but the women's weapons look more like wooden staves or clubs. The participation of women and the combatants' nakedness point to ritual rather than actual battle. There is evidence for two kinds of ritual battle in antiquity: those fought to secure success in actual battle and those connected with fertility magic. Women took part in both.9 Here, in the rural context implied by the ploughing groups, a fertility ritual seems more likely.

9. Human Figure with Head Reversed. Pl. III. British Museum 1951-3-29-1. Purnell, Haig, and Craufurd colls. H. 7-3 cm. Cast solid in one piece. Medium green patina. Right hand missing. Sotheby's Cat., 8 May, 1873, lot 199; ibid. 18 Jan., 1951, lot 191.

Walking with right leg forward, the arms raised in front of the body. The head is completely reversed in relation to the trunk and limbs. The figure, which is naked, appears to be female, though the breasts are not marked. The hair is treated like that of the female combatants, no. 8.

Neugebauer has collected figures in which various parts of the body are reversed in relation to one another.10 To his list we may add two statuettes in Syracuse, one (from Sicilian Naxos) in bronze, the other in lead. The bronze statuette is close in style to Berlin 163. The lead statuette bears a Greek magical inscription which seems to confirm Ippel's view, quoted by Neugebauer, that these reversals have a magical significance.11

Next, five mythological figures.


Standing with left rear leg advanced. The centaur is composed of an entire human figure joined at the buttocks to an equine belly and hindquarters. This type, according to Baur,12 is not older than the type with horse's forelegs, but it seems to have been preferred in the earlier archaic period. The human figure turns half-left. The head is bearded. Hair is not indicated on the crown, but it falls behind the neck in a plastically modelled mass.


These two bronzes are closely similar. The gesture is intended for swimming.14 Beneath the belly the Breslau merman has two fins side-by-side, the London merman only one. The heads are more elaborately finished than those of the other bronzes. As well as having impressed circles for pupils the eyes are outlined by oval furrows. Both mermen have beards marked by wavy lines and wide, drooping moustaches. Both have a fringe of hair over the forehead, brushed straight forward and the head is turned 90° to the right. The head is not bearded, as stated in BMC Bronzes.15

11 Berlin, Bronzen I, 66 ff., no. 163. The bronze statuette from Cephalonia in the British Museum (BMC Bronzes no. 216) is more complicated than Neugebauer suggests. If we take the feet as giving the forward direction, the legs from the knees upwards and the body to the top of the stomach are reversed; the chest faces forward; the left arm is reversed.
13 Centaurs 135.
14 Architect to King Otto of Greece. He accompanied Ludwig Ross on his travels to the Aegean Islands and the coast of Asia Minor, returning to Germany about 1844.
15 Cf. Payne, Necrocorinthis 77 ff. and fig. 22a.
on the Breslau merman, parted in the middle on the other. On both the hair falls low behind
the neck.

one piece. Medium green patina.

Sotheby's Cat. 26 Aug., 1852, lot 1499; *ibid.* 9 May, 1872, lot 200; Walters, op. cit. 22, no. 228.

Standing with forelegs pushed forward, looking to the left. The feathers are marked on the left
wing and on the left side of the breast only. The front edge of the hair is indicated by a ridge.
The back of the head is too rough to say certainly what is intended there; probably low-falling hair.

piece. Medium green patina.

Sotheby's Cat. 26 Aug., 1852, lot 1532; *ibid.* 9 May, 1872, lot 200; Walters, op. cit. 22, no. 229; Weicker,
*Settenegel* 103.

Standing with her thick, spatalate tail touching the ground, her head half left. The wings are
folded on the back, but do not cross. The wing quills are marked by parallel lines, the breast
feathers by small curves. The hair is parted in the middle and swept back from above the roughly
modelled ears to fall in a thick mass on the back. A few incisions above the brow indicate separate
strands.

The remaining bronzes all represent animals.

solid in one piece. Medium green patina.

Grazing. The antlers have only two tines below the flattened palm. This suggests the fallow
deer, though ancient representations of this animal usually show the spots of its summer coat.

16. **Stoat.** Pl. IIId. Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum 04.11. McClean bequest. L. 9.5 cm. Cast solid in one
piece. Medium green patina.

Standing with its head turned slightly to the left.
The long tail suggests a stoat rather than a weasel. Though popular among the Greeks and
Romans as pets and mouse-catchers, the stoat and weasel are rare in ancient art.15

17. **She-goat.** Pl. IIIe. Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum 04.9. McClean bequest. L. 6 cm. Cast solid in one
piece. Medium green patina.

Standing with head turned half left.

18. **Sheep.** Pl. IIIf. Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum 04.10. McClean bequest. L. 6 cm. Cast solid in one
piece. Medium green patina.

Standing with head turned half left.

one piece. Dark green patina.

Standing with head turned half left. Two curved incisions over each eye.

piece. Medium green patina.

Walking with head turned half left.

For the type of dog with arching tail and square muzzle compare the lion-hunting hounds on
a Hittite relief from Alaca Höyük.14

piece. Medium green patina.

Walking with head turned half left. The tail curls forward over the right haunch. A small
striated ruff round the neck.

---

the Tomba del Triclinio one (Keller's fig. 50; wrongly said to be from Caere) is certainly a leopard or panther (see Prentice
Duell, *Tomba del Triclinio* 17, pl. I). Another (Keller's fig. 58, the animal climbing the tree; of which only the tail survives,
appears from old copies of the painting to be a leopard cub (see Prentice Duell, *op. cit.* 29, pl. II). The third (Keller's
fig. 56, the animal on the ground on the extreme right; now headless, looks like a fox (see Prentice Duell, *op. cit.* 30, pl. II). The
animals on the Sabouroff *pyx* must be cats and mice as Furtwängler originally suggested (*Collection Sabouroff I*,
or fox as on other Etruscan candelabra (cf. *BMC Bronzes* 772, 777-781; Ridder, *Bronzes antiques du Louvre II* 3175). On the
coin of Segesta it must be a moun. The animal on the Berlin mirror (*Arch. Zeit.* 1879 p. 100, not engraved on it, as Keller
says, but cast in the round and attached to the rim, has the pointed ears, short body, and large haunches of a fox. On the
other hand Keller does not notice a creature on the east wall of the Tomba del Triclinio which may well be a weasel
as Prentice Duell suggests (*op. cit.* 27, pl. II). The animal, whose head and tail only are preserved, appears to be jumping
up into the tree on the left of the plate. Another animal with a long, low body is climbing the tree in the centre of the west
wall (Pl. III). This looks to me like another cat or weasel, but Prentice Duell takes it to be a leopard cub.
14 Rosser, *Altannatollen* 117, fig. 520.
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Sotheby's Cat. 8 May, 1872, lot 198; ibid. 18 Jan., 1951, lot 191.

Walking with head turned left. The eyebrows are formed by three lines forming an arrow-head pointing upwards.

23. Horse. Pl. IV f. Athens, British School. Finlay coll.; said to have been found at Tchésmé. H. 5.1 cm. L. 7.2 cm. Cast solid in one piece. The bronze has been cleaned and is now dark brown.
MS Cat. Finlay coll. 241, bronze no. 11.

Standing with head turned half left. The forelock, the strands of which are marked by incised lines, falls in a broad, thick fringe down to the eyes.

Sotheby's Cat. 9 May, 1872, lot 198; ibid. 18 Jan., 1951, lot 191.

25. Mouse. Pl. IV e. Athens, British School. Finlay coll.; said to have been found at Tchésmé. L. 7.8 cm. Cast solid in one piece. The bronze has been cleaned and is now dark brown.
MS Cat. Finlay coll. 241, bronze no. 12.

Sotheby's Cat. 9 May, 1872, lot 198; ibid. 18 Jan., 1951, lot 191.

All three mice crouch with head on forepaws. Nos. 24 and 25 have long, curling tails and are probably intended for the common long-tailed field mouse. The shorter tail of no. 26 suggests the short-tailed vole.

27. Bird. Pl. V f. British Museum 1951.3-29.6. Purnell, Haig, and Craufurd colls. L. 6.7 cm. Cast solid. Medium green patina. The beak is formed from a separate piece of bronze which seems (so far as one can say without taking it off) to be pegged and soft-soldered in position. The join looks ancient: the surface is patinated where it has been filed away to fit.
Sotheby's Cat. 9 May, 1872, lot 199; ibid. 18 Jan., 1951, lot 191.

Sitting with wings folded, the head turned slightly to the left. Wing feathers and wing and tail quills marked by incised lines.

Sotheby's Cat. 9 May, 1872, lot 199; ibid. 18 Jan., 1951, lot 191.

Sitting with wings folded, the head turned slightly left. Feathers marked on the back of the neck, feathers and quills on the wings.

Sotheby's Cat. 8 May, 1872, lot 199; ibid. 18 Jan., 1951, lot 191.

Three curved incisions on each side of the head.


32. Fish. Pl. V e. Athens, British School. Finlay coll.; said to have been found at Tchésmé. L. 4.9 cm. Cast solid in one piece. The bronze has been cleaned and is now dark brown.
MS Cat. Finlay coll. 241, bronze no. 14.

The three fish closely resemble one another: each has two large lateral fins set vertically and a horizontal tail fin. The lateral and tail fins of no. 30 and the tail fin of no. 32 are marked with striations. On these two bronzes, but not on the Cambridge one, nostrils are shown. Miss Trewavas of the British Museum (Natural History) has kindly sent me the following note: 'I should think the artist must have had a fish in mind in spite of the fact that the tail-fin is horizontal as in a dolphin (or a bird) instead of vertical. The big "wings" or "pectoral fins" suggest a flying fish, and the shape of the head suggests, not Esox acutus, but the flying gurnard, Dactylopterus volitans.'

For the Greek names of flying fish see D'Arcy Thompson, Glossary of Greek Fishes, s.v. ἠρπες, κόκκυς, χελιδίνον.

Sotheby's Cat. 26 Aug., 1872, lot 1532; ibid. 8 May, 1872, lot 199; ibid. 18 Jan., 1951, lot 191.

The mouth is marked by a notch across the front of the face and a slit under each eye. Three parallel incised lines run along the nose to the back of the head, where the middle line forks into two, one arm, accompanied by one of the outside lines, curving down each side of the throat.

It is not possible to date, except within wide limits, work which clearly stands apart from the main current of Greek art. There can be little doubt, I think, that the bronzes are all contemporary,
the products of one workshop at one time. At first sight the more elaborate treatment of their heads might suggest that the mermen are later than some of the more roughly finished pieces; but a comparison of the profile head of the British Museum merman (no. 11, fig. 1) with the same view of the centaur (no. 10, fig. 2)—a particularly “primitive” looking piece—shows that the difference is only superficial. The primitive character of the bronzes is likely to be due to provincialism rather than earliness; even, it may be, to the presence of an un-Greek element. If sometimes they recall early clay figures and bronzes of Furtwangler’s “Terrakottastil”, this will be because the same forms tend to recur whenever and wherever a soft material is moulded in the fingers.

Fig. 1.—Detail of No. 11.

Fig. 2.—Detail of No. 10.

A safer, though still very general, indication of date is given by some of the mythological creatures represented. The merman does not appear in Greek art until the seventh century, and is not common before the sixth; the nearest parallel to our examples, a merman on a Corinthian plaque in Berlin, dates from the first quarter of the sixth century. The armless siren with folded wings, a type derived from Egypt, also points to the later seventh or sixth century; and so does the sphinx with sickle-shaped wings. These indications, slight though they are, suggest that our bronzes are not likely to be earlier than the sixth century.

The evidence for the provenance of the bronzes has been confused by a dealer’s conjecture or invention which has been accepted as an established fact. One of the ploughing groups, the combat of two men, the centaur, the sphinx, and the siren (nos. 2, 7, 10, 13 and 14) were said by the dealer who sold them to the British Museum in 1875, to have been found in Cyprus: Cypriote antiquities were then much in vogue. A Cypriote provenance was accordingly ascribed to these bronzes in Walter’s catalogue; and hence to the Cambridge and Copenhagen ploughing groups. No one, it appears, noticed at the time of the purchase that three years earlier the same five bronzes had been sold at Sotheby’s as part of the Purnell collection. Their identification is certain. Lot 200 at the Purnell sale (see Appendix C) comprised a centaur, a sphinx, a harpy and a group of two gladiators; lot 627 included a man driving two oxen, attached by the horns to the beam of a plough, guiding it with his left hand; both lots went to the dealer from whom the British Museum made its purchases in 1875. In the sale catalogue they are described simply as “Roman toys”; there is no mention of Cyprus.

With Cyprus out of the way the remaining evidence points all in one direction. According to George Finlay’s MS. catalogue of his collection (Appendix A) nos. 6, 23, 25, and 32 of our list were found at Tchèsme (Çeşme), a town on the Turkish coast about fifty miles west of Smyrna. Finlay’s evidence is apparently sufficient in itself; but it is corroborated by the fact that several of the other bronzes can, as Appendix B shows, be traced back to the Borrell collection. The bulk of this collection, particularly of the less important pieces, is likely to come from the neighbourhood of Smyrna, where Borrell had lived for thirty-three years when he died in 1851.

17 E.g. clay figures: Artemis Orthia 155 f., pl. XL, XLI; Olympia IV, pl. XVII. Bronze figures: Olympia IV, pl. X, XI, XVI. Farrell’s remarks on clay technique, quoted by Dawkins, Artemis Orthia 155, are relevant.
18 Cf. Payne, Narcremblata 77 f.; Shepard, Fish-tailed Monster 10.
19 AD I, pl. VII, no. 11.
20 Cf. Weicker in Roscher’s Lexikon IV, 621 f.
21 Cf. Ilberg in Roscher’s Lexikon IV, 1038 f.
22 The failure to note that one of the oxen is reversed is probably to be accounted for by the fact that this is the ploughing group (no. 2) from which both oxen had become detached.
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Finlay says nothing of the circumstances in which the bronzes were discovered. It is unlikely that he knew anything. The story of the finding of the Chatsworth Apollo shows how little the attitude of the Turkish authorities of that time encouraged precise reporting of provenances. The number of the bronzes and the repetition of subjects tell against a grave-find. Other possibilities are a foundry-site or a votive deposit. We know little of the practices of ancient foundries, but it seems improbable that they would have carried any large stock of finished bronzes; they are more likely to have worked to order. In any case our bronzes will be votive objects dedicated, or made for dedication, in some local sanctuary. Can we say whose? Not, I think, with any certainty; but the fertility ritual to which the ploughing and combat groups testify, the wide variety of animals represented, and the presence of real and mythological sea-creatures would all be appropriate to a sanctuary of Cybele, whose cult was already well-established among the Greeks of Lydia by the sixth century. And if the sanctuary were Cybele's, might not Finlay's 'man and woman in cart' (Appendix A, no. 9) and Borrell's 'chariot with two seated figures' (Appendix B, lot 1541) prove to be the Great Mother and her consort in their car? One hopes that they will come to light again.

D. E. L. HAYNES

APPENDIX A

Extract from George Finlay's MS. 'Numismatic Catalogue' dated 1864 (Finlay Library, British School at Athens, R.9-33), p. 241

BRONZES

(1-6 are Egyptian bronzes)

1. Man ploughing one o.x yoked backward
2. Women at gymnastics
3. Man and woman in cart
4. Serpent
5. Horse
6. Mouse
7. Bear
8. Fish

Remarks

= no. 6, p. 74 above.
Lost. It perhaps resembled no. 8, p. 75 above.
Lost. Cf. this page above and Appendix C, lot 628.
Lost. = no. 23, p. 77 above.
Lost. = no. 25, p. 77 above.
Lost. = no. 32, p. 77 above.

APPENDIX B

Extract from Sale Catalogue of Collection of H. P. Borrell of Smyrna (Sotheby's, 26 Aug. 1852)

CURIOS VOTIVE OFFERINGS IN BRONZE, AND OTHER OBJECTS

Lot 1532 A Chimæra, representing the figure of a bird with human head, the feathers and wings delineated by rude lines, and two Serpents, engraved and finely patinated

Lot 1533 Two rude figures in the act of wrestling, and grotesque figures terminating with the body of a fish, finely patinated

Lot 1534 Cobra in coil

Lot 1535 A Fish, Rat, Ferret, and other animals

Remarks

Lot bought by Purnell.
The 'Chimæra' = the 'harpy', Purnell sale, lot 200 = no. 14, p. 76 above.
The two serpents = the '2 serpents', Purnell sale, lot 199. One of them = no. 33, p. 77 above.
Lot bought on behalf of British Museum.
The two rude figures = no. 8, p. 75 above.
The grotesque figure ('figures', as the lot total shows, is a misprint) = no. 11, p. 75 above.
BMC Bronze no. 1907; it does not belong to our group.
Lot bought by Chaffers.
The 'Ferret' = perhaps = no. 16, p. 76 above. If so, probably all the McClean bequest bronzes in Cambridge go back to Borrell via Chaffers. Cf. lots 1537, 1538 and 1540 below.

23 See Gjerstad, Etruscan XLIII.
24 For Cybele see Rapp in Roscher's Lexikon II. I. 1638 ff.; Schwenn in RE XXII Halband 2250 ff. For the association of Cybele with animals of many kinds, cf. the Conservatori mosaic from the Basilica Hilariana (Cat. Conservatori 277, Gall. Sup. I, no. 20, pl. 110) on which a crow or raven, a snake, a stag, a lioness, a bull, a serpentine, a bear, a goat, and a dove are grouped apotropaically round an evil eye. Another deposit of bronze animals found near Rome is published by Giglioli (Bull. Comm. Arch. Com. Rom. LVI, 5 ff.), who connect them with an oriental cult.

For the spread of the cult of Cybele among the Greek cities of Lydia see Schwenn, op. cit. 2252 ff., 2287. It is recorded at Smyrna, Phocaea, Cyme, Claizomenae, Erythrae, and Chios, to name only cities in the neighbourhood of Tchismé.

I should, however, point out that Borrell's 'chariot with two seated figures' must almost certainly be Purnell's 'two men seated in a car, drawn by two oxen attached by the horns to the shaft' (Appendix C, lot 628).

During the Hilariata at Rome (23 March) Cybele and Attis rode together in a car drawn by lions; heifers drew the plautum in which the goddess alone was taken to the Lavatio (27 March). See Graillot, Calle de Cybele 131 ff., 139 ff.
CURIOUS VOTIVE OFFERINGS IN BRONZE, AND
OTHER OBJECTS

Lot
1536 A Monkey, Lizard, Zebra, etc. 6
1537 A Lion, Fish, Mouse, etc. 6
1538 A Dog, Fish, Human Figure with head reversed, etc. 7
1539 A Frog, a Lizard, Panther, etc. 6
1540 A Mule, Dog, Elk, and other animals 8
1541 A Centaur, Figures wrestling, Chariot with two seated figures, etc. 6
1542 Lion, Goose, Mouse, Bird, Lizard, etc., engraved and patinated 6
1543 Rude Figure ploughing, the oxen drawing in different directions, very singular and curious 2

Remarks
Lot bought by Purnell. Cf. Appendix C.
Lot bought by Chaffers.
Lot bought by Chaffers.
If, as seems probable, the 'human figure with head reversed' = no. 9, p. 75 above, Chaffers must subsequently have sold it to Purnell.
Lot bought by Gale, whom I have not traced.
Lot bought by Chaffers.
The 'Elk' perhaps = no. 15, p. 76 above; its large antlers would explain the misnomer.
Cf. the remarks on lot 1535 above.
Lot bought by Purnell.
The 'Centaur' = the 'centaur', Purnell, sale, lot 200 = no. 10, p. 75 above.
'Figures wrestling' = 'two gladiators', Purnell, sale, lot 200 = no. 7, p. 75 above.
The 'Chariot with two seated figures' presumably = 'car drawn by two oxen', Purnell, sale, lot 628.
Lot bought by Purnell.
Lot bought on behalf of the British Museum = no. 1, p. 74 above.
The lot total '2' is a misprint.

APPENDIX C

Extract from Sale Catalogue of Collection of Purnell B. Purnell of Stancombe Park, Gloucestershire (Sotheby's, 8 May 1872)

SECOND DAY'S SALE
Antique Bronze Implements (continued)

Lot
197 Very curious Roman bronze Toys of Animals—a tiger, fox, goat, stag, dog and ram 6
198 Roman bronze Toys of Animals—leopard, monkey, hare, rat, mouse, squirrel, frog and dog 6
199 Roman bronze Toys—3 birds, 2 fishes, lizard, 2 serpents, and a man 9

200 Roman bronze Toys—a centaur, a sphinx, a harpy, and a group of two gladiators, very curious 4

Remarks
Lot bought by Lincoln, whom I have not traced.

FOURTH DAY'S SALE

627 Curious Roman Toy, representing a man driving two oxen, attached by the horns to the beam of a plough, guiding it with his left hand; and a two-wheeled Racing Chariot, rare.

628 Roman Toys—two men seated in a car, drawn by two oxen attached by the horns to the shaft, and a Horse, rare.

Remarks
The 'man driving two oxen' = no. 2, p. 74 above.

Lot bought by Schmidt, whom I have not traced.
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INTRODUCTION

The following five notes deal with some neglected or controversial points concerning Alexander's operations in the two decisive years January, 332, to January, 330. Though independent of each other, they have a certain external unity, since all concern the crucial third act of Alexander's career. Early in 332, the Persians, in spite of Issos, still hoped to recover Asia Minor, raise trouble in Greece, and transfer the seat of war back to the Aegean. Two years later, after Alexander's dash to Persepolis, Darius was no longer King of Persia; he was left indeed with virtually no forces except his Greek mercenaries and the troops of the Bactrian barons, who had ideas of their own.

I have found myself at certain points in disagreement with the views of Sir William Tarn. Tarn has indeed left little to be said about Alexander, except where one disagrees; and I would not wish to end this prefatory note without an expression of admiration for his great work.

I. THE PERSIAN COUNTER-OFFENSIVE, 333–2

No extant writer except Curtius (IV. 1, 34–40) mentions the Persian counter-offensive in Asia Minor early in 332, while Alexander was held up at Tyre. Arrian says nothing of it, and almost all moderns have followed him. Grote, for example, devotes half a page (XII, p. 206) to the expression of pained surprise that Darius did 'nothing' to relieve the pressure on Tyre or to save his fleet from collapse; especially during the first half' of the period between Issos and Gaugamela. Actually, the Persian commanders did all they could; though it is true that we cannot say how much of the credit for a bold effort or blame for its failure attaches to Darius.

It was reserved for Tarn (Alexander the Great, II, p. 110) to point out why Arrian omits the episode: namely, that the hero of the Macedonian defence was Antigonus, and that Ptolemy, who was to Arrian what Antigonus is to modern writers, was not going to record the aristeia of one who later became his greatest enemy. Of other sources, Plutarch, the most popular, was, as he repeatedly reminds us, writing not history but biography; while Diodorus was necessarily abridging his narrative to proportions suitable for a Universal History. Diodorus, however, does show, if one reads him with Curtius in mind, that his source at this point gave a similar account of action taken by the Persian forces that escaped from Issos. It was in fact, as may be seen by comparing the two accounts (Diod. XVII. 48. 6, Curt. loc. cit.), almost certainly the same source.

As to what that action was, I do not think that even Tarn has completely done justice to it. Hence the present note.

It will probably save space in the long run to quote in full Curtius' narrative and comments on these events. After describing the adventures of the exile Amyntas, who tried (anticipating Ptolemy) to secure Egypt on his own account, and was killed there, he continues thus:

34. Darii praetores, qui proelio apud Isson superuerant, cum omni manu quae fugientes secuta erant, assumpta eisiam Cappadocum et Paphлагонium iuventuе, Lydiam recuperare tentabant.
35. Antigonus praetor Alexandri Lydiae praecerat; qui, quamquam plerosque militum ex praedisidibus regem dimiserat, tamen, barbaris spretis, in aciem suos eduxit. Eadem ilic quoque fortuna partium fuit; tribus proelios alia atque alia regione commissis, Persae funduntur. 36. Eodem tempore classicis Macedonibus ex Graccia accita Aristomenis, 1 qui ad Hellesponti oram recuperandum a Dario erat missus, captis eius aut mersis navibus superat. 37. A Miledis deinde 2 Pharmabazus praefectus Persicae classis pecunia exacta, et praesidio in urbem Chium introducto, centum navibus Andrum et inde Siphnum petit, easque insulas praesidiis occupat, pecunia mulcatat.

1 Probably a blander of a copier, or of Curtius himself, for Autophrades, whose name never occurs in Curtius; cf. Arrian, II, 1, 2 and 13.
2 Deinde here is a mistake of Curtius'; or Ph. was already at Siphnum when the news of Issos arrived (Arr. II. 13). Ph.'s operations here described are therefore simulaneous with the land operations described previously. Curtius has confused, probably, what came next in his source with what came next in time.
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Curtius' judgments on these operations (38, 40) are as sound as his information is interesting. Few modern readers, thanks to the omissions of Arrian and Plutarch, are aware that anything happened in Alexander's invasion of Asia, except for Alexander's personal doings. Curtius alone here, gives the true picture of the magnitudo belli, spreading now over all parts of the Near East. Fortresses changed hands in Crete, cities and islands in Ionia and the Cyclades, fleets clashed in the Aegean, and one of the greatest of all the Macedonian captains—third, with Antipatro and Parmenion, and of the great men 'found' by Philip—made his reputation on the battlefield of Asia Minor. But (in the judgment of Alexander as well as of Curtius) the Schwerpunkt of the whole war was still in Phoenicia, where Alexander himself, bulldog-like, had his teeth into the throat of the enemy's sea-power.

Now what part did the Persian offensive in Asia Minor play in all this? Curtius (34–5) says that it aimed at the recovery of Lydia. Tarn (op. cit. I, p. 29, II, 110 and n. 3, 177 and n.) says that 'Lydia' here is a mere slip on Curtius' part, for Phrygia (which was, of course, Antigonet's satrapy when we next hear anything of him; D.S. XVIII. 3. 1), and that Curtius did not know what the Persians were aiming at. In his opinion they were really trying to cut Alexander's communications at the 'bottle-neck' between Cappadocia and the Taurus.

This is surely a little cavalier. It was not what our only source says; and Alexander's army was not, like a large modern force, to be paralysed in a few weeks for lack of food and motor-fuel. No, Curtius, who, as Tarn has shown (loc. cit., cf. II, 72–4), was here using the good 'Mercenaries' Source, is probably perfectly right.4

The Persian project was to break through to the Aegean, which meant recovering Lydia by an advance from the east, parallel to the axes of the mountain ranges, a route familiar to Persian armies since the days of Cyrus the Great; to regain contact with the fleet and with Sparta; and to cut off Alexander from Greece not merely by the breadth of Cilicia but by that of the whole of Asia Minor. Curtius may have made the mistake of thinking that Lydia was Antigonet's satrapy: but it was part of the great 'line of communications area' for which, as Tarn has shown (II, 177), he was probably responsible.

Darius' plan since before Issos (cf. D.S. XVII. 30. 1, like that of Memnon, in 334, ib. 18. 3—also from the 'mercenaries' source?') had been to carry the war into Europe, mi[et]r[io]po[lo]v de τῆς Ασίας εἰς τὴν Εὐρώπην, which some editors have needlessly proposed to emend. Even Arrian-Ptolemy has, in fact, an allusion to this as the Persian objective in Alexander's speech before Tyre, II. 17. It may sound surprising, after the event; but it was simply the traditional Persian strategy, using Phoenician sea-power, Greek allies, and liberal subsidies in gold, which had been employed against Agesilaus in the early fourth century and again against Athens in the fifth. So far, Darius had been able to keep in touch with the Aegean by sea through Phoenicia, sending and receiving messages, sending money and even receiving troops; but now that Alexander controlled Syria and was besieging Tyre, there was urgent need to re-open communication by another way. If Lydia, which was the hinterland of Ionia, and the western section of the Royal Road could be cleared, then troops and gold could once more freely reach the Aegean, and there was hope of rekindling the flame of resistance in Greece itself.

It is remarkable how, in the light of Curtius' text, the details about the war in the Aegean, which we have from Arrian and elsewhere, fall into place and make sense. The proceedings of Agis and Pharnabazos in this winter of 333–2, considered apart from the land operations, look desultory and futile; which, in a son of Artabazos and in a King of Sparta, is, one may fairly say, absurd. The capture of Mytilene, early in 333, besieged already by Memnon before he fell sick, makes obvious sense, as does that of Tenedos; together they were a base threatening the Dardanelles. The capture of Chios, again (summer 333), helped to ease the movements of the Persian fleet and to impede the

3 Id. from Issos, cf. Att. II. 15. D.S. XVII. 48. 1 ff.
4 Mention of the Mercenaries' Source, so admirably described by Tarn, prompts the question why so good and unsensational a source was not used by Arrian, and is not named, at least in the manner enabling us to identify the writer, among the numerous authors mentioned by Plutarch. It might be because the writer had little to say about Alexander personally; but surely the soldier Arrian would have been interested in what the Mercenary had to say about the campaigns. Compare his detailed account of Phenouches' and Andromaches' disaster, where Alexander was not concerned, IV. 5. 6.) I would suggest therefore that the Mercenaries' Source as represented by Curtius and Diodoros derives not from the published Anabasis of some pro-Persian Xenophon, but from the oral reminiscences of one or more Greek mercenaries, used as a source by a good Greek historian. If this material thus first appeared in a general history along with less good material, marked by that prejudice against Alexander, against which Arrian revolted, that would account for Arrian's rejection of it together with the rest of the professional historians' books, in favour of the 'original sources', the eye-witnesses who wrote themselves.
communications of Alexander's friends, between Greece and Asia Minor. But why, after receiving the news of Issos at their conference at Siphnos (Arr. II. 13) should Agis send his brother with the Spartan navy to Crete, and himself 'tarry among the islands' (ib.)? why should Pharmabazos from Chios raid Mileto (Curt. IV. i. 37) and Autophradates, Halikarnassos, where the King of Sparta presently joins him (Arrian, ib.)? Is all this simply a desultory warfare of pinpricks, as in the palmy days of the city-states?

Taking all the evidence together, one can see that it was not. All the Persian and allied operations in the winter after Issos fall into place together as parts of a grand strategy, aiming not only at cutting Alexander's communications but at drawing him off from Asia by threatening Macedonia. The raid on Mileto (which also produced badly-needed money) and the re-occupation of Halikarnassos must surely have been meant at least to assist by a diversion the Persian drive through Asia Minor; at best, to secure a port and base for the Persian columns if they got through to the sea. The operations in Crete and the Cyclades impeded any attempt of Alexander's to communicate by sea, even by fast dispatch-carrying galleys, by depriving him of ports (one has to remember the very short cruising radius of ancient warships); as well as interfering with the recruitment and perhaps the loyalty of one of his two indispensable archer battalions. Surely in this way Alexander, like Agesilaus, could be compelled to march home with his main army?

It is difficult to see what better strategy could be adopted, once Issos had shown that—unless on the broad plains of the interior—Alexander's main army could not be defeated in battle. It was a fine piece of planning, and a gallant adventure by the Persians who tried to carry it out; and it must have looked, about midwinter, as though it were succeeding. The 8,000 Greek mercenaries whom Darius had withdrawn from the Aegean to fight at Issos were on their way back, though some at least of them became involved in Amyntas' Egyptian adventure (Arr. II. 13); and the Persians and their allies in the Aegean had, even without them, carried out their part. By the end of 333, they had captured or recaptured Mytilene, Tenedos, Chios, Siphnos and other Cyclades, a great part of Crete, Kos, Mileto, and Halikarnassos. To us who know that Alexander, in the next twelve months, was going to win Tyre, Egypt, Babylon, Susa, Persepolis and Pergamum, their achievements may look small; but they would form a not inadequate content for a book of Thucydides or Xenophon. The south Aegean had been made, if not impassable, at least dangerous, even for fast enemy galleys. One would dearly like to know something of the adventures of the solitary Macedonian fifty-oar which got through, presumably with dispatches, to join Alexander before Tyre in the spring.

The chief thing that we do not know about these proceedings is why nothing that leaves a mark in history happened on the Greek mainland; but Agis evidently reckoned that nothing could be done without help from outside, and, pending the return of the Eight Thousand, Pharmabazos had no land forces to give him. Sparta's usual enemies—Argos, Messene, Megalopolis—were staunch for Macedon. On the other hand, Antipatros from Macedonia dared not march south, leaving the home country weakly garrisoned, while the enemy were supreme at sea. Athens, for which Alexander had hostages in the crew of the twenty Athenian ships which he kept with him (Diod. XVII. 22. 5) made no move; and Rhodes remained neutral. There must have been intense underground activity: coming and going of secret agents, persuasion, bribery, propaganda; but nothing overt came of it. Alexander's friends, the prestige of his victories, and his proclamation of democracy in Ionia when he liberated it, held the position for him long enough. As Tarn says (I, p. 19) he had shown fine judgment.

Meanwhile the Persian army, reorganized after Issos, reoccupied Cappadocia, through which Alexander had marched in the spring (Arr. II. 4) and called to arms with some success (as Curtius tells us) the young men of that province and of the formidable and warlike Paphlagonians, whose chiefstains had made an act of submission to Alexander at the same time (Arr. ib.). The Anatolian winter had no terrors for the Persians. Was it not by a campaign out of season that Cyrus had overthrown Croesus, 200 years before? But it was not Croesus that they had to face now. By hard fighting, Antigonus the One-Eyed kept them out of Lydia, in those 'three battles in different regions' about which one would so much like to know more; and at Halikarnassos, Agis and Autophradates waited in vain.

The crisis was over in the spring of 332. With Alexander firmly ensconced in Pheonia, the Persian fleet was breaking up, its squadrons, except the Tyrian, deserting wholesale and going over to the conqueror. The land-fighting must have died down about the same time, for 4,000 newly-recruited Peloponnesian mercenaries under Kleandros, the brother of Koinos, who must have marched through Asia Minor, and had probably taken part in the fighting, were then able to join Alexander before Tyre (Arr. II. 20). Simultaneously, Rhodes abandoned its neutrality and sent him ten triremes (ib.; and cf. Curtius IV. 5. 14). Amphirotos and Hegelochos, Alexander's admirals, issuing from the Dardanelles and the Thermaic Gulf, were able to sweep triumphantly through the Aegean. Pharmabazos stood a siege in Chios, and was captured (ib. 15 ff.), though, game to the last, he afterwards escaped (Arr. III. 2). In Asia Minor Antigonus, going over to the offensive, was
of the Companions are those ‘half’ of the Agriânes and of the archers, and Balakros’ javelin-men’ thrown out to deal with chariots.

I would hold it, therefore, for certain, that the troops described by Arrian, III. 12, as forming Alexander’s right wing, were in échelon, not in column, and that their formation was approximately as follows:

![Diagram of Alexander's right wing formation]

**ALEXANDER'S RIGHT WING**

(b) *The Composition of the Left Flank-Guard*

In the right flank-guard, Arrian thus mentions six units: three of cavalry, two of light infantry, and one of hoplites. On the left, on the other hand, he mentions only one unit of light infantry, Sitalkes’ Thracians (not cavalry, as Tarn says (I. 48) but javelin-men like the Agriânes, cf. Arr. I. 28) and three of cavalry: the Greek Allied (or League) horse under Koironos, the Odrysians under Agathon, son of Tyrmmas (another native name), and ‘in front of all in this part of the field’, Andromachos’ mercenary horse, balancing those of Menidas.

It would not be surprising if Alexander, for lack of troops, had made the flank guard on Parmenion’s wing weaker than on his own, and most writers, including Tarn (op. cit. I. 48, 50; II. 184), take it that he did. But if we turn to Diodoros (XVII. 57. 4) we find that he mentions as standing in line, outside the Thessalian cavalry, two units which Arrian omits altogether; the Cretan archers and Achaian mercenaries. These latter were presumably infantry, for both Achaian (League) cavalry under Erigyios and two regiments of Greek mercenary cavalry are otherwise accounted for; and it is hardly likely that Achaia alone produced two mounted units. It can hardly be doubted that Diodoros’ mention of them here is right; for the very important Cretan archer regiment is not otherwise mentioned (unless they were all out in front of the main line?) and moreover, on the left wing was their normal position, just as it was that of the Thessalians, the Greek Allied cavalry, Agathon’s Odrysians, and Sitalkes’ Thracian javelin-men. (See Arrian I. 14 (Granikos), II. 8. 9, I. 28, on the battle of Sagalassos.) Alexander’s battle-formations were by no means stereotyped, but they were fairly regular. Most of his units had what may be called their normal stations, which were only varied for particular and definite reasons. It looks as if Alexander’s left flank-guard was an exact replica of his right, though the troops were not of such high quality; javelin-men echeloned back on the left of the Thessalian cavalry; then archers; and then, covering the archers, hoplites; though the cavalry units on this flank, since Alexander intended to advance half-right, may have been lying farther back, to delay the moment when they had to engage not only the enemy’s right wing but his right centre as well.

What is puzzling about this mention of the Cretan archers and the Achaian mercenaries is not so much that our text of Arrian omits it—that might be an early抄ist’s fault—as that Diodoros gives it; for Diodoros is by way of naming only the units in Alexander’s main front (which he does quite efficiently), and not those in the προσκευμα τῶν στρατιῶν on each wing. And yet, after the Thessalians, who were on the left of the main line, as we are told quite definitely by Arrian, Diodoros mentions these two regiments, while Arrian omits them.
It looks very much as if there were some connexion between these two vagaries; as if there had been some peculiarity in the early sources, such as an accidental omission in the text of Ptolemy, corrected by some other writer. Anyone correcting Ptolemy might well tend to emphasise the point; and this might have influenced Diodorus, or his immediate authority. Meanwhile, omission by Ptolemy would lead to the omission by Arrian of this just as of several other more or less important details.

4. Gaugamela

(a) The Sources

(Arrian, III. 13-15; Diod. XVII. 56-60; Curtius, IV. 15-16; Plutarch, Alexander, 32-7.)

The general course taken by the battle of Gaugamela is not in doubt. We have one plain and straightforward account of it, by Arrian, who was himself a soldier, from Ptolemy, who was present. We have also one rather muddled account (as we may see by comparison with Arrian) by Diodorus, and one disgracefully muddled account by Curtius, who ceases to be seriously misleading only when he becomes unintelligible. The inferior accounts, however, preserve some details not found in Arrian, which appear to be authentic, coming originally it may be from the 'Mercenaries' Source. Some of these statements of fact, as well as some mis-statements, are common to Diodorus and Curtius (who probably used Diodorus, as Tarn has shown, II. pp. 116 ff.). Plutarch, though concerned to give an account of the battle only in so far as it sheds light on his hero's personality, also agrees with them and not with Arrian on one important detail—the question who captured Alexander's camp. On Gaugamela at least, there does seem to be a common source or 'vulgate' underlying all these three writers and quite distinct from Ptolemy-Arian.

Ptolemy's story, as we have it from Arrian, is a plain, unvarnished, eye-witness's narrative. It is candid and rings true, and there can be no question of preferring the inferior sources to Arrian for any detail which Ptolemy saw. But it is purely a personal narrative. It seems as though Ptolemy made no use of any written source for a day which he remembered so vividly. Every careful reader of Arrian must have been struck by what he does not tell us: by the absence, especially, of any details about the fighting on Alexander's left, where Mazaioi was nearly overwhelmed by Parmenion's division, and the contrast between this omission and the detailed account of the initial cavalry-fighting on Alexander's right. Arrian's apparent omission to use any other sources than Ptolemy is a pity; one would have liked especially to have an Arrian using the Mercenaries' Source; but as I have suggested above, Arrian probably did not have the Mercenaries' Source available in an undiluted form. He probably had it only contaminated with inferior matter, including armchair battle-pieces like those of Diodorus and Curtius. Arrian obviously, had read widely in the available Alexander-literature; and if our extant secondary authorities give a fair sample of what he found there, one cannot blame him for jettisoning it almost completely and going right back to Ptolemy (especially for battles) and Aristoboulos.

So we have, from Arrian, Ptolemy's account of what Ptolemy saw and took part in on the field of Gaugamela. We have first the oblique advance (ἔστιν τῷ στρατεύειν, 13. 2; ἔτι στέρω, 14. 1) to which the Persians try to conform (ἀντιστρατεύειν, 13. 2) a manoeuvre which must inevitably have had its effect of stringing out the ranks of an army by no means equal in drill to the Macedonian. Thus to disorder an enemy's array by forcing upon him an unpremeditated sidelong move or change of front had, of course, always been one of the objects of the 'oblique approach', ever since it was first worked out by Epameinondas (cf. Plut. Pelopidas, 29). We have the detail that the Persian left stretched out far beyond Alexander's flank, ὑπερμελαγκοβήτυς πολύ—the best evidence that Alexander really was heavily outnumbered, on the field and not only in the imagination of rhetoricians. And we have the detailed account of the fighting between Alexander's flank-guard and the outflanking Iranian cavalry; fighting in which Ptolemy was not engaged, but which he must have watched tensely, as he still rode, half-right, at a foot pace, with his squadron of the Companions. This part of the narrative lets us see in how masterly and economical a fashion Alexander 'fed the battle' incidentally, using the units of his flank-guard in just the order that one would expect from their positions in the original formation: first, the outermost units of his flank-guard, from front to rear: Menidas', Arison's, Kleanos' regiment (I omitted to mention these in my former account of the battle), while still keeping the Companions, on the flank of the main line, covered by Aretes' lancers

Sir W. Tarn has argued (Alexander, I. 49; II. 184-5) that the Bactrians and the Saka cataphracts did break into the ranks of the Companions, who expelled them only after suffering considerable losses. His grounds are that Arrian here speaks (13. 4) of 'the Macedonians'—and the Companions were the only Macedonians in this part of the field—and that if 'the Macedonians' after suffering considerable losses (more than their antagonists) drove the Sakas out of their array, ἱπποδrome ἐκ τῆς κάτασθος, then they must previously have got in. I do not think this argument is cogent. 'The Macedonians' here simply means 'Alexander's troops'; in the next chapter Arrian uses the word of the camp guard, who were Thracians, as Arrian himself has told us; and ἱπποδrome ἐκ τῆς κάτασθος surely means 'drove them out of line'—out of the formation which they were trying to take up for a concerted charge. It is inconceivable that Ptolemy and most unlikely that Arrian should have omitted to mention that the cataphracts broke in, if they did; and it is also inconceivable that Alexander should have let them get at the Companions, whom he was reserving for the decisive charge against the Persian King, without using Arctes' lancers to check them. The Lancers were, in fact, probably between the Sakas and the Companions, and even so, they were not engaged till a little later.
and the Agriani and archers. We hear about the failure of the Persian chariot charge; about Alexander's commitment, at last, of Arretes' regiment to join in the flank battle; of the decisive charge, victory, and pursuit; and (then and only then) of Parmenion's hard struggle on the left, where Alexander's rightward move had left him, with less good troops, to face more than half of the whole Persian army. One other thing Ptolemy omits, even about the battle on the right: namely that, soon after Arretes' regiment, Alexander unleashed those 'half of the Agriani,' who were 'next to the Royal Squadron' on the right of the Companions. Curtius (IV. 15, 21) supplies the omission, though with characteristic carelessness he makes the 'Agriani' here into cavalry. That Ptolemy omits to mention them here is also characteristic. They were to the right of and behind the Companions, whom Alexander just then ordered to turn half-left again, to their original front, and to charge the gap that had opened in the Persian left-centre. Ptolemy saw the Lancers go off; he did not see the Agriani go, and so they leave no mark at this point in his personal story.

Parmenion's hard fight thus comes into Ptolemy's narrative just at the point where he first heard of it on the day of the battle: after the battle in the centre was won, and at the point when Alexander checked the pursuit in answer to the old marshal's appeal for help. And Ptolemy's narrative of the battle proper ends—a personal narrative to the last—with an account of the desperate struggle, with fronts reversed, between the Companions, coming back to help Parmenion, and the Indo-Iranian cavalry, who had ridden through the gap that opened between the advancing right and the stationary left of Alexander's line; an episode without tactical significance but, from the sheer desperation of the fighting, unforgettable to one who had been personally engaged in it.

Such is Ptolemy's story of Gaugamela; an account just such as one would expect to find, not in a regular history but in an autobiography. To it the inferior writers, largely but not wholly from the Mercenaries' Source, enable us to add some important details. One is that about the 'Agriani' mentioned above; another, the fact that Mazaio was the commander on the Persian right wing (Diod. 60, 5). Curtius also enables us to correct a mistake that is no doubt Arrian's own, based on a misunderstanding of Ptolemy. Arrian says that in the final mêlée between the returning Companions and the Indo-Iranians, Hephastion, Koinos, and Menidas were wounded. This is no doubt right about Hephastion; it seems unlikely about Menidas, whose regiment was last heard of, heavily engaged, out on the right flank; and it is scarcely possible for Koinos, an infantry officer. Curtius confirms our suspicions by adding (IV. 16, 32) that Koinos and Menidas were wounded by arrows. This certainly did not happen in the intense hand-to-hand mêlée with none of the usual manoeuvring and javelin-throwing, which Ptolemy has just described; it is reasonable to presume that Koinos, whose battalion, on the right of the phalanx, would have come opposite the Mardian Archers, was shot by a Mardian in the decisive charge, and Menidas by a Saka horse-archer during the flank-guard action. Curtius adds that Perdikkas was wounded by an arrow. His case is the same as that of Koinos; but as Arrian does not mention his being wounded, it is possible that his name is a mistake for that of Koinos, derived by Curtius from some other source.

(b) Who Captured Alexander's Camp?

We thus come to the last crux about Gaugamela: the question, who captured Alexander's camp? Arrian says that it was the above-mentioned Persian and Indian cavalry; these were no doubt (since after Alexander's rightward move they came opposite his left-centre) the Persian Guard cavalry and the Indians, who came next to them in the captured list. (As Tarn has pointed out, there were no other Persians in that part of the line.) But Diodorus, Curtius, and Plutarch all give quite a different account, according to which the camp was taken by a raiding detachment sent off by Mazaio, early in the action, from the Persian right wing.

This, of course, is not a case of three witnesses against one. Diodorus and Curtius certainly, and Plutarch here probably, share a common source; and one cannot without good reason prefer this unknown source to Ptolemy. Even if it was the Mercenaries' Source, he was not an eye-witness of what happened on the right flank. But Ptolemy, for that matter, was not an eye-witness either; for the sack of the camp took place miles behind his back, at a time when his attention was fixed on other matters. It is really a case of choosing between a third-hand and a fourth-hand account: one reported at second hand by Ptolemy and passed on to us by Arrian, the other reported by three late writers, from whatever early Hellenistic writer gave currency to the Mercenaries' Source and kindred matter. Both the original second-hand reporters, Ptolemy and the Mercenary (if it was he), were sensible men. In order to choose between their stories, when for once they flatly contradict each other, we must consider which is inherently more probable, and which could more easily have arisen by error.

Let us take Ptolemy first. His story, when scrutinised with the care which no story receives until one has been given some reason to doubt it, proves to involve serious difficulties of timing. The gap in Alexander's left-centre, through which the Persian cavalry rode, did not open until the right-hand two-thirds of the phalanx went forward in the grand assault. By that time Parmenion and the whole left wing were already heavily engaged; for this was the reason why the two left battalion-commanders felt unable to go forward with the others. Between this and the time when the Com-
panions, returning from pursuit, collided with the returning Persians who had ridden through the gap, Alexander had charged across the last few hundred yards, broken the Persian centre in what Arrian–Ptolemy describes as a fierce but short hand-to-hand struggle (χρόνον τινά διήλθον), and pursued until recalled by Parmenion’s appeal for help. Since Parmenion was already in trouble before the charge started (Plutarch and Curtius say that he had already reported being in trouble), the pursuit and indeed the whole decisive episode, including the return, must have been over very quickly. Any attempt to suggest just how long it took is of course guess-work; but one thinks of something like half an hour or forty minutes.

Meanwhile, according to Arrian, the Persian and Indian cavalry had ridden to Alexander’s camp, overcome the baggage-guard, freed the prisoners, done some plundering, been driven out by troops from Alexander’s second line, formed up again in a dense mass, and ridden back to a point well beyond their original position; for when they ran into Alexander, he was still on his way to join Parmenion.

Now apart from the two fights which they are recorded to have been in, and whatever time they must have spent inside Alexander’s camp, and the time necessary for their officers to rally and reform a large and polygloyt mass of cavalry, after scattering to plunder and then being driven out of the camp with heavy loss (Arr. III. 14. 6), this story also involves the Persians in a ride of at least ten or twelve miles, between riding through Alexander’s centre and meeting Alexander in person when returning. For the camps were originally sixty stades apart (Arr. III. 9. 3), i.e., assuming this to be the short Macedonian stade (Tarn, op. cit. II, 169 ff.), about five miles; and Alexander’s approach-march had covered the greater part of this interval. The Persians, with their unwieldy army, remained where they were; except for the cavalry thrown forward on their wings, they only advanced to meet Alexander at the last moment (Arr. III. 14. 1, ἤτοι γεγένη δὴν). Moreover, Alexander had not advanced straight but on a slant, and the Persians had, as we have seen, conformed. It must have been at least five miles from the point where the Persians rode through Alexander’s centre to Alexander’s camp; and more from Alexander’s camp back to the point where they met Alexander, returning from pursuit towards the scene of the battle.

The two time-tables really do not agree.

But there is also a difficulty of place, independently of time. If these Persian cavalry rode to Alexander’s camp, then they first rode through Alexander’s second line; but let us make no difficulty about that. The second-line troops (who were infantry, by the way) then (seeing the battle in front of them won?) turn and follow them, back along four miles odd of the oblique advance, and ultimately drive them, with heavy loss, out of the lines—in what direction? Obviously, to Alexander’s original left, more or less to the east, and away from the scene of the battle, from which they had come. And yet after this, these horsemen form up again, and instead of riding off to the east or south-east, where all was clear, ride round their late vanquishers, back to the scene of the battle, and round the battle still going on between Parmenion and Mazaioi. If they wanted to get away, why did they come back towards the fighting? And if they wanted some more fighting, then, when they found some, why did they not join in?

As to why the Persian Guard cavalry might have ridden straight to Alexander’s camp from their break-through, Sir William Tarn (I. 50, II. 187–8) has suggested a reason: Darius had ordered the rescue of his family. The authority for this is a sentence from the pre-battle Hortatio put into Darius’ mouth by Curtius; ‘Eripite viscera mea ex vinculis; restitute mihi pigiona ... parentem, liberos’ (IV. 14. 22). On this I would urge, first, that before accepting the theory, the whole speech should be read. It is a typical Curtian performance—not a very good speech, even as silver Latin rhetoric goes; but at such a crisis he obviously felt that Darius, as well as Alexander, had got to have one. Darius appeals to his Persians by all that they hold dear—the pride of empire, the memory of Cyrus, etcetera, etcetera—to win the battle. Among other aspects of the desirability of winning is the prospect of rescuing the King’s family; that is all. In their context, the words ‘eripite viscera mea’, etc., strike me at least simply as a piece of exhortation to fight hard, and not even Curtius’ idea of a military directive. Secondly, such a directive, if given, would have been so lunatic that even Sir W. Tarn’s phrase ‘Darius’ foolish order’, is hardly the word for it. Apart from the fact that, if given, it probably lost the war, and that a directive that any troops that broke the enemy’s line should forthwith leave the battlefield would be most people’s idea of how to lose it, it was only by chance that the gap in Alexander’s line, through which the Guard rode, opened at all. If the Persian flank attacks had succeeded in stopping Alexander’s right wing as well as his left, then Alexander could hardly have won a decisive victory, but on the other hand his phalanx would not have broken in two; and in those circumstances no cavalry that had attempted to ride through it would have been in a state to rescue anyone. If Darius wanted to send raiding forces to rescue his family, the place for him to station them initially was on the flank—or on both flanks. There is in fact no evidence that he did not concert such action with Mazaioi; but on the other hand, there is no evidence that he did.

No, the whole story of Alexander’s camp being captured by the Persian Guard is a mass of difficulties. The rival story, on the other hand, that Alexander’s camp was overrun by ‘Scythian and Kadousian’ cavalry (Diod. 59. 5), sent early in the action from the Persian right wing by
Mazaios, presents no difficulties at all, and also it fits in very well with a fact which our authors are not at pains to stress, and indeed do not mention. This is the fact that Alexander’s advance obliquely to the right automatically uncovered his camp, except for the meagre baggage-guard of a few hundred Thracians, which was all he could spare. Mazaios, a resourceful commander, seeing the enemy’s left wing moving away from him and having enough men to outflank Parmenion and to spare, then presumably seized the opportunity to do something that might draw off enemy troops from the main battle, or at least shake their morale, as it shook Parmenion’s.

It will be noticed that this episode is not a mere excrecence on Diodoros’, Plutarch’s and Curtius’ view of the battle; it is presupposed in Plutarch’s and Curtius’ story of Parmenion’s message to Alexander before the decisive charge; and it even accounts for one, and the most far reaching, of Curtius’ extraordinary blunders. Curtius (IV. 15, 6–18) has simply confused the two forces of enemy cavalry which rode round Alexander’s two flanks—the force which took the camp, and the force against which he sent Menidas and Arates; and that is how he comes to make Menidas and Arates take part in the fighting at Alexander’s camp!

I would suggest, then, that there can be little doubt that Diodoros’, Plutarch’s, and Curtius’, or rather their common source’s, view of Gaugamela is right in this detail as against Arrian. Who was the common source, we cannot say; probably a Hellenistic historian of considerable attainments, who used Ptolemy as well as other material of unequal merit; it is our misfortune that Arrian, disliking some of the inferior matter, rejected him and all his works, good or bad. In this particular case, where what became the ‘vulgate’ (yes, at least for Gaugamela!) was right, Arrian, going back to Ptolemy and nothing but Ptolemy, was wrong. As for Ptolemy’s mistake, it is a mistake of a type not uncommon where an account is of a complex action is given as seen through one pair of eyes only. Ptolemy knew the camp had been taken by enemy cavalry that had penetrated behind Alexander’s line. Ptolemy knew also that he had been in one of the toughest fights of his life against enemy cavalry that had penetrated behind Alexander’s line and were trying to get back. He had not seen Mazaios’ cavalry ride past Alexander’s left wing while he was facing to the right; and he was at no pains to find out what happened on Parmenion’s wing in any detail; probably, like others of the young men, regarding Parmenion as due for superannuation. He simply identified the two bodies of enemy cavalry, of whose activity behind the line he had good cause to know; and he passed on this natural error to Arrian, and through Arrian into most modern books.

5. The Sequel to Gaugamela: Alexander’s Exploitation of his Victory

The victory of Gaugamela had laid open Babylonia, the economic centre of gravity of the Empire, and Susa, one of its political capitals. So much Darius recognised, as Arrian tells us (III. 16). But by retreating himself on Ecbatana, through friendly country which had known him as governor, and by mountainous ways, impassable for a large invading army, he made good his own escape with his Bactrians and what remained of his Greek mercenaries and his guards. Iran was still intact, and the home forces of Persia, Media, and eastern Iran might yet prove equal to holding its mountainous West Wall in the spring.

A point that has never, so far as I know, been properly emphasised in any book (including my own) is the astonishing character of Alexander’s achievement in upsetting this calculation by his winter campaign, in January, 330. We take such things for granted of Alexander, just as we take for granted his three campaigns—each involving serious fighting—in Thrace, Illyria, and Greece, all packed into the summer of 335, or his mountain campaign in Pisidia in December, 334, after the Granikos, the conquest of Ionia, and the siege of Halikarnassos. ‘Every schoolboy knows’—if he has ‘done’ Alexander and remembered what he read—that after Gaugamela Alexander occupied Persis, defeating local resistance. Of course he did, one thinks; what could be more natural? One may hazard the conjecture that it did not seem ‘only natural’ to his opponents that winter; nor, probably, to the Macedonian troops.

Alexander rested his army at Babylon, we are told, for thirty-four days (Curtius, V. 1. 39, who adds some curious and fascinating details about the alleged effect on their military efficiency). This takes us already to mid-November. Meanwhile no doubt Alexander and his Persian-speaking intelligence officer, Laomedon, pumped any suitable Persians from Mazaios downward on the topography of the roads and mountains ahead. Like Philip before him, Alexander was no respecter of the view that one did not campaign in winter; but the five weeks at Babylon would give time for reports to reach Darius that he had gone into winter-quarters this time. Even when in mid-November he marched out for Susa, which Philoxenos had occupied for him soon after Gaugamela, no one can have guessed his real intention, after reaching Susa (which is about 150 miles due south of Ecbatana) to march on another 300 miles to the south-east, to force his way over the mountains, to occupy the Persian home-country in mid-winter, and to deny its man-power to the enemy for the next campaign.

As everyone knows, it was done, after severe campaigning, turning the hill-positions, first of mountaineers in a country so difficult that the kings of Persia had paid blackmail to be let through,
and then of the native Persian home-levies themselves; and 30,000 young Persians (one cannot vouch for the numbers), the flower of the country's man-power, had been rounded up and sent to suitable localities, to be trained under Greek or Macedonian officers as soldiers of the new king. Like all Alexander's brilliances, it was in the long run a most economical operation. If he had chosen to march from Susa direct on Ecbatana in the spring, he would have had to fight at least some of these young Persians, stiffened by Persian Guards and Greek mercenaries, on a worse gradient that that of the Persian Gates. It was one of the most tremendous pieces of exploitation of a victory in the history of warfare.

In a sense, every educated man knows what Alexander did; but the more one studies him, the more one realises how difficult it is to appreciate after the event the audacity and the still more amazing judgment of what was possible, shown in the planning of his early campaigns by this young man of twenty to twenty-five. One takes his achievements for granted; one underrates his opponents. That is, in a sense, our best tribute to the sheer intensity of the flame that burnt itself out before he was thirty-three.

A. R. Burn

(The above was written before the publication of Mr. G. T. Griffith's article in *JHS* LXVII 77.—A.R.B.)
ARCHAEOLOGY IN GREECE, 1951

[Plates VI-VII]

This year, like the last, has been an exceptional one. The Archaeological Society and the Foreign Schools have been engaged in widespread excavation. Among the spectacular discoveries of the season are richly furnished Late Minoan tombs at and near Knossos, and a new shaft grave—somewhat earlier than those inside the Lion Gate—alongside the Tomb of Clytaemnestra at Mycenae; attention will be focused on Pylos in the coming spring now that the arrangements for the resumption of work there are completed. The German Institute has been re-established with Dr. Kunze as its new director. The reconstitution of the museums is proceeding at a measured pace: but the most manifest achievement this year has been the restoration of monuments in the field, which has been carried out on an unprecedented scale under the direction of Prof. Orlandos with the help of an exceptionally large allocation—unfortunately not to be repeated—from Marshall Aid. The Tomb of Clytaemnestra has been restored, and great improvements have been made at the Temple of Aphaia in Aegina and among the houses of Delos. At Knossos and Phaistos, despite the delay in the transmission to Crete of the sums made available, Mr. de Jong and Dr. Levi, in conjunction with the Ephor, Dr. Platon, have made great progress with the conservation of the two great palaces.¹

ATHENS AND ATTICA

At the National Museum the repair of the old building has proceeded apace; the roof and windows of the north side and of some galleries on the west and east sides have been remodelled without prejudice to the architectural style. The big basements under the old galleries have also been completed and equipped with fluorescent lighting, and the vast accumulation of material of every kind not intended for exhibition has been transferred from the roof and inner court of the old museum; this has resulted in a re-ordering of much of the material and significant discoveries which include that of joining fragments of the Epidaurus sculptures and the identification and reconstitution by N. Yialouris of scattered pieces of the Argive Heraion sculptures.

The vase-collection has received two donations, one from Mr. Hadziargyris mainly a collection of Geometric amphorae in severe style. The other, a bequest from Mr. D. Kyriazi, consists of three handsome vases. One is a Mycenaean Palace-Style amphora, the second a Geometric amphora with a prothesis and six mourners on the body, and a lower zone with a file of warriors in the manner of the Dipylon kraters. The third vase is a fine big r.f. stamnos by the vase-painter Polygnotos, with a satyr dancing the sicinnis between two maenads on the back. The scene on

---

¹ Source: Archaeology in Greece, 1951, Plate VII.
the front is one unusual in the classical period and painted in the grand manner—Helen in frontal view being directed by Paris to the waiting chariot while one of her women waves good-bye—and Mrs. Karouzou suggests that it is copied from an Athenian fresco or cycle of paintings of the story of Helen, perhaps in the Anakeion.\(^2\)

The examination of the sack-loads of potsherds brought in 1940–41 from the Acropolis Museum has been proceeding steadily; this material had been laid as ballast under the floor at the time of the building of the Acropolis Museum and was not known to Graef and Langlotz. It includes joining fragments of Acropolis vases. One Geometric fragment may come from a house-model; the fragment of a plaque with a horseman (Fig. 1), of about the end of the seventh century, is regarded by Mrs. Karouzou as Corinthian rather than Attic. Among Orientalising fragments there is one outstanding bit showing a human head and a dove with white paint on the upper wing by the Ram Jug Painter (Pl. VI. 4b). Among the fine b.f. fragments is a piece with horses' heads and chests from an equipage of the gods on the Sophilos dinos and pieces of two kantharoi by Neairos; the fragment of a b.f. plaque (Pl. VI. 4c) was recently found in front of the Propylaea. Among r.f. pieces of which further fragments have come to light are a kylix of Oltos (Graef-Langlotz, Pl. 3) and a fragment of the Brygos Painter, also the Pistoixenos Painter's white Orpheus kylix. Other new fragments include a fine ivy-wreathed head of Dionysos by the Brygos Painter, the base of a askaphos with the name of Kharios incised, presumably therefore as dedicatory, the signature of Hieron on a handle that joins the cup by Makron (Graef-Langlotz, Pl. 20, 2), and the name Isodike (that of Kimon's wife) in fifth-century letters on the rim of a lamp. There are also a few bronzes from this Acropolis hoard; the most significant is the elongated lower body of a pre-Daedalic male figure which joins the trunk of the "Theseus" \(^3\) and comes from a big lebes.

The roof of the Acropolis Museum has been partially stripped in preparation for rebuilding, the poros sculptures being given temporary protection; a new basement has been completed opposite the museum door. In the Epigraphical Museum the search for new joints has been continued; the latest discoveries are to be published shortly under the title "Επιγραφές και Αθηνών VII." Recent acquisitions are mainly funerary inscriptions. The director, M. Mitsos, has undertaken the study of the inscriptions of the Amphiparaion, and ascertained that there are many honorific decrees which still await publication; these will be published in the near future together with the funerary stelai and inscriptions on bases from the site. Various Attic inscriptions are published in articles by Mitsos, N. Kotzias, Miss Th. Arvanitopoulos, and A. Papayiannopoulos-Palaiou in the issues of Παλαιστίνα IV, together with studies by D. Pallis of an inscribed Salaminian relief-stele figuring the hero Ajax and by I. Meletopoulos of antiquities from the Piraeus harbour. The Benaki Museum has received some notable embroideries and Byzantine icons and carvings in the last years, among them a fourteenth-century mastich-gum icon of St. Nicolas, a fifteenth-century triptych of the Portaitissa, Coptic textiles with representations of Diogenes and Lais and of Dionysos and Ariadne, and four bone carvings of the fourth-fifth centuries A.D. from Egypt; accessions of the classical section include two gold pendants and a gold lion's head of the third century B.C., Roman glass vessels, and a portrait of a young man of the second or third century A.D. from the Fayyum. The Gymnasiad Library is receiving some 900 volumes, including old travellers and early Greek printed books, under the will of Mr. D. Kyriazis.

The restoration of the SW wing of the Propylaea is to be continued: two grades of the krepis, laid down in poros blocks in 1880, have been replaced in the black limestone from Eleusis. Orlando has now restored the stage-front and marble flooring of the orchestra in the Odeon of Herodes, and repaired the damaged seats in the cavea; new seats for several of the five cunei have been prepared in the quarries, and it is hoped that funds will be sufficient for installing them. The restoration of the arcades is also being studied. Orlando has in addition carried out minor repairs and restorations to a number of Byzantine churches in Athens and Attica. I. Travlos has concluded his investigation of the building inside the court of Hadrian's Library.\(^4\) The first and largest building had four apses and mosaic floors; it was apparently built by the governor Herculius about the beginning of the fifth century A.D., when many other notable buildings of late Roman Athens were erected, and was probably designed as a lecture hall and not as a place of worship (though it came into use as such in the course of the century); the outer structure of the library seems to have been substantially restored at the same time. The building with the four apses was destroyed about the beginning of the sixth century and replaced by a basilica, which in middle Byzantine times gave place to a church of moderate size (the "Big Panayia") that was totally removed in the excavations of 1865.

The excavations of the American School in the Athenian Agora were continued in April–July 1951, the object being to complete the clearing of the market square proper, with some exploration of the deeper levels. The resulting clarification of the lay-out of the Agora can be seen in the new plan (Fig. 3). At the same time the work of conservation has been carried forward, and the main topographical outlines are now much more readily apparent on the ground (compare the photograph Fig. 2, taken from the west end, which shows the reconstructed foundations of the Temple of Ares in the foreground on the left and the rebuilt stage of the Odeon of Agrippa in the centre). Along the west side of the monument of the Eponymous Heroes has been re-erected a short length
of the stone fence on which the Athenians rested their elbows as they read official notices posted in front of the Eponymoi. To the east of this (on the right in Fig. 2) the podium of an altar has been rebuilt, and a piece of the moulded balustrade has been replaced; Thompson considers that this altar, which dates to the fourth century B.C., originally stood on the Pnyx and reached its present position in the first century B.C., and that it may well be the altar of Zeus Agoraios, who is reported to have been worshipped both on the Pnyx and in the Agora.

In the SW sector of the square, in the angle between the Odeion and the Middle Stoa, the tenuous remains of a building had been detected in 1933. These have now taken shape and form as a temple with a porch facing west towards the Tholos, whose overall dimensions of 11.5 x 20.5 m. permit the restoration of a cela more capacious than that of any other temple in the Agora; several fragments of fluted Ionic columns of Pentelic marble found in the area may come from the porch. The construction of the foundations, of conglomerate blocks above a packing of field stones bedded in crumbly mortar, and the associated pottery suggest a date in the first century A.D. The precinct was bordered on the south side by a narrow colonnade of somewhat later date set against the terrace of the Middle Stoa, and it was closed toward the north by a simple wall that ran from the Odeion to the NE corner of the Tholos precinct. Thompson argues from the late date of its erection that this temple was designed to house some imperial cult which may have been related to civic life. The thorough clearing of the west end of the terrace of the Middle Stoa has shown that the terrace originally stopped short of the building proper so as to interfere as little as possible with traffic through the SW exit from the square. The end of the terrace was at first surmounted by a large monument, the foundation for which is bonded into that of the Stoa and therefore contemporary, and which was doubtless that of the donor of the stoa—in Thompson's view very likely a Hellenistic monarch. This monument was eventually removed to make way for a staircase providing a thoroughfare along the south side of the Agora by way of the stoa terrace.

Clearing around the Temple of Ares has brought to light the pillaged foundation pits of two large monuments to the south of the building and a terrace along its north flank. Here undoubtedly stood some of the many statues and groups of sculpture located by Pausanias by reference to the Temple of Ares. The more thorough study of the precinct of the Twelve Gods has shown that the enclosure had an entrance in the east as well as in the west side and that the parapet in the second period of the sanctuary, when the worship of Eleos had been introduced, was adorned with a sculptured panel on either side of each entrance; in a communication at the American School at Athens Thompson has given reason for supposing that a group of reliefs surviving in copies, of which one is the famous Orpheus and Eurydice, occupied this position. Another well-preserved stretch
of the Panathenaic Way, heavily gravelled and bordered by a stone water channel, has been exposed
to the east of the Altar of the Twelve Gods and the Temple of Ares. Two square monument bases,
one of which had been moved from its original position, have come to light at a bend in the road
here; they may have carried herms, of which several are known to have stood in the north part
of the Agora.

In the NE sector of the square more has been exposed of the great square peristyle, now con-
sidered to be a closed market, that preceded the Stoa of Attalos (outline given in a broken line in
Fig. 3); the new evidence tends to confirm a date in the time of Lykourgos (338–326 B.C.) and shows
that the building, in its western part at least, was never finished. The small round building
previously exposed in the NE corner of the square, which is a good example of Vitruvius' first type
of round temple (the monopteros, without cela wall), is now shown to have had unfluted columns
of serpentine and a brick dome; the floral ornament on its cornice blocks and the associated pottery
indicate a date in the Antonine period. The removal of a tongue of modern road has exposed
the east end of the Middle Stoa and the area to the SE of the Stoa. This area now appears to be
a plaza-like widening of the Panathenaic Way bordered on the east by the Library of Pantainos
and on the west by a narrow screening construction of which as yet only the indented eastern
foundation has been exposed between the ends of the Middle and South Stoa; this screen closed
the east end of the 'Commercial Market' which lay between the two stoas.

One of the most interesting results of the campaign was the discovery of Mycenaean and Proto-
geometric burials in the area of the Temple of Ares and the NE corner of the square. The
Mycenaean period is represented by three chamber tombs, four pit graves, and two sepulchral
deposits found in small pits, the Submycenaean by one pit grave, and the Protogeometric by three
pit graves, one urn burial, and one cremation burial. Other Mycenaean burials had come to
light in previous seasons to the south of the Odeion, and beneath and behind the Stoa of Attalos,
and it thus seems fairly certain now that the Agora area was a large cemetery in Mycenaean times
and that deep-level digging will bring to light many more graves. This cemetery, which seems
to be distinct from the family burial plots of the Mycenaean–Geometric periods on the adjacent
slopes, was in continuous use over a long period from early in L.H. II to the developed Proto-
geometric period. The earliest tomb-groups are of special interest since they belong to a stage
of the Mycenaean hardly represented before in Athens. The bowl on Fig. 4 is one of a group
of ten vases found, together with an ivory comb and personal ornament, in the pit grave of a young
girl, and presenting affinities with the pottery from the first Shaft Grave at Mycenae. The chamber
tombs were cut in level ground and of necessity small with steeply inclined dromoi. One of them,
beneath the Temple of Ares, had received no less than thirteen burials ranging over about three
centuries (L.H. II–L.H. IIIc). Besides painted vases the tombs yielded some jewellery, a small
bronzes bowl with spout and wishbone handles, bronze weapons and obsidian arrowheads.

A number of ancient wells have been cleared. Two have yielded important groups of pottery—
one, which contained much household ware and finer pieces including the fragment attributed to
the Barclay Painter (Pl. VII. 1), filled in about the middle of the fifth century, the other closed at the
time of the construction of the Stoa of Attalos. New pieces of sculpture this season include two more fragments of the archaic man-and-dog stele giving the man’s hip and the dog’s muzzle, some fragments of female figures in high relief attributed to the Altar of Ares, and a fine fourth-century torso which may belong to a muse and come from the pedimental sculptures of the Temple of Apollo Patroos. The crop of ostraka is small, but is distinguished by one of Pericles with painted characters and the first known ballot against the demagogue Kleophon, who was put to death in 404 B.C., and who now appears as the son of Kleippides, a general in 428 B.C. (Pl. VII. 2). Pericles’ ostrakon will probably have been cast in 443 when Thucydides, the son of Melesias, was banished, and Kleophon’s in the celebrated ballot of 415 B.C.

G. E. Mylonas has resumed the excavation of the Early Helladic village and cemetery at H. Kosmás (Cape Kolias). The centre of the settlement has been cleared, revealing a group of five houses set among streets and lanes; the houses were oblong, with a front porch, a large main room, and an inner chamber. The walls were of mud brick on a stone footing which is preserved to a height of 0.75 m. Much Early Helladic pottery similar to that of Zygouriés and Eutresis has been found, with obsidian blades and tools on a scale suggesting a local industry. A well-laid road ran along the seaward side of the settlement. The NE side of the cemetery has been cleared and two groups of cist-graves with five burials each have been opened; they seem to have been covered with slabs secured on a sort of cantilever arrangement and in the main to belong to the last years of the settlement. The grave shafts were almost devoid of furniture, but offerings seem to have been laid in small enclosures above, one of which contained forty-nine small vases and much obsidian. The pottery from the cemetery shows strong Cycladic connexions, and fragments of stone vases and a marble figurine have come to light.

Travlos reports on the results of the excavation which he has recently made in continuation of Kourowhétis’ latest work in the Telesterion at Eleusis. The position of the Anaktoron has been established near the centre of the Periclean Telesterion, at the west corner of the Peisistratian one; and Travlos believes that it already occupied the same position at the back of the Solonian building almost directly above the remains of the Mycenaean oikos.

Orlandos has undertaken the renovation of the Temple of Aphaia on Aegina, as appears in the photograph courteously provided (Pl. VI. 2). The battered standing columns are being strengthened and the iron bands removed; missing parts have been filled, and the new stone, mined in the ancient quarries, has been coloured to blend with the old; the two columns of the opisthodomos have been re-erected. Orlandos proposes to restore a section of frieze and geison at the SE corner of the temple and four or five cela columns with their architrave. Some misconceptions on minor constructional points and the distance between the cella wall and the first internal column in the German publication have been corrected. The marble plinth of the west akroterion has been found, with cuttings for the fitting of the cover tile; and a piece of a hand evidently from a figure of the west pediment has come to light. A Greek guide to Aegina has been published.

The Peloponnese

At Corinth, apart from study for publication, which is proceeding, no work has been carried out this year; three panels of mosaic pavement of rooms in the Roman Villa have been transferred to the museum. Tests have been carried out at Sikyon with a view to an excavation by the Archaeological Society. Orlandos has cleared the façade of the ancient Bouleuterion of the Hellenistic city and found the broad foundation of a colonnade extending along the whole north front which faced the Agora. Chance finds include the base of a black-glazed lekythos with the word ΗΣΡΟΣΕ (= ἤγεροσ) incised in the Sicilian alphabet, a headless marble figure of a youth of the first half of the fourth century B.C., and a bronze votive discus.

The excavations of the Archaeological Society at Mycenae were continued this summer by I. Papademetriou and Ph. Petsas on the site where the magazine full of Mycenaean vases had come to light last year. The excavation has been extended to the NE and north, and in the uncovering of other rooms the house has been shown to continue northwards. Many plain vases and L.H. III sherds have come to light in one of the rooms here; the L.H. IIIb house with the magazine was built on top of the ruins of a house dated by L.H. II and III pottery. A large number of vases, mainly plain long-stemmed L.H. III kylikes, were found in a room alongside. Another room beside the magazine, which had seemed likely to prove to be a store, contained over a hundred figurines in human and animal forms, some of considerable interest; but it can hardly have been a magazine. Many L.H. IIIb vases were discovered here, including plain kylikes and stirrup-vases with simple decoration; also two alabastroid stirrup-vases with confronting sphinxes and birds resembling the designs on ivories from Attica. Fragments of Corinthian vases from archaic graves have also come to light here.

M. S. F. Hood has continued work on a small scale at the Cyclopean Terrace Building to elucidate details of its plan left unresolved at the end of the 1950 campaign. The building seems to have had a rectangular plan resembling a megaron. Trenching up the slope brought to light two superimposed walls, the lower belonging to a Mycenaean house with a beaten earth floor, which was apparently destroyed by fire; adjoining this was another Mycenaean building, also
destroyed by fire, whose floor was partly rock-cut and partly laid in plaster. In the investigation of another Cyclopean wall just south of the Cyclopean Terrace Building, the corner of a store-room of an earlier building containing pithoi with clay supports and sturrup-jars has been revealed. On the Aspra Khómatá ridge north of Mycenae building traces and remains of a temple have been examined by Papademetriou and Petsas;¹⁸ the finds include tiles, one being inscribed, and the lower part of a Hellenistic marble statue.

Following on the consolidation of the walls of the dromos last year, Orlandos has completed the reconstruction of the Tomb of Clytaemnestra. The dome is 12.95 m. high internally and proves to climb rather steeply towards the top¹⁷ and not to describe a true arc in profile. Thirty-seven of the 170 running metres of stone blocks required to complete the dome were recovered and reused, while the remainder were cut in the ancient quarries of Mycenae. The tomb is illustrated in the photographs Fig. 5, which were taken in November 1951 just before the closing of the dome.

In the cutting away of the low crest immediately west of Clytaemnestra to get earth to cover the dome a sculptured stele with a tauromachy and its socketed base came to light, and an excavation revealed a shaft grave about 4 m. deep with a rock floor and a low roughstone wall at the sides. There were two skeletons, one laid with its head to the east, the other in a crumpled position as though disturbed. The finds consist of a gold ‘garter’, a small silver jug, three bronze swords up to a metre in length, daggers and a spearhead, a big Minyan vase with a brown surface, and smaller

Fig. 5.—MYCENAE. TOMB OF CLYTAEMNESTRA.

vases of matt-painted ware, one being polychrome. The deposition to which the vases belong should date somewhat earlier than the sixth Shaft Grave, and is of exceptional interest as showing that the burial customs of the Shaft Grave dynasty go back into what are regarded as Middle Helladic times. Papademetriou and Mylonas have discovered traces of a circular stone peribolos outside the new tomb and believe that this enclosure contains further graves. They have also observed the socketed bases of stelai at the Shaft Grave Circle inside the Lion Gate. A Greek illustrated guide to Mycenae and Tiryns has been published in the Βιβλία Τήξης series.¹⁸

Papademetriou also continued the Archaeological Society’s excavation at the Maleatas sanctuary at Ἐπίδαυρος this summer. The east corner of the retaining wall has been disengaged and in the clearing of the wall many pieces from the cornices and engaged columns of the stoas surmounting it have been brought to light. The west end of the retaining wall has been cleared down to the substructure, which rests on the soft rock. The black earth from the altar tip on the slope in front of the wall has been excavated and has yielded much pottery of prehistoric and Hellenic times; Papademetriou has distinguished a series of strata in the debris here. A large rock of reddish “ironstone” has come to light at the west angle of the retaining wall; in its east side is a cavity which was filled with earth containing principally Mycenaean pottery and many L.H. III figurines; this rock was left untouched when the retaining wall was constructed in the late fourth century, and may have been a cult-spot. A rougher supporting wall of a double row of poros blocks 1.2 m. thick has been exposed 7 m. in front of the great retaining wall; it provided a level space through which the road to the temple terrace may have passed. Finds include fine Mycenaean and Corinthian pottery and further fragments of the mid fifth-century r.f. krater depicting Heracles, Athena, and Dionysos.¹⁹

Papademetriou has reconnoitred the site of the ancient city on the peninsula SW of Παλαιά
Epidaurus, where there are abundant remains of buildings and fortifications; he reports a series of Doric column drums from a large temple, which are incorporated in a building of Christian times, various sculptures including the lower part of an archaic kouros torso, a fourth-century B.C. schistone base with a dedication to Apollo, and in the Early Christian basilica on the hill-top a dedication to Aphrodite, whose temple is mentioned by Pausanias, with the unique epithet "Epoufes. Various antiquities have come to light in the clearing by peasants of an ancient well at the corner of the Asklepieion at Troizen; a length of a fifth-century painted terracotta sima has been recovered and brought in to the British School; it is of interest because no building of this date has been noted on the site.

At Mystra Orlandos and the epimelepletion Drandakis have carried out extensive tasks of conservation in the ruin field. Streets have been cleared, the palace has been tidied up, the chapel of H. Georgios has been restored, and wall-paintings in H. Theodoros and the Aphendikon have been cleared by the nun Kale Khriskakou. The church of H. Khrisostomos by the palace has been excavated to a depth of two metres and sections of fourteenth-century wall-painting recovered. With the restoration of its dome the eleventh-century church at Khrisiano is now shown to full advantage once again. N. Zapheiroupolos has conducted a brief excavation at Mazi (Skillountia) on the site of the temple discovered in 1939. The temple measured ca. 16 x 35 m. and had a

Doric peristasis of 6 x 13 columns and Doric columns inside the cela. A complete triglyph-and-metope block, pieces of geison, 20 column drums, and cover-tiles with painted palmettes have come to light; the tiling is of Corinthian type and in marble, whereas the building itself is of a soft stone. The form of the triglyphs and the double-T clamps suggest a date around 400 B.C. From the pedimental sculptures a hand holding the handle of a bronze sword has been found. The temple has been pillaged in places right down to the lowest course of the foundations.

In the spring J. K. Anderson of the British School carried out a small excavation in conjunction with the Antiquities Dept. in the ancient ruins near the village of Mamosia in Achaea, and uncovered the foundations of a small house. There were three rooms on the ground floor: the largest seems to have been a workroom and store, and contained many loomweights and two pithoi, a few bronzes of less interest than the goose-handle previously discovered, and a quantity of pottery which probably dates to the first half of the first century B.C. The second room was a bathroom, and the third seems to have been merely a lean-to against one wall of the house and was perhaps used as a stable. At Derveni, an hour below Mamosia, Zapheirouropolos also reports the discovery of a pithos-burial containing twelve Geometric vases of local manufacture and rumours of other Geometric vases previously discovered; this is of some significance for the history of Achaea, where Geometric wares have not previously come to light apart from two or three vases at Kalandrissa.

The French School has continued its work at Gortys in Western Arcadia. The object of the 1951 campaign was to complete the exploration of the site and the excavation of certain monuments already partly examined. The building A south of the temple 21 seems to be a stoan facing north rather than a propylaea. On the site of the temple itself there is a massive wall on a slanting axis which preceded the construction of the temple and is dated by Corinthian Geometric pottery. A
potter’s workshop of the Roman period has been uncovered against the façade of the temple. On
the north of the excavation there is a large inhabited quarter to which the buildings F and G and
other houses exposed this year belong. The most interesting single discovery of the season is a
rotunda of ca. 7 m. diameter sunk in the ground on the south side of the temple (Fig. 6); it has
nine bath-cubicles, which are vaulted and plastered and were equipped with a seat and a small
trough for the feet. A narrow stair led down from the entrance and separated one of the cubicles
from the rest; and a short narrow corridor gave access to a room, not completely excavated, with a
mosaic floor. The tiles found here bear the stamp ΑΣΚΛΑΠΙΟΥΔΙ. A hundred and fifty coins
and a prehistoric stone axe have come to light on the site.

The Early Christian mosaics discovered by Orlando at Tegea have been roofed and made
accessible. Orlando has completed the restorations at the monastery of H. Lávra; a museum
has been constructed in which historical relics and illuminated manuscripts of the eleventh and
twelfth centuries are exhibited.

Central and Northern Greece

At Delphi the French School has continued the soundings begun in 1950 around the Dionysion
on the east of the Hieron.24 Bouquet has explored an archaic set-up with a brick eskhara full of
ashes, which is dated by Corinthian sherds and fragments of Attic Kleineimer cups; and a row of
three polygonal-walled oikoi has been discovered on a terrace. Under the sixth-century level
lies an earlier layer with traces of walls and Protocorinthian and local Geometric potsherds.
An abbreviated form of the name Dionysos can be read on sixth-century sherds found near the eskhara.
The buildings of the Dionysiac cult were not damaged in the construction of the third-century A.D.
baths; on the north of the east oikos was a bathroom of Hellenistic times, which may perhaps have
belonged to the house of the priests of Dionysos. These soundings have brought to light some
sculptural fragments and a number of inscriptions. L. Lerat has explored further sites in West
Lokris, especially on the Aeolian border. No inscriptions have been found to permit the identifica-
tion of further sites, but at Pentápolis near Skalóula five fifth-century epitaphs have been found by
the remains of a Hellenic tower. At Malandrino, where inscriptions had been found in 1959,25
a new inscription with regulations for a Dionysiac thiasos of Roman date has come to light.

N. Verdelis reports on his activities in Thessaly. At the ancient Pteles, about 4 km. beyond
the modern village of the same name, he has excavated at two points against the foot of the Gritsa
hill, which is crowned by the ancient city fortification.26 On the north-west of the hill traces of a
Middle Helladic house, with a well-preserved wall and pavement outside, have been uncovered;
beside this are traces of an earlier building of the chalcolithic era. A couple of hundred metres
away from this a partly collapsed Mycenaean tholos-tomb has been revealed in a small mound; the
confused bones of more than fifteen dead came to light, together with a considerable number of
complete L.H. III vases, arrowheads, gold and porcelain ornaments, four carved sealstones, and
an ochre powder perhaps used as a cosmetic. Near the adjacent village of H. Theodoroi another
such Mycenaean tomb has come to light; the finds include six skulls and disturbed bones, a small
chalcedony sealstone carved with a gryphon, and an L.H. III one-handled cup with two incised zones
in a technique which descends from the ‘Minyan’.

On the west edge of the modern town of Phárrala a tholos-tomb with a dromos, encircled by
a peribolos of one course of orthostates on a socle, has come to light. The tomb contained two poros
sarcophagi and numerous early Hellenistic sherds; but two r.f. fragments and an almost complete
krater by Exekias, with the battle round the body of Patroklos and a four-horse chariot, have also
been recovered. It is hoped that the completion of the excavation will show whether the tomb
was built in archaic times or later. Two inscriptions have come to light in the city of Phárrala;
one is a fragmentary marble dedication, the other a marble stele with two rosettes and the epitaph
Μένονιος Πινίαπου. The Volo Museum has also received a well-preserved Hellenistic marble
head, 15 cm. high, of a goddess with polos (Tykhe?) (Fig. 7), and a bronze 6 cm. high in the form
of a standing heron, both from the region of Phárrala. About 4 km. SE of Tríkkeri at the entrance
to the Gulf of Pagasai the hypocaust of a Roman bath has come to light at a site under Mt. Tisaon,
where ancient and Byzantine remains are spread about, and which Verdelis is inclined to identify
with the ancient harbour Tisai. At Gonnino a marble votive slab inscribed 'Ασκληπιόν and an
anthemion-stele have come to light close to the ancient city; the latter has two rosettes and a
Heraic stele in relief under the inscription Νικάριος Νιμαχόνος. Arvanitopoulos' catalogue of
the painted stela of Demetrias is continued in the new issues of the periodical Παλαια. Th. Axenidis
publishes some new public inscriptions of Larisa in the second volume of the philological journal
Παλαια.

With the appointment of an epimeleter of the Antiquities Department there has been a resum-
ption of archaeological activity in the Epeiros.26 The archaeological collection in the Paregoritissa
at Arta now contains over forty inscriptions, which Petas hopes to publish shortly. During the
sinking of the piers of the new iron bridge across the Arakhthos alongside the celebrated hump-
backed Bridge of Arta, it was recently ascertained that the lowest courses of the old bridge are
formed of large, well-worked blocks of ancient construction. A small excavation at Pitsianà near Arta brought to light a small enclosure with cremation burials; one burial was untouched and contained a bronze lebes with gilded lip and folding handles which was filled with burnt bones; the grave also yielded four clay vases of local style and iron knives. From the same area a bronze statuette representing Artemis or an Amazon in a short chiton and leather breastplate has been recovered; it is probably of Roman date. Petsas notes the ruins of a Roman bath-complex, with an octagonal chamber, at Strongyli west of Arta.26 Farther north at the village of Kato Graikikon some tombs of the Byzantine period containing jewellery have been excavated.

At Nikopolis, at the point called K阿拉ü, a piece of mosaic has come to light, and a sounding on the spot has shown that it belongs to the narthex of a large Early Christian basilica with aisles and transepts, whose plan resembles that of the Basilica of Doumetios; the nave is ca 32 m. long, and the width ca 18.5 m. The building is to be excavated in the coming year by Orhandis. Petsas publishes a variety of marble sculptural and architectural fragments and inscriptions found in recent years at Nikopolis.27 In May 1951 a small trial excavation was undertaken among the ruins of the ancient Kassope, one of the cities destroyed by Aemilius Paullus, which lies on Mt. Zalóngos north of Nikopolis. An almost square building measuring 32.85 x 30.9 m. was selected for excavation; it is constructed of good polygonal masonry and contains seventeen rooms and an entrance ranged along the interior walls, with an internal colonnade of probably twenty-two eight-sided pillars. One room was partly dug; it had a hearth at a depth of 1.1 m., but the original floor lay about a metre lower than this. The building had an upper storey and seems to be not later in date than the fourth century.

A prehistoric settlement site, with occupation continuing down to Hellenistic times, was discovered at the end of 1950 in the course of field work near Kastritza south of the lake of Ioánnina. Soundings this year have brought to light, amongst other types of pottery, punctuated sherds related to those of the earlier Neolithic of Thessaly,28 abundant sherds with plastic decoration of rope-type and stud-like disks which resemble those of Dodona and other regions, fragments with highly polished dark brown surface, ribbon-handles and flaring lips which form a sharp angle with the interior wall of the vase, and finally much ware with dim geometrical decoration in brown or dark brown glaze; these are similar to the wares of Bouboústí and the Páteli gravefield in Western Macedonia.29 At Volonti, on the Metovo road east of Ioánnina, where an ancient acropolis is to be seen, a series of rough grave stelae of Hellenistic date was discovered in 1940 and is published by Petsas.30

At Verría (Beroea) in Western Macedonia a rock-cut chamber tomb has come to light, with its entrance closed by two courses of stone blocks, in a hillock NW of the town. It had two chambers, the second one provided with two irregular niches containing burials, and the first containing two pyres and burnt bones. The finds included much pottery, clay lamps and female statuettes, and some mediocre goldwork. The burials seem to date early in the second century B.C. M. Andronikos has also continued his investigations among the tombs around Vergína. Some of the burials have
been proved to be older than the fifth century at least; the finds include jugs with cut-away neck, bowls with thumb-grip and other types current in Macedonia in the Early Iron Age. The investigations are to be continued. Styl. Pelekanidis has continued his activity in Kastoria. The basilica of H. Nikolaos of Kasntizis has been completely restored, and notable wall-paintings of the eleventh century have come to light on the inner faces of the two tympana—on the east Christ between the Virgin and the Baptist (the Trinomorphos), and on the west an almost intact Ascension. The little basilica of H. Athanasios of Mouzakis, which was in danger of collapse, has been repaired; the late fourteenth-century paintings have been secured, and a Transfiguration belonging to this series has been uncovered. The main concern has been with the much damaged early basilica of the H. Anargyroi. The walls of this church have largely been rebuilt in their original form and the roof has been renovated; finely preserved paintings of the second period of the building in the eleventh century have been brought to light in the tympana—the Trinomorphos on the east and Virgin flanked by angels on the west—and marble fragments on the sanctuary screen have been recovered. The notable churches of Kastoria have thus been put in order, except for the little basilica of the Taxiarchai of the Gymnasion which Pelekanidis hopes to restore in its original form next year. Old icons, manuscripts, wood-carvings, and specimens of jewelled and embossed work have been collected in the vestry of the metropolis with a view to the formation of a museum of Byzantine art.

Kh. Makaronas reports the discovery of numerous Late Roman and Early Christian tombs on a building site at Edessa; the finds include a piece of a marble slab with a metrical epitaph and a relief-stele depicting a child between a man and a woman. A tomb with smoothly plastered walls and two marble cover-slabs has come to light just north of Ryzári near Edessa; beside the tomb was a fragment of a cylindrical milestone of Lecinius with the figure A', indicating presumably the first mile on the road from Edessa to Thessalonike. In building operations on the street of the Friendly Society in Salonica (cf. JHS LXXI, 244) further ancient material has come to light: in one plot a large inscribed marble funerary altar of Roman date with a pine cone carved on top and scrolls surmounting the ends, and in another two sarcophagi—one merely inscribed, and the other with cupids in the centre of the sides raising a garland whose ends are held by female figures at the corners. In the levelling of the ground for the International Exhibition a tomb of late Roman date has come to light with its interior walls revetted in marble; it contained an intact glass vase. In vol. VI of the "Επιστημονική Εφημερίς" (Salonica, 1930) Kh. Makaronas publishes ephebe-inscriptions of Thessalonike and concludes that the gymnasium was on the site of the Basilica of St. Demetrios, and B. Kallipolites publishes two funerary inscriptions found in Salonica. Tasks of conservation have been carried out in the rotunda of St. George; and with the replacement of the marble balustrade-slabs of the gynaikonitis the restoration of the Basilica of St. Demetrios is now reported complete. Makaronas has this autumn been continuing the excavations of the Archaeological Society in the late Roman cemetery by the Leof. Stratou. Many tombs of types α, β and γ, and built altars similar to those discovered in 1949 but without shafts for liquid offerings, have come to light, as also a built funerary monument in the form of a marble sarcophagus covering two ostothelai. Of special interest is a tomb of type γ, which had a cylindrical pipe on top for the percolation of liquid offerings; it contained the relics of the cremation of a woman and abundant offerings, including gold and bronze ornament and about fifty terracottas, mostly of a pudic Aphrodite. Other finds from these tombs include gold earrings and a pendant, and terracotta statuettes of a pair of embracing Erotes and a naked Aphrodite with a dolphin.

In Thrace a vaulted tomb of the Macedonian type has been investigated at Stavropolist of Xanthi. It is constructed of large squared blocks of local marble and consists of a dromos, vestibule, and tomb chamber. The dromos was 4.68 m. long, with a breadth of 1.58 m., and likewise covered by a vault now largely destroyed. A door 1.23 m. wide leads into the vestibule, which measures 2.07 x 3.05 m., and connects by a door a metre wide with a tomb-chamber of 3.1 x 3.05 m. One of the doors had marble leaves similar to those found in the tombs of Langadà and Vergina. Traces of coloured ornament were noticed on the lintels and on the decorated band which runs round the tomb-chamber at the level of the springing of the vault. On present indications the tomb is dated within the limits of the mid-third and mid-second century b.c. From the region of Didymoteikhon in East Thrace an ancient cist-grave and a copper statuette of Bendis are reported. Stikas has commenced large-scale restoration of the old metropolis of Sémrai, which had been burnt down by the Bulgarians; numerous reliefs and colonnettes from the Byzantine chancel-screen have come to light.

EAST AEGEAN AND ISLANDS

In Thasos the French School has continued the excavation of the Agora. The south-east part has been thoroughly cleared, and many pieces of the architecture of the great stoa there have been recovered; the building had monolith Doric columns, unfluted on the lower shaft, with separate capitals, and oval terminations of the flutes under the necking-ring. In the centre of the Agora two small monuments, which have been partially excavated to the south and SE of the Heroon of L. Caesar, have been completely cleared. The excavation has been extended to the south angle of the Agora, revealing the whole length of the main drain which traversed the Agora from SE
to NW. A late wall, which perhaps belonged to a Genoese fortification, has been dismantled, and a large number of ancient blocks, including three large inscribed bases of the fourth century A.D., have been recovered from it. In the south corner the foundations of a new structure, as yet unidentified but perhaps a Roman trophy, have been discovered, and pieces of its architectural decoration have been retrieved. Trenching has brought to light the back wall of the North Stoa at a distance of 13.8 m. back from the foundations of the stylobate at the front; there is no trace of a colonnade down the centre. Two bases have been partially cleared behind this wall, marking the line of the road which bordered the Agora.

A stretch of fine walling, perhaps from a peribolos of irregular outline, has come to light in the village, and two sculptured fragments and an inscribed funerary base have been discovered in the gravefield at Patáryia. The season’s finds include several sculptured heads, one being of Scopasian style, and the unfinished piece Fig. 8; twenty-eight new inscriptions are reported—among them a fragment of a law concerning the cult of Demeter, a fragment of an honorific decree, and lists of theophoroi.

Lehmann has continued the excavations in the Sanctuary of the Great Gods in Samothrace. Behind the NW corner of the ‘New Temple’ a large building, apparently of the early sixth century B.C., has been brought to light; it is 22.6 m. long (north-south) and 10 m. wide, and had a west façade of six limestone columns in the Doric order between the wall-ends, and a single step; the building was of soft stone and stuccoed outside and in. The walls were built of stones which decreased in height upwards, the upper courses being laid in such a way as to resemble mud brick; there are also traces of wooden ties. Over the frieze there was a white stuccoed stone geison without mutules, of which many fragments are preserved, and some show deep nail holes for the affixing of a terracotta sima. The geison of the long sides was raked upwards at the corners, and there was no horizontal geison under the gables of the end walls, the latter being built without a break up to the slant of the gable. The interior must have been covered by a wooden roof supporting tiles of the Laconian type. The building was restored at the end of the fifth century B.C., when a new floor was laid on a carefully set bed of small stones with a raised border along the edges; this floor was itself superseded, probably in Hellenistic times, by a stuccoed pavement whose surface was coloured red, and later green. The walls were originally whitenashed, but later painted grey-blue and finally red with white stripes. Two gilded bronze letters, which were fastened to the entablature, have been recovered. The building continued in use until the sixth century A.D., when it collapsed in an earthquake; to this time belongs a heavy marble plane for finishing stuccoed
surfaces, which was found on the floor. The fill under the fifth-century B.C. floor contained debris of numerous dedications including a fine fragmentary terracotta head and Attic b.f. and r.f. pottery.

Immediately south of this building another massive foundation, previously incompletely investigated, has been more thoroughly examined. It measures 17:15 × 14:5 m., and bore an unroofed structure of marble with a Doric columnar façade, probably of four columns between antae, on the long side facing west. The intercolumniations were closed by grilles, and the central space was wider than the others. This enclosure seems to have contained an altar and to date to the latter part of the fourth century B.C. Fragments of inscribed architrave and altar blocks indicate a dedication by Arrhidaios, the half-brother of Alexander, from the spoils of conquest. A fragmentary inscribed stele of late Hellenistic date has come to light just west of the pronaos of the 'New Temple', which forbids entry to the building to people not entitled; Lehmann considers it probable that, while the Anaktoron (access to which is shown in another inscription to have been denied to the uninitiated) served for the first stage of initiation, the 'New Temple', with its curious liturgical installations and its benches for spectators, may have served for the higher initiation, or epopteia. Marble architectural members of the 'New Temple' have been assembled on the spot with a view to the re-erection of the Doric façade; and valuable fragments of sculpture have been recovered in the removal of the spoil dump of earlier excavations in the sanctuary.

On Lemnos the Italians have resumed their study of the finds from the prehistoric city at Poliokhni; more than a hundred vases have been restored, including some great pithoi. Tests have been made at points on the site, which has suffered severely during the war years. D. Mantzouranis publishes in ΠΑΓΩΝ, vol. II, an invocation or dedication to the Mother of Nemesis by the poet M. Pompeios Ethikos in ΜΥΣΙΕΛ; the mosaic floor of the Early Christian basilica of H. Demetrios at Ypsilometopon in Lesbos has been secured and roofed.

The excavation at Old Smyrna was carried on in June-July 1951 under the direction of E. Akurgal and the writer, and the work in the main sectors of excavation has been brought to a conclusion. In the large trench, where a succession of habitation levels ranging from the fourth to the seventh centuries had been cleared in past seasons, the excavation was carried down to the prehistoric level immediately preceding the Protogeometric occupation. Two strata of curved buildings were first disengaged, and below these a series of rectangular rooms probably dating to the ninth century was found; one of these rooms contained a number of clay bins and many charred beams on the floor. Traces of buildings of the Protogeometric period were slight, except in the south part of the trench where a single-room house with rounded ends, built of mud brick on a damp-course of small stones, was disengaged; the Protogeometric deposit, however, proved to be a rich one, consisting of more than one stratum, and seems to have covered a considerable span of time; in its forms and development the pottery corresponds closely to Attic Protogeometric. Several vases have been temporarily made up, including an amphora (Fig. 9b) and a large krater. A few scraps of Mycenaean vases came to light as strays in Protogeometric and latest prehistoric levels (Fig. 10). The local Geometric style seems to have become established in the second half of the ninth century; the Protogeometric pottery must go well back into the tenth century but probably not earlier. In the early stages the Protogeometric pottery looks like imported ware alongside the local monochrome pottery, but in the ninth-century levels the painted ware becomes dominant; if the pottery can be used as a guide, it would seem that Smyrna had already passed completely into the hands of the Ionians before the end of the ninth century. The completion of the primary Ionic settlement of this coast and the events associated with the Panionic federation are therefore likely to be of greater antiquity than has latterly been supposed. In the eighth century the proportion of monochrome wares in use was extremely low, but there seems to have been a revival of the grey ware in the seventh century. A narrow strip has been dug to link up this sector of excavation with the temple area, and in this way a cut ninety metres long has been carried across the north part of the site; fifth-century occupation has come to light in this trench, and a gap in the history of the site has thus been filled.

The excavation in the temple area has been continued. Traces of earlier platforms have been discovered by tunnelling; the earliest temple platform had a curved corner at the south-west and was erected about 700 B.C. The three successive archaic platform walls appear superimposed in Fig. 9a, with the south cella wall behind. The west front of the great outer platform of the temple has now been cleared; it seems to have had a staircase on the south-west and a coping of whitestone blocks stepped down at the corners. This platform was built over the foundations of a handsome hairpin-shaped house of the early seventh century, whose plan has been recovered nearly complete. On the south side of the temple was an enclosed area raised to a height not much below the temple platform, which was cut in two by the passage which gave access to the temple from the town quarter on the south. This passage was entered through a pylon (Fig. 11, where the rough wall on the left is a later addition), which seems to have been flanked by buildings above and may therefore have had an upper storey. The external doorway of the pylon (on the right in Fig. 11) was constructed of neatly fitted whitestone blocks without cramps; the inner face of the threshold block was protected by a beam, presumably of wood or bronze, which was held in position by three slotted stone brackets embedded in a plaster step. The inner doorway of the pylon facing the passage
seems to have been open and was probably flanked by piers of white stone carrying the lintel; since almost all the whitestone blocks have disappeared, any restoration of the pylon and temple platform is conjectural; but there seems little doubt that the builders of the later seventh century sought deliberate effects from the contrast of white tufa and dark andesite. The stone flags are still in position over a large part of the floor of the pylon and show that there was a considerable slope of the ground in this part of the entrance passage. At the east end of the temple no platform wall has come to light, and the stone filling continues at a high level to the edge of the hill; it therefore seems likely that the temple platform was carried eastward to the city wall. A trench was dug on the north side of the temple platform where in 1949 three battered whitestone column drums were found at the foot of a later revetting wall, but no further architectural pieces came to light here; in this sector a short stretch of stout wall was dug to a depth of over two metres and seems to form the outer face of a fortification wall whose mud-brick core was overridden by the temple platform. Two fragments from archaic capitals or bases of white stone, with lotus patterns carved on the convex and concave members, have come to light in debris on the south side of the temple; they still bear traces of red and yellow paint; the larger one is illustrated in Pl. VI. 3.
A number of fragments of smaller drums and squared stone slabs came to light in the digging of the temple pylon; some of these were found high above the floor, and it may therefore be assumed that they have fallen in from a building above. The pylon itself was blocked in the sixth century by a rough cross wall and formed a chamber in whose sloping earth floor a number of pithoi were set; above the pithoi was a deep burnt layer with a number of iron spearheads, and below, between the pithoi and the floor of the seventh-century pylon (Fig. 12), a large cache of iron weapons was uncovered; this cache also consisted largely of spearheads, some of considerable length, but also contained an iron helmet with a bronze plume-knob. The fragments of an inscribed bronze bowl came to light in the weapon deposit; the vase has not yet been cleaned and only the word αὐτής can be read at present.

Work on the city wall was confined to the east side. Owing to recent depredations the line of the late seventh-century wall can no longer be established with certainty at the south end, but an outer wall, probably of later date, has been traced along the whole east side of the site and the opening for a gate has been discovered at the NE corner. In the large trench the stone fill which backed the early city wall underlies the curved buildings of the eighth century and appears to be fitted against the rectangular buildings of the ninth century. A short campaign in the easterly part of the gravefield brought to light further tombs, one apparently of Late Geometric times, and another archaic painted sarcophagus.

The pottery discovered this year is mainly monochrome and painted wares of the Proto-geometric and Geometric eras; but some fine Orientalising fragments have come to light around the temple, and in other sectors a few fine figured pieces of the sixth century have been found. A small cache of Corinthian vases was unearthed in the temple enclosure, once again of Transitional and Early Corinthian date. A hoard of twenty silver coins of the Lydian, Persian, and Phocaean mints was found in a habitation level of about 500 B.C.

A new museum has been opened in the Izmir Fairground, containing a selection of the finer exhibits from the old museum. The French excavation at Klaros has been continued, and the Swedish excavations at Labranda concluded; they are being reported on in the journal of the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara. G. E. Bean and the writer have commenced a surface exploration of the Halikarnassos peninsula. Two pre-Mausolos Carian town-sites have been discovered, one of them probably being Palaimyndos; a Hellenistic watchtower has been found on the Çatalaradasi (Karabağlar Island), and upwards of a dozen new inscriptions have been copied. At Mylasa, where an archaic Ionic head was discovered a few years ago, the upper part of an archaic marble kouros has come to light in the course of constructional work in the modern town.

On Delos there has been no excavation this year, but progress has been made with studies preparatory to the final publication. Orlandos has cleaned the walls of various buildings and secured them against deterioration by cementing the joints. The walls of the House of the Masks have been rebuilt, four rooms with important mosaics (including the panther-borne Dionysos and the dancing siren) being roofed in concrete with joists in imitation of the wooden ceiling. The walls of the House of the Trident have also been rebuilt in preparation for roofing. N. Kondoleon has continued his excavation on Naxos for the Archaeological Society. On the south side of the Mycenaean room discovered last year 37 the wall of an adjacent room has been discovered. A court or vestibule, 7 m. broad and 3.5 m. deep, has been cleared in front of the first room; it may be an addition to the original plan since it overlies the corner of another Mycenaean house. On the landward side walls of later date have been examined; in contrast to the Mycenaean walls these are here preserved to a height of as much as 1.8 m.; they belong to a complex of rectangular rooms which descends as late as Early Geometric, much pottery of this era (including whole vases) being preserved. The occupation, interrupted at that date, seems to have been continuous from Mycenaean times. Among the finds from the surface earth are the shins of an almost life-size archaic kouros. Late tombs, consisting of stone slabs jointed with thick mortar, have been found in the vicinity; they contained no offerings. The cemetery area on the east has yielded two Cycladic marble idols and requires further investigation. Kondoleon has also discovered a great temple, which is preserved for three courses above the euthynteria, in the valley of the village of Sangri.

Two fragments of Diocletian's edict have been discovered in Euopea by E. Doyle of the American School, and members of the British School have noted antiquities, including a fragmentary victor list, at Aliweri (the site of the ancient Tamynnai) in the same island. In Ithaca Miss Benton has completed the study of the finds from British excavations in the island; a thousand vases and various other exhibits have been put in order and are arranged in the new museum at Vathy, and a representative collection of sherds is stored in the basement.

War damage to the fortifications of the Knights in Rhodes is being repaired. Two sections of the harbour enceinte have been rebuilt; the easternmost tower of the Collachium has been secured; the east wall of the Fort of St. Nicholas has been rebuilt, and St. Paul's Gate has been re-erected together with the contiguous fortification of the French Tongue. Archaeological exploration has been begun this autumn in Rhodes by the Archaeological Society under the direction of the Ephor, I. Kondis, to whose kindness I owe this notice. Excavation was limited to the city of Rhodes
itself. In the mediaeval city remains of ancient buildings brought to light in the clearing of debris of the wartime bombardments have been investigated in the area SW of the central gate of the commercial harbour. The west side of a late Hellenistic building over 21 m. long has been uncovered on a width of 8 m. in Pythagoras St.; its plan has not yet emerged fully; it is overlaid by a Byzantine building constructed in the main of Doric architectural members. Alongside Sophocles St. and Euripides St. the west wall of a Hellenistic building, 6·5 m. deep and 2·14 m. broad, has been excavated for a length of 28·5 m. Both these buildings, whose excavation is to be carried to a conclusion, evidently belonged to large complexes situated alongside the great harbour. By the Acropolis the upper stretch of Pindos St., which follows the line of an ancient road, has been investigated, and adjacent building traces have been excavated; the ancient road here had a breadth of 4·3 m. and led from near the temple of Athena Polias and Zeus Polieus to the centre of the great harbour. The first part of a Greek historical and archaeological guide to Rhodes by Th. Papamanolakis has been published. 39

**Crete**

The year 1951 has been one of quite exceptional achievement in Crete. A substantial grant from Marshall Aid has enabled considerable progress to be made in the reconstitution of the

Herakleion Museum. The colossal statue of Pythian Apollo has been transported from Gortyn and set together, and the sculpture room will be opened when the new marble bases are ready. Many vases have been restored. Show-cases have been improved, and new ones ordered from England; and in spite of the lack of space the present exhibition is reported to be more satisfactory than before the war. Platon hopes to have twenty galleries open in the coming year and to divide the material into a select exhibition for tourists and collections for study. Funds have not been available for the other museums and collections in Crete, but at Réthymo the Venetian Club is being restored with a view to serving as a museum. Under the will of the publisher, Andreas Kalokairinos, a house in Herakleion has been given to be reconstituted as a Cretan Historical Museum; it is to contain a collection of Byzantine and mediaeval antiquities, an exhibition of works of popular art and folklore of modern Crete, and historical relics of the struggles of the island. In conjunction with this plan a Society of Cretan Historical Studies has been founded and has already made progress with the collecting of exhibits for the new museum. The mediaeval collection of the Herakleion Museum will probably also be transferred there. The cloister of the monastery of Arkadi has been restored, and wall-paintings of the Gouverniotissa and other Byzantine churches in Pediada and Merabello have been secured and cleaned. 39

There has been considerable activity at *Knossos* this year. About a kilometre north of the Palace a number of Roman graves and four late Minoan tombs were revealed during the preparation of the ground for the erection of a sanatorium this spring, and P. de Jong proceeded to excavate on behalf of the British School. Of the Minoan tombs, one was a shaft grave containing a single
skeleton clasping a bronze sword ca. 60 cm. long with a gold-plated handle bearing spiral decoration and with a pommel of ivory (Fig. 13). By the side of the skeleton lay a beautifully chased bronze spearhead with a butterfly incised on the socket (Fig. 13 left). The other three were small chamber tombs. One contained a bronze sword, a spearhead, and the unique remains of a bronze helmet with attached cheek-pieces and plume-knob; the second was well furnished with vessels and bronze weapons—arrowheads, a spearhead and a gold-riveted dagger, below whose hilt lay an octagonal gold bar grooved round the middle and tapering at the ends (probably the toggle of a baldric); under this gold toggle lay an ivory strip with running spiral decoration, perhaps from a quiver or scabbard; other finds from the same tomb include two fine lindot slabs of onyx, a cylinder of carnelian, and a three-sided sardonyx seal with gold mountings. In the third chamber tomb two burials were found, apparently raised on wooden biers or sarcophagi on legs, with a good collection of Palace-style vases. Trials were made in the vicinity, but with the exception of one empty cutting no further graves came to light, and it seems that those found formed a small family burial plot rather than part of a larger cemetery.

A double-chambered Roman tomb, perhaps of the earliest Christian times, came to light in the diversion of the watercourse here; it is built of coursed rubble with heavy coverslabs, and has a marble griddle floor with a cross, and a niche at the back. Remains of a Roman house were also uncovered; in one room was a polychrome geometrical mosaic ca. 3.50 × 2.85 m. with hippocamps and plant motives and the signature of the maker Apollinaris (Pl. VII. 3). Fifteen wells were dug and produced much pottery, especially of Roman times. Other finds in this area were a length of classical cornice with painted cymatia, and a Corinthian anta-capital. In the village of Makryeikhos close to the Palace a small room of an L.M. III house was cleared and yielded painted vases.

M. S. F. Hood, together with de Jong, continued the excavation in the Middle Minoan cemetery of Ailia just south of the Mavropélio, where a large chamber tomb has been excavated. This tomb had two main compartments divided by a thin wall of rock; the further compartment was packed with larnakes of Middle Minoan type piled two or three deep, and had been blocked off before the collapse of the tomb with a large slab closing the entrance. An interesting feature was the discovery of a stairway cut in the rock and leading up through a low cliff to the cemetery area. Hood also examined the foundations of a circular structure at the south end of the Isopata ridge, which proved to belong to a tower of the classical fortifications of Knossos. In the Palace of Minos great progress has been made with the conservation of buildings and the replacement of worn gypsum pavements under de Jong's supervision; the approach to the West Court has been relaid so that the visitor comes up to it at the correct angle by way of the Minoan ramp. Miss A. E. Furness has completed the study of the neolithic pottery of Knossos.

Styl. Alexiou has excavated two chamber tombs at Katsabà outside Herakleion on the east. The one, which was square, contained a bench along one side with the bones of six dead, apparently in a sitting position, on it. The vases have marine and plant ornament and are fine examples of the Palace Style; two burners with traces of polychrome decoration were also found. The second tomb is horseshoe-shaped. It had a blue-painted sarcophagus along one side; underneath this were a tripod altar, an alabaster vase with fittings for the lid, and two burners. Two more burners, with polychrome patterns, stood in the middle of the chamber; a handsome jug with plastic decoration consisting of stud-like knobs decorated with nautilus and plant-life was found in the corner, and at the back of the chamber were two Egyptian vessels—one of doriote with a flat rim and cylindrical handles, of the type falsely called predynastic, the other a tall, two-handled alabaster vase with a cartouche of Thothmes III. Other finds in this tomb include fluted gold beads from a necklace, which had spilled from a bronze cup, and a sard engraved with a figure of an animal. The second tomb is slightly later than the first, and is dated about the beginning of L.M. III. Neolithic pottery, for the most part undecorated, has come to light in deep levels in the vicinity. A Minoan stone stool has come to light in Páros on the east side of Herakleion; it has three depressions in the seat for the comfort of the sitter. Unfortunately, the building to which it belonged has been levelled and built over.

Platon has continued the pre-war excavation at Prásas NE of Knossos with funds provided by the Archaeological Society. The Middle Minoan repository, which had been excavated to a depth of 13 m., has been dug deeper, and M.M. Ib pottery has been recovered. House A, whose construction belongs to the same period, has been further investigated, the four basement rooms being cleared; one room had sixteen pits, perhaps designed to hold pithoi; the second had an indoor shrine. The pottery from the latter is M.M. III and L.M. Ia and includes two interesting vases with light-on-dark decoration of double axes coupled with the sacred knot. A repository containing M.M. III pottery was found in connexion with the basement of the shrine. The ground floor of the house had a veranda on the east side; besides the front door there was a second entrance with a connecting stairway. A second house (House B) has been dug not far away; it forms a square of four rooms; one is shown to be the kitchen by the presence of a hearth, a pot-stand, jars buried in stones, and a perforated trough which may have been the sink. Another room contained a great funnel-mouthed vessel with two holes for carrying on a pole. The pottery shows that the house
was occupied in the L.M. Ia phase; among the finds is a four-sided limestone vessel with an inscription.

At Vathiápetro, 4 km. south of Arkhánes, Marinatos has continued the excavation of the Minoan mansion found three years ago. The whole south face, consisting of large squared poros blocks, has been cleared. In the SW corner an entrance comprising a hall with four pillars has been discovered; in front of it is a porch with a stone kalderim, and the trace of the road ending here shows similar stone paving. Among the rooms of the south quarter the easternmost is especially interesting. The walls are of ashlar and the floor is paved with poros slabs; two pillars, not quite axially placed, stand in the room. This room was converted at a somewhat later date into a wine

press, whose installation has been preserved intact. It consists of a large basin provided with a strong spout, with a jar underneath partly embedded in the pavement. Another jar rests on a rubble stand alongside. On the floor there is an irregular stone basin, with a stone drain which discharges into the adjoining South Corridor of the mansion. Finally, two large pithoi and about a dozen smaller vases were scattered about the floor. Marinatos suggests that in the dead season the room served for a weaving-shed since many loom-weights were found in a pile in the SE corner of the room. To the west of this two smaller rooms served as labourers’ quarters. The west extremity of this quarter was furnished with a poros staircase, eight steps of which are still in situ; there is no evidence of an upper storey, and this stair apparently led to a veranda at a higher level. The whole of this quarter shows signs of a second occupation after the original construction was ruined; but the interval between the two periods was not great. Farther east was found a heap of pottery from the cleaning of the ruins. The building continues into the adjacent vineyard, which has been
expropriated for excavation next season. The discovery of a potter’s kiln is anticipated on account of the presence of much burnt and vitrified pottery.

Approximately in the centre of the whole complex a hall with the bases of three columns in hardstone has been found. In front of the stylobate a stone drain is still preserved. To the east of this hall extends the central court of the building. Upwards of 40 m. to the east are the remains of a supporting wall about 80 m. long. It seems probable that the complex was originally designed as a palace but never completed. The building was begun, ca. 1600–1580 B.C., from the west front; but owing to the instability of the ground it was soon in ruins. Instead of being completely abandoned, however, it was transformed into an industrial installation with looms, wine and perhaps olive presses, and possibly a potter’s kiln. Soon after 1500 B.C. it was finally abandoned. The ceramic finds are L.M. Ia, and only three early marine-style sherds have been found to date. Other finds include three gems with fowls, the lower part of a youthful bronze ‘adorant’, some stone vases and a shapeless piece of iron, all in L.M. Ia contexts. In a little treasury evidently serving religious purposes some vases, mainly handleless cups, were found upside down.40

At Mesámbeila near Arkhánes a poor Mycenaean tomb with an incised larnax has come to light; there were no grave goods. In July an Early Minoan tomb in a rock hollow was discovered by workmen at Dourgoutzi near Kání Kastéli. Several dozen subneolithic-E.M. I vases have been recovered, some being smoked and partly incised, while others are of the type of the H. Onouphriou jug with linear-painted decoration. Alexiou further investigated the tomb and recovered three bronze knives, of which one is unusual in having a reinforcing rib, obsidian blades, and ornaments. The finds came from a burnt stratum full of charred bones, which Platon regards as indicative of a sacrificial or purificatory rite rather than of cremation of the dead. This find has already been published by Alexiou.41 Between Dourgoutzi and Galéni a large building of rough limestone blocks has come to light, possibly in association with sherds of the latest Mycenaean epoch.

At Mália the French School has concentrated on the private houses of the Minoan town. A new house of L.M. I date has been investigated to the east of the palace; its plan has emerged clearly, and the finds comprise pottery of good quality with floral and marine decoration, numerous instruments of bronze, including axes and a saw 1.40 m. long, as well as an ivory sphinx of Egyptian type which may have been the foot of a casket. To the south of the Palace the large House E has been further explored. Its central part, where L.M. IIa and pottery abounds, cannot yet be satisfactorily planned, as it had been considerably altered at the time of the ‘Mycenaean’ reoccupation. The north part, however, better preserved in its L.M. I state, is of so monumental a lay-out that the building must be regarded as a small palace rather than a private house; the ‘ironstone’ threshold is 4 m. long with an L-shaped court in front of it, and there are numerous plaster floors and pavements. The limits of the building have not yet been ascertained. Here also there were interesting finds, including engraved sealstones, stone lamps and vases, and bronzes. In a field on the site a large offering table has come to light, which resembles those of the Palace and Khrýsókákos (Fig. 14).

In the district of Pediáda several tombs have come to light, including a chamber tomb at Etískopi with two larnax-burials and other skeletons in a squatting position against the walls, and a geometric pithos-burial at Alítzani. At Lyttos a base of a dedication has come to light; it is of local stone, and bears reliefs of a hero with his horse and hounds chasing deer, with the inscription 'ΑΧΙΛΛΕΟΣ 'ΑΧΙΛΛΕΟΣ. At Gortyn the corner of an important Hellenistic building has come to light and been investigated by the Italian School; the walls are formed of a double row of great orthostates resting on a foundation of gypsum blocks. At Metropolis, also on the site of Gortyn, a fine marble copy of the Athena Parthenos has come to light; investigations by the Italian School on the spot resulted in the discovery of an extensive late Roman building, one of whose areas has the form of a small stadium.

At Phaistos D. Levi has continued the exploration of the earliest stages of the Palace. At the SW corner of the façade of the first palace, where previous tests by Pernier had been negative, Levi has exposed an impressive building complex of an earlier period going down to a depth of 6.5 m. below the later pavement. This construction shows two strata, the earlier sealed by charred roof-beams and the second by a great fall of ‘cement’. Fine Middle Minoan polychromy pottery has come to light in both these layers and has been found in special abundance in a sunken area approached by a flight of steps with a red plaster pavement; some dozens of whole vases have been recovered, as well as numerous fragments consisting of barbotine wares associated with new forms and unusual colours, and painted plastic vases which included three handsome bullrytons.

Another test in the adjacent Room XXVIII confirmed the stratigraphical observations already made; in later times a hole was bored in one of the walls here to give access to the substructures under the façade of the second palace; among the finds from this test are two fragments of a lid with a painting of two women in full skirts. The stages of neolithic occupation have been further explored in a sounding in one of the magazines of the second palace; laid pavements and beaten
earth floors, wall traces and hearths have come to light, and the pottery shows decoration in ochre on a polished surface, enhanced sometimes by dichrome decoration in red and white. The work of restoration has been continued. The quarries in which the gypsum was cut for the palaces have been identified near H. Triada; saws have been established, and with newly cut slabs from these workings the Lustral Area no. 83 has been successfully restored. Hellenistic walls in the Upper Court have been removed to reveal the colonnade against the retaining wall.

At Khoumiri in the district of Mylopótamos east of Réthymno two rock-cut tombs of L.M. III date have been discovered; they contained numerous vases, a small pithos full of bones and a plainly decorated sarcophagus with lid. At Grivíta, also in the district of Mylopótamos, a bronze statuette has come to light (Pl. VI. 1); it is 0.25 m. high, and represents a worshipper with long locks falling in coils on the dress and the right arm held across the body in an attitude of reverence. Platon has made tests on the acropolis there and established the existence of an extensive settlement. Trials on the spot where the statuette was found revealed traces of buildings and terrace walls of Protogeometric–Geometric times, but no trace of Minoan buildings though L.M. I sherds are abundant on the surface. Farther west, at Drámia in Apokoronas, a rock-cut tomb has come to light, containing a larnax whose lid is decorated with a plastic animal's head at the end; the decoration of the sarcophagus consists of two horned animals.

![Fig. 14—Malia. Offering Table.](image)

In East Crete at Kanéne near Siteía a larnax with painted scenes has come to light together with a stirrup-vase and a bronze knife. Twenty-three vases of Mycenaean date have been discovered in a tomb at Xerámbela near Kavoúsi and been removed to the Ierápetra museum. Alexiou has dug the archaic shrine at Kavoúsi, which proves to be similar to those at Dréros and in the settlement at Karphi which are connected with L.M. III bench-shrines. Unfortunately this shrine has suffered serious damage, but it has been shown to have had a bench-altar at the back and on it the base on the great cult-figure. The shrine was certainly founded in Protogeometric times, but the worship probably continued (as the figurines of the latest deposit indicate) down into classical times; the shrine was isolated in a rocky position and was in all probability a rustic sanctuary. At Alaisomádri near Pakhyámmos Alexiou has dug an L.M. III chamber tomb with interesting bath-shaped larnakes; two of these are well preserved, and are decorated with octopods, papyrus flowers, and stylised lilies. One of the sarcophagi was empty, the bones of the dead having apparently been transferred to a sacrificial pit, marked by a holy table, at the foot. A handsome lidded pyxis, decorated with religious motives and graceful birds, and containing necklaces of glass paste and of gold and precious stones, was found alongside.

In H. Nikolaos a Middle Minoan tomb with a small elliptical larnax, and containing a small pithos and a cup ornamented with a spray, has come to light; the finds correspond to those found by Seager at Pakhyámmos. Platon has recovered the finds from two simple rock-tombs near Kritsa. These consist of a large number of vases (including stemmed kylikes) of different types and workshops found, together with three larnakes, a burner with perforated lid and two stone vessels, in the larger of the two tombs. The second tomb contained a skeleton laid on a shallow oblong basin, but two cylindrical urns with interesting decoration of sacred symbols held burnt human bones.
and thus offer, together with Xanthoudides' cremations at Moulia, the first testimony to burning of the dead in Late Minoan times. This tomb also contained a large potter's wheel whose form belongs to an earlier epoch.

Dr. Yiamalakis has added a variety of vases, some early Minoan stone vessels from a tomb in the Mesara, a gold jar from Malia and some notable sealstones to his private collection in Herakleion. But the finest of his recent acquisitions are archaic bronze objects, mainly from Axos. These include an undecorated mitra with a dedicatory inscription, and a fragment of another of the sixth century with a drawing of a Nike holding an olive twig, a Daedalic bronze group of a woman riding sideways on a lion and holding its tail in her hand, a griffin protome from a bronze cauldron, and fragments of another cauldron with ring-handles on which are seated birds. The owner intends to bring out an illustrated catalogue of his collection. K. D. Kalokyres has published the first part of a history of Rethymna. New issues of the Κριτική Χρονική contain Alexiou's publication of a group of Protagenic vases with a remarkable clay model of a shrine in the Yiamalakis Collection, articles by M. Hatzidakis on El Greco and Cretan painting and E. Platakis on Cretan earthquakes, and N. Platon's account of his recent discoveries (including interesting figurines) at an M.M. I hill-top shrine at Mazâ in the north of Peidiâda, supplemented by a study of Minoan hill-top sanctuaries.

The British School at Athens.

J. M. Cook

1 I am obliged to Prof. Orlandos and Dr. Papademetriou, H. Gallet de Santerre and J. L. Caskey for the provision of reports used in this account, and to those colleagues who have kindly furnished me with individual notices of their excavations and discoveries. The drawing Fig. 1 is by A. Papaniopoulos of the National Museum staff.
2 The chariot comes into the story in the Cypress, which may be the source of this painting.
3 De Ridder 50. This important statuette is to be reinterpreted in a forthcoming issue of the AE.
4 PAE 1950, 41 ff.
5 Cf. the previous discovery in this area of a marble base for a bronze statue in honour of Livia Boulia (Hesperia VI, 464).
6 Cf. Hesperia VI, 324.
7 Hesperia V, 21 ff.
8 Hesperia XIX, 325 ff.
9 Hesperia Suppl. VIII, 373 ff.
10 Cf. Hesperia XX, 57.
11 Cf. Hesperia VI, 90 ff.
12 The only previously discovered ostrakon of Pericles Hesperia X, 2 f., fig. 2.
13 AE 1950, 1 ff., where illuminating plans and restorations are given.
15 Cf. JHS LXXI, 239 ff., and the report PAE 1950, 203 ff.
16 Two large chamber tombs were discovered by Tsountas, and the archaic inscription Hesperia 1946, 115 also came to light here.
17 Like that of Areus, BSA XXV, Pl. 36.
18 N. Papakhatzis Μουσείο της Αθήνας (Athens, 1951).
19 PAE 1950, 201, fig. 11.
20 The mutules have three rows of drops, not two (as reported AE 1946, 236).
21 Cf. the plan BCH LXXV, 190, fig. 22.
22 Cf. BCH LXXV, 138 f.
23 Cf. BCH LXXV, 141 f.
26 Cf. BCH LXIII, 319, and LXXI-LXXII, 419.
27 JHS LXI, 250, fig. 10.
28 Πάτρος, Ιστορικο Πανσημόνιο (Athens, 1950).
29 Dr. Platon has prepared a special report on the year's work in Crete, on which he has allowed me to draw in advance of its publication in the Κριτική Χρονική.
30 I am indebted to Prof. Marinatos for this report.
31 Κοινωνικος Χρονικος V (1951), 275 ff.
32 Η 'Αρχαιο Ρεθυμνος (Candia, 1950).
ARCHAEOLOGY IN CYPRUS, 1951

At the Sotira Neolithic settlement P. Dikaios, working for the Curium Expedition, has followed up his trial of 1947 with the clearance of the greater part of the hill-top. A tightly-packed group of house foundations of light construction was laid bare. In form they ranged from circular to rectangular with rounded angles (Fig. 1); the upper parts of the walls were evidently of mud brick and the roofs of the rectangular houses probably flat. The topmost floors overlay a demolition layer which sealed well-preserved hearths, post-holes, and other features. These lower floors yielded an unusually rich series of implements, of flint, stone and bone, as well as bowls and jugs of the combed ware characteristic of this site.

New Neolithic-Chalcolithic sites have been noted by G. Eliades in the neighbourhood of Paphos, notably a large one of the Erimi culture at Kissónerga. A site of the Khírokitia stage has been located near the monastery of Apostolos Andreas, not far from the point of the Karpas peninsula; and one of the Sotira period at Kouphóvounos near Kandou by J. S. Last.

![Fig. 1.—SOTIRA. THE NEOLITHIC SETTLEMENT.](image)

A new burial group accidentally located in the Early Cypriot I cemetery at Philia has been recovered for the Cyprus Museum. It contains a complete bowl of a black-slip-combed ware reported by Prof. Goldman from the Early Bronze Age layers at Gözlü Kule, Tarsus. The chronology of early cultures in Cyprus down to the Early Bronze Age is discussed by P. Dikaios in the forthcoming report on his excavations at Khírokitia.

Much attention continued to be devoted to the Late Cypriot period. S. Weinberg, taking up the late J. F. Daniel's work on the Bamboula settlement, for the Curium Expedition, completed the study of the architectural remains and prepared new plans. Publication must await re-examination of the stratified material.

At the Pigdóthes sanctuary site near Myrtou the Ashmolean Museum—Sydney University Expedition, directed by Miss J. du Plat Taylor, rounded off its work with a very successful second season. Excavation below the courtyard floor showed that the first use of the site goes back to the Middle Bronze Age, ca 1700 B.C. Remains of walls and floors in the second level bear witness to the erection of an important building ca 1500 B.C. To the alterations and extensions which followed belong a series of four rooms with good plaster floors under the courtyard and a long line of store-rooms added to the east. One of these yielded a fourteenth-century Mycenaean rhyton, three bronze tripods, and two bronze ring-stands. One of the latter has a hunting scene in relief and the other a pierced spiral design and four incised characters of the Cypro-Mycenaean script. In VOL LXXII.
an adjacent room were a jug inscribed with four more characters of the same script and several offering stands. The disposal of all this ritual furniture is associated with the final rearrangement of the sanctuary in the course of the thirteenth century, when the courtyard was laid out and within it was erected the altar of large ashlar blocks found in 1950. Simultaneously the Expedition excavated a number of tombs in the Middle and Late Bronze Age cemetery at Stephania west of Myrtou. While a well close to the Pigadiées excavations was being deepened another Mycenaean rhyton was found by villagers (Fig. 2). It has been purchased for the Cyprus Museum.

At the Enkomi town site there were no further excavations by the French component of the joint expedition, but Dr. C. F. A. Schaeffer completed a report on the work of the French Mission up to date which will be published shortly. P. Dikaio resumed work for the Department of Antiquities in the area immediately west of the sanctuary where the bronze god was previously found. Here too there were in most rooms five levels, the earliest containing Mycenaean IIIC: I and contemporary local wares. Below the original floors earlier remains were found dating back

to the L.C. II and L.C. I periods and resting on the rock. Along the north wall of the town he cleared an area between the wall and the first east–west street inside it, but to the topmost (eleventh-century) floors only, so that no new light has yet been thrown on the date of the wall. Outside the wall and attached to it, the foundation course of a great tower measuring 20 m. by 16.5 m. was cleared. Constructed mainly in bossed blocks, it is of much more finished workmanship than the curtain walls on either side, which have two faces of boulders and a filling of rubble. The Cyprus Museum has acquired a group of L.C. II gold boat-shaped earrings and two gold frontlets with stamped patterns, believed to come from the cemetery at Dhénia west of Nicosia.

Accidental discoveries have added two useful Early Iron Age tomb groups, from Philiá and the Vathyrdákas cemetery at Karavás, to the series in the Cyprus Museum. Somewhat later is a large group from a built tomb found during building operations on the southern outskirts of Nicosia close to the old Greek cemetery. Within the town, foundation excavations for public baths under construction beside the old Municipality hit several tombs of a known Iron Age cemetery, the excavation of which was carried out by the Antiquities Department. One yielded a complete sword with traces of the wooden hilt preserved, another a large free-field jug, much defaced but with traces of a hunting scene (?) in the bichrome IV style. On the dating of this colourful figured
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Fig. 2.—MYCENAEN RHYTON FROM PIGADIÉES. (Scale 1.)

---
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pottery some light is thrown by the other vases from these tombs, for none of the known examples have come from properly excavated tomb-groups. Important on the same account is a tomb-group accidentally found at Arnaudhi in the Mesaoria, which contained a free-field jug with a black and red bull sniffing a lotus flower, perfectly preserved (Fig. 4). The later phase of the same style in which the decoration tends to form a carpet-like pattern over the whole vessel (bichrome V) is represented in a large amphora purchased for the Cyprus Museum. It has two figured friezes, on the neck and shoulder, each formed by repeating a single motif: a pair of female figures confronted on either side of a complex lotus composition. Among other archaic acquisitions of the Museum is a faience figure-ware from Marcium, which has produced other 'Naucratite' material. It is in the form of two monkeys seated back to back.

Among material found during building operations in Limassol is a large Iron Age tomb-group from the Bambolida locality. This with other recent finds from the district is housed in the new local museum in Limassol Castle, which was opened during the year.

The excavations on the site of Palaeapaphos at Koutkla started in the summer of 1950 by T. B. Mitford and J. H. Iliffe were resumed in 1951 under the joint sponsorship of St. Andrews University and the Liverpool Museums. Opening up in the area west of that cleared in 1887 a substantial building with four periods of Roman construction and a number of mosaics floors was laid bare. Some sections of mosaic were raised and where excavation preceded to lower levels the building was found to rest on earlier foundation walls, equally extensive and belonging probably to the Late Bronze Age. On the Marcello hill overlooking the village (site A) further investigation of the puzzling mound of rubble yielded additional sculpture and architectural debris of archaic date, including a male head of fine quality (Fig. 3). Beneath the mound the excavators cleared a section of the deep ditch in the fortification wall previously found. Under the wall a series of tunnels came to light, some of which seem to penetrate into the mound. This, the excavators suggest, may have been constructed as a siege-mound in 498 B.C., according to Herodotus (V.115), all the cities of Cyprus were invaded by the Persians. The tunnels would then bear witness to Paphian attempts to destroy it. Immediately west of the mound a test trench disclosed a wall of drafted and bossed blocks backed by a foundation of mud-brick extending the whole 15 m. of the trench. The pottery overlying these remains was mainly archaic, but the building to which they belong may well be earlier and the excavators, who will resume its excavation in 1952, suggest it may be a bastion flanking one of the city gates. They have yet to find the source from which came the statuary and the architectural pieces found in the adjoining mound. Some Chalcolithic burials containing pottery of Erimi type and several productive Iron Age tombs in the neighbourhood of Koukla were also excavated.

The Koukla Expedition has also made a number of soundings on the site of Nea Paphos, the modern Kato Paphos. Directed to the area near the harbour round the Saranda Kolonnes hill, they struck no remains earlier than Hellenistic or later than Roman, and yielded some fragmentary sculpture. Further inland, under the direction of G. Eliades, an interesting group of rock-cut chambers has been cleared, locally regarded as the catacomb of St. Lambrianos. Chance finds from the Paphos area acquired by the local museum include a small Hellenistic amphora inscribed in red paint ΠΙΡΙΤΙΟΥ ΝΑΥΠΗΓΟΥ, reminder of an industry for which Cyprus was once renowned, a statue-base with an unrecorded Greek inscription of the Roman period and a ringstone engraved with a representation of the Paphian temple of Aphrodite.

A minor sanctuary has been located near Pergamos by chance finds of stone figure sculpture, archaic and later. The contents of some Hellenistic tombs found during road works at Yenagra, including one coin, have reached the Cyprus Museum, unfortunately somewhat disordered. The erection of poles for the Central Electrification Scheme across the Vikles site near Dhekelia, led to the discovery of a large Hellenistic stone amphora, now in the Larnaca Museum, inscribed ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙ | ΚΕΡΑΙΑΤΗ | ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΣ | ΜΕΝΩΝΟΣ | ΑΝΘΩΝΗ. In the Cyprus Museum Miss A. Wilson has completed her examination of the Ptolemaic coins, both silver and bronze.

A trench cut up the slope of Kaphlci hill near Nicosia, under the direction of P. Dikaios, yielded a good harvest of inscribed and plain pottery from the dedicct Nymph-shrine in a cave on the summit. The gaps filled in the known syllabic and alphabetical dedications, which T. B. Mitford is studying, and the growing repertory of well-dated Hellenistic pottery have demonstrated the usefulness of further systematic work on this site.

At Curium the excavations of the Pennsylvania University Museum expedition under Dr. B. H. Hill were limited to the Apollo sanctuary, of which plans have appeared in Fasti Archaeologici III (plans C-E). Further examination by G. McCadden of the South Building brought to light some walls of an earlier building, similar but smaller, which was probably destroyed in the earthquake of A.D. 76-77. More of the Roman Doric columns of its successor were re-erected. In the South-East building the four porticos enclosing its open court were further examined. That to the north was found to front on the main approach to the sanctuary from the city two miles away to the east. A porch with two Doric columns covered the entrance from the street. Part of the back wall of the west portico, which had fallen forward, was re-erected, including two complete windows (Fig. 6). These windows had been converted into niches and the statue which stood in one of them
was recovered in the debris. It is a well-preserved, but indifferently proportioned limestone figure casting stones, probably representing some aspect of Apollo (Fig. 5). The building is tentatively dated to the period between the earthquake of A.D. 76–77 and the completion of the South Building in A.D. 101. J. S. Last, investigating the water supply systems of Curium, has cleared the remains of an arched aqueduct which carried the main supply over the saddle which separates the acropolis from the higher ground to the west, whence the pipe line has been traced to a spring at Sotira some five miles away.

In Kyrenia investigations by the Department of Antiquities have thrown new light on the Byzantine castle, which Crusader and Venetian constructions largely replaced or obscured. A section of the external face of the South wall, including a postern and the greater part of one of the towers, has been exposed behind the Frankish curtain. The entrance is embellished by three
couchant lions in relief, of rather classical type, one above and one on either side. The tower, which is filled solid, is of the pentagonal form in which one face is formed by the curtain wall, here 5·5 m. thick. These features suggest that the construction of the castle may date back to the Arab wars of the seventh century, if not earlier. At Famagusta under the direction of Th. Mogabgab further excavations in the Ravelin have established that this outwork covering the main entrance through the Venetian fortifications was at one time separated from the latter by a continuous rock-cut ditch. Much of the subsidiary ditch encircling the Ravelin and cut in the floor of the main moat has also been cleared.

Additions to the medieval collections of the Cyprus Museum, for which an annex is being made ready in a fourteenth-century building nearby, include a small pricket candlestick of enamelled bronze of Limoges style, from the Palouriótissa suburb of Nicosia, and three coin hoards: one, from Larnaca, consisting of thirty-six Byzantine solidi ranging from Maurice Tiberius to Heraclius and the others of Lusignan silver and billon, evidently buried at the time of the Genoese invasion in 1373. Building operations in Nicosia yielded two small pit-groups of twelfth-century pottery, including Byzantine sgraffito ware, which is rare in Cyprus, a small Seljuk jug, and coins of Manuel I.

A. H. S. Megaw

Nicosia.

1 Thanks are due to all those named in this report for kindly supplying the information on which it is based.
2 Pennsylvania University Museum Bulletin, XIII, pl. 3, 16 f.
3 3, 2 March 1946, 244-5.
5 Antiquaries Journal XXXI, 51 f.
Dedication to Men in Antalya.—In Hellenica IX, 39-50, J. and L. Robert publish, with a full and admirable commentary, an interesting inscribed altar in the museum at Antalya. Their text and restoration of the main inscription is as follows.

"Οδός ΝΕ... ΕΛΕΥΘΕΡΙΑ Κέλλες Ψήλες Μήσης, νας άνοι συν κατασκευή
cαταρπής δόγο και
ανάλληλη
tην επίστασα στην τωια[ν]κα και
κατ' ευκρίνεια στην τοπική
γενική πολιτική.

I had been working independently on the stones in the Antalya museum, including the altar in question, and my scribes shows rather more letters than the editors print, it may be possible to advance the restoration a little further.

For lines 1–2 the editors propose, with some reserve, "[Σ]έβασμος Ελευθερίας Ψήλες Μήσης." At the end of line 1, after ΠΑ, I read on the stone and on the squeegee a ρα: the characteristic curl of the loop, turned out at the end and disjoined from the upright, is unmistakable. There can, I think, be no doubt that the reading is πάρεσα του Μήσης. In front of this, the letter-group ΕΛΕΥΘΕΡΙΑ is, as the editors observe, unmanageable; but the smallest possible change will give a familiar name, ΕΛΕΥΘΕΡΙΑ. I accordingly read [Σ]έβασμος [Ν]έμων[ος] ζακύνθου πάρεσα του Μήσης. It is perhaps worth noticing that the parallel texts from the region south of the lake of Burdur, by which the editors (pp. 40-1) have brilliantly shown the provenance of the altar, 5 we find both names, Neon and Soos, and also omission of the article το before the grandfather's name.

Human πάρεση of divinities are known from a number of inscriptions from Asia Minor or the adjacent islands. So at Hiera on Lesbos (IG XII, 2, 484 = IG IV, 116), Bροένος θερείος ἀρχήνοιον... τοῦ Δίας τοῦ Μακεδόνιου τέκνον αὐτοῦ, and at Rhodiapolis in Lycia (TAM II, 3, 920), Αρμίτης ὁ ἐπὶ θεωτοῦ πάρεσα τῶν θεῶν ('μινυμείνει αυτῷ τὰς' Καλικά). At Milethus, in connection with the cult of Apollo Didymnus, there frequently appears a τομαίος τος πάρεσας εν τῷ λεός: he is most often mentioned as performing, together with the ὑποτέλες, κατεργάσεις, prayers and processions to Apollo Miletus (Delphinian nos. 36, 37, 143, 146, 150); he is also named in dating formulae, e.g. τομαίος ὁ πάρεσας τῆς τροφῆς ἔξων, ἐπικράτων κτλ.; ἐπταυτάκες καὶ ταῦτα ἐξουσίας τῆς τροφῆς καὶ τους μάρτυς (ibid. pp. 237–9). At Magnesia ad Maeandrum, on the occasion of the inauguration of the new temple of Artemis, it is decreed (Inscr. v. Magn. no. 100 = Syll. II, 695): γνώνειν ὅτι καὶ γνωστές τις αὐτού τοῦ λεός καὶ παρεστάθηκαν ἐν τῷ λεός τα ἐπιβαλλόμενα τιμή καὶ παρεστάθηκαν τιμωρίας τῆς θεότητος. These πάρεσα are not discussed in the recent article in Ke (1949). I propose to subdivide the inscriptions. The chief priests, like the archons, strategi, and other officials, had their "assessors" or assistants; these called, very naturally and for convenience, assessors of the deity. In OGl 185, Bασιλείας Πατρών Σιδηρομηχανος... το πραγματικός τα πραγματικά του καταλληλότατο αὐτῷ, ὕπατος ἱπποτών πάρεσας. Lysimachus has been thought to be either a judiciary officer or a court dignitary: may he be simply the assistant priest of Isis?

On line 6 the editors observe (p. 43, n. 8), 'nous ne vons pas d'autre restitution possible avant παρέσας. Les mots στο το παρέσας seraient sans doute trop courts et ne donneraient pas un sens acceptable. There is room on the stone for παρέσας for the place names, but the words στο το παρέσας is also a trifle short. I had thought a restoration ΠΑΡΕΣΑΣ τον και το παρεσας. Whether this gives an acceptable meaning seems to depend upon what is understood by παρέσας—a point not discussed by the editors. If it means the whole precinct, στο is out of the question; but equally, in that case, στο το παρέσας is a mere redundancy. I take it therefore to mean the enclosing wall, and visualise the four benches as forming a kind of alcove or exedra with a surrounding wall against which they were seated, just like the scenes presented by Rhodian. 8 On line 13 the editors comment (p. 49, n. 9), 'Doit-on reconnaître encore le mot ξυλοκατασκευή? S'agirait-il d'un objet en bois, en rapport avec le trone à offrandes? Il ne semble pas qu'on puisse s'arrêter à l'idée de l'acheter des sacrifices. 9 But the stone, the squeegee, and even the photograph in Hellenica Pl. VI, all show, at the beginning of the line, ΑΟ. Rhodon has therefore presented six denaria for a ξυλοκατασκευή, a bin for storing the sacrificial firewood. In line 14 my scribes shows, ΟΥΛ... ΜΟΥ. The first ύστερον is very indistinct; after it, σύγκες and εὐαίσθητος are equally possible. The editors' restoration [καὶ] διάλογος seems therefore (in spite of the mu) not to be possible, τοῦς βεβαιοδε 

1 The middle stroke of the epsilon is very short, little more than a dot, separate from the upright; but it appears to be a genuine stroke, not an accidental mark.
2 Or [Σ]ύνες or [Μ]αλκού? I found it impossible to decide between [Σ]ύνες and the lambda, not an accidental mark.
3 In one of these texts Νέων Κάςων [το] Mάλκος is proposed by the Roberts, 'sans certitude,' for the editors' [Ἀγάμην]. Was it the custom in this region to omit the article, have commonly the simple notion of enclosure. Whether it would denote here the whole precinct or, like παρέσας above, some kind of inner enclosure, I leave undecided; the restoration is of course far from certain.
4 Οὐ λέγεται το be the total cost of the various presentations: 'altogether, in all, 300 den.'

The text, as I should be disposed to restore it, runs therefore as follows.

"Οδός Νέων[ος] Ζάκυνθου, πάρεσας τοῦ Μήσης, κλειστος τον κατασκευή και ταραντός δόγο και
πάρεσας τους παρεσας
tην επίστασα στην τωια[ν]κα και
κατ' ευκρίνεια στην τοπική
γενική πολιτική.

5 [Δ]ακτυλία τέσσερα
[συν και τοι] την [παρέσας]
[και τοι] τον [μάρτυρη]
[και τους παρεσας]
[και τους μάρτυς]
[και τοι] τον [παρέσας]

G. E. BEAN.
Notes on Spectacle Fibulae and Horses.—Marmariani.—In
JHS LXX. 18 I attempted to show that there were Late
Geometric elements in some of the vases from the tholos
tombs, and that therefore the spectacle brooches found
with them need not necessarily belong to the Early Iron
Age. Since then I have had a demonstration from Mr. Maryon
of the use of steel and bronze tools (see AIA III, 116), and it is
now clear to me that the 'rocking' pattern on the bracelet
from Marmariani (BSA XXI, 34, nos. 9 and 10) must have
been made with a steel tool, and cannot date from the begin-
ing of the Iron Age. Since bronze is more
difficult to work than gold, they are not likely to be earlier
than the Elgin brooches, which themselves belong
between lines carried out in front only, the shoulder decorated
with a row of strokes and dots, and the neck. Relief contour
for the lower edge of the chiton and for the index of the left
hand. Brown for the vertical folds of the sleeve and of
the chiton below the cloak and above the right shoulder.
The lower part of the woman's eye is for the greater part effaced.
The vase is reproduced in
Minervini's Mon. Barons, pl. XI, 3. It can be best com-
pared with the lekythos 536 of the Ashmolean Museum in
Oxford or with the lekythos E 76 at Tübingen.3 Date
about 460–450.

The dog belongs undoubtedly to the Malta breed (Molos sons)
which enjoyed such popularity in antiquity, especially
in Greece.4 Small, with a rather broad forehead and a pointed
muzzle, erect ears, long thick hair, and a bushy tail, he was
the pet of the Greek family and so often appears on vases and
reliefs.5 The scene itself is a novelty. In fact, whereas in
other instances a dog is greeting his master as he emerges
from the bath in the Roman baths (FR, p. 139), or is playing with him
as on the Argonaut amphora from Ruvo (Mon. Inst., III, 49)
or on an Apulian crater (Tischbein, II, p. 29), here he is
'begging' before his mistress, eager to snap at the dainty
bit which she is holding teasingly to him.

The next lekythos (inv. no. 2756; height 15 cm.), dating
from about 450, is a work of the Carthusian Painter. It
represents a woman standing between a chair and a basket
and juggling with three balls. Reserved: the upper part
of the foot, the base fillet running all round, the upper band
decorated with a meander between lines carried out in front only,
the shoulder with two rows of strokes, and the neck
(broken off together with the handle). Traces of preliminary
sketch. Broken in for the folds of the chiton below the cloak
and for the vertical strokes on the seat. The right hand
has almost entirely disappeared owing to the surface being
damaged. The vase is a replica of two lekythoi by the same master,
in New York5 and in Oxford,6 but for the chair on the right
which the woman wears on our lekythos, whereas on the
other two vases she wears only a loose chiton with kolpos.
The same garment as on our lekythos appears on another
lekythos of the Carthusian Painter in Oxford.7

The last vase, a round-mouthed oinochoe (inv. no. 2772;
height together with the handle 14 cm.) by the Shuvial
Painter, is the most carefully executed of all and is perfectly
preserved. It represents a flying Eros who brings a box to
a woman seated on a chair and holds the chiton in her
left hand. Egg-pattern below and above the scene, carried
out in front only. Beautiful glossy varnish of violet hue.
Preliminary sketch. Contour in relief for the right arms and
faces of the figures, the alabaster, and parts of the chair.
Date about 430.

The shape of the vase and the subject are familiar to us
from the works both of the Washing Painter and the Shuvial
Painter, but the drawing points decidedly to the latter.
For the figure of Eros I find the closest parallel from
the Shuvial Collection,8 where we see Eros flying towards
a standing woman with an alabaster in her right hand.
As for his head, it is instructive to compare it, e.g.,
with the oinochoai Berlin 21459 and 24770 and Louv. 209.

The woman here is seen from the side on the hydria E 218, for example, of the British Museum.10

KAZIMIERZ BULAS.

1 I express my heartfelt thanks to the Presidency of the Accademia dei Lincei for the permission to publish the vases as well as to Prof. Beazley, who has kindly read my text. He agrees with two of my attributions, but does not feel sure of the Aichines Painter.

2 JHS XXV, pl. II, 2; CV, pl. 38, 9; Beazley, ARV, p. 496, 189.


4 Beazley, p. 496, 57.

5 Keller, Die ant. Tierwelt, p. 52 ff.; DS s.v. canis, p. 8, RE s.v. Hund, 2552.


7 Formerly Gallatin Collection: CV, p. 26, 9; Beazley, p. 510, 59.

8 CV, pl. 38, 2; Beazley, p. 510, 55.

9 CV, pl. 36, 3; Beazley, p. 510, 42.

10 RM, 42, 1927, p. 233; Beazley, pl. 755, 48.

11 FR III, p. 317; Beazley, p. 754, 49.

12 AZ 1879, pl. 5, 1; Beazley, p. 754, 23.

13 CV III 1 c, pl. 90, 1; E. Zevi, Mem. Lincei. VI, 1937, pl. II, 1; Beazley, p. 755, 44.
NOTES

Professor Page's Simonides: A Note.—In the last volume of this Journal (LXXI, 1951, 139-140) Professor D. L. Page disagreed on some points with an article of mine (CQ XXIX, 1935, 65-69) on the text and metre of Simonides fr. 13 Diehl (the 'Danae' fragment). For most of his disagreements he made out what I may be allowed to call a convincing case, but on some points his arguments fall short of conviction, and one of these seems to call for immediate comment.

In my article (loc. cit. 69) I accepted Nietzsche's view that the reading of the later MSS. (M, V), πρόσωπων καλὸν, must be construed as a vocative and that this is 'not Greek'; Professor Page (p. 139) comments, 'That is a hard saying; an over-statement, perhaps, of the suspicion aroused by the suddenness and semi-detachness of this concluding vocative. He might perhaps have considered the date of my article and have allowed something for the brisk intolerance of youth; but before I agreed with Nietzsche I had made a careful, and altogether unsuccessful, search for parallels to this use of πρόσωπων. I have not found one since, and it does not seem that Professor Page can have been more fortunate, since a single opposite example would obviously have established his case against Nietzsche and me on this point far more conclusively than does his merely grammatical explanation of πρόσωπων καλὸν as 'a vocative in opposition . . . to the whole of the preceding picture'.

But this is not the whole story. The oldest MS. (P) has not πρόσωπων καλὸν but πρόσωπων καλὸν καλὸν, and various emendations have been proposed to account for this reading. Of these, I did not think Nietzsche's πρόσωπων καλὸν πρόσωπων probable enough to be worth mentioning; I mentioned Bergk's πρόσωπων καλὸν πρόσωπων, but only to reject it (perhaps too summarily) as an anachronism; and I accepted Ahrens' πρόσωπων καλὸν πρόσωπων, which seemed to me not only not to make excellent sense (I referred to Soph. El. 753 with πρόσωπων and to Pind. Nem. v. 17 πρόσωπα καλοι πρόσωπων) and to offer some ground for explaining the dittography in P but also to involve the least possible change in an easily explicable metrical pattern. Professor Page's answer is to disregard the metrical problem set by P's recurrent πρόσωπων, treat the palaeographical difficulty as a mere piece of scribal carelessness requiring no particular explanation, and make the following comment on the conjectures of Ahrens and Nietzsche: 'in both, the verbs—especially the prepositions—are unsuitable; they, you like, are 'not Greek'. This does not seem at all too hard on Nietzsche, but I feel that it is most unfair to Ahrens (and hence to me), since the meaning 'to bring to light from under' (clothes) that this conjecture requires us to give to πρόσωπων is that demanded in Soph. El. 753, where the chariot-wrecked Orestes displays his legs to heaven (from under the charioteer's long chiton). It may not be entirely irrelevant to add that Bacchylides 5.77 uses πρόσωπων of the appearance to Heracles of Meleager's soul through the gloom of Hades. Perseus appears, like Meleager, out of darkness; and his face becomes visible from under the chiton he is wrapped in, as Orestes's legs appear from under his long chiton. The case for πρόσωπων καλὸν πρόσωπων may not be overwhelming, but it is stronger than Professor Page has admitted, and much stronger than that for πρόσωπον καλὸν alone.

J. A. DAVISON

A Red-figure Vase Found in Dalmatia.—In JHS 1949, 122, Sir John Beazley refers to the column-krater fragments found at Nona in Dalmatia, formerly in the University of Vienna (ARV, p. 392). These were seen and sketched in Split Museum by R. L. Beaumont in 1936, and are apparently referred to by him in JHS 1936, 194 and n. 248.

T. J. D.

Two Oriental Bronzes. A Correction.—Our illustration (Fig. 1) shows two bronze rein or belt guides which belong to the Walters Art Gallery in Baltimore. There can be no doubt, I believe, that the one at the left is the one published by Richard W. Barnett in JHS LXVIII (1948), 12 and n. 68, and pl. V, a. Mr. Barnett believed the piece to have been in

Fig. 1.—Two Oriental Bronzes.

the museum in Berlin, where, it seems, he purchased the photograph. However, that museum was well supplied with photographs of objects which had passed through the market only to end in other museums or in private collections.

The two bronzes, so very similar one to another, were purchased by Mr. Henry Walters from a well-known dealer who made a practice of presenting him annually with a scrapbook of photographs of the year's purchases. Unfortunately the book which contains these bronzes is undated; but since the series runs from 1911 through 1914, it is a reasonable assumption that this particular annual scrapbook belonged just before or after those years, say 1910 or 1915. Other items in the book are said variously to have been excavated in 1909 and to have been obtained at sales as early as 1858; therefore, a date before 1911 is more probable than one after 1914. To Mr. Walters the place of discovery was stated to have been Bagdad, not Cappadocia.

To one viewing the two pieces together, the motive is clear. I do not think that the origin of the Chimaira is recognisable here, for each group consists of three distinct animals: a goat attacked by a monster, the monster itself with snaky head, long neck, two pairs of legs with each pair combined into a single member, a long tail, and finally, a second goat to whom the monster anchors himself by his tail. In one case the monster's tail is hooked behind the goat; in the other, it winds about his belly. In neither case does the monster protrude from the body of the goat.

The importance of this pair of Oriental bronzes for the study of the origins of early Greek art is obvious. The similarity
in design between them and the ring handles of certain Geometric bronzes is one point of departure. The hatched triangle pattern is also important. As for mythology, though there are no Chimaeas here, we may some day see a connexion with things Greek.

In their animal style these bronzes have always suggested Lyristan bronzes to me. For that very reason I think it important to emphasise the fact that they were on the market long before the Lyristan bronzes were first discovered. Finally, their known presence before the First World War is proof, if proof is necessary, that they are genuine ancient items, not forgeries such as conceivably could have been created after the Lyristan bronzes had become famous.

DOROTHY KEST HILL.

The Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore, Maryland, U.S.A.

1 Walters Art Gallery, 54.113 (at left) and 54.114 (damaged, at right). Diameter of circular parts, 0.07 m. Greatest height, 0.103 m. Cast bronze of rather yellowish fabric with green patina and traces of red, and with heavy muddy deposit. The backs of the buckle parts are quite plain, the decoration of the fronts being engraved by hand after the casting. The animals finished equally well on both sides.

Demeter and Dionysos.—In JHS LXIX, 18-24, Mrs. A. D. Ure discusses some interesting vases supposedly of Mykaleian make. I am quite incompetent to criticise her remarks concerning their provenance and date, and wish merely to point out that her interpretation of one of them as alluding to Boeotian ritual is highly doubtful.

The vase in question is described on pp. 19-20. It is a pyxis having a lid with a human or divine figure shown wearing what looks like a fawn-skin and holding in the right hand something which may well be a στυγος, while in the left there is, according to Mrs. Ure, who of course has examined the object itself, a faint but discernible fork; I cannot find it on her reproduction. The figure sits on a small elevation which the artist has covered with round spots, quite possibly intending it for a heap of threshed corn. This is flanked, on the spectator’s left, by a basket of fruit, on his right by a small pig. The figure’s head is adorned with horns, apparently those of a goat and growing from, not merely attached to, the crown.

Mrs. Ure contends (p. 19) that the figure is presumably Iakchos, who is Dionysos. But Iakchos, who is merely a projection from the Eleusinian ritual cry, ιακχος, whatever that may have meant, is not equated with Dionysos (via his title Bakkhos) save in Attic tradition, which I see no reason to assume for Boeotia in the third quarter of the fifth century, Mrs. Ure’s date (p. 21) for the vase. The figure is, in fact, rather puzzling, if we try to relate it to any known cult. The Halos is quite out of the question. Even if it were attested1 for Boeotia, it is a midwinter feast, having nothing whatever to do with the threshing or winnowing of grain,2 and the statement that Dionysos had some part in it is doubtful and rests on the word of late authorities who blunder in other respects. In general, Dionysos and Demeter are rarely associated in cult, if we omit the Attic identification of Dionysos with Iakchos; it is noteworthy, for instance, that they only once (at Lerna) have mysteries in common.3

The fact that Pindar (Isth. 7, 3) calls Dionysos the ταπεινος of the goddess proves nothing for cult, as we may see if we look at other passages containing the same word, notably Od. 8, 21, where Themis is the ταπεινος of Zeus Xenios and yet in the same breath desires, putting her back to the status of an abstract noun, not a figure of cult; Pindar is merely saying in poetical language that in Aiginia justice, which is of God, is practised towards strangers. So, when he thus speaks of Dionysos we need suppose no more than that he associates the givers of the two great gifts, corn and wine, much as Euripides later does,4 unless and until we have something like evidence of a real association in local worship of the two deities.5

Assuming, then, as we may reasonably do, that the figure on the vase is Dionysos, or at least a Dionysiac daimon of some kind, I prefer to take it that the artist is saying in his technique what Pindar and Euripides say in theirs, and that there is no light thrown by the vase on any actual Boeotian ceremony; or if there is, then we do not know what the ceremony was.

H. J. ROSE.

1 Outside Attica, it is not known to have existed, the attempt to find it on Mykonos being a failure, see Nilsson, Griechische Festes, p. 329. That there was such a festival somewhere in the Ionian world is of course perfectly possible, but not a thing to be assumed, especially outside it.

2 See Deubner, Attische Festes, p. 60 sqq., Nilsson, loc. cit.


5 That there is none, Farrwell, who supposes that Pindar alludes to something of the kind, admits in his note on Isth., loc. cit.

The God with the Winnowing-fan.—Professor Rose is perfectly right in holding that there is no allusion to any Boeotian cult or ceremony in the pyxis figured on p. 21 of JHS LXIX. Vases of the fabric to which this pyxis belongs have for the last fifty years been regarded as Bocotian,1 and it seemed not unreasonable to search for the meaning of the representations on them in Boeotian life, and in particular in the customs and cults of the district in which three of them are reputed to have been found. However, shortly after Boeotian Halos had been published, I saw in the museum at Corinth a number of sherds of this fabric which had been excavated in the Potters’ Quarter there. They are to be published in a forthcoming volume of Corinth by Mrs. Stillwell, who tells me she is convinced that they are all Corinthian, and indeed the place of finding puts that beyond doubt. So all arguments based on the supposed Boeotian origin of the pyxis and its companion vases fall to the ground.

Not only is there now nothing to connect this young god with Mykaleian and its harvest celebrations, but he cannot be brought into relations with any Halos. It is a question whether this festival had to do with threshing or gardening, and because in Attica it was held in the month Poseideon Professor Rose is on the side of the gardeners. Being a tiro in these matters I cannot dispute his ruling.

We are left then with internal evidence only, on which to base our interpretation of the scene. The pyxis shows us a young god in the guise of Dionysos holding implements which, if my interpretation is right, are winnowing-fan and fork. Professor Rose suggests that by pushing these implements into the hand of the god of wine the vase painter is representing the association of the givers of the two great gifts of corn and wine. I venture to think that it is most unlikely that a vase painter, if he wished to indicate such an association, would do it in this way. If a painter puts an attribute or implement into the hand of a god it is the attribute or implement of that god and not of another. So, while recanting in the matter of the Halos and of all that has to do with Bocotia, I reaffirm my belief that we have here a god apparently indistinguishable from Dionysos, horned and clad in a skin, who used a winnowing-fan and therefore was concerned with corn, not wine. He must inevitably have been associated with Demeter, unofficially if not in cult, but he cannot in the art of this period be a hybrid, symbolising in a single person the association of the two gifts of corn and wine. If this latter I would see in him an agricultural deity with whose help men availed themselves of the gift of the great corn goddess.

A. D. URE.

1 AM XXVI 1901, 143 ff.; British Museum Cat. Vases III, pl. 21; Pluhrr Ma7 715; Payne, CV Oxford II, p. 65 no. 32; Lane, Greek Pottery, p. 57, Plate 95(a).
NOTICES OF BOOKS


The late Professor J. M. Paton, whose many services to learning included the editing of the American publication on the Erechtheum, was engaged for many years before his death in 1944 in collecting material for an extensive work on the monuments of Athens. The contents of the present volume, edited with devoted care by his sister, Dr. Lucy A. Paton, and appropriately published as a 'Gennadeion Monograph', show that for his purpose the term medieval covered some twelve centuries, from the time of Justinian down to the visit of Stuart and Revett in the eighteenth century; and reveal, no less clearly, his complete mastery in his chosen field. What we have here is, however, a mere fragment which scarcely indicates what would have been the scale or plan of the work had the author lived to complete it.

As an introduction to the extremely valuable collection of excerpts from hitherto unknown, or almost inaccessible, sources to be found in Ch. II, the first chapter ('Turkish Athens') gives us a survey of the five centuries ending with the Venetian siege of 1687 and introduces us to a little-known visitor to the city, in about 1670. This was neither Roberto de Dreux, almoner to the French Ambassador to the Porte, who lodged with his brethren in the Capuchin Convent recently erected, nor in and around the Monument of Lysicrates and eagerly explored remained of antiquity. His identifications of what he saw follow the more ignorant of the traditions then current, such as the association of the Tower of the Winds with Socrates, the Stoa of Hadorian as the 'Palace of the Olympos', the 'Olympia' as the 'Palace of Theseus' (a slip for Hadrian?), and the Parthenon, which he was allowed to enter, as the 'Temple of the Unknown God'. These, or similar, fantasies abound in Ch. II, where we have extracts from MSS. or printed works, to the number of only a few pages, which are carefully transcribed, and in some instances fully annotated.

The earliest of these is no more than local interest, for it illustrates how little was known of Athens or its history in the west during the ninth century. It is taken from the material put together by Abbot Hilduin of St. Gall, who claims the De Nicolaus the Areopagite was identical with the patron saint of his Abbey. To the extract from the Pasio S. Dionysii (reprinted more than once, e.g. Migne, P.L. 106) are added supplementary documents found in MSS. in the Philibps Library and the Bibl. Nat., none of which recall a personal acquaintance with the Athenian monuments.

The fullest account of Athens by a traveller previous to the seventeenth century is that of Niccolò da Marton, who paid two very brief visits to the city early in 1595, on his way back from a pilgrimage to Jerusalem (pp. 30-6; cf. W. Miller, Essays on the Latin Orient, pp. 140 f.). His narrative forms an interesting contrast with that of Ciriaco d'Ancona, who followed him forty years later (and again in 1444), as is pointed out in Appendix I. In their accounts of the Parthenon 'it is characteristic of the two men that while Ciriaco never mentions the temple or the sculptures Ciriaco totally ignores the church and interior and thinks only of the work of Phidias'.

What, one wonders, is the origin of Niccolò's statement that the west doors of the church were brought from Troy 'quando civitas Troye fuit destructa'?

Among the less-known travellers of the seventeenth century is Nicholas du Lorrain, who visited Athens on his way back from Constantinople in 1643. His account (reprinted here from Le Siaur du Sieur du Lorrain contenant en plusieurs lettres une description de sa voyage au Levant, Paris, 1654), shows that he was better educated and more critical than most of the earlier visitors to the city: he of course describes the Theseum and the Tower of the Winds with commendable accuracy, though in identifying neither correctly; and rejects the story that the Monument of Lysicrates was the 'Study of Demosthenes'. But he mistakes the Stoa of Hadorian for the Olympieum and has no suspicion of the actual dimensions of the latter.

In Ch. IV, which occupies more than one-third of the whole book, we have a full-length account of the career of Rinaldo de La Rue, who served with the invading Venetian forces in 1687. His description of Athens (as is suggested, p. 126) may owe more than a little to the help of Giraud, who was the English consul at the time, and exists in two versions with slight differences in arrangement and details, reprinted here (with an English summary, pp. 142-4). The adventurous life of this garrulous young man, who served as a Bondito, very possibly with the battery which landed the fatal shell on the Parthenon, and was fatally wounded in the attack on Negroponte in the following year, has been reconstructed with great industry from an impressive variety of documents in Florentine and Venetian archives. As its concern is his employment in the service of Marguerite Louise d'Orléans, who was living in France apart from her husband, Cosimo III, Grand Duke of Tuscany, and his adventures—including an enforced sojourn in Martineau (1687-88)—following his undeserved dismissal from her service—it is of no direct interest for Hellenists. Nevertheless, they will find in this volume a great deal of interesting material, admirably indexed and carefully printed, and will surely regret that the author did not live to complete his task.

A. M. WOODWARD.


Professor Highet has conceived, planned, and written this book on a grand scale. One of the chief ways in which Greek and Latin influence has moulded the literatures of Western Europe and America—'res est immutabilis aetatis'—and it has been an immense task for one author, even within the small fields of specialist industry and enthusiasm for the pursuit of a 'thorough and journey over twenty centuries through the literatures of six countries. But it was a task supremely well worth doing, and it has been well done. In this age of specialism one might have expected the covering of so wide a field to be divided among half a dozen, but Highet is impossible to withhold a tribute of admiration for the single-handed achievement. For Highet has done more than give an outline sketch of his subject: much of the interest and attractiveness of the book lies in the careful analysis and treatment of the classical elements of the English, French, German and periods—Anglo-Saxon poetry, Shakespeare's plays, Goethe's Faust (to mention only a few)—and in the author's own bold pronouncements on points of literary criticism. No reader will fail to recognize and appreciate the free play of the experienced mind and critical mind over the whole range of Western literary culture, even when he is stimulated, as he will be at times, into disagreement with the author's own personal judgments and predilections. Despite the length of his period there is an air of leisured about Highet's writing, and he does not refuse to turn at times into some pleasant bypaths or to throw off some provocative observations on non-literary subjects. But he does not stray outside his main theme: Philosophy, art, education and other works of the Roman spirit have been 'the says in his frontispiece (p. 543), mentioned only so far as they contributed immediately to modern western literature'.

The book begins with a brief but thorough account of the extent to which Greco-Roman civilisation survived the shocks and ravages of the 'Dark Ages' to have its literary and mental heritage gradually rediscovered and revived from the twelfth century onwards. The following twenty-two chapters discuss the principal aspects of this story: Old English literature; French literature in the Middle Ages; Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio, Chaucer; the translations, the epic and dramatic poetry of the Renaissance; the writers of pastoral and romance, Rabelais and Montaigne; lyric poetry from the sixteenth century to the present day; tragedy, satire, and prose writers; Baroque—particularly W. Europe; romantic or 'romantic' era in France and United States, England, Germany, and Italy; the conflicting trends of the nineteenth century summarised as 'Parnassus and Antichrist'; a review of the nineteenth-century scholarship; a discussion of the 'symbolists'; poets and of the 'reinterpretation of the myths' by psychologists and dramatists of modern times.

In this long and detailed discussion Highet shows a wide acquaintance with the great classics of Western Europe, and with the vast specialist literature that treats these periods, phases, and periods, phases, and phases, and the range of the author's learning and his easy management of it are equally
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admirable. A most valuable feature of the book is the series of notes on the Greek tragedies. They are given in the order in which they occur, and covering more than one hundred and fifty pages. These are packed with a variety of information and should certainly fulfil the author's hope that with this aid readers may 'branch off and follow any particular channel which successive generations may find most interesting' in his quotations, other than those from English authors, to this corpus of notes and to translate into English all book-titles, to avoid the jostling of several languages on the same page.

The narrative thus runs smoothly, and the page looks clean but the vivid and immediate impact of the original is lost, and it may be suggested that it would have been better to adopt the compromise of printing the actual Greek, Latin, French, etc., at the foot of the page.

Many of the problems treated, particularly illuminating are the discussions of the influence of Senecan tragedy in the sixteenth century, of Milton's epic diction, and of the reasons for the failure of English and French verse satire to progress from the successes achieved in the eighteenth century on points of Horace and Juvenal.

An example of Hight's shrewd handling of the bygone disputes of scholars in the light of the perennial problems of classical studies one may cite the ten pages (pp. 479-89) in which an appraisal of Matthew Arnold's controversy with Francis Newman on translating Homer leads on to a most interesting review and criticism of Homeric translations, and this in turn serves to illustrate the whole art of translation.

For many of Hight's readers the most stimulating and provocative portion of the book is that which deals with the scholarship of the period 1814-1914 (ch. 21). This century saw a vast increase in the garnered knowledge of ancient Greece and Rome, yet in the latter half of the century its distribution was less wide in society, and that familiarity with Greek and Latin poetry, philosophy, and history, which once was general in the educated classes, began to dwindle away and be replaced by other intellectual disciplines. For the rapid and intensive exploration of new fields of study in classical antiquity by the methods of scientific research and industrial technique, while enormously extending and deepening our knowledge of Greek and Roman civilisation, broke into fragments the old unity of classical knowledge. Thus 'the gap between the scholar and the public, which in the Renaissance and in the revolutionary period was bridged by an almost interminable interchange of teaching and questioning and...translation and emulation, has now widened to a gulf.' Hight reminds the scholar that he has a duty to society, both to know the truth and to make it known, to disseminate and interpret that classical tradition which has in the past repeatedly saved the world from attacks of materialism and barbarism.

Hight's style is clear and perspicuous; his language concise and vivid; his accuracy in statement and detail, as well as in textual reconstruction, is such that for so long a volume and for so many mistatements may be recorded. Hight asserts (pp. 6, 13, and 557) that W. Europe suffered a total loss of contact with Greek literary tradition after the sixth century a.d. and ignores the serious centres of the 8th and 9th centuries, speaking of S. Italy and Sicily which directly influenced the scholarship of the Latin West long before the immigration of Byzantine scholars in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. On p. 9 Spengler is credited with a view of the Saxon strategy of S. Paul which had been put forward much earlier by Sir W. Ramsay. An occasional colloquialism arrests the reader, as when Hight refers to 'Edward (Night Thoughts) Young'; the borrowing of the term 'baroque' from architecture as a style of thinking, puzzling and writing about Casaubon's parents having to hide from the S.S. (whom are presumably Catholic partisans hunting down Protectors). But these are mere trifles: one must end with a final expression of admiration. To sail a sloop alone across the Atlantic requires a stout heart, great self-reliance, and a profound knowledge of winds and currents. No less fortitude and knowledge of the currents of literary tradition are shown in this book, and Professor Hight never lacks confidence in his own judgment.

R. D. McCLellAN.

Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome.

By F. G. Kenyon. 2nd ed. Pp. vii+136, 8 plll.
Cambridge: At the University Press. 1909.

In reviewing for the first time in this Journal a book from a scholar who has occupied himself with papyri ever since he gave us the Ap. Pol. in 1891, one can but subscribe to the general praise with which the first edition was received, and add a few remarks of detail.

The first twenty pages, dealing with the use of books before 400 B.C., about which we know very little, will probably arouse most interest. The author puts Homer not later than the ninth century, and is emphatic in favour of written transmission from the first. Of the transmission of lyric poetry we know nothing, but the Athenians of the fifth century would no doubt know strongly from what sources it may account for the absence of Sappho from the Old Comedy. Choral lyric is a problem—Aristophanes, with one famous exception, does not assume verbal knowledge of it in his audience—but the fourth-century Timotheus papyrus shows that it was early written down. The Greek papyri infer from P.x 775 ff., 797 ff., that Steichorches' Orestesia was known by reading. Ion's 'Apos, apparently a popular 'hit', is mentioned, ibid. 835. One could have wished for a word about the price of books.

It is difficult to accept the view of Ar. Ran. 1114 put forward on p. 23—that between the original and the (exceptionally) repeated performance (δει την παραθεσιν) the audience had acquired copies of the play, and now sat with them in their 'reading' ('now Kerameira), seeing the world in the course of their military service'.

P. 45. To write about the Dead Sea Scrolls is writing on sand: how many would now accept the dating of the Isaiah c. 100 B.C. ?

P. 55. The combining of two or three books of the Iliad on one roll throws light on (the apparent) publication of the Annals of Ennius three books at a time. Pp. 67 ff. (Aids to the reader). Add the use of descriptive headlines (as in the A.V.) in the Didymus papyrus and the Herodotean Life of Socrates, and chapter-headings in technical works (e.g. a Leyden chemical papyrus). The Eusebian and Euthalian sections in the N.T., for harmonistic (and lectionary?) purposes are well known.

An important addition in this edition is the account of papyrus fragments from 1922 to 1945, of which the most significant are fragments of seven new plays of Aeschylus (with one each of Ag. and St. Th.), against only one in 1922; and above all the anonymous gospel fragment published by Beloch and the fragment of St. John, by C. H. Roberts, both in 1935, of the first half of the second century. Perhaps a word should have been said of their devastating effect on various widely held theories of N.T. critics. The Gymnasie tragedy appeared too late to be included.

W. B. SEGWICK.


This is a Christ–Schmid in Muse. The periods covered by either volume are subdivided into two sections: namely Vol. I. into (a) from the beginnings to 480 B.C. and (b) thence to 323 B.C. Vol. II. treats of (a) 317 to 146 B.C. and (b) in the 'Roman' (down to A.D. 520; but some later writings are mentioned), with (c) a concluding chapter on the Christian literature. Within each section, every literary genius is treated separately, the poetical ones first; the main sections have general introductions. Modern scholarly literature is quoted only in the chapter on the 'Homeric question' (with a rigid disregard of contributions non-German); besides there are, here and there, a few odd references, sometimes to rather irrelevant (H.H.) or antiquated (H.A.) books.

The adopted arrangement need not cause much trouble in Vol. I, since the various types of literary utterance provisionally emerged in succession and roughly in accordance with the historical scheme. In the case of the strange delimitation of the 'Hellenistic' period, that Polybius fails to appear among the Hellenistic historians, but follows (73) straight upon the Christian scribes of Gaza (cent. VI) and incidentally long after his commentator Posidonius (50), while the latter, as well as Plutarch and others, lived in the same narrow roof with Plotinus and Proclus. On the other hand, Dionysius Thrax, though more recent than Polybius and important chiefly through his influence upon Rome, figures in the 'Hellenistic' chapter (p. 36). While no consideration, and historical appreciation the scheme could permit in Vol. I is marred by chronological inconsistencies: Sophron (64), Pherecides of Athens, Antiochus of Syracuse (cf. Diod. XII.71.2), Helianicus (67) as well as Empedocles, Anaxagoras (71), Democritus (73), and Hippocrates (73) are included in the first chapter (pre-480 B.C.). Only in the case of the last-named a note stresses that this was done simply 'for the sake of continuity';
yet the chronological scheme was allowed to cut off Aeschylus from the beginnings of tragedy

Materiaily we are given the traditional scholastic data and opinions, rarely enriched by some out-of-the-way information, e.g. that a Kirghiz singer expressed himself about his inspiration in the same way as does a poet in the German Odyssey (I.150). Kepler wrote a commentary on Plutarch de factis (II.79). One may feel less happy at the suggestion that Odysses may originally have been a sun-god or a demonic being or even a historical king of the Cephalenians (I.14); that a 1-10 'home' vessel founded in the latter to Ptdemy (II.48); Duris, too, by his main work, forms the bridge to Diodorus, Plutarch, and Nepos (II.43). The renderings of the plot of the Epitrepontes (II.11) and of Antonius Diogenes (II.101) are models of contorted obscurity; similarly, the effort at condensation of the Treasury of Hymet's death into a mystery (I.50); Hypatia (II.86) fares no better.

Aesthetic judgment rarely rises above a philistine level; e.g. Eur. I., though inferior to Goethe's, is 'creditable' (wohlgelungen), but Or, 'far more unpleasant' (I.91); Ptolemy 'shall be forgiven' for his astrological escapades (II.85). A few translations are inserted, among which those by the author are monstrous in style and metre (II.53 Crinoras; b. 86 Ptolemy). References to German literature are frequently and generally irrelevant; e.g. Plato's apocalyptic abominations (which nobody excepting 10000 Germans has read) are quoted twice (I.97 and II.8) and Sophocles' book on the chorus—of which not one syllable is known—has 'a parallel' in Schiller's essay on the same subject (I.61; cf. also 176 and 916). A writer's name is not neglected: the Rudens recalls (II.13) the Tempest—and instead, there is a tempest in both.

He who consults these small volumes on points of detail, may often find some useful information; he who tries to read them through will find nothing but an irksome feeling of melancholy. If such is the fruit of Wissenschaft.

The paper, binding (or rather, stitching), and typography are rather poor; especially the Greek type. A list of about thirty misprints has been sent to the publisher.

G. ZUNTE

Geschichte der griechischen Literatur: Ester Teil

The New Testament, together with a few references to a book of this type to produce original solutions to long-standing problems. He should at least present problems and evidence with the utmost objectivity; and preferably, when concerned with a writer as overgrown with controversy as he is, Th. should strive to avoid, or at least get down to essentials. S. fails to do this. He has something in common with that tradition which treats Th.'s work not as an attempt to describe events but as a piece of creative fiction. This accounts for the space devoted (pp. 43–106) to summarising the contending views of modern work (surely obtuse in democracy as it does, and for a more serious defect, the exclusively internal' treatment of Th. and the consequent failure to disentangle him from his contemporaries. S. attempts at some length both to assess Th.'s competence as a historian and to discover his political standpoint, without fulfilling the conditions which alone make the attempt feasible. The first requirement is the bringing to bear of all our knowledge of the period; but so far from doing this, S. passes lightly over Th.'s best-known sources and passages. Eustathius' and modern works (p. 158, n. 1), and makes no use of the knowledge of the practical working of the Athenian democracy which the orators provide. The second requirement is a consistent hypothesis on the nature of the speeches. It is necessary to be able to judge S. either by the argument of Gomme's Essays in Greek History and Literature, pp. 155 ff. In fact, he does neither; he assumes, with varying degrees of confidence (pp. 20, 107, 176), that the speeches express his own reflections. In using their content he generally warns us that they are speaking, but with some notable exceptions (e.g. p. 120, n. 7). The consequences of this failure to detach Th. from his subject are seen most clearly in S.'s account of Th.'s political views. Th. viii.7.2 speaks plainly, and interpretation of the text and the English must conform to this (176, n. 18); but to S. the Periclean democracy is so interpreted as to detach Th.'s ideal (pp. 23, 118) that he calls it virtually a 'Mischverfassung' in the sense of viii.7.2 (p. 121).

Again, the section on language and style (pp. 184–201)
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essentially a classified catalogue of phenomena, which is always
useful when dealing with a topic covered com-
pletely. S. rightly rates the influence of Gorgias low,
recognises the colloquial element in Th., and warns us against
assuming deliberate 'Ionicism'. Much more should use have
been made of Attic inscriptions, which (in the fifth cen-
tury B.C.) is discredited.

Presentation of the composition problem (pp. 127-39) is
sketchy and not very clear. S. takes his firmest stand on
the least firm evidence (the φραγματα, p. 128, and Th.'s attitude
in particular) in a counter-argument with those passages
in the text which on independent historical grounds give
us upper and lower termini (e.g. ii.23.3).

The evidence for Th.'s life is presented adequately; but
S. treats too gently the ancient stories that Th. was a 'pupil
in playing and inventing games' (pp. 5-6, 8) and related to the
Panaetiai (pp. 5, 150). On the connection with Cimon he says nothing
of Cavaignac's hypothesis (RevPhr 1929, 20 ff).

The account of textual transmission (pp. 210-22) is marred
by ignorance of papyri; the text used is 1375, and the
Tischendorfian MSS are not considered at all.

H. J. Rose, Demosthenes (pp. 224-349). Here S. tackles
a harder task, the presentation of the work of authors known
to us only in fragments and the reports of others. Many
fragments occur in uninformative contexts, and alternative
dependents are not considered at all. This is the state of
finding out what I. and D. in fact said requires first a full
critical discussion of the transmission and of criteria of
authenticity, and secondly a positive statement of what little
is undisputed combined with a clear distinguishing of the
ambiguous fragments. In general S. has sacrificed much to
systematisation and a deceptive clarity.

His information on sources and transmission (pp. 243-64)
is less rich than the general questions of authenticity
are naturally involved therein (cf. pp. 343 ff.), but it is not
to enough to take dialect as a primary criterion (p. 251), considering
the highly Atticised morphology of D.'s fragments in Stobaeus
(of which Diels-Kranz give hardly a hint, though S. shows on
p. 322 that he is aware of it). The authenticity of individual
titles and fragments has been settled offstage; the reader's
attention is drawn to major controversies (in footnotes), not
always with sufficient indication of the issues involved.
There is a laudable rejection of the view that D.'s work is
rejected as spurious in P. n. 2, accepted as genuine on
p. 275, and left in doubt on p. 247.

So it is with interpretations. S. is sensible and clear on the
atonic theory of both L. and D., but his account of D.'s
Mērēs Αἰθωνοῦ (p. 161, n. 1 of S.'s remark on the
Philos. xxvi, 25 ff.) was damagingly criticised by J. H.
Dahlmann (De philosophorum Graecorum sententias ad laqueas
originem pertinens, Diss., Leipzig 1928), that we possess only
a fragment (antiphonale) of D.'s work, and that S. should have dealt with
human development at all rests on a single interesting but tentative
suggestion (Reinhartz, loc. cit. 553).

The available material makes it inevitable that a description
of D.'s rhetoric as a whole, tying in with the text of D. should be
a somewhat disconnected catalogue, and S. tries too hard
discuss his as an organic whole, thereby discounting the fact
that ancient anthologists ransacked an author without caring
for the result. The long discussion of D.'s rhetorical
of 'disjointed matter'. But S. is rightly non-committal in
separating the original element in D. from the derivative, and
takes only one bold plunge in suggesting, on quite inadequate
grounds (p. 339), that D.'s ethos presuppose Socratic teaching.

Bibliographical guidance throughout the book is good, though
it is not exceptional. The index comprises also an
index to Bd. iv.

Anthologia Lyrica Graeca. Edidit ERNESTUS DIELH. Fasc. i.—Poetes Elegiaci; Fasc. ii.—Thyrs. Ps.-Pythagoras;


$2.40, 1.97.

At the first publication in 1922-23, Diehl's ALG was at once
recognised as a standard authority, though it must be conceded
that this recognition was less a tribute to the merits of the new
work (which were indeed considerable) than an indication of
the desperate need for an up-to-date general list of lyric fragments.
The new edition ('D'), embodying marked improvements in content
and layout, began to appear in 1935, and the four fascicles of Vol. i were complete by the
middle of 1936; Vol. ii, however, did not appear until 1942.

Whether it nor the fascicle for 1943-44 of Vol. iii, which has ever
come generally available in this country. Diehl's
afterthoughts on Alcaeus and Sappho can be read in RbMus.
N.F. LXXXIII, 1943, 1-26, but a republication of the second volume has been an urgent need ever since the end of
the war, when it became known that the second edition would
never be obtainable. This crying need seems to be as far as
ever from being satisfied, though it is to be hoped that further
fascicles of ALG will appear in due time to join the two
now under consideration.

Diehl did not live to complete the revision of even the first
of these fascicles for the press, and the editorial work has been
undertaken by Professor Rudolf Beutler of Munich, who in a
short preface to fascicle i says that he has made it his
primary duty to bring the second edition, adding thereto his own
supplementary notes and points from periodicals and books
which have appeared since Diehl's death. One or two of
the new notes are marked 'Beut.', but apart from these it is
now clear which of the new features are his and which
are to be ascribed to a change of mind by Diehl, and which to his editor.
Whichever of them is responsible for the new headings, giving
the name and nationality of the poets in Greek, this change must
be roundly condemned as an idiotic piece of vandalism certainly
known and correctly given; but what is one to say of (e.g.) Ταυροῦςδ Μῆθηρος or Ἀριστεία ἡ Αἴσθησις? Nothing else which has been added to either
fascicle comes near to plumbing the depth of absurdity reached by
the latter example; but it must be regarded as a more serious
defect of the new edition that a certain amount of space
has been wasted in the commentary by adding to Diehl's
already over-lavish assembly of alleged parallels—if this
collection had been pruned, there would have been space
for fuller reproduction of the contents (Diehl has niggardly with these) and for some relevant passages which have not
been included.

But users of Diehl already know only too well what to expect
on the negative side, and it is not surprising to find the
down the main changes revealed by a partial collation of
the two fascicles with their predecessors. The bibliographies
have been expanded thoroughly, and nearly everything relevant which has appeared since 1935, 1939, and
included (the most notable absences are perhaps Snell's Entdeckung
dei Griezis and Becker's Bild das Wegen). Among the books, we have
new readings of the Berlin Tyrtaeus papyrus (Tyrt. l)
by Isscher, which is for the most part greatly improved,
though he must wonder if Dfn. 45.4 is right (placed According to
the critical lines 20, 21, 28 in the new version, and of the Sophocles
Paeas after Oliver (Hesperia v. 1936, 91 ff.) and v. Blumenthal
(BataviaJahrhbuch CCLXXVII, 1943, 71 f.) a new fragment
(12a) of Minnemurs (a couple from a Hermopoulus
papyrus, ed. p. Vocke, with note that D. is missing a
adeptas, 6A and 12A (both insignificant) from Philodemus,
and from a Strabo papyrus (ed. Snell, Hermes Einzelschr.
V. 1937); fasc. ii has new sections for Chares the gnomologist
(without any reference to Snell's collection) and
Aristides' anonymous σωφρίνου (Poet. XV; 1795; due credit
is given here to Powell, op. cit. 199-200).

I add the following notes on points of detail: fasc. i. 9 (and
elsewhere)—scholia to Pluto should now be quoted from
the Thesaurus of M. O. C. W. (above noted), and Dfn. 13,
new note on Tyrt. 6.7.5 *audia Aeneae fata * deserves mention for its
almost sublime irrelevance; 19.—on Tyrt. 8. the lemma
in Stobaeus is now given as μη πονδυς (σπόντων Dfn); id. 6
now reads (γωνια for (γωνια); on id. 7. there is a
completely different reference to Orien. 17.—on Tyrt. 9.2 the MS.
reading αύτος 8 replaces Bergk's 8 oiv; 37.—on Sol. 15.1
υμικ NumberOf this is still quoted without

K. J. DOVER.
suppose that the translator did not consider these worth inclusion, for he might well miss a footnote to the introduction which states that the dramatists are reserved a further volume.

While there is much to enjoy and admire in the book, it cannot be called a complete success. The print is rather too small for pleasant reading, and it is to be feared that some will be put off by its length and the crowded appearance of its pages. In addition to the translations there is a general introduction, individual introductions to each author, and notes distributed throughout the book at the ends of each section. Also A. L. X. II, which is the supplement to Greek drama, is included. The rest of the volume comprises selections from Hesiod and the Homeric hymns, the lyric poets, and hexameter and elegiac verse from the post-Homeric period to the Byzantine. The only noteworthy omission is of the Attic dramatists. The careless reader might

A. DAVISON

Greek Poetry for Everyman. By F. L. LUCAS. Pp. xxxiv + 414. London: Dent. 16r. 36s. 6d.

'There are now,' writes Mr. Lucas, 'plenty of modern versions of Greek poetry, but not to my knowledge any attempt to combine all the best of that poetry in a single homogeneous book, with a minimum of notes and metrical adaptations for the classical'. This want he has set out to supply in Greek Poetry for Everyman. He has done it on a generous scale. The book contains nearly 10,000 lines of verse in all. About half is accommodated to Homer; another quarter, like one-half the Iliad and the Odyssey is included. The rest of the volume comprises selections from Hesiod and the Homeric hymns, the lyric poets, and hexameter and elegiac verse from the post-Homeric period to the Byzantine. The only noteworthy omission is of the Attic dramatists. The careless reader might

M. L. CLARKE


However presumptuous I may seem in trying to judge researches of which the greater part far exceeds my competence, and however hard it may consequently be for me to write convincingly about them, I have yet no hesitation in attempting this notice of M. Charles Autran's last four volumes, because I am quite sure that the need to assimilate his results, and extend the range of his method, is very urgent, but scarcely yet even recognised.

The urgency of the need should be clear to anyone who reads the volumes attentively. For example, it is immediately obvious that the dependence of the dependence of Greek epic language on oriental originals, of which it is in places formally, or indeed formidably, a translation, and also of other evidence proving affiliations of many Greek words which are by no means adequately enlightened by Indo-European parallels, could, in Greek lexicography alone, quickly waste thousands of pounds, and set back for generations the advance of knowledge.

The first volume of Homère . . . is concerned with Homer's mythical background. Greek epic is the richest storehouse of individual heroes who are characters in the poems, and the third with ethnic and tribal groups mentioned in the poems or relevant to them, and with their temples, and their divinities. According to M. Autran's general dictum, which is professedly a hearsay, Greek hexameter poetry is derived from hymns chanted to deities and heroes in pre-Hellenic times by priests belonging to a vast cultural complex extending over Western Asia and the Aegean, and no less widely extended. The epic language has its parallel in some dialects of Madagascar. These comparisons are, surely, a brilliant use of great learning, and may prove final. Hexameter poetry, then, is, at base, bilingual or multilingual, simplified, artificial, formal, of course, not original, and it does speak. It has the same characteristics of formulation, in language as in allusion; here M. Autran, penetratingly forecasting later arguments, for example as recently proposed by Sir John Myres and Miss H. L. Lorimer, suggests that all allusions of this kind must be considered as unadulterated by the archaeological material has been incompletely interpreted. To its hieratic origin Greek epic owes its perfect unity of tone, and also its persuasive moral elevation.

I have not fully disposed of the possible answer that anaepaestheit seems natural enough for Greek, and indeed that a dance in waltz-time would have started a hexameter rhythm anywhere. Mr. A. C. Harwood calls the hexameter the normal rhythm of breathing. Plato's Ion, mentioned indeed near the end of Homère et le Christian et M. P. Servies, Les rhymes comme introduction physique à l'esthétique, might suggest that in manipulating a metre both hard work, in Goethe's sense, and later a free, fluent composition are equally possible in the same genre, so that spontaneity is not only to be desired for art, but just as useful for this question. Room should be left for 'integration' (my term) and 'neo-analysis' (the term of M. J. Th. Karkidès). It is hard to assert 'translation' from Aesopic in Fick's sense, but it is as hard to deny it, and with good reason, for instance in cases such as Παραπληθυσμού. There have, of course, been very able reconstructions of an original Greek epic dialect in which language and metre are not in conflict. On the whole I doubt if they are secure enough to threaten M. Autran's view. But surely the style and tone of the Homeric poems vary. I have a sense of a different author and idiom at the beginning, for example, of Iliad X and XIII, and of Odyssey VI; and, for the Iliad at least, Mazon has shown such differences to be matters of plain fact, not just a figment. Certainly, modern priests preach high moral conduct, and ancient priests did too. But at least some poets of secular, or at least not ecclesiastical, outlook preach, or intimate, a higher code than some. The individual conscience, and its relation to it, also have contributed to the progress; and as Sam Wide, for example, and now W. K. C. Guthrie have indicated, the religion of individuals mattered in Greece. Homer, therefore, may have expressed his own moral sensibility, just how high, or just how low, the use, in the persuasive construction of his poetry; though a certain campanilismo does begin to seem still more evident in Homer from an article, and now a book Homère, by M. Fernand Robert, who, unlike many scholars, has had, and used, the chance to develop M. Autran's observations. M. Autran does, however, seem to imply, and to argue from, a too narrowly limited conception of ecclesiastical tradition, in too sharp a distinction from the possible activities of educated or at least eloquent priests. There may have been tribes with no close contact with literary centres, but certain tribes, as Professor H. J. Rose would call them, told or chanted heroic stories of living or recent chieftains. The effect of the 'Wiro's' has perhaps been underestimated; M. Autran argues
NOTICES OF BOOKS

convincingly against M. Georges Dumézil's equation "flamenbrahman", and he notably proves that the I-I layer is anything but a thin and does not contain ethnic layers or "The Charioteers". But, for balance, it is now necessary to hold present, if not all that M. Dumézil suggests, at least the common Wiro "pattern of belief" so well treated by Professor L. R. Palmer, Professor George Thomson's "motif" approach, and the school of structuralism, especially in Ireland, and distinctions between the Wiro mind and the hierarchial psychology of the earlier cast for which reference can be made, for example, to M. E. Cavaignac and members of the "School of Göttingen". In all this M. Atuan may leave some distortion of emphasis in the minds of some readers. He is, of course, right to deprecate the "Hellenic obsession", and his book is not about the appearance of people, if there were any, exclusively Hellenic. But it may well be felt to lacerate the "northern" side of the question, for example the Bohemian Bronze Age, Halos, and the rest.

On the other hand, M. Atuan could reply that no facts or possibilities on this side of the question are excluded by what he has written. Again and again an objection suggested by one passage is amply met by a later passage, perhaps hundreds of pages afterwards. In particular he is fully aware of the character "à demi lascie" of Homeric poetry, and of its place between democratic tradition, and "Pindarisation". And his discussion of the insufficiency for great poetry of Japanese grammar and sound-values, and of the interplay of Iranian, Arabic, Sumerian, and other influences to create Persian epyllia and eventually the mature epic of Firdousi's "Shah-nameh" is strikingly reflected in his taking out wondrously brilliant. So too are many linguistic demonstrations, for example of the affinities and meaning of the names Apollo, Hector, and many more, and of the vast early, perhaps Nevertheless, the pre-I-E vocabulary to which Greek, Chinese, and many other languages are related, retains a sense of "dog", "pig", and "arrow". Some affinities displayed are newer to science than others. The forms of the name Agammemnon, rightly analysed, as M. Atuan warmly says, by Professor B. J. South, are to have been familiar, and something was known of the non-I-E connections of ωραιός, διόνυς, and ἰππ, etc. Many of the impressive survivals of Asiatic words in pre-Latin Italy are in Schubert's lists of names. But M. Atuan, though he always tries to cite every modern authority, and several that some have failed to have been, familiar, and something he will add from Malay and Cambodia. So, too, in history he is as ready to show the like effect of ecclesiastical Greek on the different languages of the Balkans as he is to characterise Germanic American linguistics, distinguishing its peculiarity, and distinguishing, too, the better from the less successful among modern authorities on pre-Columbian America. He once notes that all the words used for a comparison are in one list or lexicon or in another. But he still gains, because he is familiar with them all; surely no one else would have made so convincing, by cumulative linguistic evidence, the diffusion through prehistoric Italy of Asiatic proper names; and few would have known both the comparative material and the Egyptian texts of many periods well enough to show quite plainly that ἄγαμος (sic) is simply ἀγαμός.

The four volumes do not seek to create a system or even to reach conclusions. That is emphasised. They seek only to array sets of facts not safely accepted, and, without being infectious, to open controversy in them, and what there is of courteous or extremely difficult. If the account of the Achaeans is different from received views—it is not our fault', but the result of the comparative chosen. The facts, and the perspectives, are both a valuable evidence, the diffusion through prehistoric Italy of Asiatic proper names; and few would have known both the comparative material and the Egyptian texts of many periods well enough to show quite plainly that ἄγαμος (sic) is simply ἀγαμός.
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The first of these writers makes the remarkable claim that he has identified ‘the oldest poem of the Western World’ in Iliad 5-7. He claims that in the thirty pages of his introduction the rest of the book consists of a translation of this earliest poem of European literature. While one or two of these three sentences are not entirely without foundation, the author’s independent, objective criticism for the chronologically valid of the old epic style ‘(as he calls the use of the short dative plural in -or) is against his own. Nothing is said of Leaf’s opinion that this episode must belong to the Second Stratum. The subsequent deductions about ‘the oldest type of European man’ are puerile. Until Mette can make a better case than this, the history of European literature need not be re-narrated. The pages of his introduction provide much of interest, but his bibliography and list of incidental remarks may be useful to Homerists.

Professor Patrons long work is the fruit of over half a century of Homer study. His main point is that he discovered that the ‘Achaeans’ (belonging to the pre-Homeric myth of Odysseus) from the ‘Achaean’ elements in the Odyssey. To do this he reviews the whole poem incident, adding copious remarks on theological, ethical, archaological, metrical and other matters. He writes of detail (certainly much as we have, but also in his main thesis of far-reaching speculation is not entirely satisfactory. The reader has to piece together the author’s views on his main thesis from widely scattered observations, and there is much tedious repetition. But an agreeably sympathetic, scholarly and conservative approach to Homer’s genius—makes the whole book pleasant to read.

According to Patrons theory the author of the Odyssey was a young bilingual poet, skilled in both the ‘Mediterranean’ and the ‘Achaean’ languages and literatures, who was, as he puts it, the seventh century B.C. for a successor of Erechtheus at Athens. Only clairvoyance could justify the precision of some further biographical details as given by Patrons. This Homer took the plot of the poem from a predecessor whose grand literary achievement was to connect a story of an astute and resourceful mariner with some elements of the Achaean saga. Possibly this combination was first suggested by a similarity between the names of the fabulous voyager and some heroic personages of his time. In the pre-Homeric Odyssey the wanderer preceded the epic of the Iliad, so that the wanderer was absent from home for only ten years, not twenty. Homer reversed this order when, to suit his Achaean patron, he made Odyssey’s wanderings into an Achaean nusar. But he overlooked some adjustments that are anomalous; for example, the childlessness of Telemachus in the opening scenes; in the original version he would only be ten when his father returned. Homer wrote the Odyssey before the Iliad. Consequently his religious and political thought is less mature. In order to give Odyssey some standing as an Achaean prince Homer (or his poetical predecessor) allotted him a remote kingdom in Ithaca and the surrounding islands. The failure of archaologists to find any remains of Odyssey’s residence in Thikai (which Patrons accepts as genuine) is significant. For it was Odysseus who was formerly the historical at all, but mythical.

Though Homer ostensibly wrote the Odyssey to glorify and please Achaicus, his true sympathy (like Patrons’) are with the ‘Mediterranean’. He secrely disliking the blood-thirsty, tyrannical, the peace-loving, humane, industrious pre-Achaean peoples. His whole poem is tinged with this predilection. Sometimes he even caricatures the conventional Achaean battle scene, as, for example, in the slaughter of the Surtis with a literally absurdly examined number (Odysseus holds, there were only six or twelve of them). Almost all that is kind, good, and gentle, in the Odyssey, is to be attributed to ‘Mediterranean’ sources. Mediterranean’ elements can also be discerned in the theology of the Odyssey. Calypso, who is a offspring of the supreme Mediterranean deity, the Potnia. Originally the male ‘Tin-Zeus’ was more than her servant and occasional consort. The Achaicans exalted him to the presidency of the Olympian assembly because they preferred a masculine and warlike god. (The only form of epithet approved of in the ‘Mediterranean’ theology and ethics was the vendetta, which they pursued relentlessly.) Athené’s pre-eminence in the Odyssey is due to the Potnia’s surviving influence. Homer preferred the Mediterranean cult. Thus, his view of the adulatory of Ares and Aphrodite in the Odyssey is almost nothing. In fact, the one independent, objective criticism for the chronologically valid of the old epic style ‘(as he calls the use of the short dative plural in -or) is against his own. Nothing is said of Leaf’s opinion that this episode must belong to the Second Stratum. The subsequent deductions about ‘the oldest type of European man’ are puerile. Until Mette can make a better case than this, the history of European literature need not be re-narrated. The pages of his introduction provide much of interest, but his bibliography and list of incidental remarks may be useful to Homerists.

There are many noteworthy obiter dicta. Menelau’s visit to Proteus is thought (with Pestalozza) to have been originally an incident in Odyssey’s wanderings. Sclerina is Malthe, names the pivot of the whole poem and as the main preparation for Homer’s later composition, the Iliad. The second Nekta was probably composed independently by a son or pupil of Homer. Homer’s vivid descriptions of lions, as in chapter 24, are unrecorded. On almost every page Patrons has something unorthodox to suggest.

It will be clear from this necessarily curtailed selection opinion, based on very dubious criteria. He re-divides the poem into twenty-seven books largely on the assumption that 459 lines was the normal length of a book. He adds the extraordinary remark that the division into twenty-four books was made by the Patrons and that the name was chosen to correspond with the number of letters in the alphabet—but why should an early Athenian committee think in terms of the devolved Ionic alphabet? And why, then, do no pre-Alexander writers cite the Homer of Odyssey? He indulges, apparently in an attempt to make some naïve numerical interpretation of the quantity of lines in some books as re-arranged by himself. For example, the number of lines in Book Thirteen (as he re-arranges it) is 462: 4 symbols Odysseus himself, 2 more properties of Odysseus’, 2 more properties of divinity; so 452 means ‘the beginning of the vendetta of the divine Ulysses’. Similarly 491 in v means ‘here begins the vendetta prepared by Ulysses and Athena’, 466 in B means ‘the greatest success of Ulysses’; and 407 in v is ‘the end of Odysseus’ (the Ithacans). Perhaps the reader did not realise that to imply that the Greeks in Homer’s or Peisistratus’s time understood the concept of zero was among the boldest of his suggestions.

Some of Patrons’s interpretations of the text disregard the plain meaning of the text and turn to his own theory, e.g. when he takes 152 as indicating that Odysseus must be younger than thirty-five, and assumes that βρόχος as applied to Nestor must refer to horse-riding not to chariot-driving. In search of ‘Mediterranean’ phrases far beyond their contextual value, in the case of Menelau’s references to Odysseus and his gift of horses to Telemachus, which are probably nothing more than the courtesies of a self-satisfied prince. At one point if some of these statements are then even Patrons’s theory is dismissed as one of the poet’s more serious lapses. Yet this is a book that every Homerist should study carefully. Even when its theories are most far-fetched they remain stimulating and suggestive. Many of the comments on details are illuminating and these remarks make every reader will be faced with a problem similar to Professor Patrons’s own—
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to determine how much is mere fantasy and how much is ascertained fact in the work before us. At least I must agree that in nobility of style and thought this work is worthy of its subject.

W. B. STANFORD,


Professor Bolling has happily realized the hope he expressed in The Athetised Lines of the IIiad: 'If time remained I should wish to print "for the use of scholars" an edition in which the reader should follow my reconstruction of II, with the 'plus' verses—plus verses in the text—regarded as the critical apparatus'. He gives us an edition of the IIiad shorter by more than a thousand lines than the modern 'vulgate'. His omissions are largely based on the evidence afforded by the preserved fragments. For a thorough study of his text, it is essential to have before one certain works, The External Evidence for interpolation in Homer, Oxford, 1925, and The Athetised Lines of the IIiad, Baltimore, 1944, where for his omission of passages are set out.

B. gives a brief and concise account of his position in his Introduction, and along with this may be read his article in JTP 1949, pp. 367–75. 'On editing the Homeric poems.' He holds the view that we may use the evidence furnished by the Alexandrians to reconstruct (to some extent at least, our knowledge of the work of the IIiad. The manuscripts being (or complete) the single manuscript (II) written in Athens in the sixth century with which our tradition started. It would not be universally accepted that all our sources of information about the ancient text do in fact come from such a manuscript, but the case for believing so seems strong.

Admirable chapter on Peisistratus and the Homeric vulgate by P. Mazon in the Budé Introduction à l'Iliade, he maintains that a manuscript may well have been brought by Hipparchus to Athens. The unique position of the IIiad to the evidence contains, some stage of a single written source, and quite apart from the ancient testimony about Athenian activity in this matter in the fifth century Athens is the obvious city which might have established and maintained the text for a long time. The evidence of the Ptolemaic papyri strongly indicates the existence of a single source; their plus verses are to be explained as a fanning out of the tradition, and not by any means as the preservation of a different written tradition. What is remarkable about them is not their differences from the manuscript vulgate—striking though these may seem at first sight—but that these differences are not on a large scale, as they might be if the tradition had descended from more than one original written text. The accuracy of this Athenian version, and the supremacy of Athens, resulted in the destruction of other versions; but (as shown by the Ptolemaic papyri) interpolation gradually began, aided no doubt in place of oral tradition, and continued until the standardisation of the text in the second half of the Alexandrian text.

Now B.'s argument does not depend upon or include the question of how this sixth-century manuscript came into being, whether it was 'reception, redaction, or original composition'. That problem he leaves outside the scope of his work, being only concerned to determine what lines are best attested as having been in the manuscript. He stresses that if we grant an Athenian manuscript of the sixth century to have been the common source of our tradition, we are not thereby making any claim in the Higher Criticism. We are not claiming or denying the unity of Homer; we are regarding the possible of interpolation before the sixth century; we are making no special claims for the excellence of this manuscript. But if we can reconstruct it with any degree of probability, we are pushing back by several centuries the antiquity of the tradition.

B.'s method of reconstruction depends on a number of points especially interesting. (i) That in the reconstruction of II the shorter text is to be preferred; (ii) that neither Zenodotus nor Aristarchus was an editor nor editorial unless it was attested in manuscripts seems to have seriously affected conclusions. (i) B. finds a parallel in the Mahābhārata, and the obvious interpolations of the Ptolemaic papyri support him. His hypothesis, which is in itself highly reasonable, is not disproved in its testing; but it does not seem to be proved true, or to become anything higher in the scale of evidence than a reasonable hypothesis. (ii) This is the crux of the matter: we have no real evidence of the grounds on which the Alexandrians attained their conclusions given by the scholia for the attestation of lines—largely aesthetic or moral explanations—tell very much against B. They may well be the grounds on which later commentators developed the attestation of the Alexandrians, or they may be added at a later date. (iii) Attestation for the "vulgate" text is given by the scholia for the attestation of lines—largely aesthetic or moral explanations—tell very much against B. They may well be the grounds on which later commentators developed the attestation of the Alexandrians, or they may be added at a later date. (iv) B. does indeed sometimes show that his hypothesis explains certain facts of the case, but more often he has to be content with the negative statement. And therefore it is not surprising that Aristarchus did not have manuscripts which attested these lines.

It is indeed a question of whether the burden of proof lies: B. often tells us that there is no sufficient reason to insert a certain passage, where his opponents will reply that there is no sufficient reason to excite it.

B. has done a great service in insisting that the manuscript vulgate must not be regarded as sacrosanct, and that passages which it includes, but against which evidence exists must be considered with an open mind; but he has not proved conclusively that he is right in starting the other way round. The opposite hypothesis, that the readings of the Alexandrians are subjective conjectures, and that the vulgate is in the main reliable, has been strongly maintained by Dr. van der Valk in his review of The Critical and controversial discussions, Leiden, 1949 (see Bolling's review in JTP 1950, pp. 11–12). This work is well, in some of the cases he discusses, and can be shown to be possible in almost all. The question remains very open.

B.'s standpoint must still be treated largely as hypothesis; I cannot yet feel convinced that the Textual Criticism is even or largely on documentary evidence. But however far we go with him in his conclusions, we owe a great debt to him for his discussions, in the two books which preceded his text, of the passages which were not or may not have been present in the Alexandrian text, or of the passages which he regards as interpolations. It is incidentally a most pleasing piece of book production.

The challenging appearance of this new edition should go far towards stimulating the study of the tradition of the text, another time when necessary for its reconstruction. It is most valuable that the implications of B.'s hypothesis should be clearly before us. The gap between Aristarchus and Homer has still to be leapt rather than bridged, but it is right and proper that all methods of bridging it should be explored. It may be that this is the most satisfactory version of Homer that we can achieve, but we must not rest in that assumption. B.'s reconstruction of the sixth-century manuscript will not meet, I think, with general approval to Homeric scholarship that it should have been made.

R. D. WILLIAMS,


This long-awaited edition is perhaps most erudite that any Greek play has ever had. The Prologomena, which extend to eighty-five pages, are confined to technical matters—textual criticism, the MS. tradition, some editions which for one reason or another are considered. A commentary worthy of mention, and the contributions of sundry eminent scholars appear occasionally in the play. It spends no space over the vague aesthetic criticism which so often takes up the corresponding section of an edition of any classic, and is full of information not readily available elsewhere. The volume is also a very good reading text. The text is conservative, at times, I think, too much so; for instance, I would assume small lacunae (generally of a line or two) often than the editor does. It is faced with an English translation which makes no pretense to be more than a supplement to the commentary, a plain indication that the Greek is to be construed, not of how, given sufficient poetical powers, it might be adequately reproduced in a foreign dress. Stage-directions, brief and useful, accompany
it. There are, of course, full critical notes under the text and footnotes under the translation that ‘the text is uncertain’, or that another rendering is possible, or the like. I list, without comment, a few disputed passages. Line 7 is bracketed, as in most editions; at 57, a short lacuna is supplied after πάντως; at 70, 650, and at 97, 118, 137, however, no emendation is accepted, the text being simply marked corrupt. In 125, τι is in square brackets; at 145, πέρας, treated in the same way; at 182, ἄνοιξις is retained. At 287, ‘Ahrens’ 1955 is retained as the reading in the text, but marked corrupt; so with the reading of F in 326. 405 again is simply marked corrupt, but at 412-3 Hermann’s well-known conjecture is printed. At 426 the obolus comes into play again, and being left outside the brackets, I do not, as in the apparatus criticus as vadé suspicat. 527 is in square brackets, 539 marked corrupt, but 547 emended by Schadé’s conjecture, ἱεροπόταμος for στρέμμα αργομέτρος. In 531, ἔνας δέ is the conjecture (Headlam) in 613, after τες. Auratus’ conjecture, τάξις τις δίκαια, is printed in 660. 714 and 715 are left corrupt; in 730, 73, 74, 75 is read, Schneiderein not even being mentioned. 760 and 761 are recommended, 803 marked corrupt, a lacuna supposed in 806-7 between ἀπάνως and παῦζε. Brackets condemn both 883 and 881, the same treatment being given to 900 and 902, with the comment that ‘hac non possumus manifestum. Πάντως’ is also cut out. By a combination of West and Wecklin’s suggestions, 943 appears as ἡπείρον ἡ παρὰ τῶν [τα] ἔνας εἰς θάνατος. In 948 no emendation is judged necessary; ἡπείρον ἡ παρὰ (Wecklin and Willamowitz) is accepted in 985, but the hurts of the 982-2 left unhealed, the first of 1052 is ignored; 1053 marked corrupt, also the latter half of 1057, and 1058 is bracketed. Brackets again enclose the ἐκατοστάσις and 1059, before 1060, corruption is indicated, a little doubtfully, in 1099, and once more at 1172 (Ἀπόλλωνι). 1172 in 1172 is the likewise condemned, 1221 in 1223, 1226 bracketed, but 1235 left standing as in the MSS. and justified in the commentary. Omissions suggested by Willamowitz make 1256-7 two laconic dimeters with ejaculations prefiguring them; ὑπέρτατος in 1257 is declared corrupt, 1259 is bracketed without its transposition rejected in 1299. 1324-5 have the signs of corruption before 1315 and after 1290, because γραμματέας διατηρεῖ εἰς τὴν οὔτως, quibus quos urbam affecta sint accuratissimi deinitur nequit. 1314 is considered corrupt in 1325, and 1315 completed respectively by Schneiderein’s ἔκκριτον ηταῖρων ἐν Αἰγίλω, and Enger’s οἱ. The last word of 1329 is left standing as in the MSS., but marked corrupt, ἐνιαύτης in 1329 carries the dagger, as does ὅπως in 1374. After sundry small corrections, marked at 1329, in the interpolation of 1321-2 retained with a lacuna postulated after them and another after 1326, the last two words of which (τις ἐπὶ ταῦτα) are condemned, with the note ‘hoc loco abs Abschjo nel men scriptum’; 1355 is also bracketed by a lacuna; 1600 is in brackets and 1627 secondly marked corrupt, and some new doubts raised over the concluding couplet.

Plainly there is nothing very startling in all this, not departing widely from the sounder readings of earlier editors. Of his own suggestions Professor Frankel has been very sparing, receiving few or none into his text. Most of the emendations he does accept have stood the slightly ambiguous test of long usage, which does indeed generally support a good alteration, by the accumulated judgments of editions of scholiasts but some of which are of the kind of spurious prescriptive right. Most texts have some of these at 1228-9; Frankel retains but one, Canter’s comparatively harmless ἄσπορος κάρστων. It is a different question if he always takes the careful and thought he has established, most likely view of the meaning of the text he has established. I receive few or none of his text, favourable or other, of how he renders the Greek; stylistic points are deliberately omitted, since he makes no pretense to anything but a faithful rendering, but in fact the general tone of his English is good, often unadorned. Consequently, if we have a departure from the μελοτραπέζων, in which the commentary abundantly justifies; it is rendered ‘tapping (as sap from a root) this medicine of song against sleep’. Line 50 becomes ‘in extreme grief for their children’. This, I think, quite misses the point. The ancient authors mean that the scene of the vultures (or whatever the exact species of the birds may be), their grief and their robed nest takes place in a lonely spot, ‘away from the paths’ where men usually go; and that the fact that the particular word it agrees with signifies ‘grief’ and not, for instance, ‘bird’ or ‘nest’ is irrelevant, in the somewhat easy-going syntax of a Greek poet of the best age. At 123-5 we have, ‘Now when the wise seer of the army saw the two Atridae, twain in temper, having seen the harvest of the hearth, the Ancestors, the sowing the flames’. Again I disagree, and would translate rather ‘saw the two (birds),’ of different temper, he recognised the two warlike sons of Atreus in the devourers of the hare’. A little later, in 129, ἅπαξ is rendered ‘and then it is not there’, but the context is that of apposition, ‘dividing of the spoil’. In 276, the sense is on any reasonable explanation doubtful, for we are not sure what Aeschylus supposed Homer to mean by ἄσπορος κάρστων, and consequently what its connotation is. The contemporary poetry of Aristophanes would seem to offer what Cahen calls a ἐνίοτε ἀφθονίᾳ, exciexi here is hardly to be doubted. But I am far from convinced by the editor’s rendering ‘Can it be then that some swiftest-winged rumour has made my wife grow thick?’ However, he defends his decision to extend or mutilate two pages, and tells the reader the reference is.

In 302 and 303 Frankel refuses to see any proper names, rendering ‘and the light shot down over the Gorgon-eyed lake and reaching the mountain of the roaring gale’, again justifying himself in a lengthy note, the beginning of which at all events no one is like to quarrel with: ‘Poets are not always kind to their interpreters, or to topographers looking for straightforward identifications’. I disagree with the translation of 437, ‘it [the angry talk of the Geны] arising out of the mutterings of the people’, and side with the views of Paley and others which the note on the passage rejects. The Chorus mean, in my opinion, to say that anyone who has made himself so unpopular as Agamemon (see 456 ff), better as ‘that man’ has been cursed in due form; the mutterings about the war and its causes are so to speak the curse’s factor or business agent and have made payment on its behalf, a strange but not altogether unexampled application of the commercial in Greece. A Greek stratagem is nowhere more clearly expressed, than in the case ofGN. To see the true relation to another of the clauses has gone wrong in 443 and does not recognise that ὁδέποτε ὕπαντος is a quotation, the one faintly audible bit of what the people mutter. His note there shows an added ὕπαντος, whether on or therefore or not. In his rendering of 637 I think him definitely wrong; he translates ‘such a celebration is apart from the gods (of heaven)’. ‘Celebration’ might pass muster as an equivalent of τῇ, and the long note on the precise cleanness of making ἐπὶ δεσμόν mean ἐπὶ τὸν δεσμόν, but that ὕπαντο περ ἐν can mean superi remains unproved. But, right or wrong, the editor deserves thanks (as in many other places) for honestly calling attention to a difficulty. Whether his note is right or wrong, as such a place of less moment. At 899 the translation gives what is a possible and even likely supplement to the defective text, ‘now deeply and in true friendship loyal (do I approve of the old saying, “sweet”) is labour to who have brought to[o]o great a punishment (coloured and young [no point after 695]). If the translation is interesting; he renders ‘for I am well acquainted with that mirror, intercourse—I may pronounce image of a shadow those who seem most devoted to me’. At 972, ἄρα τῶν ἀρχομανίων more than a ‘husband’. 1026-7 are rendered, ‘did not establish destiny prevent my portion from winning more from the gods’, which certainly is a grammatical possibility, but I doubt if it be the most likely sense. I do not interpret to means we seek none of these interpretations of the gods’. But is it not rather ‘we need no one to interpret your prophecies’, i.e., what you have said so far is perfectly correct. I cannot agree with the translation ‘without cries of woe’ for ἀποκλαυομαι ἐν τούτῳ, and one feels the righting of the sentence and Frankel recognises the note. His interpretation (Vol. III, p. 526) is that ‘the bird does not cry with pain, since she was mercifully rescued at the last moment from the most terrible fate, death by the sharp blade’, and he closes the character of the nightingale’s lament in the end of the death of her son. I think this presses the special meaning of καίκας and its cognates too hard, and I think we are supposed that ἐπὶ means ‘except for’, as it does in Pindar, Nem. 7, 27 (Als is the form most Greek). At 1235, ἄδος μὴ τρίτη is translated ‘hellish mother’, and the difficulties discussed in a long note; but it seems to me that the central difficulty of the phrase is not untouched. Hades’ mother is a perfectly familiar mythological figure, Rheia, whose Kthoniasthéma does not resemble in the least the form note results in Frankel taking the solution of the none too easy phrase ὄν ἔκτισσαρχεῖν.

The authors of this book, one a scholar the other a physician, have devoted ten years to its preparation. Their purpose was 'to enable the medical student or doctor, and indeed all who are interested in the beginnings of science, to gain first-hand acquaintance with the original Greek'. They have made a good choice of some 150 medical works. The translation is fresh and readable and long stretches tolerably accurate. I read The Sacred Disease and The Nature of Man, for example, without misgiving.
But the version will not throughout stand up to the test of a close scrutiny of the text. In most cases the translation is inaccurate or sometimes incorrect. There is little sign of awareness of the difficulties inherent in making any valid contribution to the understanding of early science. There is sometimes an absence even of common sense. Thus in the writing here called The Science of Medicine, written from the following information (chap. 10): "The divisions of the body may be likened to a series of vessels, each containing within its various organs, some of which are harmful and some beneficial to their possessor." This physiological theory would have seemed very strange to the Hippocratic writers, and hence responsibility for it by consulting the Greek, where no equivalent of the word organs will be found. The tract On Ancient Medicine, here called, not badly, The Tradition of Medicine, contains information still more surprising. Here (chap. 14) it is stated that just about the end of the 4th century B.C. "so much has anything it may touch even eating away the clothes around the face." W. H. S. Jones thought that the sense of the Greek here was "eating through the covering of the eyeball," and since the Loeb edition of this author is one of the very few books referred to by the new translators it is a pity they did not ask themselves whether his rendering had the greater propriety.

It would be possible to find other similar lapses. It is not therefore surprising, but it is most regrettable, that the opening chapters of the book dealing with the Hippocratic Onchnaean are handled with carelessness and misunderstandings. It was above all to be desired that this key passage in the history of early science should survive intact.

B. FARRINGTON.


Many qualities combine to invest the work of Festugière with its rare distinction. In addition to accuracy and range of scholarship he has the gift of enthusiasm; while his various studies seem united by a common purpose, the renewal of faith in the work of the ancients, which is not for one who believes in its ultimate validity. Particularly gratifying is it, then, that he should have directed his powers of interpretation to a text so worthy of his attention as Ancient Medicine.

In Taylor's Varia Sacra (1811) turned the eyes of my generation to this work. The appearance (1922) of the first volume of W. H. S. Jones's Loeb Hippocrates gave us a convenient text and interpretation. Jones at that time remarked that the treatise, though much discussed, had never had a separate edfition for English readers, and he himself had made good in 1946 with his Philosophy and Medicine in Ancient Greece (The Johns Hopkins Press). This added something to the excellent contribution he had already made. To study Festugière, however, to be made to understand how much still remains to be done for the elucidation of the text. F. has been for the most part content to reprint Heiberg's text. It is in the commentary, to which the translation is subsidiary, that the strength of his work resides.

His method, the historical determination of the meaning of the key words, is nothing novel, but it is carried out with superb competence. No trouble is spared to discover what the writer understood by φόρμα, τύχη, διαφοράς, λογισμός, and so forth. Ten large pages of close print are devoted to the interpretation of the twenty lines of the first chapter. But by then the reader is in a position to understand the advance in theory and practice signalled by this little work. We are the more grateful when we remember the mists in which the subject was involved. Taylor's work bears witness that progress is going on from this work that the Ideal Theory antedated Plato. F. shows (confirming in this the conclusions of Gillespie and Jones) that the occurrence in Chapter XV of the famous phrase αὐτός τι ἐστὶ διαφοράς (454) is nothing more than a variant of the verb διαφοράς in 1170, a passage which has been taken as a hint towards the setting of the text. In a second impression it would be well to indicate the papyri by suffix-numbers: Π and Π' (especially when the latter is mis-printed, as in 534, as Π') are not satisfactory signs for distinguishing two documents that happen to preserve the same passage.

The Helena has always appealed to critics of a speculative turn of mind, and Prof. Grégoire does not disappoint on this count. His forty-six-page Introduction could have been

1 It is a pity that he did not refer to the case of JHS VIII, 322 f. in regard to v. 1507.
2 This also occurred, I believe, in Eowill's, 1909.
3 In part offered, by transposition, πόρφυρα νευ' Ἀλονὸς (546-7) instead of 546 f. (642-3); for γένος τοῦ it might be better to keep γένος of MSS. and dispense with the article.
4 Curiously, Festugière does not refer to vv. 1447 ff., which surely give strong support to his main contention.
pruned to the length normal in the Budd series without sacrifice of essential information, for few will accept his exaggerated emphasis on politics and Sicilian matters on which he places considerable weight in his general interpretation of the play, fewer still his fanciful association of Evagoras of Salamis with Teucer; this scene has its own ration d'être without the need for far-fetched a hypothesis.4

His text, set out with apparatus and full testimonia, is not unduly adventurous, but is spoiled by two crass metrical errors, the first an unlucky supplement for 186, (Δ Αναγεών), which adheres to the few sugg. of Wycherley in 1733; the second is line 974, which reads καλος φαντασματος τινος ἀποδίδων λήγη.6 He shows, especially in the choruses, marked dependence on Murray: his view on the difficult "Mountain Mother ode" (1301-65) and the supplements he gives for this and a few other antistrophe passages is that of all the evidence that can be brought to bear on the aetiology of the piece. Among his other emendations, none impress: samples are: φιλος (φιλος Λ.), 90: ἄραιν (ἄραιν Λ.), 289: πόρος σιών σιών σιών (πόρος σιών σιών σιών Λ.), 359: [κατ] ἄνω (κατά [κατά] λέγει [κατά] (πόρος Λ.) 993: τέων (τέω Λ.) 924: θείου (Ἀθηναίοι Λ.), 1127. I doubt especially his re-writing of 1104, his cures for 1512 and 1590 and his λ' in anastrophe in 654, while I am puzzled by his note on the apparatus on 616. It is surprising to find that his emendation at 1086 and Vertell's ἀντίκερως at 312 are rejected, but Nauck's specimen κοινωνίας adopted at 112. To be consistent with his note on p. 87, 905 should be in square brackets; in another printing the false reference on p. 62 should be rectified.

The translation misses, in my reading of it, the effect of some lines; e.g. the doubled κἀνος in 125 is lost, 299 is wrongly taken as a wish, in 993 he renders something different from its text; and there are other blemishes. His notes are lengthy and not always relevant, but some (e.g. that on Sirens in 169 and that on cranes in 1405) are interesting. A reference on 116 to art-representations of Menelaus' meeting with Helen (e.g. the Dwarf Painter's vase in Beazley, ARV, 651 (4)) would have been in point.

Though therefore notwithstanding shortcomings the work has its uses, it leaves no doubt of the need for much judicious scholarship in elucidating this difficult play. John G. Griffith.


This work is hardly an edition so much as a series of comments on conjectures of others interlarded with jottings in support of O. C. Gilbert's readings of his own that the author sees fit to exhibit. A slight preface, a list of editorial characteristics, and some remarks on the text complete the gallimaufray. Little or nothing to the point is said on cardinal problems of excess or the relation of the play to the very similar I.T., no note is made of the earlier fragments of which any literature that might have illuminated his path in these matters. They are, one must suppose, too unspeculatable for him; his interest lies elsewhere. In his re-writing of the text he is at least consistent with his own heretical dogma (p. 82) it is a preraccious matter to emend some (p. 172). Thus he will not tamper with one word if a whole phrase can be transformed by his caprice: to take random examples: ἐργάνων ... ὕποργυρ ὅς ὅσοι (399) becomes (ἡ) ... ὄντα ἐργασίαν πῶς ὄντα ἐργασίαν πῶς (p. 118) emerges as πῶς ἐργασίαν πῶς ὄντα πῶς (p. 418) emerges as πῶς ἐργασίαν πῶς ὄντα πῶς (p. 943) is twisted and expanded to ὅπως ὃς ὃς ὃς (441) undergoes a metamorphosis. The very nature of the comments account... to have space of the fifty lines. So the... the aetiological bacchanal proceeds, culminating in an orgy of fourteen corrections in the nine lines 1325/33.

Not that a single obelus, he cannot acquire in the modest decay of dots to mark the real or imaginary, but must foist on Euripides some eight trimeters, none good and the worst (e.g. his 1494) banal. He will gratify a preconceived idea of continuity by the wholesale transposition of strophe β and antistrophe β in the first stasimon.

He does, however, note that the evidence is not always accurately presented: in line 98 there stands in part, at least, of our tradition the little word ἐκδωρ, extra studium in stichomythia. It may perhaps seem spurious to a casual reader, but G. looked up Jebb's note on Soph. Tr. 425 he must have paused, for the hesitation is in point: is Helen in this play to tell a chance-comer of an old love-affair of hers? But trampled underfoot in the plethora of emendation, ἐκδωρ has vanished from the text without so much as a word of obituary in the Commentary.

The hunt within this jungle for suggestions deserving of favourable comment is not made any more agreeable by the recurrent petulancies and stylistic affections with which C. commences in Menander, which was reviewed by Gomme in CR LXI, 94, discusses principally the Heroi, Epitrepontes, Samia, and Georgos. The subject of the third is another of Webster's groups of plays (a grouping to some extent must overlap), the 'Plays of Social Criticism', which includes the Kolon, Eumenides, and the Bacchae. From the last the attempt is made to arrange forty-four plays into a chronological framework. The fourth, entitled 'Plays of Adventure and Satire', is concerned with the Apistos (which Webster regards as the original of the Acharnians), the Div Exapaton, the Kolon, and the First Delphic Festival. Webster traces the influence on Menander of earlier drama, mainly Classical Tragedy and Midye Comedy (in discussing which he makes full use of the evidence of South Italian Vases). He then estimates the effect of Aristophanes' account of Menander's dramaturgy and of the ethical writings of the Peripatetic school on his characterisation. The final chapter appraises Menander's position in relation to contemporary philosophical concepts. Menander was not bound by Peripatetic influence, but, so far as his dramatic activity can be demonstrated. But his comedy has a new seriousness, the result of the importation of philosophical thought. The book has a full index, and a very useful index locorum.

Notes of Books.
NOTICES OF BOOKS

There are many points of detail in this book with which scholars will disagree, and naturally so, when reconstructions are not susceptible of proof, except by still further discoveries of papyri. It is not within the scope of a short review to discuss such points of future disagreement. As a rule, however, it seems to me that the catchwords of this work of Dr. G. W. P. Eland, "CR LXI, 94" of Webster's suggestion (p. 36) that Simias in the Epitrapezoi is a slave. Gomme notes that in the only scene in which Simias certainly appears, the words ωδήν φρίζει (480 K) make against Gomme's objections: 470, τάξεως (I. 69) is not necessarily sympathetic, and the emphasis on ωδήν (I. 76, where the text is certain) is not noticed by Gomme.

Gomme (CR LXI, 94) believes that Webster is too mechanical in his reconstructions. But the texts demand full use of the mechanics of arithmetic and of arguments based on parallel scenes. Menander used the traditional comic situations; broadly, a mechanical plot can be reconstructed mechanically. Gomme's objections (pp. 53, 54) are often stronger than the text; it is improbable that a second should act in the same way in a second play, and he doubts the value of a guess. But with stock situations, the action of one play is likely to be the same as that of another. The similarity of the texts is not very strong, and the comparison is often a doubtful matter. Menander's characters are mainly stock types, but Webster (e.g. p. 281) appreciates that they have a distinguishing originality, and though their actions may be the same, their difference in manner and speech is the interest. Webster's characters, drawn from his wide knowledge of the ancient and artistic developments of the fifth and fourth centuries, provide illumination which students fail to find elsewhere.

A work as hypothetical as the reconstruction of plays demands, over and above the factual and historical research and accurate observation of detail, a sympathetic insight and an extreme sensitivity to nuances. These qualities Webster displays, and it is to his credit that he is willing to publish his results, although some are as yet incapable of being stated with complete definiteness, and no such over-confidence would ever offend his spirit. His work is a work, short forthwith, on fourth century drama. Meanwhile the six chapters of this book provide material which will long be studied by scholars whose interest concern Greek and Roman comedy.

J. N. T. CARLTON


The first volume of Gow's Theocritus consists of a long introduction (pp. xv-lxxxiv), text, and translation. Gow first examines the problems of the poet's life and style, and the results of this investigation are based on the discoveries of the "Early Comedy," which is closely related to the comedies of Greek, Sicilian, or "Theocritus than with Sicily." He maintains that the floricul Ol. 124 (i.e. 284-281 B.C.) is by Gomme. Schol. Id. 4. Arg. is too early, but does not exclude the possibility that Theocritus began writing at that date. O. 124, 125, 126, 127. He held to the tradition of the names Praxagoras and Simichos, which are evidently connected with the former (xvi.; see this is rather surprising, as he rejects the theory of the 'Mas- cera de bucolique' (vol. II, pp. 129 and 65, vol. I, p. xxxi, n. 2). If Sidkydes of I. 7 is Asclepiades, and Simichos is Theocritus, (and Gow believes that this is an error of the text), then Simonides may be one of the names of the poet's father, if only a nickname (the snub-nosed) used parallel with the real name Praxagoras. For the use of praxagoros in Greek and Latin poetry (e.g. id. 25.197. 15.68, Apollon. Rhod. III. 4. 50, and Alc. 55, etc., this will be found in Eindt's edition of Theocritus in the Cambridge University Press, 1930, 6s.

Gow's views as to the relations of Theocritus with Apol- lonius Rhodius and Callimachus (pp. xxii f.) raise serious objections. It is now clear that Apollonius in certain passages of his Argonautica is dependent upon Theocritus and Callimachus (cf. Pfeiffer, Callimachus, Aetia I. 7-21 and Pfeiffer's note at bottom of p. 17); if, as Gow believes (vol. I, p. xxi, and vol. II, pp. 231, 382), in Id. 13 and the second part of Id. 22 Theocritus took episodes from the first and second book of the Argonautica and rephrased them in his own words, so that his work would place Theocritus impossibly late, for the Aetia after all appear to be in their earliest form a work of the sixties. The only reason Gow gives for this view is that Apollonius would not have written such imperfect poetry had he had before him the highly finished work of the master. They both agree in certain grounds, are, of course, insufficient. Apollonius after all did not make any better use of the parts of the Aetia he imitated. In fact, if we exclude the spurious Id. 25, there is no real dependence of Theocritus upon the work of Apollonius (as in shorter striking), and this should lead us to believe that he is the oldest of the great Alexandrian poets.

The second part of the introduction contains a clear and extensive exposition of the Medieval and Renaissance manu- scripts of the papyri and other early sources of Theocritus. Gow has not worked on the manuscripts himself, and the information he gives is almost entirely derived from others, especially from Gallavotti, who published his 1946 text of Theocritus on a full inspection of nearly all the manuscripts. Gow, following Gallavotti (who in this matter was guided by Wende's edition of the Theocritus Scholaria) distinguishes three families of manuscripts (the Vatican, the Ambrusian, and the Laurentian), and shows how many manuscripts change allegiance from one section to another. As P. Maas has shown (Gnomon VI, 561 f.), they all go back to a common hyparchetype which is later than that of our papyri and the texts used by Apollonius. With such a complex codicological question it is not surprising that Gow gives no full stemma; but even where he does give a stemma codicum in skeleton (p. lili), or reproduces Gallavotti's stemma of the Vatican and Laurentian families (p. lvii), he does not give the "Significant Errors," which would enable the reader to understand his reasoning.

Gow next rightly tells us that the language of Theocritus is a composite of artificial dialects, and that the poet was not consistent even in his own usage of it. Yet against the consensus of the manuscripts he has chosen for his text from Id. 12, 22 and 23 (though we know really nothing of what is meant by the ωδήν 565 of the hypothesis to Id. 12) and in other idylls he changes the dialectal forms (again against the consensus of the manuscripts) for the sake of uniformity (e.g. Id. 16, 29, 29, which he writes in Menander, instead of Μοσχός in the analogy of Id. 58, 69 and 107, disregarding the fact that in i. 3 the manuscripts have Μοσχός which Wilamowitz changed into Μοσχός. One could have wished in this introduction for a chapter on the nature and the art of the poetry of Theocritus. For nowhere in this long and scholarly book do we find clearly put together or adequately stressed all the artistic elements which constitute the poetry of the greatest Alexandrian poet or the place that he occupies in the history of Greek and Western literature.

The text which follows is generally sound and is based on a judicious choice of readings and on later emendations. The most striking feature is that we find there none of the new 'cruces' which were put into the text (e.g. in Id. 25) by the Bucolic Grecian. Some of them have been satisfactorily explained and abolished, but others—and the majority—are unconsciously removed. Thus for example in Id. 11, 60 we are told that οὖνος (which is after all a conjecture of Paley, as οὖνος is in Kop and οὖνος in QALNE) reinforcing the repeated ωδήν is plausible, and the limitative γί is appropriate. But μακροθύρεα remains an unknown form for μακροθύρεα and the limitative γί in that position is improbable (cf. Dermont, Greek Particle, 146 f.) or again in Id. 14, 70 which he writes in Menander, instead of Μοσχός in the analogy of Μοσχός in the analogy of Μοσχός. However he uses the l. 562 θαλάσσης θυμός which is another instance of his not understanding the exact sense even of that...

On the other hand Gow rightly includes in his text a number of new 'cruces'. Certainly I know of no satisfactory explanation or emendation of Id. 17, 2 (though the dialectal point is late). But even though the choice of readings and emendations is generally judicious, certain important points are not sufficiently elucidated. The 'N' of Πολεμίων, which is an unknown word, and a very few brilliant emendations overlooked. The most striking example of the latter is in Id. 18, 29, where
NOTICES OF BOOKS

Eichstädt's μέγας δόμα (for the υπόλοιπον, like, of Ps. 73 and τιμίος τις of our manuscripts) is disregarded, an emendation supported by the new papusus published by Gow as an Addendum in p. 257 of Vol. I in which l. 29, υπόλοιπον, appears, and Virgil's Er. 5, 33 see me it funguitur arbor. A cypress tree can adorn a garden and comes to mind when we see it called in a fielid.

Gow's own emendations are, as he himself tells us, few and on the whole unimportant. Some are not easy to accept. Thus in Id. 15, l. 27 he emends δόμα (which is in all MSS. and not according to the Lycian), to δόμαν, Reschössbach's emendation τῷ χρόνῳ for the τῷ χρόνῳ of all MSS. and Pep. 3 in the following line. One is always inclined to suspect two successive emendations, especially when the φως of Ahrens is palaeographically much better than δῶμον, and gives the same sense. (One emends δόμαν to δόμα, as l. 14. In l. 261, 12: 14, 11, 13, the δοσίς . . . διαφως . . . διάφως.) That one bed is necessary is obvious (cf. l. 131), but we need not alter the text in order to obtain that sense; it is already there. Μήν . . . 84 in l. 128 convey little meaning, and are perhaps the same (cf. e.g. l. 1, 128, Soph. Tr. 226) particularly as the same ψάργα is reported before both (cf. Denniston, Greek Particles, 376). I should translate accepting the Ahrens emendation: 'mine is the bedspread for the fair Adonis; the Cyprian lies on it and so does Adonis with the rose arms.' Thus we also avoid the rather unsympathetic picture of the embracing Gods.

The apparatus, though mainly based on the readings of Gallavotti, is much tidier and easier to use. But Gallavotti has made a few of the old mistakes of Ahrens, as e.g. on the rendering of the major part of the quotations to Δικτύων, where 8QM3 is given as having τῶν which must surely be υπόλοιπον as Willamowitz and Legrand tell us.

The translation which faces the text is not, as the author tells us, a literal translation, but an adjunct to the commentary; it aims to show what is not in the text. It underlines the parts of the text that are opaque to the reader, and be the poets meaning. It is both successful and helpful with only a few slips, such as Id. 18, 30, where θεοφορούσος πατήρ is translated as 'Thracian steed' (in the commentary the right meaning is, of course, given), or Id. 11, 35 where δοσίς is translated as 'snowdrops white' (a meaning which is not supported and explained in the commentary). But the ψάργα here is rather the white lily, the ilium candidum, and it seems 'scapes in Greece in summer; the ψάργα is the poppy, the papaver somniferum, in Spring, in certain parts in early spring (almost amounting to winter), and this, it seems to me, is the contrast we find in l. 27.

Volume II consists of the commentary (pp. 1-357), a bibliographical appendix, indices, and plates. The commentary carries the weight most in this publication, and is indeed remarkable in many ways. It gives a great deal of information on a vast number of subjects, linguistic, stylistic, metrical, etc., and also historical, archaeological, topographical, elements of material civilisation, folk-lore, magic, etc. It should be read when examining the language of the Theocritus, the history of which is admirably traced, as well as the new sense the poet gives to words, his constant novelty of expression and far-fetched vocabulary, which are borrowed from his predecessor's commentaries much of value. Perhaps the least satisfactory treatment of this he is a little austere, occasionally even dogmatic, for parallel or opposite views to his own are on the whole rather seldom presented to the reader.

On the other hand less appreciation is shown for the structure and character of certain of the poems of Theocritus. In Id. 29, for example, we are told that Theocritus seems to go out of his way to place the Dioscuri in an unfavourable light (p. 384). But this is certainly not so. Gow admits the lacuna Willamowitz most convincingly pointed out after l. 21 (cf. Kastor only in D, Λουκός in all other MSS.; I. 186 Καστόρ only in D, καστός Tr. M.) and agrees that Castor is speaking in l. 17. This is quite evident—as P. Maass has pointed out—that the Dioscuri should be reconciled with their opponents in the part of the poem which fell in that lacuna, though it is displayed there the true Greek magnanimity towards the Acheiropoia, and that the θεοφορούσος of the latter finally caused them to have their voice heard. Thus Castor in l. 171 η 18 ἦλθεν κρησθῇ πόλεως πολύ, etc., are unimpeachable, and was ultimately punished with death.

In a commentary of this length and nature there are, of course, many points on which one can disagree; moreover one cannot find the answer to certain problems or clues hoped to be solved (e.g. why is Asclepiades so greatly honoured in l. 46, whom we now know to have been among the enemies of the Callimachian school of poetry—cf. Pfeiffer, Callimachus, schol. Fl. Ad. Ap. II, 45 in a poem which a few lines later, (II. 45 f.) avows allegiance to that school, etc.). But in spite of these objections Gow's Theocritus as a whole is a work of first-rate importance, a monument of erudition and patience for which all classical scholars and all lovers of the poetry of Theocritus must be grateful; it honours Cambridge scholarship, and will be the standard book on the subject for years to come. In conclusion, I should like to add that the indices and bibliography are magnificently complete, and the plates which follow make more easily intelligible a number of passages in the text.

C. A. TRAPANIS.

Epictetus. Entretiens, livre II. Texte établi et traduit par J. SOULIÉ. Pp. 118 x 2. Paris: Société d'édition 'Les Belles Lettres', 1949. The basic task of the editor of Epictetus is straightforward. Sackur and Schenk have done this last well. But the later MSS. possess derive directly or indirectly from the Codex Bodleianus (S.), and need to be called in only when the archetype is mutilated or meaningless or gives an otherwise doubtful reading. Accordingly for the foundations of his new edition M. Soulhé has used and hand-collated; it a high tribute to the scholarship of Schenk, who was indeed the first to collate this MS., that corrections of the earlier recension are few and far between. He has not attempted a detailed re-examination of the later hands which have added to this MS.; hat is of secondary importance. But he has examined all the other MSS. down to the end of the sixteenth century in sufficient detail to confirm Schenk's claims for S. and to satisfy himself that five of them are the sources of all the other MSS. which he has found in the remainder of the tradition. These (PVBF) has used and hand-collated out. In all this his work is likely to be definitive. There remains the problem of the codex recorded by Upton and since lost. This contains a number of unique readings; its place in the tradition is of secondary importance. But it see his principle of discrimination. There are also some inaccuracies in his citations of editions, and one or two passages which his reading might have improved. At 1, 33 Kroener's edition is preferred to Schenk's, and is the only edition which does justice to the MS. In 46 he does correctly 2 φιλοσόφων, which is as likely as anything else.

As a translation, I would expect, is excellent, careful, and at the same time fluent. Φρονοφόρος is fairly rendered 'la personne morale' φρονότητα are promotions; at 11, 4 the word is not translated and the passage slightly misrepresented. 'Fonctionne' for ὑπερήφανος omits the element of profession. One or two details may be mentioned. At 1, 4 he takes ἔργων as active and personal with Upton rather than passive, as applied to the syllogism with Wolf, probably though not certainly correct. At 1, 8 φιλοσόφων is Schenk before Salmasius. At 22, 31 Capp's addition of αύτος is not mentioned, though M. Soulhé translates as if it were there. M. Soulhé is sparing of his own emendations, but the vexed passages gives us ὑπερήφανος, which is as least as likely as anything else.

As a translation, one would expect it to be excellent, careful, and at the same time fluent. 'φρονοφόρος' is fairly rendered 'la personne morale'. 'φρονοφόρος' are promotions; at 11, 4 the word is not translated and the passage slightly misrepresented. 'Fonctionne' for ὑπερήφανος omits the element of profession. One or two details may be mentioned. At 1, 4 he takes ἔργον as active and personal with Upton rather than passive, as applied to the syllogism with Wolf, probably though not certainly correct. At 1, 8 φιλότιμος is Schenk before Salmasius. At 22, 31 Capp's addition of αὐτοῦ is not mentioned, though M. Soulhé translates as if it were there. M. Soulhé is sparing of his own emendations, but the vexed passages gives us ὑπερήφανος, which is as least as likely as anything else.
hand opinions (19), to realise that it does matter what we learn and not merely that we learn (21). His shrewd telltale at the Academics for saying πιστεύειν ἂν ὅτι οὐδὲς πιστεύεισθε (20, 5) has its contemporary targets, such as Bertrand Russell’s friend who said she was a sceptic, and could not understand what she was talking about. Of them, however, there is his sense of life as a journey with many inns on the way (23), so like and yet so different from Jesus’ words ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ Πατρός μου μοι διὸ πολλοί σαν (John 14, 2), and his recognition that God does not live in temples made with hands. We call it the life of the mind (18). We are fortunate in possessing in Schenkl (1916), Oldfather (1926), and now M. Souléthre three reliable editions. It is the more to be regretted that death has robbed us of the two volumes that remained to come from the pen of the last.

JOHN FERGUSON.


This volume begins a new series, papyri discovered at Antinopolis in the winter 1913-14. Edited by Mr. C. H. Roberts, it offers a representative selection containing much that is illustrative of the papyrological and biblical scholar, as to the papyrologist and ancient historian. The notes are full without ever being superfluous, and palaecographical comment, as one would expect from an editor of such skill and experience, is both ample and judicious. Each papyrus has been consulted, and every papyrus seemed likely to be illuminated by their specialist knowledge, so that the whole edition bears striking witness to that spirit of cooperation which is most evident in papyrology and to that high tradition of scholarship which over fifty years of imperial rule won for Egypt.

The O.T. supplies most of the theological texts, of which there are eight, amongst them the first substantial contribution made by the papyri to the Book of Proverbs, seventeen third-century fragments shown to contain a translation of a pre-Oriephic text of the Septuagint. Two fragments of Ezekiel are compared with the Scheide papyrus to which they show considerable similarity, though marked divergences betray an influence not represented in any other MS. Fragment of St. Mark’s Gospel contains one variant reading of interest, and a papyrus preserving the greater part of the Second Epistle of St. John has several uncommon nominative, one of them unprecedented. A sheet from a miniature de luxe codex gives us the fifth MS. of the Acta Pauli found in Egypt, and the second edition possibly belongs to a Latin version of the lost portion of the same work.

The second section comprises eight new classical texts. A real problem is presented by the relationship between the recto and verso of No. 29, of which Wace concludes: ‘the publication of another fragment of the same codex does not entirely resolve. It may be of interest to point out en passant that PMich. VIII 597, 8 now provides a parallel to the dative ζει[εη]/ζει in line two. Of the remaining papyri in this section, the only one which is entirely satisfactory is No. 37, of the mysteries’, whose possibilities are thoroughly examined, and which may well be an extract from the epitome of Dionysius Halicarnasseus, a narrative of the Coriolius story bearing unmistakable resemblances, which the footnotes illustrate, to the Antiquitates Romanae. A Latin legal fragment whose elegant hand contrasts violently with its shocking orthography and inconsistent abbreviation concludes this section.

Eight papyri contain fragments of extant classical authors. No. 29 gives us one new reading of Odyssey x, 165, one of the most important to the great lacunae in the Iliad. A fragment of Thucydides VIII has several new readings, one probably true. Xenophon is represented by a Symposium fragment of double interest, for Mr. Roberts plausibly illustrates that this is the only MS. of a parchment roll used for a work of Greek literature in Egypt, and that the hand is quite unparalleled—so as to suggest that the roll was imported. No. 27 contains a passage not found elsewhere in the many papyri of Demosthenes, of which there are over twenty. A fragment of Hippocrates is perhaps ‘the local practitioner’s code mècon’. Finally, there are five fragments of the Georgics, the first to be unearthed in Egypt, and one from Aeneid XII.

There follows a cross-section of documentary papyri, several of which are fragments of documents to which our knowledge of the institutions and administration of Roman and Byzantine Egypt. Three of them refer to the logistae; they prove his existence at Antinoplis, illustrate his position vis-à-vis the municipal magistrates, and show him performing his official duties. A return of patrimonialia illustrates the continued existence of the strategos as late as A.D. 339, and an official account of expenditure contains interesting additions to known technical terms and titles. The prefect petitioned in No. 35, C. R. 59, Fortunius, has a doubling of A. Stein’s list in his recent ‘Die Praefekten von Agypten.’ Of the remaining documents perhaps the most significant are the declaration by a guild of silversmiths, seemingly a direct result of Dioclétian’s Edict De Maximiis Pristis, and the receipt for repayment of a loan, which throws light on the practice of paying for requisitioned goods and also gives another example of the formula adopted to get over the difficulty of dating in the period of uncertainty preceding Chrypos. A receipt for resit militaris is unique in having a prescriptive clause, and the further letters further illuminates the manufacture of textiles in Egypt.

An Appendix, contributed by Professor W. D. McDharry, contains four Hebrew fragments (47-50) which ‘may well fall somewhere within the period of the Greek papyri’ (p. 50, 6th cent., three of which are identified as extracts from I Kings, II Kings and the Book of Job, the fourth being as yet undecipherable.

B. K. REES.


Four years have passed since the publication of Professor Lejeune’s Traite. Its author’s reputation in linguistic and philological, was borne out by the fewness of the detailed additions and corrections which earlier critics could adduce; and after their meagre harvest further gleaning is not likely to be profitable. In general, one can only echo the conclusion of the author, that the point of its career, and express the conviction that it has fulfilled the destiny then predicted for it and taken its place as a classic exposition of Greek phonetics.

One of the outstanding merits of the book is to combine a great width of material with clarity and firmness of outline. The author, with a skill that is his own, has presented his subject according to well-established linguistic principles and a well-established method of arrangement. An introduction devoted to general principles, exemplified by parts dealing with consonants, the vowels and the phonetics of the word both in isolation and as an element in the sentence. In each part appropriate subdivisions bring together sounds of similar type, and lead from the system of Indo-European through its development in ancient Greek to its brief description in the post-classical, Byzantine, and modern periods. The clarity of the book is by no means due to its orderly, even orthodox arrangement, but also to constant recurrence to the guiding principles of the introduction, and by the exhaustive treatment of the text, together with the excellent indices and table of contents, Professor Lejeune is able, in effect, to present several arrangements of his material simultaneously. There is, for example, no section of the book dealing in general, of course, in the chapters and the author may discover the chapter which the author would have written had his method afforded place for it. There are (perhaps regrettable) no chapters on the alphabet or on pronunciation; the former lack is compensated by the relevant entries under Pronunciation deals with faults of the current French pronunciation of Greek.

A most welcome and unusual feature of the Traite is its careful unravelling of the chronology of the Greek sound-changes. After a presentation of the facts of absolute and relative dating in historical phonetics, the chronology of each phenomenon is established where evidence permits, and the scattered paragraphs are brought together in an index entry which could in itself serve as the preliminary sketch for further research.

An important innovation is the constant use of principles of general experimental phonetics to explain the probable course of the Greek sound-changes. These explanations are based on Grammion’s Traité de phonetique, to which frequent references are made. The basis of explanation which introduce the treatment of each class of sounds are sometimes too summary to be useful to a reader without initiation in phonetics. How, for example, would such a reader understand the term ‘force articulatoria’ appearing to which Greek articulation is said to differ? Here excessive brevity goes with over-technicality of expression; elsewhere the reverse is sometimes the case. On p. 12 the formulation of the progressive nature of sound-changes—‘Ces altérations partielles s’ajoutent les unes aux autres, et, au bout d’un nombre suffisant de générations, le changement se trouve acquis’—could lead
the inexcuseable to think that there is some criterion other than mere ossification for judging the completeness of sound-changes. A similar inexactitude is seen in the paragraph (p. 13) distinguishing conditioned and unconditioned sound-changes. This distinction, useful as it can be, is not absolute nor easy to define precisely; there are changes which can be regarded conditioned or unconditioned according to the method of analysis used. So, when Professor Lejeune gives as his example of unconditioned change 'l’amusement d’une sifflante intervalecalaire en grec commun' he overlooks the fact that the term 'interactional' is only a set of terms whose present use is meant to be the first of several, with the aim of consolidating the ground covered in Aeschylus and Athens (p. 7). It is in five parts; their captions are Kinship, Matriarchy, Communism, The Heroic Age, and Honor; in each there is much entertainment and also instruction. All the parts, and the scheme in which they are combined, are open to criticism of form and of detail, partly no doubt of the kinds which the author seems, candidly and modestly enough, to suspect, and partly of others, it seems to me. Chapters I and II, on the Classificatory System and Totemism, could be called over-simplified. The arguments in favour of Morgan have been strengthened. But it is not merely through bourgeois intragence that belief is withheld from The Primitive Tribe. The belief that the Pueblo Hopi has probably left traces in Greece. But it is hasty, and, I think, dangerous, to conclude that 'snake-worship' is 'totemism in a modified form' (p. 20). Later a better but quite different explanation is given (p. 215). It is such a suggestion that makes the document sociologically precious; it is, beside, too anthropocentric. Certainly the animals have their social stresses and even snobishnesses. Animal life might also supply conditions. The facts would have changed; what is now no longer the case that it was not probably in the excellent section on moon-worship (p. 210). There are cursory judgments, confused arguments, and imperfections in documentation; for example, on the Achaenians (pp. 305-432), where the cardinal reference, Arrian, Periplus XVIII, 4, for the Indians (p. 96) near the Cauca/Greek civilisation (p. 345); on θηλατον (p. 172), now brilliantly explained by M. Ch. Autun, who is never mentioned, and the Ιλιον, hardly now after work of Professor Th. Gaster and others to be identified as Trojans (p. 401); on the text of the Homeric poems which had lost their unity; we are not told that they had never possessed it (p. 574), a good point made as if it were new (I made it in print myself in 1939, and I were not the first); and on other more important subjects, such as the neglect of Bacchae, too important to be given here; but what is really important, I think, the three times, of Professor H. J. Rose on Hephaestus, of Mr. D. P. Costello, himself a Marxist, on tribal organisation, and of Mrs. N. K. Chadwick and Dr. Rosamund E. M. Harding on poetry, Grecian and non-Grecian. The point is this: with reference to Di lectus, the work is a vast, in Einzelstudien, and a little disconnected. On every part, however, Professor Thomson has thrown some new light, but perhaps especially by his comparison, in the tradition of Jane Harrison, of 'anthropology and the classical'. The book has a high tone and not an academic-cult and snake-cult, perhaps on land-tenure, and certainly on poetic origins, he has used a keen mind to use effective. His criticisms of other scholars are amusing and often victorious. But he tends to let the Marxist Imprimatur count instead of care...
and self-criticising. An opponent of sufficient learning and skill might easily make the book seem far worse than it is. To treat this great subject well, a vast and intimate knowledge concerning a score of ancient oriental languages is really needed. Often the truth is, so far as I may judge, approximately guessed, but not much more. It is surprising that M. Ch. Autran's great work Homoires..., which began to appear in 1938, is overlooked, all the more since it ought to have seemed very relevant and very sympathetic.

It was not easy to cover so many topics in the space and the time available. But I think the attempt has usefully mapped the territory to be explored. All these matters should be considered, and in some sense considered together. Certainly co-operative research is needed, and certainly the conditions of the modern world play a part in the need. They will show it better when they are errors than when they are confusions, for truth notoriously emerges more easily from error. There is some danger of confusion in the omissions, for example concerning epic verse. It is misleading to say little or nothing about the question whether the hexameter can have been originally a Greek metre, or about the strong probability that the Homeric tradition had a long prehistory in very civilised oriental centres, quite different from the simple, partly civilised feudal society of the Homeric age. It is also misleading to give no hint of the rich source of Homeric commentary in oriental languages. Few who had not read Bacher would think from the present book that he had, the discoverer of the right idea, and two placed religion first in a cause of historical events. Professor Thompson, starting from Bacher, whose friend and successor Morgan himself was, naturally finds difficulty in maintaining the communist line. He can hardly help being forced to persuade a materialist, perhaps even to try to persuade two masters at once. Then learning might get full advantage of his intellectual power and imaginative sympathy. He would have less embarrassment, and he would be freer to use his reason, and a more effective, method.

"I am not asking anyone to argue that human rhythm originated from the use of tools", writes Professor Thompson (p. 445). The chapter after that is called "The Ritual Origin of Greek Epic", "religious devotions were subject under the influence of music to hysterical seizures" (p. 450). Then, in this, and in many other books, text is the medium of expression; and of course it is not misleading to give no hint of the rich source of Homeric commentary in oriental languages.

Now, instead of speaking of a "right idea", we should be speaking of a religious devotions were subject under the influence of music to hysterical seizures" (p. 450). Then, in this, and in many other books, text is the medium of expression; and of course it is not misleading to give no hint of the rich source of Homeric commentary in oriental languages.

"The ritual origin of Greek Epic" (p. 445). The chapter after that is called "The Ritual Origin of Greek Epic", "religious devotions were subject under the influence of music to hysterical seizures" (p. 450). Then, in this, and in many other books, text is the medium of expression; and of course it is not misleading to give no hint of the rich source of Homeric commentary in oriental languages.

The ritual origin of Greek Epic" (p. 445). The chapter after that is called "The Ritual Origin of Greek Epic", "religious devotions were subject under the influence of music to hysterical seizures" (p. 450). Then, in this, and in many other books, text is the medium of expression; and of course it is not misleading to give no hint of the rich source of Homeric commentary in oriental languages.

The ritual origin of Greek Epic" (p. 445). The chapter after that is called "The Ritual Origin of Greek Epic", "religious devotions were subject under the influence of music to hysterical seizures" (p. 450). Then, in this, and in many other books, text is the medium of expression; and of course it is not misleading to give no hint of the rich source of Homeric commentary in oriental languages.

Prophecy is a development of possession. The hystericale seizure assumes the form of a prophetic trance, in which the patient becomes a medium in the sense of a "prophet", a "god of spirit" (pp. 460-1). The common speech of savages has a strongly marked rhythm and a lifting melodic accent (p. 439). Apollo... combined prophecy with music because in primitive society music is the vehicle for all forms of popularisation, including the prophetic trance" (p. 439). Nevertheless "Greek civilisation... was the fruit of struggle... the force that drove it forward was the class-struggle" (p. 432). "With the growth of class inequalities people were driven to console themselves with the belief of recovering their lost heritage in an illusory world beyond the grave" (p. 347).

These surprising discussions do not all cohere with each other, or with materialism. Yet there seems to be a tendency in the right direction. Perhaps the heavy metal of communistic doctrine weighs too much. Surely it must eventually. On the Homeric question Professor Thomon writes, "The separatists are right in accepting the evidence; the unitarists are wrong in perceiving it to misinterpret it. I find myself in the comfortable if unfamiliar position of being moderately博文 by necessity and necessity by chance" (p. 564). For all that, it is the position where he belongs.

W. F. J. KNIGHT


In carrying out the thorough revision necessary to bring Bury's work up to date, Meiggs has made a remarkable tour de force. The sections on Mycenae and the Achaeans have been rewritten, and in other places additions to our knowledge or changes of view necessitated (not merely made attractive) by new evidence have been duly noticed; and this has been done actually without alteration to the pagination, so that page references to the second edition are still valid. Only in cases of absolute necessity is a page or two added, numbered (e.g. 396A, 396B). The notes, on the other hand, have been increased by some fifteen pages of condensed summaries of evidence and references to sources or modern works. As in Bury's original notes, important passages from oriental sources are translated: e.g. the Tawagawas letter and the Egyptian account of the migration. There are also new illustrations and a new coloured dialect-map, after Buck.

The new edition, in short, attains its object of giving an up-to-date introduction to the advanced study of Greek history; and the house of Macmillan has added to the already immense value of its classical list by producing such a book even now at a price as low as 16s.

Inevitably there are some few errors and loose ends. On Minoan chronology, Bury's text on p. 14 and n. is contradicted by M.'s new n. 2 to p. 12. Generally, wherever Bury muddled he has been put right. Tutors will, for instance, no longer be able to make the result of the raid on Halieis a test of whether their pupils have read Thucydides or only Bury-Ephorus. But there remains a few minor misprints. Bury due for correction. '30' for the property qualification of drs. 2000 (p. 832, margin) was misleading and even, and in chronological table. E.g. 'Heads' (pp. 68-9) is not indexed, though Odyssey is in the index of Homeric themes, p. 749 of Proverbs, 828, 833; the references to Thucydides stop in 411 (add refs. to pp. 501, 504-10). On p. 898 (n. to p. 796), for 'daughter of Memnon' read 'widow of Memnon'; and for Plut. Al. 22 'read 21'. But as Tarn allows the words 'drown' and 'island', maybe he does not.

On p. 843 (392 n. e), for 'Megaera read 'Corinth'. On p. 844 the muddled order of events in 370-6 has been altered, but is still wrong. Here, incidentally, in the text, it should be noted that the word 'pseudo-auditor', did, may sometimes be taken to mean the current of feeling in Athens (p. 500). It was the culmination of a long series of complaints and disappointments (cf. Plut. Alc. 35, Dioc. XIII, 73-4). The implied slur on the Athenian character is, as often so, unarranted. 366-5's un. should be replaced by a reference to Os. Pop. XI, 134, which elucidates the history of Orthagogos, orae of Andreas; and the little farms of Attica before Solon were certainly not covered with 'inhabit mortgage stones' (p. 16). These stones have at least some fragments by an uncoined moneta (termi, land-marks) are likelier in 600 n.C. In the valuable rewritten pages, the 'kwesh' of Mermeth's monument is expanded as 'Achaiswasa' (p. 44) in the traditional manner, and identified with the Achaeans, while the Potidaeans may really almost certainly get only a "perspective", along with the extremely dubious 'Sikela'. On p. 151 (the Lelantine War) for 'Megaera read 'Leonini'. Among the creditably few misprints, on p. 885 (n. to p. 469) for (Andocide) read 'Priapi'; on p. 889 (n. to p. 534) for 478, 477, read 378-377.

No one, perhaps, has ever claimed that 'Bury's Greece' is a great work. He is dull—he succeeds in taking the fun out of the Ab. He has no imagination, it seems, as they must deal, inadequately with art and literature seems useless and
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inartistic. That chapters dealing with these activities of the spirit must usually, in his opinion, be disconnected with the main narrative is precisely the most damning evidence of the inadequacy of his concepts of social development. It is the more pity, because when he does write on the history of thought he is often excellent; though he produces one dictum on the method of which one would like to think that Bury in Elysium has had to give Soerates an account: 'In the history of ethics his position is supreme. He was the founder of utilitarianism' (p. 578).

Bury as a military historian, on the other hand, must run wide if he does not know his German masters (whether Die-лас, know what they were talking about) he feels it his duty to take us faithfully through the campaigns of Anaxibius and Dercyllidas, and to indulge in some singularly unhappy military criticism. For instance, he argues that the troops that retired with Leonidas must have been allowed to oppose Hydarnes, the descent from Anopai, since otherwise there was no adequate reason for Leonidas and the Three Hundred to remain; failing to realise that since the Persians were strong in cavalry and the Greeks had not a horse, if all the Greeks had retreated, all would have been rounded up in the open within the day. He fails to use Plutarch's Pelopidas, which is much more illuminating than Xenophon, on the tactics of Leuctra, and he misunderstands Arrian on Gaugamela and on the Hydaspe. With the campaign of Pericles, he slipshodly credits the decisive naval operations of the Lamian War, thus leaving the abortive affair of Cramon in solitary unintelligibility among decisive battles of the world. We should welcome references, in E. T. Tarn, C. H. H. Bech, C. H. H. Beche, and W. Beale, Reis de Philosophie, XLVIII (1924), 23ff.

But while all is said, there is no Bury but Bury, and Meiggs is his editor. Bury performed, with fine scholarship if with little historical sense, a really self-sacrificing work in producing a History of Greece, without any attempt at a history of Greece. In the absence of anything better of its size, he does well to be grateful to him, and also to Mr. Meiggs for the extreme labour (as it must often have been) by which altering its form he has brought Bury, in almost every detail, up to date.

A. R. BURN.

Griechische Geschichte von den Anfängen bis in die römische Kaiserzeit (Handbuch der Altertumswissen-


A generation has passed since the last edition of the volume on Greek History by Pochmann in the Handbuch der Altertums-

wissenschaft series. A new work on a grandiose scale, the volume is the result of the last thirty years of research and at last the need has been supplied by Hermann Bengtson, who has set out to produce in one reasonably large book a survey of what modern scholarship has to say on the matter. The result is a model of modern scholarship and work.

Bengtson aims at giving a balanced view of the achievements of international research. Many German handbooks have produced a detailed bibliography of their own countrymen's writings, while ignoring all but occasional others. Here it is refreshing to encounter with equal frequency references to English, American, French, and Italian works. The book starts with a summary of modern scholarship in which the author's own nationality only reveals itself in the way in which the German writers are described with a more personal colour than the rest. An Irishman may perhaps be allowed to deplore the omission of Malbys from this section. He did much to give Greek History a status of its own in classical studies, his contributions to Greek chronology and papyrology have influenced scholarship in particular branches, and in addition he produced important works on the history of Greece—a period to which Bengtson devoted special attention.

In the main body of the work the first feature to strike one is its exhaustiveness. Greek history no more begins with the Dorian invasion than does the history of France; Bengtson starts with thirty-four pages which cover the epoch from the invasion of the Indo-Europeans (c. 2000 B.C. to the end of the 'Transition period' (c. 800 B.C.). At the other end the book ends not a century or two after the Battle of Marathon, 490 B.C. Bengtson continues his narrative down to the close of the schools by Justinian (A.D. 529). It is magnificent in this way to have a well-documented account of all Hellenic activity within the compass of one volume, but it is a task which cannot be varied.

The problem of proportion in the treatment is specially hard. If an adequate account is to be given of the Hellenistic monarchies and their achievements a good deal of space must be devoted to detail, but this can only be gained by some

sacrifice of detail in the treatment of the classical age. Hence, for example, given fourteen pages to the period from 523 to 201 B.C. and only fifty-six pages to the Pente-

contaecia and the Peloponnesian war together. This is much the same proportion of pages by year. But both the amount of past scholarship expended on it and its value in the history of the human race suggests that the time of Athenian greatness should be allowed preferential treatment.

It may be a problem of proportion that has led Bengtson to a curious feature of arrangement and terminology. For him the Hellenistic epoch begins not with Alexander's death, as we are used to think, but with Eumenes II. This is partly a matter of the time of Philip of Macedon. Xenophon would have agreed with this view to the extent that the battle of Mantinea saw the end of intelligible relations between the city-states. But if it were to become generally accepted as terminology some historical balances would be upset. Bengtson's scheme lists the three of the greatest of classical orators. Praxiteles would have worked largely in the Hellenistic period, Ephorus would have to be reckoned a Hellenistic historian.

Otherwise in treating each period Bengtson's method is straightforward. The main sections are preceded by general summaries, and each chapter has its preliminary Quellen und Darstellungen.

Footnotes are brief and mostly confined to additional citations. This is a serious drawback. Bengtson makes his work an excellent introduction to Hellenistic and Hellenic, but not of Spartan or Cyrenian kings. There are also genealogical tables of the Hellenistic royal families, but not of any of the Greek tyrants nor of such families as the Alcmæonids. The chronological table which follows reaches from the Mycenaean times to 31 B.C., and perhaps to 30 B.C. Minyan ware is a local peasant product providing no evidence of foreign influence. The picture of Achaeans overlords, such as Agamemnon, is dismissed as improbable.

The subject matter is treated in a normal way without any novel or unconventional ideas, which is a proper limitation to a work which is meant to be a general handbook. Various particular points are worth note. In his picture of prehistoric Greece Bengtson makes no mention of the Mycenaean civilization. Minyan ware is a local peasant product providing no evidence of foreign influence. The picture of Achaeans overlords, such as Agamemnon, is dismissed as improbable.

The Achaian was a Thracian invasion. The 'Abhija' of the Histiae documents is a land inhabited by non-Greeks, probably in Cilicia.

When we come to the Hellenic period there are signs of an occasional reaction against recently accepted doctrines. The absence of an epigraphical chapter is above all the aim of the Tyrrhens was the subjugation of other communities (p. 102). This statement is not adequately reinforced with examples; just as also a reference to Busolt and Meyer seems insufficient for the assertion that tyranny arose first in the Isthmus and not in Thrace. In the next chapter we find that the title of the city is first known from contemporary Greek literature in an allusion to Gyges. Again, 'it can be taken as certain that the Spartan constitution in its individual character arose gradually; it is not the work of a single legislator' (p. 105). This is in fact the commonest objection to a theory which suggests a drastic modification in the sixth century (sic). He dates the great Rheta to the beginning of the seventh or even the end of the eighth century—a view which seems to attribute more strongly than is almost the established view of the Persian Wars as a political term.

The account of the sixth century is effectively handled, but one may doubt if it was wise economy to allot seven full pages to a detailed description, however well written, of the rise of Persia. This feature is part of a general tendency rather to stress the importance of Persian influence in Greek history. In the fifth century one unexpected point is that the five years' peace between Athens and Sparta is dated to 453 instead of 457. In a footnote (p. 195, n. 4) Bengtson tries to explain away the discrepancy between the Histiae documents and the poem of Hymettus. He does not discuss how this change would relate either with the return of Cimon from ostracism or the outbreak of war again in 446. Equally arbitrary appears the dating of the revolt of Potidaea to 433 when the epigraphic evidence suggests that it was in 432, or that of the Rheta, 432. In the years of the Peloponnesian war Bengtson chooses the chronology which would date Alcibiades' return to 408 and the battle of Notium to 407. He gives no new reasons for this decision. In the fourth century there is rather too much talk about 'multiplies', and too little attention is given to the second Athenian confederacy. Dionysius' war with Carthage from 383 is described as his last and that of 368-7 is ignored (p. 271). In treating of Alexander (as also elsewhere) Bengtson often gives a view that is not genuine and a proof that Alexander aimed at world conquest.

In the Hellenistic and Roman periods of the work, where so much of the history is still doubtful, there is less advantage in
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H. W. Parke.


162. 'The World-History of the Mediterranean area'—the theme of this work is the history of a millennium from Philip II of Macedon to the Emperor Heraclius and the formulation of the faith of Arabia by Mohammed. It is a long book in two volumes, relevant, for the Persia with which Philip II, for he must never forget that this is a posthumous work and it was never revised. The attentive reader will probably feel that much of the narrative, especially in the first volume, represents a draft which might have been considerably changed if Professor Kornemann had lived to reconsider the text—he might well have struck out his account of the Samarian, Accadian, and Hittite Kingdoms, since it is not easy to understand its relevance to his subject. Perhaps the most useful contribution which a reviewer can make is to raise some of the questions which the book has suggested.

K. had recently published two volumes on Rome; what was his aim in writing this work on Greco-Roman history? In his preface he explains that his object has been to pay more attention to the Hellenistic and Roman and to present the facts—the Alexander the Great story took much from Persia and so did Rome. The government of a great empire is rendered possible only by the help of an efficient, schooled bureaucracy and that was first created by Achaemenid Persia. Hellenism and Iranism must be studied together, an aim which will the exclusive study of the Greek tradition be overcome.

Such was K.'s programme for the book, but the surprising thing is that it was never effectively realised. The achievement of Cyrus and Darius is described with lively interest but with nothing, reliance, for the Persia with which Philip II, and Alexander came into contact was very different from the Persia of Darius. The account of Zoroaster and Zoroastrianism is superficial, for it completely fails to suggest the problems and the doubts which beset the subject. Even a book designed for the non-specialist should not give to the reader a fallacious impression of secure fact. The history of the Gathas has its own Zarathustra', writes Bengtson. Often a student may interpret 'a strophe of the Gathas in the evening and by the morning it has become something quite different' (Nyberg). A D. Noack suggests that a book be written about the 'life and death' of the model of Albert Schweitzer's famous book [1 The Problem of Zoroaster', AJA liii (1949), 725-85 at p. 285]. At least a reference might have been made to the bibliography of recent research. Passed over by P. J. Junge, Darostas I König der Perser, Leipzig, 1944, p. 162.

The faith of Zoroaster is in K.'s view the supreme gift of Persia to Europe, mainly through its influence on the Old Testament and on Christianity. But here we need a careful critical examination of what was thought of Zoroastrianism in the Middle Ages, of the manner in which the faith was transmitted. As a result of such a detailed discussion W. Manson came to the conclusion that 'all necessity to invoke ethnic or esoteric ideas for the explanation of any part of [Jeus'] teaching disappear' (Jesus and Judaism London, 1943, p. 185). One might have expected that K. would have discussed the complex Iranian myth of the Saviour who had himself first to be saved. That mythic construction, built up by Reitzenstein drawing on Mandaean materials, has been adversely criticised and it is not clear how much of the later argument still stands.

See W. Manson, op. cit., chapter I see Appendix D, and cf. J. M. Creed, 'The Heavenly Man', 26 J. T.S., pp. 113-36. If K. had lived he would doubtless have amplified what he had written.

The Hellenic incompetent is not suggested to have been so unfavourable a judgement upon the Sassanids, cannot have adopted any suggestions from them; such suggestions must rather be traced back—past Alexander—to the time of the Achaemenides. Elsewhere K. writes, 'at the end of the third century B.C. Western Asia Minor was wholly Greek and the penetration by Iranian influences which had been favoured by Darius ceased to have any hold' (I, 254). If one has set out to trace the spread of Iranian ideas it seems strange that Piatrack's account in his De Lide et Culisse should not be mentioned nor the 38th oration of Dio of Prusa where he cites a Zoroastrian hymn, while it is similarly of interest to trace the use made by Lactantius of Zoroastrian eschatology to support his interpretation of the Christian revelation (in the Divinitates Insitut) see the passages collected by Joseph Bidez and Franz Cumont, Les Magie hellénistiques, Paris, 1938). And it should not be forgotten that even in the fourth century A.D. St. Basil in a letter can say that the θρόνος of the Magi (Maguseans) who live in the οἱ άνθρωποι of the 'Paradise of Darius' which is not Adam (Epist. 258, Loeb edition vol. 4, pp. 44-6).

The Manichæan edict of Diocletian may have been the effect of war psychology, but far more damaging to Persian influence was the popular scorn of the Byzantines for a people who worshipped the blood of Roman emperors. The Greek Libri historici, 184, 1, p. 24 sqq.; John of Nikias—of Hormizd—Journal Asiatique, 7th Série, t. 13 (1879), 304. I cannot explain this belief of the East Romans (cf. O. xcvii, 50). Can it be derived from the four-horse chariot 'dost les chevaux représentent les quatre Elements et ce est conduit par un auregè eternal' (Bidez and Cumont, op. cit., 1, 91, 114, 4 n. 2).

K. might indeed have made a better case for Persian influence than he has done in this book. But besides the living force of the later Empire of a Roman, a Christian, and a Greek tradition the oriental legacy of Achaemenid Persia stands for very little.

And this book, obviously written for the general reader, necessarily suggests the problem: how should the interest in the Hellenistic civilisation be sustained amongst those who are not specialists? K. unfortunately has failed to do any such thing. He details diplomacy and wars, facts piled on facts, but no clear statement is attempted of the meaning of these facts. James Denney once wrote, 'He who does not see the meaning does not see the thing'. Can he help wondering how many there will be who will perseveres after reading K.'s account of the Diadochi. For in the first volume the human element is suppressed, and it really looks as though that suppression were deliberate. In the social history of the Hellenistic period the tragedies of Agis and the revolution of Cleomenes is a moving story; K. in passing mentions I., 247 'the famous attempts at reform of the Spartan kings—and that is all! Will these
reforms be to the non-specialist reader as familiar as household words? And then see what W. W. Tarn makes of the story and its meaning (The Hellenistic Age, Cambridge, 1923, 128-40). When K. comes to write of the Maccabean revolt, the influence of the work of Metternich still prevails; but, doubtless it is rhetorical, but it is fine rhetoric, and it helps us to feel the passion which in Jerusalem made the spread of Hellenistic civilization an impossibility; it helps us, too, to understand why the Judaism of Alex. must be a source for the conversion of the Hellenistic world. K. unfortunately ignores Hellenistic literature: why should Polybius not have been granted a treatment similar to that given to Tacitus in K.'s second volume? Personally I do not believe that we shall ever win a general recognition for Tacitus as a great historian as the Sulla to Tiberius? Can one trace a sense of 'European responsibility' in Pompey and Caesar (so Helmut Berve, 'Der Europa-Begriff in der Antike' in Gestaltende Kräfte der Antike, Munich, 1949, 170-87, at pp. 185-87)? Unity within the Mediterranean—more nostrum. But it may be doubted whether a 'European' unity was realised, though we may agree with Berve that, at least for us, Cicero appears in many respects as 'Europe's first European'. Perhaps the least satisfactory part of K.'s study of the Roman Empire is his treatment of the reigns of Diocletian and Constantine. Diocletian, in K.'s view, still maintains the Principate, it is with Constantine that the Dominate begins. It is not easy to see how Constantine, if his contemporaries were as contending a population of the East Mediterranean lands had never understood the Principate as it was conceived in the Roman West; the emperor had been the Dominus from the first. One cannot therefore fix upon a moment when the Principate ceased to exist. The Dominate is an atmosphere which Diocletian moved his court to Nicomedia he naturally adapted himself to that East Mediterranean atmosphere; the ritual of his court was fashioned on an Eastern model. Some students of the work of Otto Saeck have felt that his conception of Galatianism not only contains but is a theory of the Galatianism in the poetic toon. Unfortunately that conception in an extreme form has been adopted by K. Diocletian is drawn as a 'Backwards Renovator' (Rückwärts-RENUEm) like Sulla (I, 398-9)—regulating and it is the beginning of things to live. Considering these, these are the outstanding features of his government. It is no wonder that K.'s treatment of the persecution of the Christians is inadequate, that the theory of an emperor's duty to abdicate after twenty years of rule should still be accepted. Surely Diocletian's policy is a constant adaptation of measures to meet current needs as they arose in a critical period: it retains its flexibility. K. sees in Constantine one who was essentially a conservative—one who did not develop and abandon the institutions which had so far as possible the Judeo-Hellenistic customaries (II, 295). But in the fourth century he was regarded as a revolutionist—a turbator rerum. To K. as a statesman Constantine appears shrewd (klug) (II, 446), and was thus able to reconcile the work of Augustus and Jesus; but the decision of Constantine's sense of mission; to represent him as a conservative appears to me to be perverse. Constantine in his own person was a historical watershed, his reign marks a turning-point in the history of the Mediterranean lands. Perhaps it is not always easy to gain any clear conception of K.'s thought. A single illustration of this difficulty must suffice. When does Byzantine history begin? With the year a.d. 380, writes K., the new period commences which ended with the Byzantine State (p. 392). In domestic policy it was through Theodora that the Byzantine State experienced the hour of its birth (p. 418). Theodora built up the Byzantine State which was to come (p. 452); yet Justinian's epoch was the brilliant period in literature and art of early Byzantine civilization (p. 438), while the Byzantine Empire begins in the seventh century with the reign of Heraclius (p. 460). It is of course clear that the text has not been revised, but the confusion of these passages forces the reader to ask what are the characteristics of the Byzantine State, what is its mission, what is the faith which it sought to protect? One considers the confidence assured to the Orthodox by the protection of a Christian God, the possession of an emperor who was Heaven's delegate, the money economy on which East Roman diplomacy was based, the highly organized army and civil service, when one realises that none of these essential elements of Byzantine survival first appeared with Theodora or with Heraclius one is driven further and further back—to Theodorus the Great and to the revolutionary dream of Constantine. In its essential, the Byzantine Empire was a Christian Emperor. A change in the method of recruiting the army, the seventh century creation (by Constans) of the system of military themes, the erection of new financial ministries, even the loss of Syria and Egypt to the Persians cannot affect the permanent character of the Empire. It is but a change of means and not of ends that is in question. We are bound to fail in our task of historical understanding if we begin our study of East Rome with the reign of Heraclius. A reviewer cannot but ask himself whether what was really a new realisation that Kornemann to publish this book in its present form. It is not easy to stifle a doubt.

Norman H. Baynes.


There are two studies: I. The Western Sarmatians are from the third to the first century B.C. 2. The Sarmatians in Hungary (from about 50 B.C. to 50 A.D.) do not appreciate the treatment of the writer's border's character. The Roman writer's is that of a Sarmatian nation. Sauromatae were placed east of the Don in the first century by Herodotus and ihmparatoes. Herodotus shows them as Sarmatians, but Herodotus definitely excludes them, though his tales of Scythian wars and Amazons accounts for their speaking a language akin to Scythian and giving their women a free or even dominant position. In the fourth century the form Sarmatae occurs in 'Scylax' and 'Conulus' of Conulus. Harmatza does not mention this.

The name of the Sarmatians first occurs in B.C. 175 when their king Gutallos joins a league of Pontic states. From the second century both forms are used, sometimes even by the same writer, and kings of the Sarmatian race called themselves the Sarmatian by a contemporary's choice. Rostovtsev at one time, and now our author, have thought that the two names denoted different peoples. Certainly the Sarmatians are no longer known with the Getae, though Polyaenus has tales of very lively, though vivid, Sarmatian wars. It is not scantly, however, in the third and second century B.C. could be very lively: and they are no longer known at the Scythians; they have elaborate armour and heavy spears so as to fight in a more modern and a mass fashion. Fighting for the warrior's soul, the Scythians, whom they confined to the Crimea and the Dobrudzha. In spite of these differences the Celts, as much, are inclined to identify the names.

Strabo speaks of three Sarmatian tribes on the West between the Ister and Borysthenes—Iazyges, Basilei, and Urgi, with the Rhodolcis stretching on to the Tanais. Mainly on the strength of the word Basileus (also used by Appian) our author regards them as forming a powerful state under a ruler who reached this position about 125 B.C.; their coming would be the furthest repercussion of Hsiung-nu expansions and the second movement of the Yueh-chih about 150 B.C. These Sarmatians were at first hostile to Mithridates Eupator, but then fell in with his great schemes of expansion. A number of references are made to the Sarmatian sense of mission; to represent him as a conservative appears to me to be perverse. Constantine in his own person was a historical watershed, his reign marks a turning-point in the history of the Mediterranean lands. How is it that it is not always easy to gain any clear conception of K.'s thought. A single illustration of this difficulty must suffice. When does Byzantine history begin? With the year a.d. 380, writes K., the new period commences which ended with the Byzantine State (p. 392). In domestic policy it was through Theodora that the Byzantine State experienced the hour of its birth (p. 418). Theodora built up the Byzantine State which was to come (p. 452); yet Justinian's epoch was the brilliant period in literature and art of early Byzantine civilization (p. 438), while the Byzantine Empire begins in the seventh century with the reign of Heraclius (p. 460). It is of course clear that the text has not
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tribes mentioned come from the West, Celtic Gallaec and German Sciri. They are all swept away by the Sarmatian defeat, and the nomadic forces so as to account for the fact, but not for long, what with the Getae on the West and on the East new kindred tribes such as the Aorsi and Alani. Under various pressure the Iazyges, the most westerly tribe, entered Hungary from Ottenia, i.e. Western Rumânia, though some were still to visit Russia, when the Ostrogoths went on about A.D. 300. By then the Goths had cut their communications. Then the Alans made their way from Eastern to Western Russia and drove the Rhozolani into Hungary, where they amalgamated with other eastern nomad writers, partly the Hunian Sarmatians, partly the Dacic, who forced many of them to settle in Roman territory. Those left behind were scattered by the great turmoil caused by the appearance of the Huns who brought in the Alans, later joined to the Goths and the Vandals. Alans are particularly well known as having been in Britain, and it can hardly be a coincidence that Alan is a common name of the Dukes of Brittany; the name spread to the Norman invaders of England, and their descendants well known among us.

E. H. MINNS.


In this important monograph Professor Pringsheim attempts to establish the development of the Greek law in the views of view, a broad picture of the Hellenistic and this characteristic, the characteristic Greek law maintained in Egypt its substantial independence throughout Ptolemaic and into later Roman times. The Greek law never assumed a general law of contractual obligation; Pringsheim divides the law into two main branches, the law of the sale of goods, and holds that the sale of goods law only for damage ex delicto. Of particular contracts the first to be recognized was that of loan, and even this, in Pringsheim's view, always required for surety, that is, a certain formal element, for its full realization. As for the sale of goods, the seller and the buyer are primarily as a cash transaction in which the decisive moment was the payment of the price; before that moment there was no obligation on either party and at that moment the rights in the thing sold immediately passed, subject perhaps to any conditions on the part of the buyer or seller. Hence in Greek references to sale the emphasis commonly laid on the payment of the price. To Pringsheim's examples of actual and metaphorical sales we might add St. Paul's prayer in Col. iii, the phrase 'for which thou also wast purchased with a price'. But such a primitive concept does not allow for sales on credit, sales of goods for future delivery, and other cases where the whole transaction is not completed uno uto. The Roman juristic genius eventually met these needs of a more advanced civilization by recognizing a contract of sale, in which the consent of the parties created binding legal obligations for future performance, and notionally separating this contract from the act of payment and the conveyance of the property which were its fulfillment. The Greek lawyers went to work in a different way. Retaining the primitive concept of sale, they provided for sales on credit by treating the unpaid price as a money loan from seller to buyer, thereby giving the former the same remedies of a creditor; conversely, a sale of generic goods for future delivery was recognized on the price as the reason or the security for the seller's claim on the buyer to satisfy the contract in money or goods. There were other devices. The sale of an expected crop, that is, specific and not generic goods, could be met by a short-term lease of the ground to the buyer entitling him as lessee to gather the fruits. If so, however, the seller could enter into possession before paying the full price and thereby obtaining ownership could be strengthened by a further authorization to him to defend his possession; the also played an important part in the nearly related transactions of treci. Final agreement in personal transactions sell could, like other agreements, be accompanied by the giving of or as a sort of security for eventual performance, and again, an transaction referring to specific goods could be accompanied by a enabling the buyer to take and defend possession.

Pringsheim from his exhaustive knowledge of the sources, both in literary texts and in the papyrus records, collects and discusses many examples in which sales are combined 'in rich diversity' with a more or less fictitious application of other elements to the precise legal form desired by the parties. By a historical examination he shows how from such combinations the Greek lawyers often proceeded to the creation of new and improved types. A clumsy coupling of elements from sale and loan was eventually fused into some- thing resembling juristic classification of the law of different legal institutions'. Their law of sale was the product of juristic logic but of notaristic ingenuity; its material is to be found not in the general propositions of individual cases, but in the stylistic features of the law relating to particular transactions. Pringsheim finds all this very alien to his own early Romanistic training but not altogether dissimilar from the spirit of the English law with which he later became acquainted.

The review can do little more than draw attention to the main thesis of the work under consideration. To the present reviewer the most striking feature of Pringsheim's work is his demonstration of the peculiarly Greek character of Greek law in the respects indicated above. Among many supplementary points of interest there may be especially mentioned the principle (recalling the English doctrines of subrogation and resulting trusts) by which a third party who had advanced the price to the buyer could acquire a sort of equitable title to the property, and the other part of the law of manumission in which a god purchased the slave with money provided by the slave, so that the slave became beneficial owner of himself; also the valuable discussions of the meaning of particular technical words (e.g. Neptuni from 1595, in, in Pring- shem's predecessor as a title in which one might, to use another English term, be 'vouched to warranty') and of the historical development in the meaning of such words as τη, ἄνον, ἄνω, ἀνονε, πᾶσιν, πάντεσιν. Whether or not the book will be of interest to the law student, his study of the evidence on these and other points cannot be neglected. Its value is enhanced by the careful indexing of terms discussed and texts referred to.

We may share the author's admiration of the courage of the German publisher in undertaking a work in English for which no British publisher could be found, and we compliment the German printers on their remarkably high standard of accuracy in both Greek and English, but we regret the poor quality of paper and binding.

A. H. CAMPBELL.


This imposing volume completes the best general work on Greek religion that has hitherto been published. It is worthy, in the wake of his predecessor, A. D. Nock, The Hellenistic section begins with a sketch of the conditions prevailing in the lands which had conquered Alexander's empire. With p. 48 begins an account of religion in the Greek cities proper,
attention being paid not only to ritual but also to the accompanying literary, economic and social phenomena, the importance for instance of Greek schools in keeping traditional cults as well as other parts of the native inheritance alive, the finiteness of cults not of primitive origin of the mysterious oracles, and other prominent features of the ancient worship and such new ones as found their way in among the older forms. The relation of religion to the Hellenistic monarchicalism is next dealt with (pp. 125-74), and the more general question follows, a long section of over 100 pages, which handles 'Persönliche Religion und religiöse Weltanschauung'. This includes a comparatively full treatment of such things as the various explanations away of religion, the attitudes of the chief philosophic schools, the relationship of religion to the myth and the rising tide of sheer superstition and of belief in all manner of wonders. In an excellent summimg up, stress is briefly laid on the change from a city-state's religion, with its gods who could be and were more or less localised, to the cosmopolitanism which by logical necessity brought with it the demand for a world-wide deity of some sort (p. 579). Another matter of no small importance is (p. 585) that the religion of that age was one belonging to the towns and cities, whereas the ancient worship had its basis in the rural population. Individualism is of course given due attention, but not treated in isolation nor out of its framework of the political surroundings in which the individual then found himself. This feeling for balance and proportion indeed marks the great genious of Greek religion, and the gods have on occasion been treated as if they were isolated tesserae are fitted together into a significant and understandable mosaic.

The Roman period is treated at somewhat greater length (pp. 593-627). Here, however, is more of the municipal, not of the religious character. Hellenism perished but because of the bewildering complexity of the material. Again a short introductory section is devoted to orientation; 'Die Griechen in der römischen Welt' are sketched historically and with regard to their intellectual and emotional condition. A whole over sixty pages (517-75) suffices for the actual Greek cults of the period, including the mysteries and the worship of deified Emperors; but belief in general needs a much larger space (pp. 576-554). Since this includes philosophy, oracles of all kinds, astrology and sun-worship, the 'lower gods' are treated in its various forms, the declining, scientific, and the relation of religion to ethics, the allowance is not extravagantly gant. One outstanding and wide-reaching phenomenon, syncretism, is then given a large section (pp. 555-672) to itself, which treats successively of Hermeticism, Gnosticism, the foreign gods and cults, and polytheism. The concluding section of a score of pages draws attention especially to two important matters. The place is the first in the vast influence exercised by the 'Polemicae' theory of the universe, concerning which moderns are apt to forget that while its vision of the heavenly and earthly world was much influenced by astrology, it was vastly bigger than the popular views which it superseded not only in the minds of philosophers and scientists but in the general consciousness. The second topic is the psychology of religion in late antiquity. The book indexes of names and subjects, and a few corrections of detail in the first volume are made on p. 714.

As is to be expected, points of view are put forward and interpretations offered with which not all will agree. They are, however, always worth consideration, and, extending stronger reasons against them. For example, the author rejects completely all Christian evidence concerning the Eleusinian Mysteries (p. 535), making a doubtful exception in favour of Hippolytus' statement concerning the respiration of the body (p. 466, n. 1) (displacement of a late and cosmological attempt to connect the Star of Bethlehem with any real astronomical phenomenon; it is merely a particular instance of the popular belief, unconnected with developed astronomy, that everyone has a Sadducee (p. 558) according to its importance, which appears at his birth and 'falls' when he dies. Nilsson insists (e.g. p. 597) that we know very little of the popular mystery-cults of late antiquity, and especially, that we have no right to say that there was anything like a theological system connected with them. He sees (p. 577) nothing Zoroastrian in the dualism which is so characteristic of late pagan speculation. The cleavage is not, as in the Persian reformer's system, between a good and an evil principle manifesting themselves throughout the world, in matter as elsewhere, but between the material and the ideal universe, and the source of it is ultimately Plato. Interesting suggestions, small and great, are to be found everywhere: as an example of a principle which might serve as a basis for some elaborate study of religious conditions, not only antique, I mention the passage on p. 548 which concerns the monotheticism of the local Frankish churches, the existence of an earthly monarchy, while as a small but ingenious point I cite the note on p. 631 (3), which suggests that the gesture of the benedictio Latina may be due to some old and revered priest of one or another of the early Christian churches, not a laic, but being in consequence unable to extend the last two fingers of his right hand. On some small points slight corrections and additions seem possible. For example, on pp. 208 ff. we meet once more the often repeated statement, due ultimately to Eichhorn, that the contortio mediata 'in the conventional numbering' is derived from the mimes of Sophron of which a fragment was not long ago recovered. This is at least unproven, for except that both pieces deal with a magical process and mention Hekate, there is no discernible resemblance; Sophron describes certain women who apparently are riding a house of the goddess's undeserved attentions, for which she is trying to win back her faithless lover. On p. 466 (twice), what is the authority for a word inspius, instead of principium? Some other references to Latin sources seem not altogether happy. On p. 606, comment is made on Apuleius, Met. xi, 23, where Lucius describes the preliminaries of his initiation. The priest takes him to the nearest baths et praecipue lauro traditione, praefat aea semum, purificat aea subito oblationes. On of its value, one might have on occasion treated as if they were isolated tesserae are fitted together into a significant and understandable mosaic.

The Roman period is treated at somewhat greater length (pp. 593-627). Here, however, is more of the municipal, not of the religious character. Hellenism perished but because of the bewildering complexity of the material. Again a short introductory section is devoted to orientation; 'Die Griechen in der römischen Welt' are sketched historically and with regard to their intellectual and emotional condition. A whole over sixty pages (517-75) suffices for the actual Greek cults of the period, including the mysteries and the worship of deified Emperors; but belief in general needs a much larger space (pp. 576-554). Since this includes philosophy, oracles of all kinds, astrology and sun-worship, the 'lower gods' are treated in its various forms, the declining, scientific, and the relation of religion to ethics, the allowance is not extravagantly gant. One outstanding and wide-reaching phenomenon, syncretism, is then given a large section (pp. 555-672) to itself, which treats successively of Hermeticism, Gnosticism, the foreign gods and cults, and polytheism. The concluding section of a score of pages draws attention especially to two important matters. The place is the first in the vast influence exercised by the 'Polemicae' theory of the universe, concerning which moderns are apt to forget that while its vision of the heavenly and earthly world was much influenced by astrology, it was vastly bigger than the popular views which it superseded not only in the minds of philosophers and scientists but in the general consciousness. The second topic is the psychology of religion in late antiquity. The book indexes of names and subjects, and a few corrections of detail in the first volume are made on p. 714.

As is to be expected, points of view are put forward and interpretations offered with which not all will agree. They are, however, always worth consideration, and, extending stronger reasons against them. For example, the author rejects completely all Christian evidence concerning the Eleusinian Mysteries (p. 535), making a doubtful exception in favour of Hippolytus' statement concerning the respiration of the body (p. 466, n. 1) (displacement of a late and cosmological attempt to connect the Star of Bethlehem with any real astronomical phenomenon; it is merely a particular instance of the popular belief, unconnected with developed astronomy, that everyone has a Sadducee (p. 558) according to its importance, which appears at his birth and 'falls' when he dies. Nilsson insists (e.g. p. 597) that we know very little of the popular mystery-cults of late antiquity, and especially, that we have no right to say that there was anything like a theological system connected with them. He sees (p. 577) nothing Zoroastrian in the dualism which is so characteristic of late pagan speculation. The cleavage is not, as in the Persian reformer's system, between a good and an evil principle manifesting themselves throughout the world, in matter as elsewhere, but between the material and the ideal universe, and the source of it is ultimately Plato. Interesting suggestions, small and great, are to be

H. J. Rose.

Greek Mythology, Oracles and Politics in Ancient Greece.
By M. P. Nilsson.
Price not given.

A good deal of hasty criticism has been directed against students of Greek mythology, because they do not construct a 'mythological pattern', or integration of myths with social and religious life, after the style of those discovered, on more
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or less cogent evidence, among numerous other peoples, to prove this, it is a monograph, which its author regards as a paragon, the fruit of some leisure moments won from more pressing work, presents in masterly fashion the part really played in classical times by the cults and myths of the Greek peoples.

A sort of corollary is furnished by the last chapter, Myths as political Propaganda, and ranges from the tragedians to the genealogical figures of the Diadochoi. Chap. IV (The Use of Myths in the Late Age) carries the story down to Roman times and gives illustrations, not by any means all known, of the amount of influence, as the Romans saw it, on the modern thought. Chap. V treats of Oracles and Politics.

All these chapters are packed full of learning, and the notes point the reader not only to documentary proofs of the assertions in the text, but to all manner of fascinating lore. Due emphasis is laid on the continuous activity of myth-making and on the way in which myths became less the traditional possessions of the unlettered and more the business of the learned and the politically minded, to whom they were simply, for the most part, the story of their native country.

Two valuable appendices treat respectively of The Ionian Phylae (the author avoids the traditional rendering 'tribes' as apt to have misleading associations) and The Phrygian. The latter is really an attempt to place the Mycenaean times and represent the organisation of the people in that age (p. 149). The latter are discussed as regards their role in religion, or to express it more exactly, in the collective piece of early times. The theme is interestingly set forth and illustrated.

H. J. ROSE.


It is a well known and quite likely theory that Greek drama arose from a ritual performance of mimetic type, possibly embodying the substance of a myth or myths; but such an hypothesis who also has not, however, developed a literary form as the Greeks did. This book is meant to advance the acceptance of the hypothesis, but will not do so, for although erudite, it lacks accuracy (at least where the present reviewer, who is not a Semitologist, can check the facts) and also cogency of reasoning. The author begins by stating the theory, that drama evolves from seasonal ritual, and goes on (pp. 6 ff.) to outline the nature of such a rite, which he divides into the stages of initiation, purification, and the expulsion of evil influences, invasion (by such means as ritual combat or sexual orgies), jubilation, the return of the dead and the communal meal. This complex occurs characteristically, though not always at the turn of the year, i.e., at the equinox. His facts are of a kind familiar enough to all social anthropologists; some parts of his classification, especially the sharp differentiation between 'mortification' and 'purification', are open to criticism, which, however, would not affect an antithesis so clear-cut. He invents a new technical term, 'topocom', defined (p. 4) as 'the total corporate unit of all elements, animate and inanimate alike, which together constitute its [the community's] where the rite is performed'. In general, he does not think the word a great improvement on the familiar 'environment'. After an outline of the form which these seasonal rites take in the Near East, the author goes on to look for traces of them in all manner of documents, as the Ras Shamra tablets, passages from the Hebrew prophets (especially Joel) and psalmists, certain Hittite writings and two or three Egyptian records. In some of these it is plain we have to do with ritual, and more than once it can be fairly called dramatic; in others the interpretation seems highly uncertain, being arrived at by a generous proportion of conjecture (includibg instances of lacunae, difficult to make out because couched in a language imperfectly known, or, as in the case of the Hebrew poems, handed down to us in a tradition more than suspicion of editorial interpolation. Several times the author himself says that his task is not easy to find (pp. 225, 267, and elsewhere).

It at least leaves a tenable theory that there never was a ritual pattern of the sort he postulates in the compositions in question, and that if ritual at all, they belong to a different, more homogeneous type. But it is in the application of his general theory to Greek material that he shows himself most inadequate. Errors of detail, such as wrong or irrelevant references, misunderstandings of texts, sheer misstatements of fact, and assumptions of the sort that if they were proved or at least generally accepted, are so numerous that to attempt to list them would mean writing a bulky pamphlet. I content myself with noting one incomprehensible omission and one gross parallelism.

Nowhere are the objections to what may be called the ritual theories of the origins of Tragedy which the late Sir Arthur Pickard-Cambridge set forth in Chap. 2 of Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy fairly faced and dealt with. Without this, there is hardly a case for a supporter of such theories to argue, if he is so acecepted, are so numerous that to attempt to write them would mean writing a bulky pamphlet. I content myself with noting one incomprehensible omission and one gross parallelism.

H. J. ROSE.

Das Mutterrecht. 2 vols. By J. J. BACHOFEN. Pp. 1179; vol. 9. Basel: Benno Schwabe & Co., 1949. 65 fr. Das Mutterrecht, in its full extent, is as the great books in the history of learning, was published first by Kraus and Hoffmann at Stuttgart in 1861, and in an unaltered reprint by MM. Benno Schwabe at Basel in 1897. This firm, surely one of the oldest in the world—it has now published a very carefully edited edition of Bachofen's collected works, and among them is this second edition of Das Mutterrecht.

J. J. Bachofen, A.D. 1815-1879, was the son of distinguished Swiss parents, and one of his earliest compositions before leaving school in 1833 was a dissertation on the subject, chosen by himself, of patriarchy. The new collected edition of the works is doubly patriotic. By scrupulous integrity and vigour the editors and publishers have rendered service to the honour of a great citizen of Switzerland, and to the truth that the Republic of Learning exists to defend. There seems to be a certain excess in all greatness', wrote A. N. Whitehead. Bachofen had greatness, and probably genius. But where he exceeded it is no laughing matter for less learned editors. Here is a dish of hasty and unconsidered conclusions, some of which still survive, and in the earlier part of the previous printed version of Das Mutterrecht, the footnotes were mixed with the text. There is no sufficient indication where sections of text begin. Orthography was recklessly modernised, and for example, Alcmaeon. To correct, to complete, and to bring up to date the many thousands of references must have been arduous work indeed. Bachofen might write almost anything. When he wrote 'Hermann, maius', 'Hermannus maior', or something similar, he really L. CHR. WOLF, Malerium Graecarum, quae oriundum pro se nus sunt, fragmenta et elogia ... accedit catalogus femininarum alim

Vol. LXXII.
NOTICES OF BOOKS

Illustration. London, 1729'. The Editors have nevertheless reduced both test and notes to beautiful order. They have self-effacingly corrected, and not recomposed, Bachofen's own index. There is a Stellenregister, a List of seven Errata, and a notification of two mistakes. There is also an Epilogue of 177 pages, in which Professor Karl Meuli discusses first Bachofen's conclusion, and then the criteria of his book, and finally the history and the present reconstitution of its text. Everything about this Epilogue is to me, at least, impressive: the thorough use for the first time of many unpublised documents, careful and scrupulous judgements concerning Bachofen's very complex character, temperament, and sometimes extravagant views, the extremely able estimate of the importance and the permanent value of the book, and the unirreconcilable force of professional honour with which, at the close, he tells us, a few years after the publication, that the spelling has been modernised, and forty-seven others which, correct in the impression of 1861, appeared incorrect, through printers' errors, in the impression of 1897 and in certain volumes of excerpts derived from it. The care of the three, the latter of which Dr. Harpyly distinguished of MM. Benno Schwabe, makes any search for errors a thankless task. Even British names, a severe test, are right; though I find 'McLeannen' spell 'Mac Leannan' (p. 1115), and 'Worsley in the first impression, corrected not, as surely it should have been, to 'Wortley' but to 'Worthley' (pp. 832, 1124). Of misprints and other slight errors I recall 'virtuus' (p. 127), 'Minyerrimen' (p. 610), 'Heleneas' (p. 787), 'Hamburg' 1884 (p. 787 note 5), where 'Hamburg and Gotha, 1839, 1840' places and spaces should be 'Hamburg 1884', his work, an Alcaic stanza wrongly set (p. 810), and B2A2/A2A (p. 910). Sometimes, as in 'Heräen' (p. 692) the letter 'r' is imperfect. The form dívà, and one or two others, in Sappho thr. B = 109 D (p. 796) might raise questions in reader's minds.

So complete is the Epilogue that it carries in Professor Meuli's Epilogue an extremely satisfactory review of itself. There the discovery of 'Mother-Right' as a coherent and recurrent cultural factor, inadequately cared for by Bachofen before him had made certain relevant observations in part forestalling him, and his own faults were very great. But the credit remains his; and it also is very great. In the Epilogue this is made plain, and a great deal besides, such as Bachofen's greatness ability and energy, his intense conservatism, his primary religious interest, his contempt for 'exact scholarship' and even common-sense archaeological method, his vehement defence of Mommsen, who had been kind to him, and the simple humility of his wish to be judged not by his success but by his endeavour. He had, of course, great learning and great insight, and for them scholars in general may now be ready to forgive him his faults. In Britain resistance is to be expected on account of the regular British reluctance to accept abstract anthropological and reconstructions of the primitive even more than elsewhere, the new Edition is greatly needed, and demands close attention, because questions concerning what is known of 'Mother-Right' and what is implied by it are still living issues, but cannot properly be approached without direct access to the primitive sources. It is honest given the main criticisms of Das Muttersrecht, which are anyhow fairly well known, though probably the book itself never has been yet. Bachofen trusted his speculations too much and generalised his conclusions too soon. He was accused Quellenkritik. He believed in a series of universal cultural phases in early history, starting with ius naturale and promiscuity. Some of his inferences from late authorities, for example concerning the inner nature of Egyptian religion, are positively answers.

It is very easy to continue fault-finding until it becomes hard to believe that there is anything left. But there is, whatever faults are found. The discovery of 'Mother-Right' and with it much concerning the Kulturkrete is an immense scientific advance. Meanwhile, a bright light is being shed in many dark places, or places which are at least much darker than they seem. The revelations concerning the Lyceans and the Epizygian Locrions, for example, remain thrillingly bracing and important. Many advances find unexpected and satisfactory explanation. Das Muttersrecht needs to be read not merely by repute, or even consulted, for otherwise if the detail escapes. Also, Bachofen's ideas and discoveries agree with, or even contributed to, his successor, and that must necessarily distort argument.

Bachofen's conception of religious history is superficially ridiculous. 'The Apollonian', 'The Dionysiac', and such conceptions as 'der heutische Tellurismus' are treated as if they had the solid outline of a red pillar-box. He goes far beyond his great contempt-purity Nietzsche. He sometimes seems to imagine that all the cultural history was a perspicacity on his part. Very few years ago that was needless. Yet on the other hand Bachofen's insight was in the important things sometimes far ahead of his time and perhaps still ahead of ours. He ignores the migration of the 'the' of the 'tho' from the hub of the world, the importance of Lycia and of oriental influence on Greece, and on Italy also, which he regarded, perhaps brilliantly, as a home of lost causes. He also saw religion as the central fact, shaping change and development. In all this I should like to think him far more eligible to the praise which was to his contemporaries. Now that he can for the first time be read with pleasure, the due profit from his rare, but wild, perspicacity may at last be gained.

W. F. J. Knight.


This is an excellent and judicious account of the many problems connected with the most famous of ancient oracles. If the results are, as the author remarks (p. 231, in a handy summary of his work) largely negative, this is due to the scrappy and unsatisfactory nature of much of the evidence, and not to a lack of diligence on his part. Twenty chapters, divided into two groups, respectively of six and fourteen, handle first the method by which the oracles were given and then the machinery of consultation.

In the longer chapter (Chapter II) the first part of which is a first chapter that there is no real evidence to support the romantic descriptions in some authors of her passing into a wild frenzy, like that of Vergil's Sibyl, imitated by Lucan in his highly coloured account of Apollo's consultation. The fourth chapter deals with the implications of the passage which states the ravishing lunacy is no necessary part of it; there is therefore no support for those theories which suppose that the alleged delirium was Dionysiac in its nature and a later accession to the Apolline methods. He does not, perhaps, sufficiently discuss what would happen when the prophecy, which he himself says is that she passed into a trance, probably genuine, like that of a modern medium, be the psychological or physiological explanation of that what it may be. It is at least as much importance, however, to make clear, as the author does, that we have no right to suppose that no other kind of divination was in use at Delphi, and a fair amount of evidence that other kinds, notably lot-casting, were employed on occasion (Chapter III, VI).

Use is made of this to suggest (Chapter VII) a solution of the inconsistent accounts of the number of times in the year that the oracle was available. The succeeding chapters go into a number of curious matters, often ending with a frank admission that we do not know the answers. But the reader may know that we are impelled to ask. Chapter XVII deals with the ἐσπαθος, but the mention of Terminus (p. 109) among deities to whom it is offered would be better away, while Aeschylus, Ag. 96, surely disperses of the suggestion that an offering so described was not necessary. The Chapter XVIII gives interesting details regarding the ἐσπαθος, the tenth deals with the ecclesiastical personnel. Incidentally, the passages cited on p. 119 as indicating that there was more than one ἐσπαθος do not prove it, for the plurals might refer to successive holders of the office. The end of this chapter and the next three regretfully but justly conclude that we know little or nothing of the functions of the Hosiosi and of the use made of the laurel, the sacred stream or spring, and the famous sacred well. Chapter XIV attacks a long-standing and difficult problem. We have a number of phrases, highly significant; the majority are in plain and simple prose with no ambiguities at all (p. 167, preceded by a collection of the relevant texts). Incidentally, it should be mentioned that the author had a letter from a friend who had hoped to find the text of all the oracles, but learning that Mr. H. W. Parke had a similar task on hand, he passed on his material to him (p. 15). The following chapters are historical and topographical; they treat sanely but with no very new or surprising conclusions of other men. Chapter XVII is perhaps less to the Delphic genius fell in Hellinistic times, of his relations with Dionysos, and of the claims of Ge to have been the original mistress of the shrine, also of the whereabouts of her precint. Chapter XIX traces the history of the philosophical theory, for it never has anything else, considerably affected with Pythia; Chapter XX summarises the formation of the Delphic legend.

Where so much is sound and good, it does not seem worth while to list a few passages where the interpretation of
some detail of the evidence seems to the reviewer wrong or dubious.

H. J. Rose.


This is a most detailed doctoral dissertation, the outcome of long and laborious research frustrated by the strong good sense shown by the author in a field which has brought forth too abundant crops of wild speculation and ill-supported speculations. He gives more certainty into the title, and concerning these figures, for besides conclusions he has found about the Kabeiroi themselves, he has put together what amounts to a corpus of all cults of deities like them, i.e. groups of divinities (they seem to be for the most part male) distinguished by a general title, although very different, the group either not distinctive in the usual way or so small that except for an occasional distinction of sex (frequent use is made of Chapouthier's monograph, Les Discours au service d'une deesse, Paris 1935), there is little by which the knoppers can such as to be one of the figures of his cult from another. Hemberg does not go far into speculations as to the meaning and etymology of such non-adjective names as we have, nor into the question whether any of these groups can claim to be pre-Greek in origin, for as he has more into one point out, material for a satisfactory solution is lacking in most cases; he seems also of opinion (p. 25) that an understanding of the nature of these cults such problems matter comparatively little.

Besides an introduction, a series of appendices, full indexes and sketch-maps, showing the distribution of the cults in question, the main part of the work is divided into seven chapters. The first gives a long list of those groups of gods who, while called 'great' are neither Samothracian nor Kabeiroi. Of many of these cults remarkably little is known, and the great majority are Hellenistic, several being also foreign. Chapter II handles the Kabeiroi themselves, while Chapter III treats of the gods of Samothrace, whose only connection with the Kabeiroi seems to be theoretical identifications by several writers, the earliest and most famous being Herodotus. Chapter IV handles certain of unknown name whom the author considers 'kabinenartig'. After these enumerations come three chapters of more general exposition; Chapter V examines 'Kernzeichen der Megaloi Thea', Chapter VI the characteristics which they share with deities related in one way or another to the Kabeiroi, and Chapter VII is a 'Zusammenfassung'. There follow six appendices, dealing with a number of particular points, such as the names of the Samothracian gods and other matters of minor, but not negligible importance. The four maps show the distribution of the cults respectively of the wyidai god, the Kabeiroi, the Samothracian gods and sundry other groups, including the Dissokurioi.

As usual happens when a really sound and thorough treatment of a subject is put out, there are fairly numerous problems of interpretation left for future researchers. The author has furnished good store of material for these, and little if anything for those who come after him to reject as erroneous or irrelevant.

H. J. Rose.


This monograph is of wider interest than its modest title and size would indicate. Its subject is the miracles of healing in the New Testament, especially those recorded of Jesus and their relation to the beliefs and exorcistic practices of those times. Whatever view may be taken of the historicity of the miracles, it is certainly well to know exactly how far they were in accordance with what was then generally thought concerning diseases and their cure by other than the ordinary means. Professor Ertrem is thoroughly competent to explain the then current opinions, which he does by extensive reference to the magical papyri and other relevant material.

It is, of course, clear that the N.T. writers certainly believed in many diseases, especially those affecting the mind, and that bodily ailments, were due to the evil influence of malignant powers possessing or otherwise influencing the patient. The usual technique for non-rational cures was to exorcise, by magical means and prayer-formulary, those who were or considered to be made friendly and could drive out the offensive spirits. There were also current sundry forms of folk-medicine, on the border between magic and rational procedure, the application of spittle or the touch of a hand. The former is still to be found, the latter I am inclined to explain by supposing that, as disease was known to be sometimes contagious, so also the health of a particularly healthy person was thought to be. Some such folk-cures are recorded in the Gospels (p. 45 sqq.), but characteristically the healing seems, especially after the Baptism (p. 8) He is represented as using none of the regular techniques at all, but simply telling the disease, or the disease-spirit, to go away, and that by virtue of the ἐνοχὴ which was in him. He did not, however, perform any names of power, though his trying to raise Jairus' daughter was already so used and worn out by his lifetime (Mk. 9, 38), and very often later, both by his own followers and by outsiders.

In explaining this, the author gives what amounts to a handy compendium of the common magical formulae (including a discussion of magical formulae, pp. 14 sqq.), names of angels (pp. 31 sqq.), the vowels (pp. 39 sqq.), and other points of interest. He devotes several pages to the case of the Gerasene demoniac (p. 54 sqq.), making the interesting remark that he himself uses exercises in trance in his own practice (p. 57). The name of Plutarch should be in square brackets in line 15 on p. 41. I doubt i̇o̱μποφορισέν is in Plat., Lys. 229a7 means more than that the παρθένος spoke with a foreign accent. On p. 46 the complete avoidance of spelling might be well supplied by the restraint of Makarios of Alexandria, who never spelt from his baptism to his death (Pallad., Hist. Laus., p. 58, 3 Butler). The English style would be better with a little revision.

H. J. Rose.


In this volume are contained a section on O. Menghin on Europe apart from the cultures of the Aegean and Italy, and a section by Kaschnitz-Weinberg on Italy with Sardinia, Sicily, and Malta. But this review will take account only of the section Die Agaiis, by Matz.

This account of the Aegean in prehistoric times, according to a note at the beginning (p. 179), was originally undertaken by Matz, but not completed and largely rewritten by Matz, to whom Karo handed over his material in 1939. It offers a useful and up-to-date collection of references and summary of the present state of knowledge; but it may not commend itself to a non-specialist who is looking for a vivid and interesting general account of the early Aegean in the light of modern research, such as for example Tsountas and Manatt, The Mycenaean Age, was in its time. Whether a general account of this nature was intended or would in fact be appropriate like the Handbuch der Archäologie, is of course open to debate; but it is perhaps fair to suggest that the somewhat conventional array of photo plates, while they might very properly adorn an account of general interest, have no particular purpose in a handbook for scholars. It may also be regretted that the space and attention was not given to setting in a clear light the material culture of the various parts of the Aegean at different periods, and less to discussing theories on controversial problems of origins and dating, while the author's own particular views are apt to intrude without adequate supporting argument.

The actual statement of fact, however, is remarkably careful and free from error as far as the present writer has been able to check it. A certain amount published outside Germany since 1939 has inevitably not been accessible to Matz. But apart from this the references are very full and thorough, with few obviously important omissions; although, in connection with earlier metal working in the Aegean, Dr. Manatt's stimulating thesis about the LBA is not mentioned. It is generally deserved; and nothing is said of the interesting fixed hearths in Middle Minooan houses at Mallia (BCH LVI, 77).

Matz believes that the Messara 'Tholoi' can only have had flat roofs, and explains the burning in them by the collapse of roofs which had caught on fire; in spite of this he claims that the Mainland type of Tholos tomb originated in Crete. The statement that the Tholos at Knossos opened by Mr. Hutchinson in 1939 is of Late Minoan date and not the architectural prototype of the excavator's recently stated opinion that it cannot have been built later than c. 1500 (Antiquity 1948, 73). The theory that the poverty of known Middle Minooan graves reflects a draining up of the properties classes by the rise of Princes is interesting, but one can hardly accept it.

The text is carefully printed and the photo plates are well reproduced.

M. S. F. Hood.

This is an important book on the archaeology, hence history, of the Near East. A vast amount of information has been gathered, classified, and studied, and all this results from a methodology of excavation which was all for which permission was granted. It had also to be done on an incredibly small sum of money, hence without assistants.

Several deep pits were sunk through occupation strata to a depth of 48 feet below the surface without reaching the bottom, and this was without the least hint of material was found. The stratification falls into a number of well-defined periods. A full account is given of each, levels noted of everything found, sections are given of the only two pits that produced animal bones, the sounding, the colour map of the mound is provided, and the pottery and other objects are illustrated, catalogued, described, &c., &c.

Some of the striking changes in pottery etc. that mark the strata are as follows:

Period M represents a stratum about 3 feet thick and was probably of short duration. Painted pottery begins to appear.

Period K was some 22 feet thick, the thickest stratum that was encountered. It is characterised by grey or black polished pottery. In Period G this ceases and is replaced by new types, noticeable among which is a flower pot of buff ware. This stratum was nearly 6 feet thick. The D Period pottery is very different from anything that has gone before, and has many parallels all over the Near East. Here we meet with two varieties of polychrome ware, using red and black or red and white paint, and birds begin to appear as a decorative motif. A new animal, the pig, makes its appearance, but there were no signs of oxen, though they had been known in the earlier period. K. Sheep, however, were common in both these periods. In one grave, appears likely to belong to the end of the Period there were several skulls. The jawbones of two of these had evidently been wrenched off at the time of burial; a habit not unknown in other parts of the Near East.

Period C is marked by the general use of yet new shapes of pottery painted in a new style of polychrome. Birds continue as a decoration and a stag appears. The birds are reminiscent of the Scarlet Ware of Mesopotamia and of Susa II. At Gez Tepe they are painted in lustreous colour as are the birds at Phylakopi and at sites in Greece just before the Late Helladic I Period.

In Period B decorated pottery ceases and only plain vessels are found. These vessels are also different. The twin-shaped spout appears and a very Eighteenth Dynasty looking tall cup (Fig. 34, no. 98).

Period A introduces us to the Early Iron Age with a fine series of pottery shapes. This immediately underlies the Chaldean and the earliest of the settlements.

Barton Brown subjects each of his finds to a detailed study of the parallels that can be found all round the Near East, and the amount of learning put into this is very great, as indeed it need be. By so doing he is enabled to get approximate dates for his various Periods. To this is added a very long excursus on the varieties of polychrome pottery in the Near East.

Probably belonging to Period D a necklace was found including a number of blue glass beads. The colouring proves to be cobalt, a material not used in Egypt until the Eighteenth Dynasty, when it is probable that it was imported from some such area as Azarbaijan. At this time cobalt blue beads were being worn at Mycenae, where lumps of rock salt were also found. In the same Period D a piece of material was found which the analyst describes as 'a glassy iron slag'. By the time of the next Period, C, there is little doubt that iron was being worked. In Period A one vessel was found with a head of a human crania, and of the flint industry. These reports are amplified by full archaeological studies with tables of the analyses of copper and bronze in the Near East in the later third and the second millennium. The analyses are based on the excavation of large amounts of material, the early finds of the metal. The crania are of the later third millennium and are unmistakably of Mediterranean type. They are specially important as coming from an area that has hitherto been unknown archaeologically.

The subject of the book is very large, and the time and energy spent on the work Part IV is added which is a fully documented essay on the Third Millennium Age in the Near East. It is of course a vast subject, but like the working up of the finds this is characterised by a wide knowledge of the archaeology of the area. The foundations for it were laid some 20 years ago in the Third Millennium History and his article in the Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology, XXVIII, 3-26. One result of the study is to show that there is much evidence for a movement of peoples southwards and westwards from such a direction as Azarbaijan, Armenia, or similar countries. While the southward movement is a commonplace in Egyptian history, the westward one does not yet seem to have received general recognition in Aegean history.

G. A. WAUNRIGHT.


Troy is the key archaeological site of the Aegean world. It has been in 1870 that Schliemann discovered, as he himself said, a new world for archaeology. Its Homeric renown has made its name familiar to all. As an archaeological site it is one of the most important in the whole Aegean area, from the long sequence of settlements that arose there from the dawn of the Bronze Age until the time of Constantine, and from the consequent depth of the strata that have gradually accumulated upon the hill of Hisarlik. The labours of Schliemann and his colleague Dörpfeld, and the long series of publications issued by them have given that world the main lines of the development of the cultures that succeeded one another at Troy and Ilium. Schliemann, from the beginning of his work in 1870 until his death in 1890, conducted seven major campaigns and only in his last was it revealed to him that the Sixth Settlement in its latest phase was that of the capital of the thirteenth century B.C. of the Homer of Mycenae. In two more campaigns Dörpfeld and his collaborators explored the Sixth Settlement, laid bare its magnificent walls, and proved to the world that Schliemann was right when from his earliest years he believed firmly that Troy had existed and that it had a long and independent reality. It was Homer that inspired Schliemann, and through his faith in the historical basis of Homer Schliemann incurred the disapproval of the professional scholars whose outlook barely extended beyond the confines of their own nationalities or the gifted non-professional. By his attitude towards Homer and towards archaeology and by his great discoveries which were really epoch-making he aroused the jealousy of professional scholars and archaeologists. A few, such as the great Viret, recognized the true value of his discoveries, and others abroad such as Gladstone and Sir Charles Newton applauded his work.

In 1908 Dörpfeld and his helpers put forward their great book Troy I and II, which gave the story of Troy from the archaeological aspect, but it is far from being complete given by later scholars such as Evans our knowledge of the Aegean archaeology has increased. Countless scholars of many nations have all contributed to the study of the Aegean, its islands, coasts, and the contacts of its civilization with neighboring lands. Work has been resumed at different seasons of Troy, such as Tiryns and Tiryns, and further exploration there has taught us much. A culture akin to that of Troy has been found in Lesbos and on the other bank of the Hellespont. It has become unsurpassed in theainties undertake at Troy and a series of questions be asked of the site. The object of any new work would be 'Wissenschaft', as Schliemann always insisted. This has been carried out by the University of Cincinnati's Expedition to the Troad with the blessing and active support of the German Archaeological Institute, and the Turkish archaeological authorities. The leadership was entrusted to Professor Blegen, whose long experience of Aegean excavation
and its methods and techniques and whose archaeological knowledge made him the best possible field director. The organization in Cincinnati was undertaken by Professor and Mrs. Semple. They bore the burden of the financial support without which the work could never have been carried through.

For seven seasons Professor Blegen and his colleagues laboured and toiled year after year preliminary examination of the results in the American Journal of Archaeology pending the preparation of a definitive account of their work.

The two parts of Volume I now lie before us and deal with the First and Second Settlements for Professor Blegen with the "city" for the successive strata of occupation at Troy. One Part contains the text and the other the illustrations, plans, and maps. They are produced in the admirable manner which the Princeton University Press has now made familiar to the archaeological and art book public. Typography, printing, colotypes, and the handsome and conventional appearance of both parts are a credit to the Press and to the Meriden Gravure Company. The text falls into three parts. First comes a general introduction detailing the organization, the objectives, the seven campaigns, the methods of excavation, the classification of the finds, the settlements and their phases, and the plan of publication. Secondly, follows the First Settlement showing the areas examined, with its subdivisions, its external relations and chronology, and the classification of the miscellaneous objects and of the pottery. To this succeeds a detailed description of the three main subperiods and their stratification and of the finds from them. Lastly, the Second Settlement is described, in the same manner. There is a thorough and excellent index, but an index of the illustrations, maps, and plans would have been a useful supplement in a book demanding so much illustration.

As might be expected, the main aim of the expedition was to solve, so far as research without any 'compulsion to recover objects of startling or sensational character with high publicity value'. The first task was to re-examine the whole problem of Troy stratification in the light of recent research, and the undisturbed deposits of the successive strata and thus produce a certain evidence of 'certified material to illustrate the culture of the Settlements. The second task was to search for tombs. The third was to explore the Troad and to try to map all ancient sites in its north-western part and to test some of them, if possible.

The first objective has been triumphantly achieved, and the finds of all kinds, architectural, ceramic, and miscellaneous, give as valuable evidence for understanding and differentiating the strata and provide a better foundation for an attempted chronology.

The second objective was only partially successful. A cremation cemetery of the Sixth Settlement was discovered. In the exploration of the Troad one important thing has been found out: the site was occupied and partly anterior to the First Settlement. This will be published in a separate supplementary monograph. At Balli Dagh, once erroneously claimed by several scholars as the site of Homeric Troy, tests were made which proved conclusively that it is not a prehistoric site.

The manifold evidence collected by the Cincinnati Expedition demonstrates once more beyond doubt to all reasonable beings that Hisarlik must be the site of the Homeric Troy. It is the largest prehistoric site in the whole area, and the houses, walls, and treasures discovered in this great mound by its successive excavators, Schliemann, Dörpfeld, Blegen make it quite obvious that no other site in the Troad can possibly be considered as Homeric Troy. Some other authors have however suggested alternative sites for Troy and some have claimed that Hisarlik an 'incineration necropolis'. Here plainly set out is the fact that makes any such idea sheer hallucination. It is curious that one or two genuine ancient strata and the historical strata have been misclassified as 'incineration necropoles'. At the Neolithic site of Rasei near Plovdiv in Bulgaria one of the excavators mistook the burnt ruins of huts for sepulchres. It should now be less hazardous to speak as archaeologically proved that Hisarlik is Troy and that the Trojan war was a real event.

The book is written in a slightly subjective-factual. Professor Blegen and his colleagues have transferred to paper the strata and the objects they found with their contexts so that any intelligent person can see and interpret the development of civilization at Troy itself and its contacts with neighbouring archaeological areas in the Aegean, in Europe, in Asia Minor. They have based their judgments on their own discoveries and observations although they have been influenced somewhat by the work of their predecessors. One of the difficulties arising from the earlier excavations was the correlation of the finds with the houses, fortifications, and other architectural features of the various levels. The Schliemann Expedition paid especial attention to this problem and above all to the pottery which every field archaeologist knows is one of the essential keys to the interpretation of a site. At any excavation, more especially that of a prehistoric site, it is vital that the member of the staff should focus in person the finds from it so that he can observe from day to day the sequence of the pottery. Failure to do this may result in the divorce of the finds from the context in which they were found, and the need for the authors may lead to an erroneous chronology. One of this will see that the most meticulous care was observed in this matter, and thus the results as regards the finds and their stratification may be taken as 'isolated. The animal bones and the shells from the different strata were carefully isolated and have been studied by Dr. Gevall. One interesting point that emerges is that the horse first appears in Troy VI.

The world has long accepted the 'Nine Cities' of Troy. Professor Blegen and his colleagues have found that the main strata of the strata presented themselves where Schliemann and Dörpfeld had already distinguished them. Although these nine periods of occupation are essentially correct, they do not adequately represent the complexity of Troy. In spite of the need for the authors have decided to keep the established numbering of the strata of Troy. To begin now a new system of numbering would make it extremely difficult for anyone to equate the new evidence with the old and to form anything like a clear picture of the history of Troy. The need for such a classification is a matter of this book will see that the most meticulous care was observed in this matter, and thus the results as regards the finds and their stratification may be taken as 'isolated. The animal bones and the shells from the different strata were carefully isolated and have been studied by Dr. Gevall. One interesting point that emerges is that the horse first appears in Troy VI.

The world has long accepted the 'Nine Cities' of Troy. Professor Blegen and his colleagues have found that the main strata of the strata presented themselves where Schliemann and Dörpfeld had already distinguished them. Although these nine periods of occupation are essentially correct, they do not adequately represent the complexity of Troy. In spite of the need for the authors have decided to keep the established numbering of the strata of Troy. To begin now a new system of numbering would make it extremely difficult for anyone to equate the new evidence with the old and to form anything like a clear picture of the history of Troy. The need for such a classification is a matter of this book will see that the most meticulous care was observed in this matter, and thus the results as regards the finds and their stratification may be taken as 'isolated. The animal bones and the shells from the different strata were carefully isolated and have been studied by Dr. Gevall. One interesting point that emerges is that the horse first appears in Troy VI.
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historical identification. It is recognition of the archaeological fact that Troy VIIα and the first phase of Troy VIIIb are really the last phase of Troy VI. The vital point to remember is that Troy VI and VIIα with the first phase of Troy VIIα together belong to the Middle and Late Bronze Age and that it is to the close of the Bronze Age that the epithet Hittite should be applied.

In the First Settlement much fresh evidence was acquired. The amount of pottery and the number of small finds that can be classified is enormous. To it has been previously inadequately related to it. A comparison of this book with Schmidt's catalogue reveals this instantly. The herring-bone technique in some of the walls of this Settlement found by Schliemann was not decorative, for it is in Troy II, and it is evident that it was covered with plaster. Thus when the house was completed the herring-bone technique was invisible. A more important point is that the First Settlement, like the Second, was defended by a fortification wall, which naturally encloses a smaller area than that later on added by its successor. It suggests that from its foundation Troy was the seat of a prince, and a government. It was not a town or city in the modern sense of the term, but like all the Settlements with the exception of the Ninth, probably the Eighth, and perhaps the Third, was a 'castle' or 'acropolis' for the ruler, his family, officers, and their servants and soldiers. It is not to be compared with a fortified medieval town like Chester, but with some royal citadel like Edinburgh Castle. This first Settlement did not consist of one stratum only, but, as is shown by the succession, the successive floors and walls, can be subdivided into less than ten layers. The culture was continuous and an unbroken evolution can be discerned throughout its duration, and through the Second, Third, and Fourth Settlements until the end of the Fifth. The culture in the First Settlement can be classified into larger phases, called Early I (a, b, c), Middle I (d, e, f), and Late I (g, h, j). No burials belonging to the First Settlement were found, but six graves of infants were discovered, two below House 102 and four others outside the north wall of that building. Nothing earlier than the first phase (Ia) of the First Settlement ever stood on the hill, because that layer is founded on the native rock. The accurate and patient observation of the pottery and its provenance enabled the excavators to identify imported wares. At the same time the neighbourhood of Thermi in Lesbos and the Protoslaeus mound on the Thracian Chersonese, revealed a striking similarity in culture. Troy I is to be equated with the first five towns of Thermi and the first three at the Protoslaeus mound. The parallelism of these is obvious, and they can thus be fitted into an archaeological sequence. More absolute dating is, however, not yet possible. In the First Settlement of Troy were found many examples of Early Helladic and Early Cycladic pottery which indicate contacts between the islands and Troy. It is noticeable that this imported pottery does not appear in Early Troy I, but only in its Middle and Late periods. Further the imported wares do not belong to the wares which are recognised as belonging to the first Early Helladic and Early Cycladic periods. It is possible that Troy began to make contacts with Greek islands and Troy during its first phase. It can safely be said at the moment then that the appearance of imported Early Helladic ware in the middle phase of Troy I can hardly be anterior to the middle stages of the Early Bronze Age in Greece and the Cyclades. This caution is most laudable, for although some excavators speak of Early Helladic I, II, and III, such divisions of the Early Bronze Age on the Greek Mainland or in the Cyclades can be at present only tentative and need confirmation and correction by results from Crete. It is certain that the Early Helladic and the Cycladic sequences and those of Minoan Crete are not fixed, and those of Crete itself with Egypt, where alone an approach to absolute dating is possible, cannot yet be made. The Second Settlement was divided by Dörpfeld into three stages based entirely on the architectural evidence, mainly that of the fortifications. The Cincinnati Expedition's main concern in this Settlement was therefore to obtain new information on the dating of the different phases of the architecture. Fresh architectural evidence was derived from walls built above one another. The deposits connected with them were 'isolated', so that the successive stages of the evolution of the culture could be identified. Cincinnati's discovery of Troy II was the result of a new method of excavation. In this method, in one area, the successive phases, one of which is a kind of transition or sub-phase between IIα and IIb. In order, however, not to confuse the equation of their phases with those of Dörpfeld the excavators give this sub-phase no special designation. Thus their IIa, IIb, and IIc are the same as Dörpfeld's II 1, 2, and 3, and are followed by four other layers, II, d, e, f, and g. Phase IIg was the final period of Troy II when the whole Settlement perished in a violent conflagration. This was the 'burnt city' which Schliemann called Troy II and in some earlier accounts and identified with the Troy of Homer. This settlement has been now more accurately dated than any other, and most of the other 'treasures' of gold objects found by Schliemann. It is most striking that of the 1,481 gold beads and pins found by the Cincinnati Expedition in Troy II no less than 1,478 come from phase IIg.

The chronology and external relations of Troy II are by no means clear and are to say the least complicated. Hitherto there has been a tendency, under the influence of Schmidt and Dörpfeld's works, to ascribe to Troy II most of the finer objects found, which have been supposed to date to V. The danger of this is made clear by the Cincinnati excavations which now show that Troy III, IV, and V were not miserable villages as some have described them. The culture of the Second Settlement evolved without a break through them and many things which appear to have been in Troy II continued in use with little change even to Troy V. The authors take as an example the so-called 'depos Amphikolos', a type studied in detail by Bittel, which had a wide range from Svilengrad in Bulgaria and Boeotian Orchomenos to the interior of Asia Minor. Unluckily one of the best examples from Asia Minor has only a dealer's provenance and the Svilengrad specimen is a stray find (Gaul, op. cit., 230). Most of the chronological comparisons so far have been made on the assumption that the successive phases of the settlements in Troy III and continues through the phases of that Settlement. It occurs often in Troy III, is not rare in Troy IV and Schliemann ascertains that it continued into Troy V. Thus to use this as a basis for chronological comparisons can lead to erroneous conclusions. The successive phases of Troy II can be classified into at least thirteen consecutive phases. The same difficulty is encountered in trying to use objects from Troy of stone, metal, and bone for similar purposes. A steatite Minoan bowl ascribed by Bittel to Troy II is given by Schmidt to Troy III. This is probably due to the deposit of a Minoan stone mould was found by the Cincinnati Expedition in a Roman trench. Similarly though, as remarked, most of Schliemann's 'treasures' can be assigned to the last phase of Troy II, the Second Settlement. The evidence which concludes the possibility of their being later in date.

The imported pottery is after all the safest guide for trying to trace archaeological and chronological contacts with neighbouring areas. The Early Helladic and Early Cycladic wares found in 'a steady trickle' throughout the various phases of Troy II show the general contemporaneity of Troy II with those periods on the mainland and in the Islands. Unfortunately when closer synchronisms are desired, it is practically impossible to establish them. The Early Helladic and Cycladic contacts from Troy cannot be related to those from the Greek mainland and islands. It is clear that the contacts between them and Crete and between Crete and Egypt are still in a state of flux. The margin of error is too great. The authors give one striking example: Two fragments of vases from Troy II, others from Troy III, and some other pieces seem to be counterparts of a 'depos from Boeotian Orchomenos. This has no fixed place in the Orchomenian sequence, but Kunze assigns it to a late stage in the Early Helladic period. This might perhaps be the earliest date for a transition between the Early Helladic period and Troy II, but an exact synchronism is not possible, for fragments of similar two handled goblets of the same fabric occurred in Troy II, d, f, and j, and Troy IIIb, and so no sure parallel can be determined. The conclusion drawn is that Troy II in phase IIg perished by a most destructive fire before the Early Helladic and Early Cycladic periods came to an end.

All these points and much more can be tested by the reader from the detailed presentation of the archaeology of the site in book. Professors Delbrück and Schaeffer are to be congratulated on the masterly manner in which they have reproduced Troy on paper, archaeologically speaking. Those who do not know the site will now have brought to their studies in all its details, and to their conclusions and conclusions and conditions which the authors here set out with absolute impartiality. Those who know the site will delight to have their knowledge of it refreshed and enlarged. Baring in mind the old dictum that all excavation is destruction, the authors have no less than 3000 photographs and have recorded everything and they thus have given us a document of permanent value. None or, in short, can afford to disregard this book which is of vital importance to any student of Aegean and Near Eastern archaeology. It supersedes everything yet published about Troy, since M. Schaeffer's recent stratigraphical and chronological suggestions.
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It is difficult to decide which aspect of the author’s work deserves greater praise, the patience and accuracy of observation of their record, or the control with which they have achieved that theory and have confined themselves to a straightforward account of archaeological facts. We owe our heartiest thanks to Professor Blegen and his colleagues and shall look eagerly for the succeeding volumes of this model of careful excavation. When, as we hope, they are as they should come be them, when this is done, to write, as only they can, an archaeological and historical guide to Troy in one volume? This would be invaluable to the layman.

ALAN J. B. WACE.


The site of Vouneous in Cyprus, which is an Early Bronze Age (Early Cypriot) cemetery, lies at a small distance north-east of the village of Bellapais in the foot-hills of the Kyrenia range facing the sea. It was fast being destroyed by looters from the surrounding villages when in 1931-2 the writer of the present review started a campaign to save it. He worked on behalf of the Cyprus Museum and opened forty-eight tombs, the contents of which were published in Archaeologia Cypriae (1931-4). The site is situated in the National Museums of France in conjunction with the Cyprus Museum (Schaeffer and Dikaios) opened more tombs (side C. Schaeffer, Mission Archéologique Cypriote, 26 ft.). Both enterprises were concerned with the northern part of the cemetery, which Stewart’s styles site B, and which is now to be the later part of this extensive cemetery. The northerner part (site A), which occupies the east area of the site, that the present authors investigated, with the following results.

These are not published in a final form. The Expedition was sponsored by the British School at Athens, and both the sponsoring body and the authors should be congratulated on the remarkable finds and the meticulous presentation of the results.

Site A contained the graves of the firsts and of the ancient city, which contained the bodies of the ‘cult-vessels’ on pl. 79-83, and particularly those on pl. 81-83 cannot but impress, and they seem to imply a powerful cultural development the significance of which is perhaps prehistorically important. The finds include:

(e.g. Athens, XXXVIII, pl. 8-10, 20-25, 90) had previously thrown a flood of light on the religious, domestic, and general cultural life in Cyprus at the close of the third millennium B.C., but artistically the finds from site A, here presented, are outstanding.

Briefly, there he touches on as tasks as follows: Mr. Stewart described the tombs, and Mrs. Stewart the finds. Their work, both in the field and in the publication, has been carried out with utmost care and attention to detail. They were the beginning of their book is simply a field-report. There is no discussion of the finds, nor any attempt at relative or absolute chronology, nor a summary of the observations regarding burial customs, etc. All these ‘conclusions’ will be dealt with in a second part to be included in Vol. II of the Swedish Cyprus Expedition. This method of separating the site reports from the excavation from the analysis of its results and the conclusions to be drawn from them has been used by others (e.g. the Swedish Cyprus Expedition): it is not less preferable that every field-report should be accompanied by a chapter, short, giving the summary of the excavations on the position on the various problems elucidated or presented by his excavation. In the present case the postmodern part of all such discussion is the more to be regretted, since the material here published is of the first importance for the beginnings of burial culture in Cyprus. However, Mr. Stewart has recently given a very short summary of his opinions about the Vouneous material in the Handbook of the Nicholson Museum, (Sydney, 1948), 126 ff., and thus made his position known on various problems of the Early Cyprus. Although briefly, he touches on the relationship between the material of Vouneous A and the contents of the Phiala graves discovered subsequently by the writer of this review (cf. ILN, March 2, 1946, pp. 244-5; Guide to the Cyprus Museum, 12 ff., and Khivkult, 320 ff.). Mr. Stewart’s considered views on the relationship and the problems of dating and origins would have been welcome at this stage. Their omission from the present volume will, needless to say, enhance the interest with which his contribution to the Swedish Cyprus Expedition will be welcomed by all.

The description of the graves is clear. Extensive and detailed observations of the stratigraphy are recorded, and conclusions from them are drawn wherever possible. They show how much can be learned from close observation of all the finds connected with a grave, even though sometimes such facts may be elusive and susceptible of different and sometimes subjective interpretations. For example, in Tomb 87 A and B, which is a double-chamber tomb with a non-inscribed broken blade, a chamber A is a cylindrical room, each contained a single burial. In chamber B the author found, apart from other finds, fragments of a large cut-away neck jug with incised decoration (74, pl. VIII), but not the complete vessel. The author sees in the existence of this fragmentary vase a mesagre evidence for the author’s interpretation, especially in a cemetery where so much pottery was used for tomb furniture and when so many jug fragments occurred while the vases were brought to the graves. The ceramics had been completely reopened for the burial in chamber A, and it is not impossible that in all the cases of the fragments of the broken jug might equally well have found their way into chamber B. In this instance (Tom 87) the author explains the presence of a broken knife blade, with the upper portion missing, as the result of ‘killing’ personal possessions at the grave-side (p. 111). This, I feel, is a more correct way of interpreting the fragmentary vase which was found as a part of broken vessels did find their way into graves in one way or other.

Of Tomb 137 in site B, where the author also excavated a number of tombs to complement the material from site A, Stewart observes that when the grave gifts were found in the chamber there was in it a layer of silt some 14 cm. in some parts and 5 cm. in others deep. From this he concludes that the ‘pottery found in the chamber formed a second burial group and the grave had been opened before. As for the seepage of the objects the lay was sterile, it can be assumed that earlier remains were removed’. I think, and I think preferable, to explain otherwise the presence of the sit on which the pottery was placed. It is evident that the cutting of a tomb in the rock must have taken some time, and it is to be assumed that people had their tombs (which were often family ones) prepared before the time came for their use. It is therefore possible that following the cutting of the tomb the dramos remained open and that some time had to pass before the chamber was re-opened. That dramos were open and after a first burial has been observed already, e.g. by Dr. E. Stjörgent at the Early Cypriot cemetery of Vrysi tou Barba, near Lapithos (cf. S.B.C. I. 79).

Another interpretation which might be questioned is the assumption of a very violent storm within forty-eight hours of the burial in tomb 160 (p. 204), sufficiently violent for the entombment to bring down a portion of the roof and lift a rigid body. The displacement of two skulls from the body in tomb 163 chamber A was explained by assuming that the bodies belonged to ‘two unfortunate warriors’ buried simultaneously. But the author admits (p. 242) that following the burials in chamber A, two more were made in chamber B, which opened from the same dramos, and that possibly chamber A was simultaneously opened and a task deposited in it at the time of the second burial in chamber B. Might not the displacement of the skulls have occurred then? In fact, by one of the skulls in chamber B were found two objects, one of gold and a second of copper, and it is possible that the removing of the dramos of his burial in chamber B, chamber A was re-opened and the metal objects removed from it (in which process the skulls would have been displaced) and offered to the fresh occupant of chamber B. The lack of reverent for previous burial is well known, and has been frequently noted in the present publication.

In several cases of single burials (e.g. T. 119, p. 171) the author suggests as an alternative the possibility that these graves were secondary, without, in the reviewer’s opinion, a sufficiently sufficient other has, some cases where there were two burials in a chamber (e.g. T. 90, p. 94) the author prefers to regard as contemporary double burials, but without suggesting any explanation for the double death. No doubt the author will have more to say about such cases in the second part of the book.

The descriptions of the finds are clear, accurate, and concise.
They testify to exceptional skill and patience in dealing with such a mass of material, remembering that altogether eighty-four tombs were opened. The style of the material is excellent, and both the drawings and the photographs, as well as the plates of finds, are of very good quality. The difficulty which Stewart encountered in preparing the book, arising evidently from war conditions (p. 10), have left very few traces in the finished product. As is usual with published plans (p. 11), the drawings for which were prepared by Mrs. Austin Kennett. The letterpress is remarkably free of misprints; but for 'Vrysi tou Baba' read 'Barba' (pp. 109, 242, 590), the Early Cypriot cemetery excavated by Myres and Markides (1913) and the Swedish Gymnopedion (1973).

The report includes twelve appendices by various authors, including analyses of metal objects, material of stone implements, remains of wood, human and animal remains, impressions of seals and ostracod plates, etc. The author himself adds a table of potter's marks.

In conclusion, the authors are to be congratulated on a careful and conscientious piece of work and on the excellent presentation of their important material, which also does credit to the publishers. A first installment from an excavator who is planning further work in Cyprus, it augurs well for the Australian Expedition which Mr. Stewart hopes to bring to Cyprus.

P. Dikaios


This book will please many people. It is, as indeed it was bound to be, since it stems from Miss Lorimer's pen, a wonderfully complete survey of the evidence, and there can be no doubt that the author has achieved her purpose, which was 'to review the archaeological record of the Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages in the Aegean area, giving as complete a picture as possible of those elements in it which find a place in the Homeric poems, and to relate this survey to that other record, shadowy, fragmentary, often enigmatic, which is preserved in the poems themselves.'

The first two chapters are entitled, 'Prehistoric Greece' and 'Foreign relations of Greece in the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age'. These chapters are mainly historical. In the other part of the book the author turns to a very detailed survey of the monuments of the Homeric poems, in a series of chapters on: Cremation and Iron; Writing in the Aegean area and the age of illiteracy in Greece; Arms and Armour; Dress; The Homeric House, and in a final Chapter on Conclusions.

Miss Lorimer accepts without question certain views. She believes, for example, that the Dorian had entered the Peloponnesian before the end of the twelfth century, and that 'there can be no doubt that the colonisation' (of Cyprus) 'was carried out in the Late Bronze Age, and in the main by Aegeans'. She accepts the main Unschein circuit, and sees the great tradition of the sub-Mycenaean and the Protogeometric periods, and finds no evidence of any change of population 'can be observed in Greece, and that, in Protogeometric days the Greek world was virtually severed from contact with the East'. Of the rite of cremation she says that since cremation was not brought into Greece by any invading or intrusive population, the disintegrating Achaeans society which adopted it must have found the model abroad, perhaps, she thinks, at Hissarlik. However, she also adds that 'in a period contemporary with the Protogeometric period of the Kerameikos Crete had relations with Cyprus and commanded an adequate supply of iron, probably through Cyprus as an intermediary. In all probability she was herself the intermediary through whom the presenters of the objects got their supplies of iron.' And in the next paragraph, when they had begun to manufacture their own tools and weapons, 'the Grids of the last supply of supply.' Of the extremely important problem of the Kytherians, people she says that the evidence whereby Hall tried to connect them with Lydia 'is of the flimsiest, but the conclusion may nevertheless be right'. This may be thought a little strange, considering the extraordinary detail into which Mr. Wainwright has gone, in his attempt (usually accepted to-day) to connect those people with Cilicia.

Miss Lorimer writes for over two hundred pages on the subject of arms and weapons of the wealthy of knowledge she offers the reader is astounding. But why does she say apropos a Cypriot figurine in the Cesnola Collection holding an hour-glass-shaped shield that it is 'improbable that this unique monument represents a Cypriote type' (p. 252)? We may well wonder if she will repeat this when she reviews the other buildings with columns and Ionie capitals, nor the archaic filigree decoration so astonishingly similar to Greek geometric work, which Chantre published. And some may regret that she does not discuss the question of the origination of both as drawn by hand and as drawn with the use of a compass. Her omission of any serious discussion of the Kiev problem is also unfortunate. For, while some aspects of the history of the period are very exhaustively examined, an impress gases on the reader that other aspects are but lightly regarded, and it is possible to feel that the book is out of balance.

Miss Lorimer believes that both the Iliad and the Odyssey were cast into shape within a single lifetime, the lower limit of the being that of the approximate time which would precede the time of the 'revival' of relations between east and west. It still, however, remains doubtful whether relations were ever broken off, and until this point can be satisfactorily settled, change of the date is surely but the beginning of the Iron Age, can now, or ever will, be able to dispense with this extraordinarily detailed discussion of material.

T. BURTON BROWN


The book of the Architecture of Ancient Greece is a subject incomprehensible to nearly all students. Existing handbooks are slight or out of print, excavation reports inaccessible, unreadable, and too big. When, therefore, the greatest living authority, after forty years of continuous study, decides to rewrite one of the best known handbooks, that book should be read. The omens seem good, and all Hellenists will wish the author well. Unhappily, the result falls short of the occasion. Dinsmoor has not considered his audience. While far too intricate for the beginner, his work is too dogmatic for the scholar and presents a misleading picture of ancient art, the technical aspects of even moderate intelligence. It contains a wealth of clever theories and neat conclusions, but few will have the skill or patience to unearth them.

Dinsmoor's book is the foundation of the book, which aims at exhaustiveness up to A.D. 1444, is well arranged and far more comprehensive than any before it. Together with the Introduction, a fairly complete history of archaeological research in this subject, it takes the study a further step out of the present chaos. One must admire the impartiality of the author, who from Dinsmoor that Paoli's is the most authoritative early book on Paestum, representing, as it does, the work of Count Gazola. The sixth-century date Dinsmoor gives on p. 144 for the anti-capital of Slavochi has been disputed. But one of his objects of early Chian moulings, the one from Dinsmoor mention the excellent photographs of them in Ship's Greek Mouldings. We shall find other omissions as we proceed.

The first chapter describes the Bronze or 'Agean' Age. Dinsmoor defends his view that early houses on the mainland had pitched roofs, stresses the love of symmetry, the love of floors, and the general restriction habits. The monuments were said to be columns on the central axis of a building and decisions that their architecture (including the 'trilyph frieze') is an earlier parallel development rather than a direct ancestor of the Classical Greek. One is not, however, too confident over his disquisition of the Bronze and earlier Iron Age: for instance, he has not mentioned that the house-model in fig. 15 is a mixture of two sorts of roof.
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Coming to the origins of Greek Architecture, Dr. Dinsmoor gives a good short account of how cities, cubes, and temples presumably grew. On pp. 177-81 it is surely right to follow the advice of Deloug and assign the carved frieze of Pnias to the parapet of the early temple. He thus suggests another link, besides Pny's, between Crete and early Ionia, where we have similar carved or plastic parapets. He states: "The Olympiea of Heron, D. first discusses units of measurement, a subject to which he devotes a large proportion of his book. His passages are difficult to coordinate, the units in which he tabulates difficult to sort out but broadly speaking he seems to show that all these buildings (though not the Parthenon!) to round numbers of 'Doric' or 'Ionic' feet, the 'Doric' foot, rather greater than the English, being used in Greece proper, the 'Ionic', rather less than the English. The cella of the structures of the Theatre at Minot, which have 13 English inches apart, represent, thinks D., a 'Doric' foot of 12½ inches. This tallies very well, he finds, with a 'Doric' foot of 12½ inches (326 mm.), ascertained by measuring the blocks of the Erechtheum and comparing their ancient dimensions as given by the Chandler Marble. One can also obtain a 'Doric' foot nearly equal to it by subscription to that of 321 mm., used, according to Doerpfeld, in some of the temples of the Temple of Zeus at Olympia: but only by discounting Pausanias, who states that this was one and a half Doric feet in length, with Doerpfeld's. On this conflicting evidence for an important building, a test case for his theories, D. never breathes a word. Similarly, we find a discrepancy between the 'Ionic' foot of 11½ inches, Gottingen inches he infers from Priene (p. 222, n. 1) and the 11½ inches from Ionia (p. 118, n. 2). This variation may not worry the reader, but should disturb D., who objects (p. 229, n. 2), though on grounds never stated, to von Gern's method. On p. 25, D. gives a foot of 11½ inches as his standard, though not uncommon to Greek stadia, let alone six hundred of his own 'Doric' or 'Ionic' feet. As a corollary of his views, D. can find no single dimension of exactly 100 Greek feet in the Parthenon. It will have to be taken as an 'Ionic' feet of the 11½ inches, or a Herakleopolitan, which is generally preceded. Yet it is certain that the stadium at Athens, which should represent 600 Greek feet, is in English measurements 606 ft. to inch, while the east front of the Parthenon is 101 ft. 3 in. on the stylobate, almost exactly one sixth of it.

On pp. 56-7 we find the evidence of Doric from timber to stone. "We may unhesitatingly affirm," he says, "that the triglyphs in the frieze represent the ends of beams, and his fig. 20 shows, accordingly, ceiling beams of enormous scantling placed at intervals of one metope only. But were the cubit of the Egyptian eyases? In the very archaic wood and terracotta entablature of Themon they seem to have been 80 cm. high proportionately as large as on the classical Athenian buildings—and on D., fig. 20, appears more than twice the height. Even with this it seems to support what we unhesitatingly declare against, e.g., Guadet, who considered triglyphs began as small piers? Again, the Doric ceiling beam, as all know, above frieze level. The only exception D. cites, the Athenian Propylaia, is very treacherous.

The article on Cooke, into the Hung D. treats with exhaustive erudition in a very valuable passage (pp. 56-64). He protests, rightly, against the name 'Aeolic' for the early 'vertical-volute' capitals of Neandria and Larisa, only, however, transfer it to those of circular plan with pendant leaves on the sixth-century Delphic treasuries of Massalia and Clazomenae. Neither of these towns was Aeolic and, though Pergamum later employed the form in its stoas, its buildings are too late to count as evidence. It seems better to follow the term 'Aeolic.' The row of south coast Neandria D. denies supported a ridge-pole. The more finished front of each capital, he argues, was clearly meant to face the front door, and each is in the form of a bracket. Thus they supported not the ridge-beams but the individual trefoil. The capital from Larisa (Plate XVIII) is from an external peristyle (Dinsmoor) or a votive column (Scheffold), while, as D.'s own fig. 21 makes clear, the capitals from Neandria are not brackets. D. does not mention that his so-called 'Neandria' capital perhaps shows wrong resembled ('f. Scheffold, Larid I, pl. 22).

Chapter III. The rise of the Doric style, is perhaps the most valuable in the book. Here D. has introduced a number of new pictures, as of the Hekatompedon (X and XV) and the Gorgon Tablet in the Hekatompedon repertory of the texts. He also gives us a manageable account (at last!) and a set of plans to a common scale of all the temples of Doric Sceinus. He last all variations in the early examples of Doric Sceinus.

and decides conclusively against an Egyptian ancestry for the Doric column. He shows, surprisingly but cogently, that the Pisastrid Olympieum of the Temple of Aphaia on Aegina that it was set up before the cella. Finally, D. shows the plausibility that the Vatopaeion, the so-called evanet metopes, not found in Old Greece much before 500 B.C.

The attempt on p. 82 to deprive every single ancient capital of 'Chinese' pediments (horizontal for some distance from the corners) seems defeated at once. Dggsy, Dar (pp. 177-81) and 221 seem to me inexplicable against Dinsmoor's attacks both here and in AJA LIV.

Sicilian Doric temples appear, wherever possible, to have avoided columns inside their cellas, and D. is certainly larger, less than the English. The cella of the Parthenon, whose ceiling was perhaps partly suspended from them. How does D. imagine them? Not as trusses. For a century later, as D. himself infers from the specification for Phile's assemintes with some significance in the breadth of the cella at the apex of the Parthenon (196) that held all the rafters in position.

Coming to the fifth century, D. attributes the hall in building throughout Attica for some thirty years to observance of the "Platean Oath" not to build temples until Solon had determined. Then how could Cimon rebuild the Telesterion at Eleusis, as described on p. 195? The early classic temples of Bassae and Olympia were begun at this time, and D. well argues that at the former the cella is much nearer the present building. S. also, p. 187-8, explaining Vrourio and other building projects to attempt to date the chryselephantine statue as close as possible to the building, brings Phidias there as early as 454 B.C. and involves D. in a conflict, of which he drops no hint, with Pleithor and Alcibiades.

The bulk of this chapter is admirable. For all his enthusiasm—and he conveys the inexactiaus interest of these buildings—D. retains his good sense. He praises Greek architecture for virtues it really possessed, so has no time for Goysander, the Golden Section. P. 187-8, explaining Vrourio and other building projects to attempt to date the chryselephantine statue as close as possible to the building, brings Phidias there as early as 454 B.C. and involves D. in a conflict, of which he drops no hint, with Pleithor and Alcibiades.

The next chapter, on the fourth century, contains among much else a most interesting critique of the Temple of Athena Polias at Priene, as an example of Greek proportion and a valiant attempt to restore confidence in the integrity of the Massalleum. On the other hand, D. considers less methodically than one might wish the question of sculpture in the normal Ionic pediments of Asia.

The last chapter, on the Hellenistic and Graeco-Roman phases has to round off the book, a feat that Hellenistic art manages next to impossible. One would have liked a clearer, consecutive account of the introduction of the large stone arch into building. The market building at Allinda contains interesting examples, and is shown on p. 294. But the source of information is not given, nor the references.

Theatres occupy much space in D., to what effect the reviewer feels incompetent to judge. He can hardly agree, however, with p. 120, that the natural assumption of a sixteenth-century theatre at Athens near the Parthenon is impossible. No theater skilfully D. may argue from poor, late authorities for a sixteenth-century theatre in the agora. D. is somewhat more persuasive when arguing that actors moved on the level of the orchestra at all times before the proscenium was introduced, though he cannot say the points in D.'s history of the Greek private house. While agreeing that the third-century houses of Priene derive from the megaron-type of the Bronze Age, he nowhere mentions the intermediate megaron of c. 500 B.C. at Larisa, but strangely confines himself to the intrusive Athenian in that city. Nor is the 'occus' at Olthynus, despite p. 252,
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so obviously 'descended from the old megaron' as are the examples in Asia.

I make no apologies for signposting the book in this detail, for pointing to some of the evidence it uses and of the topics on which it impinges. With an eye to architectural students, D. has refrained from quoting Greek. In his main argument, he thinks this is a valid approach in light of the fact that minute measurements no one can correct, reaches conclusions no sane man can believe and offers no clue to the truth beyond a bibliography of frightening immensity. No one, D. seems to suggest, can escape this labyrinth unless he knows as little about it as which is implicate. 'Science' will have murdered yet another liberal study.

There is only one way to prevent all this—free and frank discussion, with properly cited evidence, of every important topic as it arises. Ambiguity, dogmatism and argument by consensus meet us on too many pages of this book. On p. xvii Hemeroscopion, a mere polychron according to Strabo, is called one of the 'more important' Greek settlements. On p. 2 the period 1500-1490 B.C. is called the 'golden age' of the Aegean Civilisation and 1500-1100 B.C. its 'silver age', while on p. 16 D. calls Tiryns our best evidence for 'royal dwellings of the Heroic Age in Achaean Greece'. The Heroic Age is nowhere dated: all the three ages are poetical rather than chronological and this in a literal format and the reader is left with an uncontrollable kaleidoscope.

On pp. 16 ff. the word 'Megaron' is used everywhere of Mycenaean houses, though not employed (except in a page-heading) for the earlier 'megara' of Northern Greece. This word is also used instead of Homerian, memory of the Mycenaean palaces, but nowhere that we get the very word 'megaron' from Homer. From p. 36 one would assume the fugitives from the Peloponnesse reached Crete about 1100 B.C. But even Gjerstad hardly resisted the entry as late as this. P. 39 says the Greeks introduced hollow-casting from Egypt, although the art was invented in Sunyer and early hollow-cast Greek griffins are of 'eastern' type (Lamb, Greek and Roman Bronzes, p. 71). Why not quote, on p. 43, A. Lamb's evidence that Corinth invented the pediment (p. 43), or rather that Corinthians built the first rectangular temple with pediments at either end? Neither from pp. 43-4 nor from the glossary would one gather that the terms 'Corinthian' and 'Lacconian tiles' have ancient warrant, 'Sicilian tiles' none. P. 59 could with advantage have mentioned the Alpheios breastplates, although one must commend D. for noticing the first combination in one running design of the lotus and palmette. P. 65 D. quotes from Fris Johansen in his Danische Altertumskde (I. 1-222) as being seen elsewhere; but Sparta sto όρυχων φυότικα. Despite p. 123, Ephesus was never at this time leader of the Ionians. According to p. 125, the Persians did not burn down the Samian Heraion, as Pausanias suggests (11.23.6), because the curfew was enforced before the Persian Wars. This is to ignore the sack of Samos during the early years of Darius. P. 183, n. 1, asserts that the temple of Nemesis was rededicated to Livia—an act which escaped Pausanias' notice and would hardly have flattered Livia. In his bibliography D. omits Bronner, who published the inscription on which he himself here depends. P. 211 omits the use of the Odeum for the Proagon and suppresses its attribution by Vitrivius to Themistocles. The statement on p. 214 that Olynthus was enlarged approximately twice in 200 years seems unsupported by Thuc. I. 389, to post-date matters by five years. Without consulting Pausanias, the general reader could not see how much of p. 263 is derived from his account of Ela. It would have been as well to make this clear to the reader. The omission of the passage. P. 273, n. 3 is ambiguous. One finds no clue in D. to the difference between an Ekklesiasterion and a Bouleuterion, mentioned as alternatives on p. 295. The building at Priene was surely the former. The 'physician Orissius', quoted by E. J. Harrison, is not Hellenistic street-planning, belongs to the reign of Julian the Apostate.

One might perhaps have expected, even in these times, rather clearer, to have lost that this sometimes Plan of Olynthus 'shows only half the city, seemingly surrounded by sea. Fig. 89, because of its very small scale, sius over the difficult interval between the responds and the end columns of the porticoes' (Comparanda Megalopoli). Fig. 15, Plate XXVIII, alleged on p. 222 to show a Perigamene stoa, shows nothing clearly. Something has gone wrong with the right hand half of Plate XXXIX. To take at random five consecutive illustrations, figs. 86-90, only fig. 89 has a scale. The elaborate table of dimensions and proportions at the end of the text, however useful for one branch of research, affords no substitute for illustrations to scale.

Unlike Robertson, D. acknowledges no source for most of his illustrations. An error, however, in fig. 44, a fragment of AJA XXXVII, 277, fig. 6, with two centre columns added. Mylonas and Kourounioudis presumed these columns existed, but found no evidence for them on the site. Nowhere does D. explain. Plate IX, of the shrine in the Corinthian forum, repeats the version taken by Robertson from the Cambridge Companion to Classical Studies, 1916 edition. A new rendering, with a different entablature, has appeared in Evans, PM III (1930), pl. XVI: but D. has ignored it. One prints and small corrections noted. (lcome:ing in these cases, I count in each case the lines of actual text only.) On p. 25, line 28 read 'west slope' for 'east slope'. On p. 38, line 39, 'tried' seems a misleading word. On p. 49, line 19, for Proseoa read 'Prosea'. On p. 61, definite article omitted. On p. 114, line 4, for 'plate' read 'plate' in line 28 change 'Fig. 4' to 'Fig. 44'. On p. 115, line 16, for 'Mount Crons' read 'Hill of Cronus'. In the heading of p. 121, for 'ALACES' read 'PACALCES'. On p. 253, line 19, for 'Plate LVI' read 'Plate LVI'. On p. 259, line 27, for 'physylakes' read 'physylakes'.

The glossary is good, though D. might have mentioned the two species of natural acanthus. 'Pseudo-Isodomic' is included and Isodomic omitted. The page-headings in the work of art section are a good deal informal (in a literal format) and the reader is left with an uncontrollable kaleidoscope. That of p. 293 could surely have mentioned Roman Doric, and that of p. 327 the Roman Triumphal Arch: and can any good result from such a plural as 'oedeme' (p. 319)? One could improve the page-headings of all three in the section on the graphic places of 'LOCORUM', 'NOMINUM', and 'RERUM.'

HUGH FLOMMER.


This book—an English translation of an essay published in Dansk Historisk Tidsskrift in 1948—has the advantage of giving an interpretation of the Attic grave reliefs of the classical period, from the time of the Parthenon to the anti-royal decree of Demetrius of Phaleron, that is, from c. 440-307 B.C. These reliefs have, as Professor Fris Johansen points out, 'a narrowly limited and homogeneous group of motifs'. Similar, though infinitely varied, compositions occur again and again. They show the dead presumably as they appeared while alive, generally accompanied by relatives, or servants, or both.

The author's method of interpreting the reliefs is not always so less or more obvious interpretation, which of recent years has again been made certain by the epigram on Ampharet's gravestone: ' Here I hold my daughter's child, the beloved one, who was used to shield us from the rays of the sun, and now, dead, I hold the dead child.' But he deepens and enlarges this conception. The departed and the survivors are shown as they were in life, but (1) the union of life and death takes place 'in a common sphere beyond time and place', and (2) the deceased is honoured and worshipped by the survivors according to old custom and usage.' In other words there is a religious tenor in the simple scenes, which transports them to a higher sphere, and the common Greek belief that the dead are better and mightier, 'eironeías kai koinov (Aristotle), than the living, is implied. All the same, did all simultaneously? (To the many instances cited by the author I may add a particularly convincing example, namely the group of a father, named Aiolos, a mother and two daughters. The two daughters are inscribed with their names, on a marble lekythos in New York, 49.11.4 (Alexander, M.M.A. Bulletin, N.S. IX, 1920-1, p. 37). One of the daughters is clearly the person to whom the monument was erected, while the other figures are shown in attitudes of mourning. The inscription is, A. father and a mother, like these inscribed Aiolos and Leonicè, are represented on a marble lekythos in the Louvre bidding farewell to a Kalliphones.
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Since Aiolas is a rare name except in mythology (cf. Mlle in Alexander, loc. cit.), it is likely that the Aiolas and Leonik of the Louvre monument are the same persons as those on the New York one. Obviously, they have been somewhat evolved by Fris Johansen's interpretation. Moreover, it explains the absence of portrait-like features at a time when one would expect them. The idealised nature of the subject would account for the generalised physiognomy, and further, since the whole of the sculptor's task was an accepted one, the artist, if he was an accepted one, would not have felt the need to show any fine or delicate traits. On the other hand, his approach to the subject would have been more abstract, as it is with portrayals of gods. The difference of degree would have been in the direction of the more abstract.

P. 155. "The case of the seated woman on the stele in New York (fig. 77) is more complicated than the one from the Louvre because she is not only smaller, but she would be explained as the female companion of the male as the author suggests, but on her lap is a fragmentary pyx, which has apparently no sepulchral connexion."

Pp. 41 f. A recent investigation at the Metropolitan Museum has convinced us that the portrait head of the deceased daughter of Thymokles and the dike of Prasiai 1, did not belong to the relief shown in fig. 22. It does not really fit. When in 1911 the niche was reconstructed to support the pediment and to contain the relief, a piece had to be broken off the head (cf. my Handbueh 1924, p. 20). According to a report current at the time of the discovery, another pediment was found in the neighbourhood of the relief, inscribed 'Maltake, the daughter of Demoles, Demoles, the son of Thymokles of the dike of Prasiai, Demoles, the daughter of Maltake, the step-daughter of the New York relief, in which case the monument was erected to a father and his two daughters. For its dating in the first quarter of the fourth century, Mr. Fris Johansen brings out a new argument in the parallelism of the clasped hands of the girl with those of Ktesicles (fig. 21)."

Fig. 41b is now superseded by the drawing in Melanges Picard, p. 864, fig. 1, b, which shows the sphinx crouching instead of seated.

Mr. Fris Johansen's book is a significant contribution to an important subject, and will be read with profit and enjoyment by both scholars and the general public.

GISELA M. A. RIECHT.


DM 12.

The purpose of this slender, well-printed, and admirably illustrated volume is to paint a picture of portraiture in the Greek world (in the widest sense of that term) from Alexander the Great to Augustus. In order to keep the book within reasonable limits, the author confines himself to the most significant of the countless period, dispenses with his notes, bibliography, and elaborate bibliographical references, and provides succinct, but serviceable, indices of in-1

 individual sculptures, of the portrait-types of famous artists, and of other Hellenistic works of a mythological, 'every-day', and of other Hellenistic works of a mythological, 'ever...
private citizen. We pass from the gradual break-away from classical canons in the late-fourth and first half of the third centuries to the early, high, and late 'baroque' — the last period of the first half of the third and second centuries; and thence to the highly experimental and eclectic art of the first century, concluding with the classicism of the ripe-Augustan style.

In the last of the fifteen sections into which the text is divided we find the conclusion of the problem: Munich, head falls into place as the product of an Alexandrian workshop of the second quarter of the first century B.C.

One of the most important lessons which the book drives home is that there was nothing artificial and purely Greek in Roman portrait art: there was a close relationship between Greek and Roman portrait art in the last centuries of the Republic. As B. convincingly demonstrates, it is in the workshops of the far-flung Greek world—in Greece proper, on the Islands, in Asia, in Syria, Egypt, and Magna Graecia—that we can trace the first experiments with which the portrait painting of the second century produced the influence of the head portrait, the trend towards massiveness, stiffness, dryness, angularity and sobriety, greater attention to surface, details, a markedly increasing tendency towards the isolation of the head from the body, as a prelude to the heyday of the portrait bust, and a notable partiality for the portrayal of old and elderly persons, with striated, creased, and rumpled faces and heads either wholly or largely bald.

We can watch works in this new, quasi-veristic, but not entirely realistic, style developing in the workshops of the Republic in the period preceding the production of works in the older 'baroque' and 'rococo' manners. The former represent a natural and gradual growth, rooted in Hellenistic soil; and we must agree with B. that it is perhaps more reasonable to describe them, when found in the East or in Sicily and southern Italy, as works from the hands of Roman or Italian artists, or as imported from Rome. First-century Rome was flooded with envy from all the Greek art-schools; and if the greatest achievements of the late-Augustan art—those produced on Italian soil, the root of which was also east in the East.

B. does not, in fact, fail to recognize the existence of Romanitas, the ejection of, that is, on a late-Hellenistic foundation of a basically chronological and isolating Roman portrait style, particularly impressive in the initial problem, manifesting itself in 'echtromische Werke', in which the 'veristic' tendencies, noted above, in Greek workshops were carried on uncompromisingly to their logical conclusions. Such works had their origin in workshops in the hands of Roman pupils of the Greek masters; and from the strictly Hellenistic point of view they may be suitably described as representing Roman Provincialismus (p. 64). But B. almost completely overlooks a vital historical factor, the contribution of the ancestral funerary mask or head, traditional in the ancient artistic Roman families, to the sudden flowering of the portrait-bust in early first-century western iconography.

B. Schweizer's Die Bildniskunst der römischen Republik (1948) is an essential complement to Das hellenistische Bildnis.

J. M. C. TOYNBEE.


(Owing to an oversight this volume and the next were not sent to the reviewer until this year: he is not responsible for the delay.)

Mr. Merlin, in his introduction (and in Malanges Felix Grat, pp. 127-44) draws a picture of the late Nicolas Plautine, that unusual, unforgettable figure of a genuine and devoted scholar. Plautine's text is full, but the detail is sometimes superfluous, and there are many good suggestions, and much curious lore on various topics. The photographs are not of good. The vases are nearly all well preserved; a few have restorations which it has not been possible to remove. Mr. Merlin describes the haphazard manner in which Rodin, as can easily be understood, formed his collection; and he, rather understates, perhaps, its value to the student of antiquity. It would be vain, he adds, to expect that these vases will throw light on the art of Rodin, whose eyes have only rested on the fragment.

Attic B. Pl. 12, 2: Red-Line Painter, on whom see Racolta Giulianili 1 pp. 36-7. Pl. 12, 4-5: as Amsterdam 1847 (CV Scheuerle pl. 6, Pans-Bas pl. 30, 4) and Copenhagen 65 (CV, pl. 106, 1); Pl. 12, 6 and 8: by the same, a neck-amphora, 1935 (IV, pl. 110); the same, Villa Giulia 555 (CV, pl. 48, 5). Pl. 13, 1-2: by the same as the last. Pl. 13, 3: manner of the Haimon Painter. Pl. 13, 4-6: Camel Painter, so called from the skphos Munich 2008 (A. Merin-Jean, p. 136, fig. 144): compare his skphos in Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg (Poulsen, Vases grecs, figs 25-6). Pl. 13, 7-8: CHC Group: cf. Bologna 131 (CV, pl. 41, 3-4). Pl. 13, 10 and 12: Painter of Würzburg 351 (and 352: Langlois pl. 104). Pl. 14, 3-6: Plautine quotes other cups by the same artist, the Caylus Painter. Pl. 14, 7-8 and 12: Sandal Painter. Pl. 14, 10 and 12: compare lekythoi in the University of Chicago (AF[3] 1943, 396) and in the Ro collection, Zurich (Blosch Antike Kunst in der Schweiz, pl. 28-9). Pl. 15, 1-7, trifling lekythoi. Group of M 351: pl. 17, 1-2 (near the Painter of Athens 351); pl. 17, 3-4, as Oxford; pl. 17, 5-10 (as pl. 17, 1-2); pl. 17, 6; pl. 17, 8; pl. 17, 9; pl. 17, 12. Manner or following of the Haimon Painter: pl. 17, 7; pl. 17, 13; pl. 17, 14; pl. 16, 11; pl. 18, 2; pl. 18, 3 and 5; pl. 18, 4; pl. 18, 6; pl. 18, 9; pl. 18, 2; Group of the Hoptite leaving home. Pl. 18, 6-7: same hand as pl. 20, 1-2 and 4-5. Pl. 20, 1-2 and 4-5: near the Beldan Painter; this is Coll. E. G. (Iolasakis), pl. 5, 123.

Pl. 21, 1-2: bad imitation of the Syrisskos Painter (ARV 199, no. 5, 21, 3-4): Agrigento Painter. Pl. 24, 4-6: Painter of the Paris Centouraumach. [Pl. 23, 5-6 is Italiot.] Pl. 24, 1-2: Barclay Painter. Pl. 24, 7-8; Painter of Bologna 417 (ARV, 600, no. 71). Pl. 25, below, middle: for '12' read '41'. Pl. 27, 4: Aischines Painter. Attic white. Pl. 27, 7, 10 must be much restored. Pl. 27, 2-3: Plautine was reminded of the Sabouroff Painter, and it is in fact by him. Pl. 27, 4-5: Triglyph Painter. Etruscan r. Pl. 28-30: an excellent photographic record of Plautine's private Etruscan cup that copies the reverse of the Attic Oedipus cup in the Vatican: see also EVP, pp. 3 and 25-7, and Festschrift Rumpf, p. 10 (The Bowdrow cup JHS LVII, p. 26, may be Falsean). The vase is called 'Etrusco-Corinthian on the plate, but in Mr. Rüssel's text (p. 22) it is said to be a South Italian imitation of Corinthian. It is not Etruscan, and it imitates not Corinthian, I think, but Attic of the Komast Group or near it; compare the Attic skphos-fragment JHS XX, 15.

Italiot r. Pl. [34, 1-2 is Attic]. Pl. 34, 3-4: by the Parrish Painter (see JHS LXIII, p. 70); another addition to the work of this Campanian artist is the neck-amphora New York JHS XLIV, pl. 26 (this is Campanian r., of the Owl-Fillar Group, see JHS LXIII, 1938, p. 111). [Hellenistic]. Pl. 40, 3 is fourth century and probably Attic.

J. D. Beazley.
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Amphora. 2734 (pl. 1, 1-2); Group Q, a group of slight amphiarc near the Painter of Louvre F6: compare, for example, Munich 1369 (CV, pl. 6, 1 and pl. 7, 3); 2523 (pl. 2, 1-2); compare this amphora with a fine example in the collection of A. Charlot, wheeling round, with warriors; B. Dionysos on donkey with satyrs. 2725 (pl. 4, 1-2; Group E); pl. 4, 2 is reversed. Inv. 118249 (pl. 5, 3-4); I have no note of this, but so far as can be judged from such examples as are offered for sale, it is far too elegant to be a foot modern? 2466 (pl. 7, 1-2) seems not far from the Antimenes Painter. 2744 (pl. 10), by the Affecter: cf. especially Munich 1442 (FR, pl. 153, 2 and III, 292, fig. 107). Impossible to tell the shape of the foot from this subject; it is in form a horse’s hoof, with a fillet (the foot of the Munich vase is lost). Pelike. 3358 (pl. 13): the seated figures are male.

Neck-amphora. 2537 (pl. 41, 2-3); by the Edinburgh Painter (Haspels, ABL, 220, no. 74); 3385 (III Hog pl. 4): Group of Vasi Epigraphici.

Cups. Inv. 272 (pl. 21, 2-1); the first female on B is not Semele but, as the painter tells us, Kallis. Vanderpool published a cup which he saw to be by the same master (pl. 23, 1-2 and 4); Herakles on B is not led-footed—the photographs is reversed. 2761 (pl. 23, 3 and 5, and pl. 24); Bloesch places this cup, from the point of view of shape, in his Andokides Group (FAS, 13, no. 6); the drawing is in the manner of the Andokides Painter and close to him. 2720 (pl. 27); I have never seen his work in the subject in the continuation of Caskey’s Vases in Boston (II, pp. 57 and 84). The cups on pl. 29 (except pl. 29, 1) all belong to the Leafless Group, a very large group of late and poor black-figure cups; Inv. 167 (pl. 29, 5-6 and pl. 19, 2-3); compare the two and JHS LXLI, pp. 185 fig. 5; 2910 (pl. 29, 9 and 31, 1) by the Cylus Painter, compare Cambridge 23, 24 (CV, pl. 9, 1) or Villa Giulia 1448 (CV, pl. 42, 2 and 4). 2740 (pl. 31, 2 and 4); the cup, of hybrid shape, is in this, in Maronibo types, with a fillet (the foot of the Munich vase is lost). Pelike. 3358 (pl. 13): the seated figures are male.

Hydria. Inv. 12 (pl. 34, 1 and pl. 35, 1 and 3); A.D. Group (Group of the fountain hydria of the London Egyptian). Inv. 293 (pl. 37, 1); the details of the Naples vase are seen more clearly in the old photograph Sommer 11038. 2514 (pl. 34, 2 and 4 and pl. 35, 2); on the second inscription, which must be KOPES, re, see CV Oxford, p. 100. There I attributed the vase to London Bayes, but now see his vases are the later work of the Priam Painter, so called from the Madrid hydria 10920 (CV, pl. 8, 4 and pl. 10); the oxen amphora 2128 is also by the Priam Painter. 3376 (pl. 34, 3); by the Edinburgh Painter. Inv. 118249 (pl. 36, 1 and pl. 37, 1); near the Priam Painter. Inv. 293 (pl. 36, 4 and pl. 37, 4) also; 2777 (pl. 38, 3 and 39, 3); manner of the Antimenes Painter: in JHS XVII, p. 90 I have something about the subject in the continuation of Herakles and Kyknos. 2455 (pl. 41, 1 and 4): the shield-device is a cart-bone.

Kyathoi. The earliest of those in Naples is Inv. 130 (pl. 45, fig. 1-4). Ure saw that it was by the same painter as Vasi Epigraphica, and a fourth kyathos by the Painter of Vatican 480, the best of the four, is in Castle Ashby (BSR XI, pl. 3, 2); 2465 (pl. 44, 3-8) and Inv. 122 (this is the missing number; pl. 43, 5-8) belong to the Group of Vatican G 57 (see RG, pp. 52-83). With Inv. 293 (pl. 37, 1), Inv. 2466 (pl. 45, 1-3), and Inv. 122, Sévres 2036 (CV, pl. 29, 1-3). Inv. 132 (pl. 43, 5-8) and 2461 (pl. 44, 1-4) are by the Cylus Painter, like the kyathos Genoa 1153 (CV, pl. 3, 1-3) and others.

The author has not been fully supported by his plate-maker; and this leads on to a general question, which many writers must have asked: why is the level of collocating in the Italian Corpus Vasorum that is to say why are the contributions of the Naples volume (which are not among the poorest) less good than those in the first Munich volume, which is also devoted to Attic black-figure? The answer may be difficult to find, but should not be by the reader unless he compare the two volumes, and see the number of疡s under whose auspices the Italian Corpus is produced. Another general question arises: many of the vases published here are heavily restored; why was no attempt made to clean them before photographing? The answer may be that the first publication was not available; in that case the proper course was to begin with the unrestored vases, of which there are hundreds or thousands in a great collection like Naples, and leave the tinted till later.

On the whole, thirty years old, it is sad that one has to go on repeating the same elementary truths: the vases should be cleaned before photographing; the photographs should not be deliberately ruined by faking, which includes cutting out the background. This is another occasion to remind one that the collection of one of our greatest old foreign works, that forces itself upon the reader. This volume publishes 100 vases and costs £3 6s. 6d. How many vases are there in Naples? Heydemann described 4,433 in his catalogue of the year 1872. Many of these are not of interest; there are some, no doubt, not catalogued or figured here, and each of those, on the same scale, would require several plates. Heydemann omitted most of the undecorated vases, also those decorated with heads; and much has been added in the last eighty years. Put the number of plates at 500; then adding too costs £3 £2 6s. 6d., 7,000 will require seventy volumes costing £32 15s. This being so, perhaps one might ask for more vases on a page and less blank space.

J. D. BEAZLEY.


This fifth and final part concludes the illustrated account of the Greek gold and silver coins in a famous collection which also contains a splendid, though unhandled, assemblage of Greek bronze coins. Very soon after this publication appeared the name of the owner, R. Cyril Lockett, died, a severe loss both to the friends of the science and those of Thessalians, Illyrians and Thracians. Mr. Lockett's continued interest up to the last moment of going to press is shown by the contents of a plate Dated 2988, which includes a series of Thessalian types, distasters, numerous fine Sicilians, and an Olympian stater with a magnificent eagle's head. The descriptive matter in this, as in the preceding Parts, is the work of the Keeper of Coins and Medals in the British Museum.

CHARLES SELTMAN.


The latest, very welcome, addition to the ever-growing Sylloge of Greek coins is largely due to the enterprise of the late Dr. J. G. Minck, who wrote the text. It consists of the first part of Sir Arthur Evans's collection, the Greek coins of Italy; other parts to follow in the next. All the Italian mints, some of which are represented here more strongly than others. The two best represented are unquestionably Tarentum and Metapontum. Tarentum we should expect in a collection formed by Evans, whose classic work on this mint has stood the test of fifty years. Rarities here include an early coin with female head on the reverse like Vasto collection 151-2; and a probably unique 'Tarento-Campanian' didrachm inscribed BPET. Metapontum accounts for a good run of silver coins—and it is a matter of course that these products are second to none for sheer attractiveness—of many of these being late-fourth-century pieces from the 'Salaonica' hoard. But Metapontum also provides the real high point of the collection, a set of the three exquisite gold coins, also dating from the latter part of the fourth century, and excessively rare; the complete set of three, lacking in most if not all public collections outside Oxford, is in fact only to be found elsewhere in Vol. III of the Sylloge, the Lockett collection. As against this the British coins? but which, if not, one hopes that the Oxford coin-room may have the good fortune to be able to fill—for instance 'Icusi' of Poseidonia, and gold and silver of the Brettii.

The scope of Sylloge does not of course allow for any but the basic information about each coin to be given, and other volumes are not always absolutely consistent on the question of exactly how much to give. Very few essential details escape mention in the present volume, but it would perhaps be possible, in the absence of all provision for fuller information, for some exceptional ones, such as Tropas for Tropa, but not the various forms of ethnic used at Neapolis, or Leukippo's
name on the Metapontine gold (nor the details of Leukippos' headdresses, chariot, or Skylla as the case may be; yet details of similar helmet-adornments are given, e.g. for Velia). There might also be a case for stating in the text where coins share a die in common, though this has not always been done in *Sylloge*, and at the same time, it is a fact that the statement provides a useful criterion of the effectiveness of the plates; some examples from the plates in this vol. are Cumaean 8 and 9, Tarentum 77-8, Metapontum 207-9, 216-8, 231-2, Velia 313-4, 321-2. This shows that the plates are effective, perhaps more so than the look at first sight, for perhaps the coins have a rather wrath-like appearance, which should be avoidable, but which may of course be a fault to be excused in the particular copy seen by the reviewer. Probably few would advocate direct photography, and fewer still for the latter, most useful for numismatic purposes, and is used here, as generally in *Sylloge*; whereas the former has often given bad results in the past, though some recent attempts have shown what can be done by the direct method which always has the advantage of making coins look metallic.

G. K. JENKINS.


This is a fine and thoughtful piece of work; few monographs on coins display so much historical consciousness or so ready a mastery of the historical background into which the coins must be fitted, as this. More than part of the fault of the limits to the results which such a reconstruction can reach with certainty, is due in the present case solely to the limitations imposed by the material itself. The author has not been well-served in his illustrations, however, which are rather worse than the best, though the layout of the coins, with the publication of the fine coins, and such a fine book, clearly deserve; the rest is all of the O.U.P.'s best production, but if they are not also responsible for the plates they should look at, and ponder, say, the plates of Rizzo's *Monete greche della Sicilia antica* published in Rome, 1949.

M.'s reconstruction of the actual sequence of the coins, by their die-linkages and all other available criteria, is done with scrupulous accuracy, and so far as the present reviewer can discern, he has made no false identifications; unless perhaps the tetradrachms with the 'double-ax' symbol may not quite certainly go with the smaller coins of M.'s group XXI, on account of the difference of style, but see M., p. 107. What is more difficult is to get fixed chronologically points beyond the criteria of style, there is no help to be got, for instance, from hoards or other finds. There is the Athenian currency decree, which clearly stops the first period of coinage at Ainos in c. 4491; but there is no such precise datum for the Ainos tetradrachms, however, in order to secure a possible discovery of fresh varieties, M. is careful to allow 'breathing space' in his scheme of issues, so that a single issue is sometimes allotted to one year, sometimes to two or even more; and although there is no necessary presumption that a Greek mint coined an annual issue, it is legitimate to wonder whether the spaces may not be rather too great.

Nevertheless, M. is able to make very reasonable suggestions as to how and when the coins fit in. Noteworthy is his treatment of the unclassified coinage occurring between 453 (M.'s dating), at a time when the tribute was remitted, and he uses this to support Gomme's theory of an Athenian garrison holding Ainos against the Odrysians, the sudden large coinage being to pay this garrison (but was it large enough to pay mercenaries as well?). Other issues, it is suggested, may well have been coined as contributions to the Athenian war chest extorted by Themistocles and Thrasybulous in 406, and Timotheos in 373. For the most part, however, the coins are arranged by their local relative value and probably, in most cases, with easier trade conditions in the hinterland consequent upon the break-up of the unified Odrysian realm; but we can be sure that Odrysian disruption led to better, and not to worse, conditions, and might not the revived coinage at Ainos alternatively reflect some modification of Athenian currency policy? (cf. *Hesperia* Suppl. VIII, 338).

Some small points. P. 103: it is difficult to see why the style of obverse A. 65 'foreshadows ' that of reverse A. 62 ' which head each section are very useful, and accurate; but it would have been convenient to include in them the symbols distinguishing the issues; or alternatively to have the nos. of groups on the plates, as a guide. Also, it would be useful to have a legend on the plates in the same plate as the corresponding large ones, so as to be able to look at each whole issue together and avoid page-turning. Ideally, enlargements of details, such as the symbols, many of them interesting in themselves, would be a desirable feature. Also, the use of a guide-book which has confused previous discussions of this coinage, and is here tentatively, but surely quite rightly, removed from the fifth or fourth centuries and given a Ptolemaic date.

M. is certainly to be congratulated on bringing this distinguished contribution to knowledge of the northern Aegean one fully worthy to stand beside the *American Jhs* and his own *Dannastion*. G. K. JENKINS.


Guide books to Museum collections, to be good and useful should serve several purposes: first and no doubt foremost, they should assist the visitor in viewing the collections; secondly, they should provide a guide to the visitor many bad things through his way with him to remind him of what he has seen and learnt in the Museum; third, they should indicate briefly and clearly the scope and value of the collections to those not fortunate enough to be able to visit them themselves. The reader of a guide-book will, of course, serve all these purposes at once and that is what this present one clearly does. Its admirable plan and lucid and simple explanation of the situation of the exhibits leave no doubt that with its aid the visitor can readily think, understand, and its helpful historical introductions to the various civilisations covered by the collections will ensure that even the uninformed visitor has the basic facts before him on which to found an adequate appreciation of the cultural background of the various exhibits. The illustrations, beautifully clear, provide the necessary visual aid to memory that will enable the book to serve as a 'souvenir programme'. And, finally, the detailed description of the main exhibits, concise and summary though it is, will remain in the mind of the reader who, by reading it, endows the Museum itself with a clear picture of the riches in store for him when his fortune changes and a visit to Copenhagen becomes possible.

The collections contain something from all regions covered by the main civilisations; some are fuller than others. Egypt is well represented in two rooms, with some good sculpture and reliefs and many smaller antiquities of all periods. Western Asia, apart from one site, Hama (Hamath), on the Orontes, excavated by a Danish expedition in 1927 under Dr. Ingelt, the collections from which fill two rooms and cover all periods from the neolithic to Islamic times, is less well represented: but there are good selections from Mesopotamia, Persia, and Cyprus, and smaller groups from Palestine, Carthage, and Asia Minor. The fullest collections are, however, those from Classical Greece and Italy (pre-Roman and Roman). These, spread over six rooms, clearly contain a most representative series of vases, bronzes, and other finds, and include a sub-collection of the two heads from a Parthenon metope must not be forgotten). Much thought has obviously been given to amassing a fine collection of vases, the lists of which occupy many pages of the text, and great care has also been taken, though the two heads from a Parthenon metope are of Roman Italy is well represented by tomb-groups and individual pieces illustrating the main phases of Bronze and Iron Age culture in the peninsula. The Roman objects, too, are varied and important, including, amongst other sculptures, two fine portrait heads in marble of the Augustan period, and of the provinces of the Julian-Claudian emperors can be readily corrected in the next edition (which is bound to be needed shortly), and it would hardly be fair to criticise an English publication produced in Denmark for its use of the
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plural 'dices' (p. 69) when so many Englishmen in their homeland—ought to know better—now regularly speak of 'a dice' in the singular!

D. B. HARDEN.


This book is a publication of the results of excavations between 1935 and the beginning of war at Saint-Blaise, an important site on an eminence by lakes, not far from the Rhône. Since 1949 further excavations have been conducted inside the site, but the earlier investigations, to which the author here limits his attention, were concentrated on clearing the rampart and immediately adjacent areas.

The history of the site falls into three major periods, to each of which a chapter is dedicated. The first covers the time before the building of the rampart, the second, which is more continuous with the sondage sous l'une des chapelles du quai, while the third followed after a desertion of four or more centuries and involved the re-occupation and refortification of the site in the last days of the Roman Empire in the west and the barbarian invasions. This last phase, during which the name Ugium was attached to the site, lies outside the normal scope of this Journal and will not be discussed here, although it occupies over fifty pages of Professor Rolland's text and is of considerable interest and importance.

The main chronological concepts are preceded by dealing with general notions of its size and the complex of its buildings, before testing the several theories by which it was established. The section on the earlier habitation of the area (pp. 34-48) has little connection with the main theme of the book. The Ligurians and Celto-I Ligurians of the Greek literary sources may appear to be little known to the reader, who is usually interested in the area which fully described or embedded in the Greek rampart, whatever their original function and significance, evidently have something to do with the native population. There was apparently also local pottery, extending further back in time than the earliest Greek material, cf. Layer B of the section on p. 55 ('terre avec tessons indigènes') and Layer L on p. 56 ('cendres et tessons indigènes'), also the deep sounding near the chapel of Saint-Blaise (p. 57). None of this is illustrated or fully described, although some possibilities or correlation with datable Greek pottery are surely of some importance for the prehistorian.

Already we come to the most serious general criticism of this book, its fantastic vagueness and lack of precision in even places where such could easily have been avoided. For instance, was this sondage on p. 37 that from which came the fragmentary protocorinthian skyphos trouvé, en position fondeur, dans un sondage sous l'une des chapelles du quai, Fig. 96? Was it per chance the 'vase importé au VIe ou Ve siècle avant notre ère' of p. 37? Apart from this fragment and a crum of a vase in the Wild Goat style possibly of late seventh century found in one of the curvilinear walls (which?) all the potteries came from the cinder-heaps or the house. But here also the situation is not entirely clear.

A good impression of the remains of Tower II can be formed from the plan and elevations on p. 110, and Figs. 142-3, but the date of the relationship between wall and cinder-heaps does not appear from Fig. 87 in which deep shadow hides the crucial part. How much one would give for a good measured drawing of an actual section through rampart and cinders instead of the diagram on pp. 53-4.

For an understanding of the cinders, the hearth-stone? (shown in this same diagram and mentioned on p. 54) is evidently important also, but there is no illustration and not enough in the matter of deciding whether it was an all or large part relevant, whether or not part of the accumulation that overlies it.

The account of the primitive structure near the cinder-heaps, and the point at which the rampart ceases to be preserved, is more satisfactory, although insufficient remains for dealing with the actual method of constructing walls really more familiar in Greece than in the barbarian west? (p. 58). Also obscure is the relation of this structure to the cinder-heaps with part of whose history it is connected. The building was made probably in the sixth or fifth centuries, to judge from the fact that its foundations cut into a layer with Asia Minor grey ware and Etruscan bucchero (p. 59) while the layer sealing the remains of a cinder-heap pottery 'une bea vernis noir (attique)', naturally illustrated (p. 54).

The fragments of the crater (Fig. 97 and p. 62) with wild goats seem to be found in the filling of this house (p. 58), although we are never informed where they come from. Its date we are told cannot be later than the beginning of the sixth century (p. 58) but rather it could not be earlier. It belongs to a late phase of the style. The earliest Greek things so far reported from the remains of a bird-bowl (Fig. 90) and of a rosette-bowl (Fig. 91), both from the cinder-heaps, the former from layer D (p. 65: why not say so already on p. 60 where is the main discussion of the piece?). The date offered is considerably too early; these bowls belong to the latter third or the middle of the sixth century.

Gela are several from central Italy: Certensi, Tomba Regolini-Galassi; Populonia, Tomba dei Frabelli di Bronzo; Vetulonia, CV A Firenze I, Pl. Italia 37-5.

Apart from these two vases, everything from this deposit (at least what is illustrated) is of the sixth century or later. The cup fragments with polychrome bands, however, mentioned on p. 63 but not illustrated, might have from the description be seventh century.

The fragments of Attic black-figure ware (p. 233) belong to typical East Greek cups, mostly of the full sixth century. The reason for the dogmatism on p. 63, n. 3, is not clear. Eastern Greek vases with linear decoration, and grey wares, are now familiar in many sites; less well known in France is Etruscan bucchero of a similar date. These fabrics occur elsewhere, on the site as well as in the mound (p. 65). Unillustrated are a fragment of Italo-Corinthian and an Attic little-master ornamental fragment (p. 67, n. 4). Then, continued and well-illuminated from the sixth and fifth centuries and two or three pieces of the late seventh, but one cannot say yet whether Greeks were actually living at Saint-Blaise in the sixth century or whether these Greek things belonged to natives, who imported them through Marseille. Only two or three pieces stand much chance of being earlier than the foundation of that city.

The erection of a strong and carefully planned rampart, which initiates the next phase, however, is the appearance of a considerable and well-organized settlement of Hellenes or Mixohellenes, as well as a Greek expert on fortification. The wall was built some time in the fourth century; the curtain wall P (p. 112, fig. 38) was built into a layer containing fourth-century Greek pottery (but cf. p. 129), and the external ramifications of the wall N (p. 109, fig. 36) were overlain by debris with 'campanicelle et tesson attique a figure rouge' (p. 109). Again the relevant pottery is not illustrated nor even described in detail.

The description of the rampart itself is on the whole detailed and clear, the photographs numerous; the discussion of the date and origin of the structure is interesting, and the suggestion that the engineer was Sicilian worth careful consideration.

The site was apparently not inhabited by Sicilians but by natives that is only likely from its equipment to have been Roman, Prof. Rolland thinks that of Caesar in 49 B.C. Thereafter the site was abandoned for several centuries.

Remains contemporary with the rampart are sparingly published. There was little red-figure, (what there was is thought by the author to be Italiote, p. 130) but apparently much black glaze, mostly probably Italiote also, and the usual local coarse wares, amphorae and the like, as well as some Iberian pottery. Objects other than pottery are of little importance.

This is a site of prime importance. It has already yielded much and it promises to throw a flood of light on the character and organisation of Hellenised Pottery, perhaps also on the Greek settlement. Rolland is to be thanked for this publication, and wished every success in his further explorations. We shall look for a later report that records all that is found with as much precision as possible; this is now a site to exploit in a manner that will not only reveal the fragments of cups and vases, and all should eventually be made available to students.

W. L. BROWN.


This is a collection of poems picked out by the author as all of some value; as the best, or as much of the best as his space allows him, from the long period covered by 'Medieval
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and Modern.' The limits are rom the time of Constantine the Great, which he very well takes as 'the beginning of a new era in the life of the Greek people', right down to the present day: the product of an actively intelligent people over rather more than 1,600 years. The book too begins with a sixteen-page preface closely and carefully written introduction on the development of Greek poetry over this long period, and the collection of pieces which follows is therefore not only an anthology, a gathering of the best, but a series of pieces to illustrate each stage of the long literature as a whole. It is too true that much of this poetry is written in very marked dialect, and this the author tells us has made him reject what he very justly calls some of the most beautiful things in Greek. But could not Professor Trypanis's conscience allow him to smooth out some of these little linguistic difficulties? Everyone would have gladly accepted any such acknowledged normalisations.

Working under these conditions Professor Trypanis has produced an excellent and very interesting book. Of the diller periods he has, though I speak without very much knowledge, selected the best. Here I am thinking particularly of his treatment of the dull and voluminous yet in his day, 1714-89, much admired poet Caesarius Dappulianus. Of writings of his own I have what my own reading has forced me to believe his only good passage: a really charming account of his life as a monk on Athos in which he has allowed a pleasant natural simplicity to guide his too fast hand. Nor is it surprising that our author's selections from the Cretan poets of the Venetian period, from Erophe and from Erotristis are admirably made, and yet, unless from a strictly historical point of view, there is too much of them; too much, that is to say, when restrictions of space have been so severe. Here I am particularly thinking of the author's treatment of the Cretan Goths when he deals with folk poetry. Here we have nothing but the best, and all anthologies must be praised or blamed for inclusions, and as little as possible said about what is not there. Here I have no doubts in my mind to the supposition of the Virgin with its preface; for at least some krepistche poetry; here again the pieces are well chosen. Yet from the poetic point of view I could have dispensed with the Kolokotronis poem or perhaps the warlike heroine Despo, and for one or the other have substituted one of the heroic ballads of Cret; yet perhaps here the dialect would stand in the way. Nor is it easy for a non-Greek to be very sure in these matters.

Much of the religious poetry at the beginning of the book with its associations and its readers, the Christos hymn of Romans and the Easter Canon of Cosmos of Maiouma, both of them wonders of stately impressiveness, and with them the hymn on Mary Magdalen by the nun Cassia of the nineteenth century. This strikes a note of personal emotion more common in the best Ecclesiastical than perhaps in other religious poetry, a big piece of the Akathists hymn to the Virgin with its preface: η ιουργοες στρατηγες φιλορυθμος. Of the selections from contemporary poets neither space nor my own reading permit me to say much. Of the eight poems taken from Cavali all show him at his best; and yet I wish there had been enough for the poem called by Professor Mavrodato The Church: it would have been a fine comment on the hymns of Romans and the other religious poets.

But to complain of the absence of anything is quite out of place; room was limited, and Professor Trypanis's selections are so good that the reader may feel as assured of his taste as he will be of his learning. This delightful book ends with a few notes and a vocabulary; it is a pity that neither of them contains long.

R. M. DAWKINS

A Grammar of Modern Greek on a Phonetic Basis.

In his Introduction the author defines his object as follows: 'to present the essentials of accent and syntax in a practical form suitable for the beginner who wishes to acquire rapidly a simple, educated style of conversation. There can be no doubt that Mr. Pring's little book achieves this purpose. It is clear also that he is successful in his further declared aim of representing only current demotic forms and style of speaking—in a sense perhaps too successful; it would probably be hard to find a better educated Athenian whose own speech was so consistently demotic.

A feature of the book is the use made of substitution tables, which appear at the end of each of the first four Chapters in Part II (Grammar). The advantages of working with substitution tables are well known; they provide the teacher with the right language for the interpreter to identify, and let students know at a glance the relevant grammatical and syntactical features of the numerous sentence patterns that are set. The sense is also preserved as a form of redundant material for the purpose of fluency and articulation exercises that have to be worked at orally before the linguistic matter contained in them comes to be unconsciously assimilated.


A new edition of Constantine Porphyrogenitus' De Administrando Imperio, taken with an scholarly apparatus and translation by Anselm Baudri (1717), reprinted in a recent collection of the Byzantine Historians and in Migne's Patrologia Graeca, and the Bonn edition of Imanuel Bekker (1840) are both out of date, and in the Budé Series the De Administrando has not yet been published.

The book starts with a General Introduction written by Professor R. J. H. Jenkins, which treats of the life of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus and the nature of his work. A Critical Introduction follows by Gy. Moravcsik, in which the manuscript tradition of the De Administrando is clearly presented and the older editions of this work examined. All our extant manuscripts (M. V. F. M. Me. Ba. Be) go back to the Constantinopolitan sixth (P) written in 1065 and 1081, therefore a roughly century later than the original (c. A.D. 952). Then the text and translation follow. The edition is literally based on P, but where that manuscript makes no sense, or appears not to correspond with the original of the transcripts and editions and those of modern researchers have been taken into account. The text has been most conscientiously prepared and is reliable and sound, no small achievement considering the fluid character of the Greek of this work; fortunately he has selected extracts from different sources of which the language is not uniform.

The apparatus criticus is elaborate and includes references to sources and parallel passages. But it also often gives readings of the manuscripts which are of no value for the understanding of the text. These, which are nearly always inferior conjectures, are given together with, and at the same level as, the readings of P, and therefore are apt to be misleading. At the same time the statement of all orthographical errors—even of the most unimportant nature (e.g. 529 ρηματα Be: φημεν P ουκειον Me Ba; or 530. 473 καταρακτης θειον η διονυσιον P etc.), and of all the conjectures of modern scholars irrespective of their value (see p. 409), as well as the occasional discussion of textual problems (e.g. 16. 8), tends to make the apparatus cumbersome. It seems material as is not useful for the reconstruction of the text included in an appendix.

Both the editor and the translator have made a number of interesting emendations, many of which have been introduced into the text in a way where γενικα καται P (P γενικα καται Φ) is emended to τα λικανα by Moravcsik; or 29. 264 where Jenkins emendes πειραμιναν into πειραματα. But certain crules are still to be found, some of which can perhaps be removed, as e.g. If we write θεονομον in 53. 101 instead of ἐν θεο

The English translation by Professor R. J. H. Jenkins is excellent; the sense is always clearly and accurately brought out, and hardly any slips are noticeable. As an example: 95 καται τω θεον θυσια Δια ου θυσια τω θεον Φ: the translator did not suspect that she was drinking water 'out of the purple goblet,' while it is 'wine mixed with water,' as the text tells us in the phrase μεσεναν μετα τω νεφαλην ου θυσια θυσια τω θεον. The ancient sense of σαποιο, to mix wine with water, is here preserved and not that of the modern σαποι, to serve, no easy thing when dealing with such a difficult and complex text.

An Index of Proper Names follows and a Glossary, both of which are appended; the ensuing Grammatical Notes (pp. 333-6) on the other hand are brief and less useful, as they are not grouped together according to the sources of Porphyrogenitus. The book ends with an Index of Sources and Parallel Passages in a second volume, which is hoped will follow soon, is to be a commentary, and will indeed be most welcome to all scholars of South-eastern European history and Byzantine literature.

C. A. TRYPANIS.

Scholars will naturally be sorry to say farewell to a periodical of thirty-four years' standing; but they will derive consolation from the fact that its place has already been more than adequately filled.

D. Mervyn Jones.

To the prosaic mind of a mythologist or folk-lorist, the Argonautic legend is in form a saga, possibly going back to some prehistoric exploit the details of which we shall never know, but heavily, overlaid, first with folk-tales (Wicked Stepmother, Ogres's Daughter, and other) and provided with the usual hero of such stories, who is assisted at every turn by supernatural beings whose favour he has won and by companions whose highly specialised gifts he uses on occasion; while further additions are due to genealogical and etymological considerations (to have an Argonautic ancestor was almost more respectable than to have one who fought at Troy), expanding geographical knowledge, and the desire to connect with supposedly known history a number of rites and customs of the Mediterranean world and places having a real or alleged association with the shadowy Minyai. Roux, however, aims at higher things. To him, the story embodies more or less accurate traditions of the glorious days when the Aegean region was divided between two great powers, Orcaconium to the north and Crete to the south (p. 194). In those times, young men of chieftain or royal stock were subjected to an elaborate initiation, involving not only religious rites but also venturesome exploits by sea and land, in companies under chosen leaders (themis). The influence of Dionysol is everywhere apparent in this phantasmaria, but the pupil leaves the master far behind in his explorations of the unknown. All manner of authors are put under contribution; Apollonius of Rhodes and his scholar naturally and quite legitimately take a leading place, but scripts of Justin, Hyginus, Nonnos, the 'Orphic' Argonautica and other late writers are eagerly snatched without any consideration of their likely sources or the part played by their own or their authorities' imagination in the matter. What seems to be a repetition of Athene's account in Plutarch's Life of Theseus are taken at their face value. Of minches Roux scorns never to have heard. Examples of extraordinary excesses of the texts may be found by the curious in every part of the book; it would be waste of space to give even a selected list of them.

H. J. ROSE.


The sub-title explains that the author treats the labyrinth or maze as 'Linienreflex einer mythologischen Idee', and he further speaks of mazes (p. 13) as 'Denkmäler Urgedanken', religious and mythological remains of the Künstlerkunstung', a doubtful proposition and one incidentally which has not much to do with mythology in any proper sense. In pursuance of his declared intention to find in what he conceives to be related legends 'die Texte zu den summen Labyrinthen', he collects examples of mazes, maze-like patterns (including Babylonian drawings of entrails, intended for the use of diviners), and other relevant material from various parts of the world—Asia, Africa, and America, as well as of original stories to set beside the maze stories, as those of Persephone and the traditions of Oceania. An appendix deals with the not obviously relevant subject of snakes and mice in the cults of Apollo and Asklepios. But when, after assembling this compact array of material, he proceeds to connect mazes with such ideas as death of life (pp. 17-20), caves, birth, the flight of birds, and immortality (pp. 34 ff., 49, 43-5, 46 ff.), it cannot be said that his arguments are convincing or rest on much more than association of ideas, i.e., his own associations, with little to show that they existed for the builders or painters of the maze.

H. J. R.


The notice of this excellent study in a learned journal may require some justification. Subsidised, I presume, by an industrial undertaking, it addresses itself to an audience to whom the frequent introduction of the grand poète latin Virgile without adding that he was автор de l'Entité et des Géorgiques (ouvrage traitant de la vie rurale). But the work is written by a scholar; it gives a careful and illuminating account of the ancient industrial processes; the price is low, and if not documented is yet supported by a good bibliography; and in between the advertisements of the products of the firm appear some forty illustrations, a lavish allowance indicative of the resources that lie behind this enterprise. Of the illustrations some are the head of Socrates (which gets in because his accuser Anytos was a tanner), will not particularly interest the scholar. Others, like the three beautiful reproductions of plant drawings from the Codex Anicetii Illianae of Dioscorides or a view of a fuller's shop in Museum of Siena, add sensibly to the value of a study capable of giving accurate information on its important subject in an agreeable way.

B. FARRINGTON.


It is a pleasure to welcome a new edition of Miss Richter's Sculpture and Sculptors of the Greeks. The new edition is of the same format as the second, with alterations where they could be fitted into the old pagination. Miss Richter has had to rewrite and expand the sections on the archaic and Hellenistic periods; the Hellenistic sculptures in particular are treated more fully in both text and illustrations. About forty-five of the illustrations are new; three include works found since 1930, and some new photographs of older works; and the plates are in better general reproduction in the new edition.

The most valuable part of the new edition is likely to be the chronological table, which has been completely worked over and brought up to date. With the additions and revision, this book keeps its place as the best general introduction and the soundest guide to Greek sculpture.

T. J. DUNBAR.


The title of this book might mislead, for it is No. 2 in a series of eighteen guides to works of art in Berlin, the volume being published under the editorship of Gerda Bruns. The more complete exhibits are all Roman or Hellenistic, and the book moves backwards from these to the classical and archaic. Starting with the famous Gate of the Miletus Agora of the second century a.D., Weickert passes to the Hellenistic, and finally to Roman works, to the Hellenistic Propylon of the Sanctuary of Athena at Pergamon. Earlier works discussed there often include excellent fragments, from both the later and earlier Didymaion, and good pieces from temples and tombs of Athens at Priene and from classical and archaic buildings of Olympia, the Miletus district, and Samos. Models of both Milete and Priene are illustrated and described, and the book ends with a useful explanatory table of technical terms and with a sketch map. Weickert is a master of his subject, and all students can profit by reading his comments with attention.

D. S. ROBERTSON.


There is some exaggeration and dogmatism in the introductory chapter of Mr. Warner's book which set at once the pace of the whole, and aroused our sympathy; for we know that he is on the right side. Greece is a country too complicated to live in. Mr. Warner was in Athens for two years as Director of the British Institute; he tells us something about the Institute, some of the Greek painters and poets ('A visit to Salamis' is a visit to Sikyon, the Isthmus, and much about the country and its monuments; the last within a restricted and on the whole conventional range—Daphni, Delphi, Mycenae, Epidaurus, and so forth; but his aim has been to convey to us 'a feeling which, though it is directed to scenes, to landscape, to the life of people, to the spirit of expectation which is never disappointed, full of reverence, excitement and joy'. 'So, in writing of Greece, I shall attempt the objectivity of
the lover rather than of the scientist, and shall describe isolated scenes and characters rather than to try to paint a broad and comprehensive picture of a country and its people. Ignorance and love dictate the method, but it is a method that need not necessarily be valueless, unless one's ignorance is total or one's love misdirected.

He has not, I think, always succeeded in his aim (but who could?), he misses much in modern Athens, and he has not much that is new to say, or to photograph, of the Acropolis or Epidaurus. He is at his best, in fact, when off the beaten track in the lively country of central and northern Attica, Pentelicus and near Rhinaus and Kalamos; which makes one wish he had let his pen go further afield (for he knows much more of Greece than he writes about). Yet it is wrong to expect a man to do what he has set out to do; Attica is the land which he has taken to his heart, and deserves the prize for beauty. Other lovers indeed will be jealous.

A. W. GOMME.
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I.—GENERAL

A

Abydos district, location of, 66 ff.
Acrarnania, Corinthian invasion of, 62 ff.
Aegina, Temple of Aphaia, 97
Aeschylus, rhetorical structure in, 11
‘Agrāni’ at Battle of Gaugamela, 89
Alaca Höyük, Hittite relief with hounds, 75
Alatsamári, chamber tomb, 111
Alexander, campaigns of 332–330, 81 ff.
alphabet, 23
Anamnia, identification of site, 67, 81
Ambracia, relations with Corinth, 62 ff.
Amphilocho Argos, 62 f.
Anactorion, revolt of, 62 f.
Antalya, dedication to Men, 118
Antigone, 81, 83
Apollozónia: relations with Corinth, 63 f., 68; terrace wall, 72 f.
Aristotle, Athēnaion Politia, emendations in chapters 30 and 31, 57
Arndi (Cyprus), tomb-group, 115
Athens: Agora excavations, 93 ff.; Hadrian’s Library excavations, 93; Benaki Museum accessions, 93; Epigraphical Museum accessions, 93; National Museums accessions, 92 f.; British School, bronze: horse, 77; horse, 77; mouse, 77; ploughman, 74
Attic chronology, 25, 30

B

Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery, bronze rein guides, 120 f.
Battles, ritual, 75
Battle-formation, Alexander’s, 86
Berlin, Corinthian plaque with merman, 78
Bracelets, from Marmariani, 119
Brasidas, march of, 64
Breslau, Archæologisches Museum, bronze merman, 75 f.
Bronzes: from Gróvila, 111; from Knossos (Minoan), 108; from Páigadeis, 113; from Pitsiná, 101; from Smyrna (inscribed bowl), 106; and see Athens, Baltimore, Breslau, Cambridge, Copenhagen, Edinburgh, London
Broche, spectacle, 119
Buthrotus, 54 f.
Butrinto, terrace wall, 72 f.
Byllis, fortification walls, 73

C

Calendar, Attic, 25
Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, bronzes: 04.9 (goat), 76; 04.10 (sheep), 76; 04.11 (stoat), 76; 04.12 (lion), 76; 04.15 (dog), 76; 04.14 (fish), 77; 04.15 (deer), 76; 04.2 (ploughman), 74; 04.3 (ploughman), 74; 04.5 (bull), 76
Capitals, from Old Smyrna, 105
Centauras, archaic type, 75
Coins: from Larnaka, 117; from Old Smyrna, 106
Colonus Assembly, 56, 58 f.
Companions, at Battle of Gaugamela, 85 ff.
Constitution of Draco, 57; of Peisander, 58; of Thermae, 58
Copenhagen, National Museum, bronze ploughman:
ABa 708, 74
Corinth, land route to Epidaurus, 62 ff.
Country Dionysia, 29
Curium (Cyprus), excavations, 115

D

Delphi, excavations, 100
Derveni, pithos-burial, 99
Dionysos, association with Demeter, 121
Dourouizi, Minoan tomb, 110
Dàmia, rock-cut tomb, 111

E

Edéssa, tombs, 102
Edinburgh, Royal Scottish Museum, horse on stand from Chauchitsa, 119
Eleusis, excavations, 97
Énkomí, excavations, 114
Épidauros, excavations, 98
Epigraph, progress of, 1948–9, 20 ff.
Épirus, routes through, 64 f.
Episkopi, chamber tomb, 110
Eumæus, in the Odyssey, 6
Europolis, Andromache, 65
Euycleia, in the Odyssey, 6

F

Famagusta, excavations, 117
Flying fish, bronze, 77
Fortifications, 68 ff.
Four Hundred, the, 56 ff.

G

Gaugamela, Battle of, 84 ff.; capture of Alexander’s Camp, 88 ff.; sequel to, 90 ff.
Gems, inscribed, 23
‘Geometric’ decoration, 11
Gortyn, excavations, 110
Gortys, excavations, 99 ff.

H

H. Kosmás, excavations, 97
H. Nikólaós, Minoan tomb, 111
Halos festival, 121
Herodotus, rhetorical structure in, 11
Himara, fortification walls, 72 ff.
Homer, see Odyssey

I

Inscriptions: from Aegina, 31;
from Aetolia, 38;
from Anatolia, 48 ff.;
from Antalya, 116;
from Arcadia, 36;
from Argos, 34 f.
from Athens, 24 ff.
from Bithynia, 51;
from Boeotia, 36 f.
from Brauron, 29;
from Cos, 44;
from Crete, 43 f.;
from Cyprus, 32 f.
from Cyno, 44;
from Coreya, 36;
from Corinth, 34;
from Cos, 44;
from Delphi, 37 f., 100;
from Edessá, 102;
from Eleusis, 29;
from Epidaurus, 35, 99;
from Euboea, 106;
from Garretzi, 29;
from Hermione, 35;
from Italy, 47;
from Ithaca, 38;
from Laconia, 35;
from Lampræ, 29;
from Lemnos, 45;
from Locris, 38;
from Lyttos, 110;
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Inscriptions: from Macedon, 39; from Malandrinus, 100; from Manisa, 49; from Marathon, 29; from Megara, 30; from Mélos, 44; from Mytilene, 104; from Naxos, 44; from Nemea, 54; from Oenoe, 35; from Olympia, 36; from Palestine, 54; from Palmyra, 53; from Panambyla, 58; from Paphos, 115; from Pharsala, 100; from Phoenicia, 53; from Rhamnus, 29; from Rhodes, 43 f.; from Rome, 48; from Salamis, 29; from Salonica, 102; from Samos, 44 f.; from Samothrace, 103; from Sicily, 46 f.; from Sicily, 54; from Siphnos, 44; from Sicyon, 29; from Syria, 53; from Syros, 44; from Thasos, 45, 103; from Thrace, 103; from Thessaly, 30; from Troezen, 35; from Troy, 33; from Villa, 29; from Xanthus Valley, 52

Iota, Corinthian, 54

K


L

Lissus, fortification walls, 69, 72 f. Locris, colonisation, 68 Londres, British Museum, bronze: 32-9.1.10 (combat), 75; 54.9.1-11 (merman), 75 f.; 75.3.11-10 (combat), 75; 75; 75; 75; 75; 12-13-12 (centaur), 75; 75; 75-13-13 (spine), 75, 76, 78; 75; 75-3-13-14 (siren), 76, 78; W.148 (fish), 77; BMC no. 216 (figure with reversals), 75; 193-3-29.1 (figure with reversed head), 75; 193-3-29.2 (panther), 77; 1951-3-29.3 (mouse), 77; 1951-3-29-4 (mouse), 77; 1951-3-29.3 (bird), 77; 1951-3-29.6 (bird), 77; 1951-3-29.7 (snake), 77; 1951-3-29.9 (ophiophagus), 77 Lykus, son of Myrel, 63 f.

M

Mállia, excavations, 110 Mammousia, excavations, 99 Margelle, fortification walls, 73 Máxi, excavations, 99 Medun, fortification walls, 72 f. Mercenaries' Source for Alexander's Campaigns, 82n., 87 f. Merman, in art, 75 f., 78 Mesambela, Mycenaean tomb, 110 Mice, bronze, 77 Mildenhall, Greek graffito, 48 Molosia, friendship with Athens, 65 Monumentum Anicianum, 51 Mosaics: at Knossos, 108; at Koutokia, 115; at Nikopolis, 101 Mycenae, excavations, 97 f.; shaft grave, 98; Tomb of Clytemnestra, 98 Mystra, excavations, 99

N

Naxos, excavations, 106 Nicosia, Iron Age tombs, 114 f. Nikopolis, excavations, 101 Nostoi, 1

O

Odyssey, analysis of structure, 13 f.; date of, 12; pattern of, 1 ff.; prologue, 1 f.; visit to Phaeacia, 3 ff.; wanderings of Odysseus, 45; return to Ithaca, 5 ff.; vengeance of Odysseus, 7 f.

Oeniades, captured by Athens, 63; fortification walls, 69, 72 Old Smyrna, excavations, 104 ff. Oricon, Cypro-Euboean origin of, 68; fortification walls, 73 Ostraca, 25; from Athenian agora, 97

P


R


S

Salamis, excavations, 102 Samothrace, excavations, 103 f. Script: Cypro-Mycenaean, 113 f.; syllabic, 52 f. Sculptors' signatures, 22 Sculpture: from Athenian Agora, 97; from Curium (Apollo), 116; from Gortyn (copy of Athena Parthenos), 110; from Koutokia (archaic male head), 115; from Mycenae, 63; from Mylasa (kouro), 106; from Naxos (kouro), 106; from Palaith Epikrates (kouro), 99; from Pergamius, 115; from Salamina (altar), 102; (sacophagi), 102; from Sikyon (headdress youth), 97; from Thasos (heads), 103 Reliefs: from Athenian Agora, 97; stele from Edessa, 102; stele from Gomno, 100; stele from Mycenae, 98

Scutari, fortification walls, 73 Scaletto, from Knossos, 108 Sikyon, excavations, 97 Simónides, 120 Siren, armless type, 76, 78 Sotira (Cyprus), excavations, 113 Speeches, in the Odyssey, 10 f. Sphinx, with sickle-wings, 76, 78
INDEX TO VOLUME LXXII

Split, column-krater fragments, 120
Stavropol, vaulted tomb, 102
Stoats, in art, 76
Strongyli, Roman bath, 101

T
Tell-Halaf, orthostat with duel of Gilgamesh and Engida, 75
Terracottas: from Salonica, 102; from Samothrace, 104
Tharyps, king of Molossia, 65
Thasos, excavations, 102 f.
Theoclymenus, in the Odyssey, 6
Theopompus, archonship of, 60
Thronion: Apolloniate campaign against, 65 f.; identification of site, 66 ff.
Trikkeri, Roman hypocaust, 100
Twelve Gods, cult of, 29

V
Vases: inscriptions on, 22 f., 34, 52; from Amsahl, 115;
from Athenian agora, 96 f.; from Delphi, 100;
from Derveni, 99;
from Dourugoutzi, 110;
from Epidauros, 96;
from Gortys, 90;
from H. Nikolaos, 111;
from Kaphrissi, 115;
from Kastritsa, 101;
from Katsabas, 108;
from Knossos, 108;
from Kritsa, 111;

Vase-Painters: Aischines, 199; Barclay, 96; Brygos, 93;
Carlsruhe, 119; Duris, 22, 25; Exekias, 100; Leonidas, 22; Pistozenos, 93; Polygnotus, 92; Ram Jug, 93; Shuvalov, 119; Sophilus, 22
Vathypetro, excavations, 109 f.
Verria, excavations, 101
Votonos, grave stela, 101

W
Weapons: bronze, from Knossos, 108; iron, from Old Smyrna, 106
Weasels, in art, 76

II.—INDEX OF GREEK AND LATIN AUTHORS

Apolonius Rhodius, Schol. on IV 1175, 68
Aristotle, Ath. Pol. 4, 57; 29, 2, 56; 29, 5 ff., 56; 30 f., 57 ff.; 32, 5, 57, 60; 33, 1, 60
Arrian, II 4, 83 f.; II 13, 83; II 17, 82; II 20, 83;
III 2, 83; III 7 ff., 84; III 12, 85; III 12-13, 87 ff.; III 16, 90
Curtius, IV 1 34-40, 81 ff.; IV 5 13, 84; IV 9 13, 85;
IV 10 1 ff., 84; IV 14 22, 89; IV 15-16, 87 ff.;
V 1 39, 90; VIII 2 40, 85

Diogenes, XVII 22 5, 83; XVII 30 1, 82; XVII 48 6, 81;
XVII 57 4-86; XVII 57 5-85; XVII 58-60, 87 ff.;
XVII 64 2, 84; XVII 63 1, 84
Hecataeus, fr. 106 in Jacoby FGHI, 64, 68
Herodotus, V 92 7, 63; VIII 47, 69
Homer, Odyssey, PASSIM, 1-19
Lycurgus, Leor. 9, 21
Pausanias, V 22 3 ff., 65, 68; VIII 11 12, 65

III.—INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

Διαίνης στεναχώσον, 9
Διαιτητήριον, 25
Διαφάνεια, 66

Γυάλος, 43
Γυαλισμένον — γυαλισμένον, 58

Δευτερό-, 21
Διαφάνεια, 84
Δραγαπάται, 39

Εἰς ἄρτον ἀλώνιος, 21
Εἰς ἄρτον ἔιναιτος, 60 f.

Θεαρόδοκον, 37
Λαμπρός, 58
Λυγγαφαίτης, 56
Δομαστής, 21

Παράγωμα, 37
Πάρηδρος, 118, 121
Πραγματικός, 118
Προδύτης, 29, 36, 44
Πρόςοδον κληνόν, 120
Πρόφασι, 120
Προταναγος, 25

Στροφίζης, 52 f.
Συστήματος, 56

Τρόφος, 59
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Bronze Statuettes from East Greece.

a. British Museum 75.3-13.10.
b. British Museum 52.9-1.10.
c. British Museum 1951.3-29.1.
d. British Museum 75.3-13.12.
e. British Museum 52.9-1.11.
**Bronze Statuettes from East Greece.**

- **a.** Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum 04-15.
- **b.** British Museum 75.3-13.13.
- **c.** British Museum 75.3-13.14.
- **d.** Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum 04.11.
- **e.** Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum 04.9.
- **f.** Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum 04.10.
Bronze Statuettes from East Greece.

a. British Museum 1951.3-29.2.
b. Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum 32.6.
d. Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum 04.12.
e. Athens, British School.
f. Athens, British School.
Bronze Statuettes from East Greece.

e. Athens, British School.
h. British Museum W. 148.


THE SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION OF HELLENIC STUDIES

REPORT FOR THE SESSION 1951–52.

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

Finance.

The 1951 account closed with a surplus of £596. This was due partly to the effect of the higher subscription rate, partly to exceptionally heavy sales of the Journal, including back numbers, which accounted for £616.

The cost of Volume 71 (the Beazley number) was £2,025, to which subscribers contributed £745, leaving a net charge on the Society of £1,280. We aim to hold the cost of Volume 72 to £1,225. It must be smaller than Volume 71, but will be larger than the other volumes issued in the last five years. It now appears that, in view of rising costs of printing and paper, the normal expenditure on the Journal in future will be at least £1,500.

In 1952 the rent of our premises is to be raised, as from July 1st, by £500 a year, of which one-half falls on the Hellenic Society; we must face unavoidable increases in salaries and in such miscellaneous expenses as lighting, heating and caretaker’s charges. The University of London has, however, guaranteed the two Societies against loss incurred by our having continued our lease for the extra year in 50 Bedford Square. Before our extended lease expires in June 1953 we have to meet heavy expenditure on dilapidations. For this serious item the Joint Special Appeal for £3,000 brought in up to date £1,835. The discovery of dry rot in the Library this year has involved an unexpected expenditure of £800, which has been met out of this Fund.

Accordingly, notwithstanding every economy consistent with the purposes of the Society, the financial position has become increasingly difficult. In particular, those members who have not yet volunteered the new membership rate of £2 a year are earnestly urged to reconsider the possibility of helping the Society to that extent. It is discouraging to note that out of the 900 members enjoying the option, those who have as yet volunteered the higher rate number only 179. Members are also once more reminded that without cost to themselves they can help the Society appreciably by undertaking a Covenant on its behalf, the Covenant giving the Society, on a £2 subscription, an actual income of £3 2s. 9d.

Membership figures as at December 31st, 1951, are shown below, along with comparable figures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Life Members</th>
<th>Student Members</th>
<th>Associates</th>
<th>Libraries</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal exchanges</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obituary.


The Joint Standing Committee of the Hellenic and Roman Societies.

In view of the greatly increased rental of 50 Bedford Square and rising cost of publication, the Councils of the Hellenic and Roman
Societies have had during the past two years to seek some kind of outside aid. Negotiations have been carried on with London University with the following results.

The Councils of the two Societies have agreed to a proposal which it is believed the University will carry out if financial provision is possible. By this agreement the Societies hand over to the University as essential equipment for a Classical Institute a collection of books of reference, viz.: (a) bibliographies, dictionaries, indexes, encyclopaedias, plain texts and corpora of epigraphical and archaeological material; (b) selected collections of pamphlets and offprints; (c) selected periodicals. These books will be confined to the Library.

In return the Societies will receive: (1) free quarters for the rest of the Library which will be available to borrowers (i.e. members of the Societies) as hitherto; (2) free quarters for the offices of the Societies; (3) a grant in aid towards the publication of their Journals.

The libraries will be housed in the same building and managed in close relationship. The Institute will be governed by a Committee of Management on which the Societies will each have two representatives. Members of the Societies will be granted access to the Institute Library by permission of the Director or Librarian. The University Library photostat and microfilm service will be available by arrangement to all members of the Societies at a low cost.

This proposal would, in the opinion of the Council, assure the maintenance of the essential services of the Societies and the retention of ownership of a large part of the Library.

**Journal of Hellenic Studies.**

Volume 72 has fewer reviews than we should like; it has been planned to increase review space in Volume 73.

**Joint Committee of Greek and Roman Societies.**

In order not to clash with the Copenhagen meeting, which is arranged for 1954, the Committee will hold the next conference in 1955 at Oxford.

**International Federation of Societies for Classical Studies.**

At the Meeting held in Cambridge in August 1951 the Society's delegate was Professor A. W. Gomme.

**Meetings.**

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

October 12th, 1951. Professor A. D. Trendall on 'Some Mid-fourth Century South Italian Vase Painters'.

February 19th, 1952. Mr. E. S. G. Robinson on 'History of fifth century Magna Graecia in the light of the Coins'.

May 2nd, 1952. Professor D. L. Page on 'Some Homeric Epithets'.

June 20th, 1952. Professor T. B. L. Webster, Presidential Address 'Art and Literature in Aristotle's Athens'.

**Provincial Meetings.**

Meetings were arranged in collaboration with the Classical Association and with the Classical Association of Scotland at the following centres: Birmingham, Bristol, Cardiff, Durham, Edinburgh, Exeter, Leeds, Nottingham, Reading, Sheffield, Southampton, the University College of N. Staffs, and papers were read by Professors Adcock, E. R. Dodds, H. D. F. Kitto, A. Momigliano, C. M. Robertson, E. G. Turner, T. B. L. Webster, and W. K. C. Guthrie.

**Administration.**

Ten members of the Council who retire in rotation under rule 19 are: J. M. R. Cormack, T. J. Dunbabin, A. W. Gomme, R. J. Hopper, E. A. Lane, C. T. Seltman, Mrs. A. M. Webster, H. D. Westlake, A. G. Woodhead, R. E. Wycherley.


Miss D. H. F. Gray has been elected a member of the Standing Committee for the next three years.

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

**The Joint Library.**

The repairs to the Library, which inevitably caused some interference with the normal working of the Library during the winter months, have been completed, and all books are now available.
The following figures show the work done during the last three sessions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1949-50</th>
<th>1950-51</th>
<th>1951-52</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books added</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books borrowed</td>
<td>4,005</td>
<td>4,559</td>
<td>3,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowers</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slides borrowed</td>
<td>5,503</td>
<td>5,035</td>
<td>3,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slides sold</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film strips borrowed</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professor A. D. Moniglano has been elected a member of the Library Committee in place of Professor A. H. M. Jones, who resigned.

A list of war-time numbers of foreign periodicals which the Joint Library has not so far succeeded in obtaining, showing other Libraries which have copies, was circulated with the 1951 volumes of the Journals. As a result, Dr. E. W. Brooks very kindly presented a copy of Byzantium, Volume 15.

A list of the most important books added to the Library will in future be circulated with the Journals. This will take the place of the complete lists of acquisitions formerly published.

The Councils of the Hellenic and Roman Societies wish to express their thanks for gifts of books from the following: The late Miss M. Alford, Mr. J. M. Bairro Oleiro, Miss M. Benece, Prof. H. Bloesch, Dr. E. W. Brooks, Mr. C. Clairmont, Mr. D. T.-D. Clarke, Prof. Ch. Dugas, Mr. R. A. H. Farrar, Dr. D. B. Harden, Mr. R. W. Hutchinson, Mr. J. F. Jones, Prof. C. Kyriakidis, Mr. W. Lameere, Mrs. D. Mackay, Prof. W. S. Maginnis, Lt.-Col. G. W. Meates, Dr. G. Murray, Mr. F. F. Musgrave, Sir John Myres, Prof. A. D. Nock, Mr. E. D. Phillips, Prof. L. J. D. Richardson, Prof. I. A. Richmond, Prof. L. Robert, Prof. C. M. Robertson, Mr. E. D. Tappe, Miss M. V. Taylor, Mr. O. Veh, Mr. M. Ventris, Mrs. H. Walton, Prof. T. B. L. Webster, Mr. G. P. Zafiropoulos, Prof. U. Zanotti-Bianco, the Byzantine Institute of America.

The two Councils wish to thank Mr. C. E. Ansell Clayton and Miss S. Benton for gifts to the photographic collection, and Prof. J. A. Davison, Prof. A. W. Gomme, Mr. D. J. Furley, Mr. E. W. Handley, and Prof. W. S. Maginnis for help in examining the classical texts in the Library Catalogue.
## The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies

**Balance Sheet, December 31, 1951.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liabilities</th>
<th>£ s. d.</th>
<th>£ s. d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total at January 1, 1951</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,233</strong></td>
<td><strong>19 0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Received during the year</strong></td>
<td><strong>126</strong></td>
<td><strong>0 0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less carried to Income and Expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,349</strong></td>
<td><strong>19 0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sundry Credit Balances</strong></td>
<td><strong>2 2 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,271</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance Account (C)</strong></td>
<td><strong>198 2 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>198 2 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance Account (D)</strong></td>
<td><strong>198 2 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>200 4 6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16,885</strong></td>
<td><strong>18 11</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Society’s share of the capital value of the Library and Photographic Department 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.

**Cyril T. Edge, Chartered Accountant.**

**Income and Expenditure Account for the Year Ended December 31, 1951.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>£ s. d.</th>
<th>£ s. d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>478</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>678</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,916</strong></td>
<td><strong>4 11</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>£ s. d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,883</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,916</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Journal of Hellenic Studies’ Account for the Year Ended December 31, 1951.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£ s. d.</th>
<th>£ s. d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,376 10 10</td>
<td>1,376 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380 13 4</td>
<td>90 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178 2 2</td>
<td>2,025 6 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,025 6 4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£ s. d.</th>
<th>£ s. d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>828 14 7</td>
<td>85 2 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>828 14 7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£ s. d.</th>
<th>£ s. d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>016 3 5</td>
<td>03 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>016 3 5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The Joint Library of the Hellenic and Roman Societies

#### (A) Premises Account for the Year Ended December 31, 1951

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Rent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates</td>
<td></td>
<td>260</td>
<td>3 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Charges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### (B) Library Maintenance Account for the Year Ended December 31, 1951

<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></td>
<td>701</td>
<td>15 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting and Heating</td>
<td></td>
<td>163</td>
<td>11 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning and Caretakers Wages</td>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
<td>5 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and Stationery</td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>12 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Insurance of Library</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage and Telephone</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalogue Entries</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### (C) Joint Library Books Account for the Year Ended December 31, 1951

<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></td>
<td>220</td>
<td>9 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£222 12 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### (D) Lantern Slides and Photographs Account for the Year Ended December 31, 1951

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Purchase</td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>16 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td></td>
<td>198</td>
<td>2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### The Special Fund (Joint Hellenic and Roman Societies) for the Year Ended December 31, 1951

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Amount on Deposit Account with The London Trustee Savings Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,835</td>
<td>7 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Net Proceeds of Appeal at December 30, 1950</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,506</td>
<td>2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions Received during year</td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Deposit Account</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,835 7 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“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.