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METAL-WORKING IN HOMER

In discussing the transition from bronze to iron in Anatolia, Dr. Stefan Przeworski incidentally identifies Homeric conditions with the stage in the historical development of metallurgy which he calls Chalcoidieric. 1 Professor Nilsson and Miss Lorimer 2 have argued briefly but effectively that the poems contain elements from different periods; but belief in an historical 'Homerian Society' dies hard and justifies a more detailed examination of all the references to metals in the poems.

Przeworski's transitional age began about 1500 B.C. in Anatolia and about a century later in Greece; in both it ended about 700 B.C. Before it began, bronze was the useful material for all industrial purposes, and the rare uses of iron were ornamental or magical. After it ended, iron was the normal industrial material, and the more malleable bronze was used for fine work or elaborate modelling. The characteristics of the intermediate period are: 1. Imitation of Late Bronze Age types in iron. 2. Simultaneous appearance of bronze and iron objects of the same purpose and type. 3. Inlay of bronze objects with iron. 4. Combination in the same weapon or tool of iron working and bronze ornamental parts. 5. Addition of iron working parts to bronze objects such as cult-wagons and utensils. 6. Use of bronze rivets on iron weapons and tools. 7. Repair of bronze objects with iron parts (Przeworski 175-6). Most of these characteristics are so technical that they are unlikely to be reflected in poetry. Moreover, so many bronze objects were in common use at all periods, including the full Iron Age, that the most significant evidence may be taken to be the relative value of the metals, the relative frequency of bronze and iron weapons and tools, and the degree of familiarity shown with the methods of the forge as distinct from the foundry.

Judged by the number of times it is mentioned, χαλκός is beyond dispute the Homeric metal. If nouns, adjectives, and compounds are all included, the metals occur: 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Iliad</th>
<th>Odyssey</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>χαλκός</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χρύσος</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αγάπρος</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οίνη</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θαλάσσιες</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only numerical difference of any importance between the two poems is that bronze and tin are mentioned comparatively seldom in the Odyssey. This is the main reason why references to iron are there 253 per cent of the references to bronze, whereas in the Iliad they are only 72 per cent. The 816 passages are grouped below according to use, for estimating wealth and value in Table A, for decoration and fine craftsmanship in Table B, and for armour and tools in Table C. Table D gathers together the few general references to sources and production and the metaphorical uses. Supernatural ownership has been ignored if similar things made of the same metal are also used by mortals, but objects found only in the possession of immortals or in the fairy-tale Palace of Alcinoos are marked by an asterisk. References are given for all but the most frequent and obvious uses. It is sometimes doubtful whether, for example, a weapon is made of a metal or decorated with it, but on the whole the classification provides distinct groups which may be compared with the archaeological material.

In the first group (Table A, p. 2) iron is paradoxically an indication of earliness, not of lateness. In Babylonia in the reign of Hammurabi iron was nearly thirty times more valuable in comparison with silver and fifteen to nineteen times more valuable in comparison with copper, than it was in the convenient translation of χαλκός, though utensils were in fact copper, and copper ingots were probably preferred, since the tin content is reduced when bronze ingots are remelted. For weapons and tools the commonest alloy found is tin, usually about 3:1 per cent, but lead, arsenic, and antimony are sometimes present, apparently as alloys and not merely as impurities [Przeworski, op. cit. pp. 80-6, and Hampe and Janzen, JdL III (1937), Bereit, pp. 34-5]. Arsenic, which is now used to give greater tensile strength to wrought metal, would also improve the hardness and toughness of hammered castings. Lead-bronze lacks hardness, but has good colour and greater malleability. Lead is mentioned in Α 237 and ω 80 as soft and heavy. In ι 75, but not in ι 460 and ι 296, ψαλίζων is probably the alloy of gold and silver. All numbers refer to occurrences of words, not to objects, e.g. the same spear described four times as bronze counts as 4 and not as 1. The equals sign is used when the relevant parts of the lines are identical.

1 Much of this material was used for papers read to the Manchester Branch of the Classical Association and the Oxford Philological Society in 1948. I wish to thank Dr. C. H. Desch, F.R.S., for reading an earlier draft and discussing some of the technical points with me.

2 Die Metallindustrie Anatolien (1939), 177. So also R. J. Forbes, Metallurgy in Antiquity (1950), 458. Both quote Andrew Lang, R. Arch. VII (1906), 290, as their authority.

3 M. P. Nilsson, Homer and Mycenae (1933), 139-42. H. L. Lorimer, Homer and the Monuments (1950), 111-21 (hereafter Monuments); since this appeared, I have been able to shorten my notes considerably.

4 οίνη, as is clear in the description of tempering in i 391-4, is strictly mild steel, a low carbon content being picked up from the charcoal; but the translation 'iron' is traditional, and it seems better to keep it than to vary the English word for the same metal or to use 'steel' for all the ferrous objects of Homer and the Early Iron Age. So 'bronze' is a con-
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the reign of Nabonidus. It appears frequently as a valuable material in Hittite and Egyptian documents of the Late Bronze Age and features in the plunder won by Tiglath-pileser I about 1100 B.C. and in the tribute paid to Tukulti-Ninurta II shortly after 900 B.C.; but it is not mentioned in the rich plunder of Sargon II towards the end of the eighth century, because 'iron indeed was nothing accounted of in his days.' 4 In the Homeric epics gold is the normal metal for expressing the exact value of a price, ransom, gift, or bribe, such as the two talents which Aigisthos paid to

### Table A

**The Metals as a Form of Wealth**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bronze</th>
<th>Iron</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) General</td>
<td>Li 15; Od 12</td>
<td>Z 48 = K 379 = A 133 = 6 324 = 10 5 473 = 1177 = 279 = 395 = 5150 = 610 = 126 = 10 36 = 16 = 28 = 41 = 149 = 271 = 341 = 19 = 368 = 40 2 = 5 58</td>
<td>Li 6; Od 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Specific</td>
<td>Li 1</td>
<td>K 35 = 45</td>
<td>Li 850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Gold
- Bronze
- Iron
- Silver
- Tin

his watchman; only once is any other metal so used, in ψ 850–1, where the calculation of iron in terms of axes and half-axes seems likely to represent two different stages. Bronze axes as weights are common; iron is usually in the form of spits, but they are characteristic of Dorian countries.62 Gold and less frequently bronze are also the normal measure of wealth generally; Mycenae is rich in gold; and Sidon rich in bronze, and great wealth is twice summarised in the phrase πολύνυμυνος πωλούχος. Silver is hardly used in this connexion; it appears only in the two lines of the Odyssey in which the bag of Aiolos is supposed to contain 'gold and silver.' The iron which in H 473 is one of the things which the Achacans barter for wine need not be thought of as a particularly valuable commodity, especially as gold does not appear in the list; but both the places in the Odyssey where iron is a form of wealth and five of the seven places in the Iliad consist of two repeated lines, πολύνυμυνος πωλούχος τε παλκάματος τε στήρισι κατεύκοκο μούνοντος πολον τε στήρισι. In these lines iron has a recognised place side by side with gold and other valuables in the assessment of wealth.

There is no trace of the decorative use (Table B, p. 3) of iron, common in the east at the time when the metal was esteemed along with gold and attested for the Mycenaean area by small finds from sites from Syria to Boeotia.9 The tin bosses on the shield of Agamemnon and the tin fittings on the chariot of Diomedes have no archaeological parallels. Tin conical studs or buttons and a boss were found on a site near Volterra said to be contemporary with the Early Helladic period,10 but this is chronologically and geographically remote from a shield which, with its crowded design and numerous bosses, most resembles the Cretan shields of the Early Iron Age.11 The θωρής which Achilles took from Asteropaios, θωρής, φάνερον κατάτηρον, sounds like tinplate, though on a base of bronze and not, like the modern tin, on a thin sheet of mild steel. So the gold and tin σίκος of the θωρής of Agamemnon can only be a facing of the soft metals on a stronger base. Since the melting point of tin is extremely low, there would be no technical improbability in the coating of bronze with tin to give a silvery surface, and the tinned bronze plates on an iron helmet from Sutton Hoo12 show that such a surface might be preferred to the natural colour of bronze; but there is no evidence for the practice in the Aegean. It is possible that the bosses and chariot fittings were also tinned, and that these passages reflect an experiment made at a time when precious metals were scarce. Bronze gleams beside gold, silver, electron, and so 61–2 sounds like, and perhaps originally was, a general description of wealth, but in ψ 81 it is limited to the iron axes.

---

7 Specified weights were presumably in bar form, but certainly in 448, 7, 469, and probably in most of the other places where gold or bronze are joined to clothing, cattle, and slave-girls, the wealth in metal would be in manufactured form, as much of it was in the fifth century, Thuc. II. 13.4–5 and VI. 46.3.
8 ∼ 9 Monumenti, 111–15.
10 Palace of Minos II, pp. 169–70. Dr. Desch drew my attention also to a bangle of pure tin which he identified among the finds from Thermi, Lamb, Excavations at Thermi, pp. 165, 171–3, 215. It also is Early Bronze Age.
11 Monumenti, 169–91.
12 The Sutton Hoo Ship-Burial, p. 25. I am told that such surface tinning would occur accidentally when tin was worked with new bronze or iron implements.
and ivory in the decorations of the Palace of Menelaos. Since there is no evidence for wall decoration of metal in Mycenaean palaces, it could hardly be a genuine tradition from the Bronze Age, but it might be a mistake arising from the later discovery of an un pillaged Tholos Tomb adorned with gilded bronze rosettes. There is a greater resemblance to the bronze plates and heavy bronze nails found in the Hieron of Athene Chalkioikos, and though these cannot be shown to have belonged to the Geometric sanctuary, there is in Athens Museum bronze plating which seems to have covered the door of a sacred building of Geometric date. Most probably the Homeric description reflects an oriental fashion which the Greeks of the Geometric period had just begun to imitate.13 There are also bronze chariot fittings and vessels, as there were at all periods; probably they were too ordinary to be worth mentioning more frequently. Silver studs often appear, and especially in the Odyssey silver cups and bowls; otherwise the metal is not often used in decoration. Gold is used to make a greater variety of objects, but except for the post-Mycenaean dress pins and fibulae they are all appropriate to any date at which the metal was available.

Two processes are more interesting. The first is found only on the shield of Achilles. The combination of many metals to produce the effect of 'painting in metal' is best known through finds from the Shaft Graves, Dendra, and Enkomi. In the Early Iron Age a few widely scattered finds, including a bronze fibula from Thespiai,14 have linear patterns inlaid in iron, but the precious metals are not used, and there are no pictorial designs. Both the metals and the technique used in the Bronze Age are known.15 Gold gave the yellow colour, whiter if alloyed with silver and redder

---

13 A. J. B. Wee, BSA XXV, p. 330: Schuchhardt, Schil- 
mann's Excavations, pp. 145 and 302. Guy Dickins, The Hieron of 
Athene Chalkioikos, BSA XIII, pp. 139-40. Monuments, 429. 
BCH LXXVII 193, with fig. 2 and Pl. XXXII.
14 Blinkenberg, Fibules grecques et orientales, fig. 50.
15 Palace of Minos III, pp. 111-33. Karo, Schachtgräber, 
Humfrey Payne has shown how improbable it is that the poly-
chrome style on vases is derived from metal-work, when the 
known techniques of metal-working are quite different 
(Nerochorinthia, 95, cf. 19 n. 2).
if alloyed with copper. Silver was white, and copper was occasionally used for red. Less obvious is the method of producing black, by mixing powdered sulphur with lead, copper, or silver to form the alloy known as nilo; the black background of the Lily dagger from the fifth Shaft Grave is said to be a plate of iron and silver alloy. Depressions showing the patterns in blank outline were cut and hammered out of the cold bronze base. Thin plates of the inlaying metals were cut to the right shapes and hammered cold into the depressions. The nilo was either applied in powder form and then fired, or first fired and cut out and then applied as a cold plate. The surface was smoothed by stoning down. In the Iliad the description of the shield is definite and emphatic. The poet knew that a picture in yellow, white, and black (blood is mentioned, but is not said to be red) could be shown on a metal surface by a combination of metals, and it does not seem possible that he meant anything except the craftsmanship of the great age of Mycenaean. The insistence on the colour effects is inexplicable if he had in mind a design worked in a single metal, which could be lifelike in every other way but not in the differentiation of colours. There is, however, no evidence that he knew how the effects were produced and some indications that he did not. There is no hint of the delicate process itself, and the poet regards the workmanship as, in the most literal sense, miraculous. Tin, so far as is known, was never used as an inlaying material, nor was κυνόν, whether it means blue glass paste or lapis lazuli. Moreover, the poet explicitly gives a wrong explanation of how black was produced when he says that the soil turned black behind the plough although it was made of gold. Such small inexactitudes might mean only that the poet had not troubled to enquire into technicalities, but since he obviously took the keenest interest in the actual processes, they suggest that the passage does not reflect the work of contemporary craftsmen, but is an imaginative reconstruction of the process of manufacture based on knowledge of a finished masterpiece. An inlaid Mycenaean bowl or dagger might have been preserved as an heirloom long after the process had been forgotten,16 but the description of such a treasure, preserved in traditional poetry, would lend itself more readily to adaptation. The Homeric parallel is confined to the use of inlay in colour and perhaps some details of the decoration; the design as a whole, with its concentric bands and balanced series of narrative scenes, is much more like the embossed or incised Cretan shields or Phoenician bowls than anything known from the Bronze Age.17 The second process is the overlaying of one metal on another. It twice provides a similar, δετ' ου της χρυσοῦ περιεστα δραγων άνδρι χρωσάτων, and a bowl and a basket are silver χρωσάτων, and the gold armour of mortal heroes are presumably similar, though the armour of Zeus may be thought of as solid. The process can be carried out in two different ways.18 A silver or bronze object can be covered, wholly or partly, by gold leaf, which is attached by rivets or pressed into grooves or simply hammered flat with a wooden mallet. Silver vessels with gold linings or with strips of gold riveted to rim and handle have been found at Mycenae, Dendra, and Bebati, while the method of pressing the gold leaf into grooves is used on statuettes of Baal from Ras Shamra.19 Similar use of detachable gold leaf continued into Classical times.20 On non-metallic surfaces it could be attached by an adhesive such as white of egg. For the process usually meant by gilding, however, an amalgam is produced between the gold leaf and the base by the use of quicksilver.21 The Egyptians used this process in the third millennium, but there is no certain example from the Greek world before the seventh century. Traces are found on a silver figurine from Chios dated to the first half of the century and on a silver fibula from Cyprus which cannot be later.22 Neither gilding nor plating, however, involves the pouring of gold in liquid form, and the aptness of the simile depends on the result, not on the process.23 The verb καιράσταω in the phrase describing the finished products is equally appropriate to either process.24 There is therefore nothing in these passages which affords evidence of date.

Armour and Tools (Table C, p. 5). On the battlefield, bronze is almost unchallenged; this is why

16 Cf. BCH LXXI-II (1947-48), 148 f., especially 243-9 and pl. XXV. The theoretical possibility is also shown by the passage 1 μαλλιὰ τοιάντα Mycenaean tombs ('επι 'Αγ. 1937, 377-90) and by accounts of 'Treasures' (e.g. Paus. ii. 16, 6, ix. 36, 5, 38, 2, 37, 5 f.).
17 L. Myres, JHS LIII (1938), 26.
19 Persons, Royal Tombs, p. 50, and New Tombs, pp. 89-91. Scheffer, Cameo Texts of Ras Shamra Ugarit, pl. XXXII and XXXV, i.
21 K. C. Bailey, The Elder Pity of Chapters on Chemical Subjects, Part I, Nat. Hist. XXXII, 64-5, 100 and 123. Dr. Desch tells me that album visum and hydrargyrum are the same product, the former natural, the latter distilled from cinnamon.
22 RSHA XLI, p. 89, fig. 5, and p. 89. Myres, Handbook of the Cnernia Collection, p. 382, no. 3209.
23 καιράσταω and its compounds are generally used of liquids or of solids thought of as fluid, e.g. a stream of people or grain, a shower of leaves or feathers. But the idea of 'pouring from above' (M 284) passes easily into the simple idea of 'covering' (Ζ 114, 319, π 47). There is little resemblance to water in the heaped bodies of geese and sheep (7 320, E 141), still less in a wooden network (2 253). So in Ω 394 and 473, quicksilver and gold were used both of knocking down sand-castles and of breaking a bow. The use of παραβολεῖον does not mean that the poet had in mind the pouring of liquid gold. Blümner suggests that χρυσάταω, used in γ 425, with χρυσάτων as an alternative, means either 'gilder', or, on the analogy of παραβολσταω or 'gold-melter', because the goldsmith would generally use gold scrap which had to be melted down; it does not mean that 'gold-pourer' was the word to describe a 'gilder'.
24 οί 1 τοιούτου καταγιγομενο ελέγχου φησι οινοπνευματικον in Homer means 'carry out' a promise, threat, etc., once 'hold sway', but the use here is appropriate, especially if the word is connected, by true or false etymology, with παρομοίω, e.g. Soph. O. C. 473. So Bechtle, Lexicon. Even if it were part of a compound, it could hardly mean more than a combination of two metals. The verb in Homer is always used of mixing drink or bathwater. It would be the exact term for 'alloy', and means 'adulterate' in ἄρματοι... προ θανάτων καὶ κλεαρθόντος καρπόν (Dem. XXIV, 214). Quick silver produces a thin layer of alloy between the base and the outer skin, but the poet could not be supposed to know this.
### Table C

**Bronze.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) Armour.</th>
<th>(i) Offensive Spearheads</th>
<th>(ii) Panoply</th>
<th>(iii) Defensive Shields</th>
<th>(iv) General Accessories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. 148; Od. 45 + 1</td>
<td>Π 393; Φ 224; τ 249</td>
<td>II. 4; Od. 7</td>
<td>II. 72; Od. 8</td>
<td>II. 5 + 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>660; etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrowheads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155; etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sword</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Εξόφος; etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battleaxe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χίλιον</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Iron.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II. 3; Od. 2</td>
<td>II. 2</td>
<td>II. 13; Od. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gold.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) Armour.</th>
<th>(i) Offensive Spearheads</th>
<th>(ii) Panoply</th>
<th>(iii) Defensive Shields</th>
<th>(iv) General Accessories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ειγόνος; Δ 123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Silver.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) Armour.</th>
<th>(i) Offensive Spearheads</th>
<th>(ii) Panoply</th>
<th>(iii) Defensive Shields</th>
<th>(iv) General Accessories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tin.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) Armour.</th>
<th>(i) Offensive Spearheads</th>
<th>(ii) Panoply</th>
<th>(iii) Defensive Shields</th>
<th>(iv) General Accessories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(b) Tools.</th>
<th>Axes and Adzes</th>
<th>Knives</th>
<th>Farm tools</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. 9; Od. 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μελών = ε 233; χαλώς = N 189; Φ 37; ψ 18;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244; θ 507; ξ 418;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

- **Bronze:** Π 278; **Odyssey:** 71 + 1; **Total:** 350
- **Gold:** Π 9 + 14; **Odyssey:** 7 + 8; **Total:** 32
- **Silver:** Π 5 + 13; **Odyssey:** 7 + 4; **Total:** 23
- **Iron:** Π 5; **Odyssey:** 6; **Total:** 21
- **Tin:** Π 3; **Odyssey:** 6; **Total:** 3
it is more common in the Iliad. Defensive armour is discussed by Miss Lorimer in Monuments, 132–254, where references not given here will be found. The Minoan–Myccenean body-shield had no metal face, and metal corselet and greaves were not worn with it, as their absence from the rich and undisturbed burials at Mycenaem and Dendra, and now at Knossos, proves. At most, metal rivets may sometimes have been used instead of stitching, and plated belts may have produced the sharp contours seen on some figurines. Two types of bronze helmet are, however, now known. The Dendra example, slightly resembling the more shapely helmets on the Boxer Rhyton, is otherwise unparalleled. The L.M. II find from near Knossos is the normal conical helmet of the period with a thin, bronze facing. In the armour which become general some time after the fall of Knossos, the small shield seems not to have been metal-faced. No faces have been found, and no representation needs to be interpreted as metal, and though the negative evidence is here less strong, this is consistent with what we know of countries which may have influenced Greece. A bronze cheekpiece from Ialysos is similar to those of the Knossos bronze helmet. The type may be less rare than actual finds suggest; some may have been missed in excavations, since not everyone would recognise and reconstruct such fragile fragments, and some of the helmets represented without indication of material may be of metal. It remains true, however, that the thin bronze facing was only one way, and not apparently a common way, of covering the non-metallic helmets of the period. Two foreign types of corselet are found on the fringe of the Myccenean world, a scale corselet, long and belted with short sleeves and collar, which was current in Asia and Egypt from the fifteenth century and is worn by a royal huntsman on an ivory box from Enkomi in the thirteenth, and a 'lobster' corselet, made of bands covering the trunk from belt to neck, which is worn both by the sea-raidiers at Medinet Habu and by the griffin-slayer from Enkomi. The latter was worn over a chiton which appears to have metal plates on the skirt. Mainland armour resembles that of the eastern Aegean so closely that the scale or lobster corselet would be expected there too, but the evidence for it is inadequate. There was a short, stiff garment, but nothing indicates that it was covered with scales. A bronze collar from the transitional city of refuge at Karphe, however, which probably belonged to a scale corselet, may be evidence for their use in L.M. III rather than in the later period, since the settlement continues Bronze Age traditions with few innovations which can be called Protogeometric. No scales have been found, on the mainland or in Crete or Cyprus. A different type of corselet is shown on the Warrior Vase and Stele and on a few sherds. A waist-length upper garment is worn over a short, sleeveless chiton, both sometimes covered with regular white dots which can only represent metal discs. Stripes down front and back, best seen on the Warrior Vase, are explained as lacing down the sides, not very satisfactorily, since similar stripes are shown along the hem of the chiton, and the horns on the helmet are drawn in their true perspective. The sharp curve and the emphatic separation of the striped area from the rest of the garment suggest rather protective plating or padding. A fragment of cloth fourteen layers thick from a Myccenean burial is thought to be part of a corselet. On the mainland leggins are conspicuous and non-metallic. I do not think that the long leggings with knee-guards on the Myccenean frescoes, coming right up to the crook of the knee behind and tied there, could have been worn if they had been of metal; possibly the unusual white colour represents padded linen. Bronze greaves are known from Cyprus at a time when the island was in contact with Myc. IIIB-C but had developed a highly individual culture, especially in the use of metals. There is thus evidence from the Late Bronze Age for three types of body armour made wholly or partly of metal, one of them at least worn by Mycceneans on the Mainland, and for bronze helmets and greaves of the same shape as those made of other materials, but no evidence for bronze shield faces.
We have nothing Protogeometric except bronze shield bosses from Athens and Scyros. In Egypt the scale corset persisted, but without possibility of contact with Greece. Geometric figurines wear broad belts, sometimes ribbed and certainly of metal; there is no evidence for other body covering. A few bronze faces from shields of pre-hoplite type have been found, none securely dated before 700 B.C.27 Bronze helmets are firmly attested for the end of the eighth century.28 Details of equipment are given on votive shields from Tiryns, variously dated to just before or just after the end of the Geometric period.29 They have helmets with stilts, one rigid, and there are none of the mistakes which usually betray familiarity with hoplites. There is therefore a strong probability that they at least reproduce pre-hoplite models, but we cannot have complete confidence in the unique features: leggings not of metal, patterned chitons with broad belts and gorgets, one of them curiously angular, very convex shields, one cross-hatched and possibly of wicker-work, others with plain faces and hatched backs which might represent a metal face on leather. Early in the seventh century hoplite armour appears on Protoattic and Protocorinthian vases. On East Greek pottery figures are rare, but where armed figures are shown the equipment is the same.40 Helmets and greaves were always of bronze. Shields sometimes had bronze faces, but more often a bronze blazon was nailed on to a wooden shield.41 The bronze corsets of front and back plates clasped down the side was necessarily short, and was superseded, in the sixth century in East Greece, and somewhat later on the mainland, by a leather corset with bronze studs.42

There are serious gaps in this evidence, and the argumentum ex silentio is rightly suspect, especially as new excavations reveal exceptional objects. With good will, it is possible to force the Homeric evidence into conformity with almost any period. The following arguments are not based on firm facts, but are an attempt to use style to supplement the defective archaeological evidence. Stock epithets must, at the time of their invention, be natural descriptions of the normal attributes of the class of objects described; it is unreasonable to suppose that they could be derived from individual objects with exceptional characteristics or from objects known only among foreigners. The question to be asked is not, Is there any object from this period to which this description could conceivably apply? but Is there any period in which this would have been a natural description for this class of things? Such descriptions are likely to be contained in metrical phrases with fixed habits, and so may (but need not) be preserved for a long time. When there are not such metrical phrases, but in the course of the narrative objects are assumed without explanation to have certain characteristics, it is probable that they were familiar to the poet of that part of the narrative. Individual objects described as exceptional are in a category by themselves; they may preserve, with varying degrees of accuracy, the memory of obsolete types, or they may be foreign rarities known from trade or hearsay, or they may be poetic inventions. I have tried elsewhere43 to show that the epithets for helmets which are stylistically traditional describe non-metallic helmets of types which go back to the Bronze Age, and that the variety and irregularity of the epithets for metal suggest that they belong to a late stage of the epic language, when bronze helmets came into use again in the eighth century. A good example of the third category is the boar's tusk helmet, a unique and precise reminiscence of a normal Mycenaean type. In the same way, a tough σόκος and a round, bossed δέσις are 'in the tradition' and reflect the shield types which seem to have been normal.

---

27 is a Geometric characteristic. The solitary χώσωντας of H.41 is not in its context likely to be a genuine reminiscence of the Bronze Age. It is more probable that it appeared at a time when hoplite greaves were taken for granted and that it replaced a word which was metricaly objectionable; perhaps πρόσωπα, since -ς (cf. ιδειναις έστεραι) very rarely retains its natural quantity in hiatus (Monro, Homeric Grammar, § 360).
28 The shields from Palaiakastro may be cult objects (Benton, BSA XXXIX, 52-64; XL, 52-64, 82). The votives (BSA XI, Pl. 27, 17) are more utilitarian. Omphalos shields: Olympia IV, Pl. 62 no. 1906-7; from Cumae, Mon. Ant. XIII (1903) 240, fig. 24, and fairly commonly from Italian sites; from a sixth-century warrior grave in Macedonia. Filow, Die arch. Neokorien von Trébizenis, no. 122, fig. 100, 2-4. Lambda shields: Fouilles de Delphes, V, 25, fig. 99: from Idalion, Perrot et Chipiez, Histoire de l'art dans l'antiquité III, 869, fig. 636. Spike shield: ibid. fig. 659. The Italian shields are discussed by A. Åkerström, Der geometrische Stil in Italien, 68, 102 fig., 119 fig., and Pl. 28; he dates the earliest to the first quarter of the seventh century, but his chronology involves lowering Thucydides' data for the foundation of Syracuse; for criticism see T. J. Dunbabin, The Western Greeks, Appendix 1, especially 466-70.
29 Miss Lorimer (Monuments, 233) concludes from the absence of metal, except for very small objects which may be a late trend, in Geom. graves that helmets were of perishable material. She accepts, however, bronze Geom. helmets on: figurines from Olympia and Delphi, Pl. XVII. 3: παξίς from Argive Heraion, Pl. XVII. 2: armouer, c. 700 B.C., AJA XLVIII. 1-2, fig. 1-4. This is enough for my argument, but I think that Geom. helmets with rigid stilts (Monuments, fig. 12, cf. similar helmets such as Matz, Gesch. d. gr. Kunst I Pl. 290-31) or metallic ribbing (Matz, op. cit. Pl. 274, fig. 124 and probably those with heavy crests (Olympia IV), Pl. 16, no. 245-3, JHK 1, 51, figs 42 and 45, fig. 44, or offset contours (A.M. 17, 211-15, fig. 2, 3 and 4 and Pl. X. 2, A.Z. 188, Pl. 9, 1885, p. 131 and 139) are bronze, and that many others may be. That would take bronze helmets well back into the eighth century. The descendants of the types are clear in the seventh, stone pipe, stilted, Corinthian and conical (BSA XI. Pl. 31, 17, Pl. 28, 31, Pl. 32, 32, Matz, op. cit. Pl. 38, a, and the archaistic ribbed helmet, ib. Pl. 69). Montelius, Die älteren Kulturperioden II, p. 310 shows Assyrian helmets which might well have been thought to be non-metallic if actual examples in metal had not been found.
30 Lorimer, Monuments 170-1, dates before 700 B.C., Hamphe, Die Geleimnose Homer, 38, to early seventh century, and J. M. Cook, BSA XXXV. 207, to after 680 B.C.
32 Pfuhl, op. cit. no. 140, 18-19, 299, with comments in text. On r.f. vases it is normal,
33 EQ XLI, 109 f.
from Myc. III until almost the end of the Geometric period; but in the narrative all shields are assumed to be made of several layers of leather or hide, with a bronze face. This cannot be derived from the hoplite shield, of which the distinctive feature was not a bronze face on hide but a bronze blazon on wood. It could be the single handgrip shield found in outlying districts in the seventh century, but since there is no trace in the narrative of the hoplite shield, which the Greeks themselves had by that time adopted, it is virtually certain that it represents its predecessor. The shields of Achilles and Agamemnon belong to the third category; both seem to be normal pre-hoplite types, the former poetically embellished with a reminiscence of Bronze Age inlay work, and the latter overburdened with a gorgoneion in an inorganic couplet which must be an unassimilated variant derived from its popularity in the seventh century. The stylistic behaviour of body armour is different. Firstly, fully traditional epithets of the Achaeans are χαλκοθησος and ἐκκυμενος. It is most improbable that in the Geometric period poets invented epithets derived from equipment so insignificant that the artists ignored it completely, and, although they were readily applied to the hoplite, they are not natural descriptions of his short, stiff plate corset and flashing bronze greaves. They are, however, peculiarly happy as epithets of the soldiers of the two centuries ending ζ. 1150 B.C. All three types of corset are aptly called chitonis, since the scales, the discs, or plates cover skirt as well as upper body, and conspicuous leggings are especially characteristic of the Mycenaeans. Secondly, the narrative never presupposes metal greaves, and usually assumes that there is no strong body protection behind the shield; but in a number of places in the Iliad a weapon meets a θυρών or θερήνος γυναῖκα strong enough to resist it and often explicitly or implicitly of metal.43 As noun or compound adjective θυρών occurs forty-one times. (a) One line destroys the sense of an otherwise coherent piece of pre-hoplite fighting in Π 358 = H 252 and overlooks Menelaos in Δ 136. (b) Single lines or couplets can be removed without injury to sense or syntax in Π 545-4, Δ 448-9 (which I suspect because Apollo’s action is ludicrous) and Τ 361. (c) The θυρών cannot be removed without some loss of considerable rewriting in Π 529, 830 (where θυρών is exceptional, but may be contrasted with leather) Α 139 = Y 415, Δ 489, Ε 282, Β 234, 373, (where by stopping to strip Agastrophos Diomedes gives Paris a chance to wound him), Ν 371, 379, (where χαλκοθήκη can be removed by deleting 372 = 398 but a θυρών strong enough to stop a spear is in the narrative), 507 (which is needed to tell what happens to Helenos’ arrow and protects the similar lines Ε 99, 100, 189, which could easily be detached, Π 173 unless 168-99 are omitted, Ρ 666, where at a turning point in the fight a θυρών strong enough to break a spear is integral in a vivid description of the use of chariots, Σ 460, which contains a useful reference to the loss of Achilles’ arms and protects Σ 610, and Ψ 819, though the whole duel in armour could be sacrificed without regret. The armour formula Π 332 = Λ 19 = Π 133 – Τ 371 does not in itself indicate material. It is convenient here to add the third category of corsets described as in some way exceptional. In Π 332 Paros as an anchor wears no corset, and borrows one which must fit. In Ο 105 Σ Diomedes’ corset made by Hephaistos comes in a detachable passage 184-87 with a team of four, wine-drinking horses which are addressed in the dual, a unique solid gold shield, and a unique belt in the almost magical efficacy of the enemy’s armour; it is best regarded as an addition by a rhapsode or poet who perhaps thought Hector’s ὑψίστη insufficient to provoke Hera’s indignation. In Λ 19-20 Agamemnon’s corset has several connexions with the ‘lobster’ type seen on the Enkomoi Griffin-slayer; it comes from Cyprus, it is made of bands of metal, and it covers the body above the belt (Λ 234). It seems certain that the poet is drawing on Late Bronze Age epic more freely adapted than the description of the Boar’s Tusk helmet in the Dolonela.44 In Ο 529 f. the corset of Meges is exotic and γυναικείoς, apparently a fine specimen of the normal type. In Ψ 560 f. the corset given as consolation prize,45 and a necessary part of the narrative of the chariot race, is inadequate without 561-2. The only exceptional greaves are made by Hephaistos (Σ 249, 613, Τ 369-70, Φ 592). The divine smith must

43 On this page, a dagger † indicates θυρών certainly of metal.
44 Since there are a few unmistakable references to the body shield, it is probable that both words go back earlier, the Greek word χαλκοθήκη perhaps being the Helladic 'Tower-shield', θάλαβον, and the non-Greek θυρών the Minoan 8-shield, διμφάδα and ποθαλκός. What survives is a small group of phrases and details which vary the narrative without altering its course. In their duel, Aias outdoes Hector at each stage, but his actions are the same.
45 At end of line, 'Ἀχιλλος χαλκοθησος Αιας δει 

46 Poulsen, Der Orient u. frühr. Kunst, 170, notes that snakes were not a Mycenaean decorative motif. The coloured bands of the long scale corset (Monuments, fig. 17) are an attractive parallel, but conflation of two Bronze Age types, though possible, is less probable.
47 See p. 6, 287. It is more probable that the poet mentioned the corset when it was relevant and left it out when it was not (Φ 179-83) than that a rhapsode introduced it in Π because the blow was aimed low in Φ (Monuments, 204). The deduction of a corset from wounds in the belly is doubtful. The advice given in bayonet drill to 'aim below the belt' does not imply a modern corset.
use metal, but the choice of 'soft tin' is proof that the poet did not conceive of effective bronze greaves; he apologises for the impossibility in Φ 504, θεοῦ δ' ἀργίσκει Δώρα. Tin has no characteristic epithet. Tin bosses are once λέκυτος (Λ 35), and tin-plating is once φαινός (Ψ 561). νεότερος (Φ 592) is neutral, but ἱδρος (Σ 613) is decisive. Since bronze greaves are neither traditional nor contemporary anywhere else in the poems, the solitary χαλκοκονίαι must be a later adaptation, perhaps to remove a metrical peculiarity. With this exception, the poems consistently ignore the hoplite's flashing greaves. In contrast the θεός is associated with metal in twenty-two of the forty-one places in which it occurs, and of these only one is objectionable and sixteen are difficult to remove; in fact, it is rather more firmly embedded in our text with metal than without. It tends to appear in the least traditional contexts, and it behaves in a less traditional way than even bronze helmets and shields, so that it cannot be explained as a verbal reminiscence of the Mycenaean corset. Miss Lorimer argues that 'the epithets and phrases which describe the corset as of metal' are interpolations of seventh-century equipment. The only other 'hoplite interpolations' which she detects are the repeated line Γ 358, etc., N 339-44, and B 542-4, and even if we admit these, the incorporation of a new piece of armour is a more serious matter. Since the epic tradition successfully resisted contamination by so much that was impressive in the new tactics, it would be odd if it had found a small, but on the whole not uncomfortable, place for one shy intruder. There is, however, no alternative if we accept the identification, made by Pausanias (X 26.5) and the scholiasts, of γυναί with the plates of the hoplite corset, γυναίκαν ἀρμόστα a being taken to mean 'composed of two plates' on the rather doubtful analogy of Π 212. The identification is not worth much, since it was inevitable when the plate corset was obsolete and regarded as heroic. All that the Homeric passages require is a leather tunic fitted with bronze plates at belly, nipple, and shoulder, where the shield was likely to expose the body, and such plates, curved for the wearer's comfort, could well be called γυναί. The interdependence of the parts of the hoplite panoply does not preclude an experimental stage; bronze helmet and blazon appear before greaves and plate corset, and there were later experiments with 'aprons', and thigh and ankle pieces. The obvious way to meet, for instance, Asiatic archery was to strengthen the leather tunic with plates which would not interfere with mobility. The absence of plates from Geometric graves proves nothing, since they are poor in metal and there is no reason, from Homer or archaeology, to think that the dead were burnt or buried with their complete equipment. Prothesis amphorae at most show a sword, suspended above a corpse which is sometimes dressed in a shroud. Evidence from vase paintings of living figures cannot be expected, since such a corset would not alter the silhouette. There is therefore never likely to be any evidence except the Iliad itself. The hypothetical adorers bold enough to make this one innovation were too timid to introduce a recognisable hoplite corset. They were presumably as drastic in reshaping the death of Hector. Χ 321 f. τοῦ δὲ καὶ ἀλλὰ τοῖς μὲν ἄλλοις ἁλώσα γόνης, τάξις, etc., cf. Γ 194 ἄρμοστα ἔνεχες δίνε, 210 'Εκτορ θ' ἀργίσει τάξις ἐπὶ χρόνι, 214 τάξις ἀλατόμες, θέραμεν is not mentioned, but on any rational reading of Hector, with only his throat exposed, had bronze on his shoulders which a shield could not protect. It is simpler to admit the occasional presence of a Geometric corset which had only begun to make its way into the tradition. Small accessories are made of gold and silver, as they might be at any date when the metals were accessible. The gods are not bound by human laws of probability; Apollo can have silver bow and gold sword and Artemis a gold distaff. Gold is correctly used for inlay on Achilles' shield, but the poet apologises for the metal's supernatural strength, χρυσὸς γὰρ ἐρκατίκες, Δώρα χοίρος, Υ 268 = Φ 163. The only anomalies are the gold shield of Nestor; the inner layer of gold on Achilles' shield, which is inexplicable except as a misunderstanding of the use of metals when the shield was made, and the gold distaff once given to Helen. This verisimilitude is remarkable in poems where so many human possessions are of divine origin, and justifies the search for historical counterparts to objects which might otherwise be explained as poetic fantasy. Weapons and tools are less ambiguous. If the supernatural is omitted, there are in Homer:

---

48 It has 13 different epithets, used only 18 times in all. θάρση (11) always comes before the cassasa and φαινό (6) at the end of the line. Other cases have no preferences. θάρση δὲ τοῖς ἄλλοις (Δ 133 = Y 415) may be a misunderstood formula.

49 BSA XII, 114.

50 A late figureine, de Riddler, Les Bronzes antiques du Louvre I, Pl. 14, no. 124, shows a simple use of round, concave plates. Geometric bronze helmets are certain, but none has been found. Starr, Nazi I, 476-80 and II Pl. 126 D, J, shows fifteenth-century plates which could only be used when sewn on to the fabric or leather base; it is known from the texts that 169-242 were needed for one garment but only 4 were found. Valeten suggested this meaning of γυναί in Mariette 47 (1919), 187 f. If a bronze corset of any kind was original, it is easier to explain the inorganic lines in which it seems intrusive.

51 For the gold ring on Hector's spear see Monuments, 266; three of the four spears from the L.M. II warrior graves had bronze rings. BSA XLVII, 267, no. II. 4, 271, no. III. 14, and 275 no. V, 7. θέραμεν are unparalleled; the gold ornaments from Schlieffen's shaft Graves, as is shown by finds from the new Grave Circle, were not worn on the legs (I. 6 March 1954, 395, fig. 19). θέραμεν and χρύσαρχαι are too obscure to be used as evidence.

52 See p. 8 above.

53 The classification of χρυσῶς etc. depends on the context. Often there is reference to a specific weapon or tool. For cutting through an enemy, mutilating an enemy and peeling bark, a knife or dagger seems most suitable; in Γ 271 = Τ 252 Agamemnon cuts off hair with the μορφός which he carries beside his sword. Perhaps Τ 412, where horses are to be butchered, should go with them, but it has been grouped as 'unspecified', a class which consists almost entirely of the weapons. The classification in such phrases as ἑρκατίκας δέλετοι γυναίκα and therefore in fact mainly refers to spears. Τ 222 is a good example of ambiguity, since γυναίκα is equally appropriate to the weapon in battle or to the sickness with which it is compared.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spear-heads</th>
<th>Swords</th>
<th>Battle-axe</th>
<th>Fish-hook</th>
<th>Grater</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Weapon unspecified</th>
<th>Axes and adzes</th>
<th>Knives or daggers</th>
<th>Arrow-heads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mace</th>
<th>Agricultural tools</th>
<th>Chains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For comparison, only a few examples need be taken. Firstly, in the full Bronze Age luxury weapons as well as small ornaments were sometimes made of iron. Few actual specimens have survived; most of the finds described by Przeworski belong to a later stage. A Hurrite bronze sword, found at Nuzi in the stratum below that occupied c. 1475 B.C., has a double hilt of iron, the opposite of the Transitional Period practice of making the working parts of iron. An axe-head from Ras Shamra, with iron blade in gold-inlaid bronze socket, is not later than 1350 B.C. In the Tomb of Tutankhamon there was a dagger with iron blade and richly ornamented hilt; the other iron objects from the Tomb are an amulet and head-rest, certainly ritualistic, and sixteen miniature chisels, too thin for practical use and best explained by supposing a magical significance. An iron axe-head from Boghaz Keui is dated to the thirteenth century; so far metal finds on Hittite sites have been few. The texts are more informative. Egypt was outside the area in which iron-working developed. The gifts of Tushratta, King of the Mitanni, to Amenhotep III included 'one hand-ring of iron, overlaid with gold ... five shekels of gold are used on it,' and 'one dagger, whose blade is of iron, whose hilt is trimmed with lapis lazuli, fastened with gold ... whose hanger is of variegated stuff, of violet-purple, twice overlaid with gold; fourteen shekels of gold are used on it.' The Mitanni expected a proper return from the abundant gold of Egypt. A fragmentary letter from the reign of Hattušili III makes excuses for failure to deliver iron from Kizvatna, because 'It is a bad time to make iron.' Mesopotamia, Eastern Anatolia, Syria, and Palestine were the regions where the new metal established itself most rapidly. Yet as late as 1100 B.C., Tiglath-Pileser I in describing his exploits mentions bronze tools and an iron weapon: 'I took my chariots and my warriors and over the steep mountains and through their warlike paths I hewed a way with pickaxes of bronze, and I made passable a road for the passage of my chariot and my troops.' Four wild bulls ... with my mighty bow, with my iron spear, and with my sharp darts, I killed.' Secondly, there are the sites where bronze and iron objects of ordinary use have been found together. Provided that there is reason to think that the objects are roughly contemporary, the absolute date is not important in this connexion. In Iran, from a level at Tepe Gyan earlier than 1100, a few iron spear-heads, arrow-heads, daggers, armbrads, rings, and awls were found with copious bronze weapons and tools. At Tepe Sialk, in Nercopolis A of the twelfth to eleventh centuries, the excavator says that bronze was used for the manufacture of weapons, mentioning daggers, spear-heads, arrow-heads, and sickles; only one dagger and one javelin-head of iron were found. In Nercopolis B of the tenth to ninth centuries, both metals are freely used, often in combination; the excavator mentions spear-heads and axe-heads of bronze only, one bronze and one iron sword, many bronze and one iron dagger, arrow-heads, knives, tridents, and horse-trappings of both metals, sickles and chafes of iron only. In central Anatolia, at Alsiar Huja IV-V, spear-heads, axe-heads, knives, chisel, and fibulae of both metals were found with daggers and one sword of iron and pins, tongs, and similar small objects of bronze. At Gerar in Palestine, in the levels before the destruction which Albricht dates c. 950 B.C. bronze is normal, and there is nothing of iron except two knives, two spear-heads, a dagger or speer-head, and an object of uncertain use; in the later tenth-century levels bronze is mainly confined to small objects, and iron is normal not only for weapons but for large agricultural implements. At Beth-shemesh the iron finds in the earliest levels are mainly weapons, in level III-II of about 1000 B.C. a chisel and sickle were found, and thereafter iron implements, including agricultural tools, are normal. Coming nearer to the Greek world, we find in the Late Cypriote III level at Idalion one sword

---

56 Mercer, The Tell el-Amarna Tablets I no. 22, pp. 83 and 85, cf. no. 25.
58 Id., Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia I, no. 222, cf. no. 256 and 247.
59 Continent and Ghirshman, Fouilles de Tepe Chiyon, p. 44, pl. 8 ff.
60 Ghirshman, Fouilles de Sialk II, pp. 9 and 45–9.
61 OIP XIX, figs. 360–21 XXIX, figs. 494–508; XXX, fig. 111.
62 For sites in Palestine see G. E. Wright, Iron I and the date of its introduction into common use in Palestine, AJA XLIII, pp. 458 ff.
63 L.C. III at Idalion, SAE II, 597 ff. C.G. generally SCE I–III passim. A few objects not assigned to one particular period are omitted. In the discussion of types in IV, p. 212, the difficulty of fixing the chronological sequence of metal objects is emphasised.
and five knives of iron and two knives, four arrow-heads, three awls, one chisel, and one spearhead of bronze. For the island as a whole, the objects which the Swedish Expedition assign to the Cypro-Geometric period are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bronze</th>
<th>Iron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.G. I.</td>
<td>Spear-heads</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fibulae</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pins</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knives</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.G. II.</td>
<td>Spear-heads</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pins</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shepherd's crook</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fibulae</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knives</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Axe-head</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.G. III.</td>
<td>Spear-heads</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrow-heads</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pins</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fibulae</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shovel</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knives</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dagger</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Crete stratified deposits containing bronze and iron are lacking. At Karphi bronze tools (18 knives, 4 awls, 1 engraver, 2 sickles, 2 saws, and 1 adze) are more numerous than weapons (1 sword, 3 daggers, 1 spearhead, and 3 arrow-heads). Iron was used, since 1 knife, 1 fibula, and 1 nail were found in tombs with bronze fibulae, pins, rings and only one tool, and 2 fragments in the city. The excavators suggest that the newly-introduced material was too valuable to leave behind; another reason for taking the iron implements may be that they were the ones in use when the site was abandoned, but the absence of discards suggests that they had not long been common. In Proto-Geometric I, Vrokastro 7 spearheads were found close together in one room, 4 bronze, 1 bronze and iron, and 2 iron. Ch. T. 1 contained a mass of not less than 25 iron swords, knives, and daggers, and an iron axe, adze, and chisel, and Ch. T. 3 contained a bronze saw. On the Greek mainland one house at Malthi contained 6 knives and 1 chisel of bronze, and 1 dagger and several blades of iron, all locally made; the site is L.H. III, but in so remote a region may be contemporary with Protogeometric elsewhere. In the 59 Protogeometric burials in the Kerameikos described by Kraiker and Kubler, the objects found were:

Bronze only—1 ring, 2 ornaments, 1 bowl.
Bronze and iron—spear-heads, 3 bronze, 1 iron: fibulae, 4 bronze, 1 iron: pins, bronze in 6 graves, iron in 21 graves: 3 bronze shield bosses, 1 with an iron loop.
Iron only—4 swords, 3 knives, 2 daggers, 1 arrow-head.

At Perachora from the Geometric temple of Hera Akraia and therefore not later than c. 725 B.C. came one spear-head and one dagger of iron, and one bronze fish-hook, and from the temple of Hera Limenia, not earlier than c. 750 B.C., arrow-heads, fish-hooks, and votive javelins of bronze. The undatable iron objects in the later temple here and at Olympia have no significance, but it is worth noting the bronze objects found among the Olympia votives: all except 2 of c. 250 arrow-heads, numerous axes, a very small proportion of the spear-heads, no swords, knives, or sickles.

Clearly the poems do not represent the Mycenaean Age or the full Iron Age. They differ from the transitional period in two important ways. Firstly, iron tools did not historically precede iron weapons, frequently though the assertion has been made. Przeworski notes that in many lands weapons were being made of both bronze and iron at a time when tools were still bronze. So R. G. Forbes says of iron in the period 1200–1000 B.C. in Asia, 'Now not only weapons but more and more agricultural implements were manufactured,' and G. E. Wright 'that at Tell el Far'ah and Gerar iron was introduced for weapons, including knives, and for jewellery in the late twelfth and eleventh centuries, while in the tenth it was also used for common agricultural implements.' Secondly, iron was not used earlier for those implements which in Homer are sometimes of iron than for those which are always of bronze. Blades generally appear first and establish themselves as normal most quickly, probably because the technique of hammering was most suitable for them, but spear-heads are among the earliest iron finds, and become common quite as quickly as axe-heads. Iron is difficult to work and, though at first the chances of failure must have been considerable, the successful iron product was strong and efficient; the time and skill were therefore first devoted to weapons, though the intervals at which the various types emerged were not generally.

---

64 BSA XXXVIII, 112–22.
65 Hall, Vrokastro, 103–6, 138–9, 143.
66 Swedish Messenia Expedition, 109–1, 367–73; Monuments, 112.
67 From the grave inventories in Kerameikos I and IV.
68 Payne, Perachora, 69–75 and 167–90.
70 See E. Mireaux, Les poèmes homériques I (1948), 298.
71 op. cit. 147.
72 The Coming of Iron, in JEOL IX, 207–14.
73 op. cit. (n. 62 above) 450.
long. The use of bronze for arrow-heads persisted longest. The reason cannot be that the cheaper metal was used for weapons which are normally lost, since they continue after iron had certainly become cheaper than bronze. Probably it was easier to cast such fine, pointed objects, for which weight was a disadvantage, than to forge them. There is nowhere anything which corresponds with the Homeric stage of knowledge, which is familiar with iron for axes and agricultural purposes and gives it a very subordinate place for knives and arrow-heads, but allows no mention of it for swords or for the commonest of all Homeric cutting implements, the ubiquitous spear.

### Table D

**Knowledge of the Source, Nature, and Treatment of the Metals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bronze</th>
<th>Iron</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Tin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trade: 184, Use by craftsmen: Σ 474</td>
<td>Trade: 184, Use by craftsmen: Σ 475, γ 435</td>
<td>Use by craftsmen: Σ 475</td>
<td>Source: Β 857, Use by craftsmen: Σ 474</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### (a) As raw material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voice: Ε 785.</td>
<td>Σ 222.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Β 490.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### (b) Metaphors

| Miraculous:
(i) Working parts of Charriot | Ε 723, Β 725, * N 30 * | Ε 723 * |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Ηοονες: Θ 41, *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some passages given in earlier tables are also relevant here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bronze</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Iron</th>
<th>Tin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The clearest description of metal working comes in the blinding of the Cyclops in ι 391–3. ‘As when a smith plunges into cold water a great axe or adze which hisses aloud, doctoring it; for this is the strength of iron.’ This describes, as a process familiar to all, the method of ‘hardening by quenching.’ The metal is ‘heated to red heat (850° C.) and quenched from that temperature,’ and the result is that the steel (σιδηρος here is certainly mild steel) becomes ‘hard and brittle.’

It is precisely this that gives strength to steel; a further process of tempering is needed to make it ‘tough and springy,’ but that stage is not relevant to the simile. In two other passages, although other metals are being used, the processes and tools are more appropriate to iron working. In γ 432–5 Nestor sends for a goldsmith to gild the horns of a living ox. This could be done only by affixing gold foil cold, and yet, ‘And there came too the smith, having in his hands his smith’s tools, the instruments of his trade, anvil and hammer and well-made fire-tongs, with which he worked gold.’ Again, when Hephaestus makes the arms of Achilles in Σ 668–77, he correctly sets his bellows to heat the crucibles as though for bronze casting; but then, ‘Hephaistos threw into the fire imperishable bronze and tin and precious gold and silver. Then he set his great anvil on his anvil block, and grasped his heavy hammer in one hand and his fire-tongs in the other.’ After which presumably he trimmed and tapped a cold sheet of bronze into concave form, etched out his design on the face, and delicately hammered cold pieces of metal into the depressions. In fact, Hephaestus making the shield is much more like Wayland Smith striking out a horseshoe, and this verb is actually used when he makes chains of unspecified material: βις ρ’ ιμεν εκ χαλακωνιν... εν δ’ εχειν ἄκμαιντον μέγας δικονος, κύπες δε δειμονος (Θ 273–4). There are σιδηρους δεσματα* in a metaphor in ι 204. Heat is needed in bronze working, to smelt and alloy the metals and to melt the ingots for pouring into moulds, and hammering is needed, to finish the surface of the casting and shape sheet into the curve of pot or shield. But bronze, like gold and silver, is hammered cold, with light tools.

---

74 Alexander and Street, Metals in the Service of Man, 131.
adapted to its fragility. Hard and repeated hammering of red-hot metal is the peculiar characteristic of iron working and the reason for its slow development. It alone needs the combination of heavy hammer and anvil with bellows and fire-tongs to keep up an intense heat. The spectacular glare and blast and din of a blacksmith’s forge have impressed the poets of Iliad and Odyssey as they impressed Lichas the Spartiate. When Achilles assumes that farmers work iron at home, going to the nearest town for the metal (ιον ρηματος τον Αγαλλιανος, it implies a widely diffused knowledge of the technique. The σολον στεγεων is obscure; iron could not be ‘poured’ and cast until the invention of the blast furnace in the fourteenth century A.D. To interpret it as meteoric because it is ‘self-fused’ and free from impurities seems to imply too modern a knowledge of chemistry; it is also unnecessary, since the iron which the farmers would otherwise fetch from town is clearly terrestrial. Pioneer workers, used to metals which had to be cast by pouring them into a mould, might well give this name to the shapeless lump which appeared, apparently spontaneously, when the smelting fire died down. ‘Die in einigen Fundstätten... entdeckten Schweissessenstücke beweisen, dass in Anatolien Eisenerze auf diese Weise ausgeschmolzen wurden.’ The lump was taken from a Trojan, but the poet assumes that Polyphetes will know how to use it. Wherever metal is worked, the poems show familiarity with the working of iron and of no other metal. Any poet might transfer the process of using one metal to another, as Vergil does with his molten steel and tempered bronze in Aen. VIII 445–51; the point is that no poet could make this mistake before iron working was a commonplace in the society around him.

The poems say little about the source of metals. Barter of iron for bronze is the basis of a plausible lie, and therefore likely to be realistic; in the Odyssey most of the ‘true’ stories are impossible, but the fictions are prosaically probable. Traders living somewhere north of Ithaca could easily take local or imported iron to a South Italian port in hope of a better exchange than they would get in any Greek market. Alybe, east of the Paphlagonians, is the birthplace of silver. In spite of its romantic colour, the fact is correct, but after the end of the Bronze Age the Greeks could hardly have learnt it until they opened up the Euxine. It sounds more like a legend than a trader’s report, and the dispute about the position of Alybe, going back to Hecataeus, is surprising if the Greeks discovered it in the seventh century. Much more is said about the source of treasures made of metal. Homeric society abounds in gold ornaments and bullion weighed out as gifts, bribes, or prizes. This is uncharacteristic of the transitional period, and the Greeks in particular probably did not see gold in bulk between the fall of Mycenaean and the reign of Croesus. But it is neither Mycenaean nor rational that so few men work gold, Nestor when he has horns gilded, Ikmalios and Odysseus in making furniture (την, ρηματος, and a craftsman in a simile. When the origin is given, treasures are obtained from foreigners or gods, or else inherited, and sometimes both. If it were a fantasy, created by poetic imagination out of rumours of eastern splendour, the details would not be so recognisable and the impossible so sharply confined to the supernatural world. The only explanation of the internal contradiction is that an epic tradition which knew the real wealth of the Bronze Age and ιον στεγεων, was being used by poets for whom gold and silver were rare imports. Gold is more common than silver in the poems, as it was at Mycenaean but not in the eighth century. In this the Odyssey is slightly less traditional than the Iliad. Silver vessels are proportionately to the total numbers three times as numerous compared with gold, and there is furniture stuited or inlaid with ivory and silver like that of Hazaël and Ahab, seven times compared with once in the Iliad. Studs on swords, however, are Mycenaean, and although the Odyssey surprisingly contains more bronze swords than the Iliad and about one-third of all the swords mentioned, they are only twice εργυροπτης, while the Iliad has 9 with silver and 1 with gold studs. It is one of the few differences in the material background of the poems which is not easily explained by the difference of subject.

In metaphorical use gold is confined to Aphrodite. It never seems to be a colour adjective, since only supernatural clouds, wings, and horses’ manes are golden. Epithets are few, εργυροπτης (2), ἐργυροπτης (2), ιον στεγεων (3), and ἐργυροπτης (4), but both gold and silver appear frequently in stock phrases and passages such as αιειν 35-43. Silver appears metaphorically for gleaming only in compound adjectives, and has no epithets. Bronze in metaphor is martial, except in B 490, and is more completely at home in the traditional language than anything else in the poems. Χελκαν

71 Casson, The Technique of Early Greek Sculpture, 227–29. In the Foundry Vase no less than six hammers are shown. All alike have long, slender handles and light heads which are not pointed. . . . The long, slender hafts of the hammers show plainly enough that the hammers were used lightly. Hard hitting would soon break so slender a shaft. The hafts on the hammers on the Acropolis fragment are even more slender, and obviously intended for only the very lightest tapping. For the whole process of bronze-working admits only of light work with the hammer or rasp or grinding stone, since it would soon crack cast bronze or bring out latent weaknesses or flaws. Steady and continuous tapping would produce good results.


73 Przeworski, op. cit. 157.

74 See Monuments, 121, for reasons for identifying Temese with Tempa in Bruttium rather than Tarsassus in Cyprus.

75 R. J. Forbes, Metallurgy in Antiquity, 196. In Asia Minor there are less than 26 important deposits, seven of which are located in Pontus in the district south of Trabzon. The golena deposit of Karasar is exceptionally rich in silver content (ib. 180).

76 Strabo 549–552.

77 Przeworski, op. cit. 180: ‘Für die chalkoisiderische Stufe ist die Armur an Edelkathedchen höchst bezeichnend.’


80 See H. L. Lorimer, Gold and Ivory in Greek Mythology, in Greek Poetry and Life, 14–33.
is the normal way of saying 'with the appropriate bronze object.' To define it as a tool or weapon, it is ἡρέλι or ὅξει χαλκοῦ (58), or more exactly ἔγχει χαλκὸς (8), ταυρίζει χαλκὸς (4), στήριχ χαλκεῖ (17), χαλκεῖ τοπο (7) χαλκεῖσσα ἔγχεσσα (4) all at the ends of lines, or ἐρέλετο χαλκεῖτε (2). For defensive armour, we have νάρωστι or σιδήρω χαλκὸς (19), and ἦμιντε χαλκὸς (3) of a fish-hook and cauldron seems to be a similar phrase for other objects. χαλκοῦ can be used in this way in any case, and is extended by ἀτείρη (3), ἀτείρε (4), or ταυτείρησα (2), and once of cauldrons and tripodas ἐνεργος, in addition to a whole series of ἔντετα καλά χαλκέα καρπάργγοντα, including nine different ways of saying χαλκοῦ ἐγχεσσα. The great majority of these phrases refer to weapons or tools, and must have originated in the Bronze Age; they show great metrical variety, vowel-consonant pairs, a preference for fixed places in the line, and a high proportion of obscure epithets. ἀτείρη (except in i 395), πολυκτῆτος-οῦ πολυκτήρος-οῦ (5), ἀδειον-α-ατείρητος-ου (4), πολυκτήρ το χαλκότου (2), and ἐνεργος ἀτείρητος (1) always end lines, and ἀτείρητος always comes after, ἀτείρητος alter or before the caesura; except for the formulae for wealth, there is no other sign of traditional behaviour. It is more common in metaphors than χαλκοῦ, another proof of its familiarity to the poets. From its intractability comes a good metaphor for a mind that will not yield to prayers or misfortunes and the epithet πολυκτήτω. The second peculiarity of iron is its change of colour, from which it is reasonable to derive all the other epithets. Connexions with fighting are the mace of Areithoos, the arrow of Pandaros, ἀτείρητος instead of the normal χαλκοῦ of weapons generally (2 in a repeated proverb), and the iron din of battle, which I suggest is literally the clash of iron weapons making a solitary appearance simply because the heaven to which it rises is bronze. Though more explicit, these passages show no greater use of iron weapons than the knowledge of iron shown elsewhere implies. The ἀτείρητος συγκοστος (2) is explained by meteoric iron, either because of its supernatural qualities or because meteorites were thought to be fragments of it. But συγκοστος is also χαλκοῦ and πολυκτήτω (3), and it is arbitrary to give them totally different meanings. 'I will make your heaven as iron and your earth as brass' (Leviticus 26. 19) and 'Thy heaven that is over thy head shall be brass, and the earth that is under thee shall be iron' (Deuteronomy 28. 23) are only two ways of saying that the earth shall be hard with drought and the firmament which divides the waters above from the waters beneath (Genesis 1. 7) solid without 'windows' to let through the rain (11 Kings 7. 2). Either metal could make a hard and stable lid over the earth. The Gates of Tartarus are iron, but other supernatural thresholds, walls, and houses, including the threshold of Tartarus, are bronze. The axle of Hera's chariot is iron, but other parts are bronze, gold, and silver. Mundane wood and leather are replaced by the metal which seems suitable. There is no clear trace in Homer of the magical qualities with which iron was from time to time endowed in Egypt and the East; it is one example among many of the striking absence from the poems of superstition and mysticism. αὐτὸς ἦν ἐπίθετο ἄνδρα σιδήρου should be taken to mean exactly what it says, without bringing in magic or magnetism. The material is satisfactory because the different use of the metals clearly distinguishes the Protogeometric and later periods from the Mycenaean and transitional.

1. To the Bronze Age only belong bronze weapons and tools, bronze corsets shaped like chitons, leggings conspicuous but not made of bronze (possibly also worn c. 700 B.C. if the evidence of the Tirysh shields is accepted), great wealth, especially in gold, iron as a way of measuring wealth (but its magical and ornamental uses are not in the poems), inlay of metal on metal, and some details such as silver and gold studs on swords and possibly Abybe as a source of silver. ἄργουρος points to Myc. I-II, and the wealth of Mycenae declined before its destruction. Other features suit Myc. III generally.

2. To the Iron Age only belong the familiar knowledge of iron as a useful metal, of the processes and tools for working it, and of overseas trade in the raw material. This knowledge is not confined to a few lines or passages which could be disregarded as interpolations, but permeates all places where metal working or metaphors drawn from metals enter into the poems. There is no justification for suspecting a passage simply because it shows an advanced knowledge of iron-working. This element is not earlier than Protogeometric. The poet's ignorance of the process of inlaying

85 In P 376 τίτων δὲ ἐν αὐτής χαλκοῦ is unnecessarily translated 'by the phials weight of their armour.' ἐν αὐτής (P 799) is a nice adaptation.

86 Many are conveniently expansible, e.g., δολοκτόνος χαλκὸς, δολοκτόνος χαλκοῦς ἐν τοίρον χαλκοῦς, δολοκτόνος χαλκοῦς ἐν τοίρον χαλκοῦς, δολοκτόνος ἐν κελι χαλκοῖς, χαλκὸς στήριχ του χαλκοῦς, στήριχ στήριχ του χαλκοῦς. Generally the use is freer, e.g., ἀτείρητος (of bronze 2) of fighters and their strength, once compared to an axe, 3 of voice 3. The entry in L. and S. (1923) needs correction. It comes in three patterns and one individual line:

1. Ε 292, 310, 315, 320  ἀτείρητος
2. Ε 247, 310, 251
3. Ε 25, 310, χαλκὸς
4. Γ 60, 54, ἀτείρητος
5. Λ 270, 266, χαλκὸς

2. Τ 233, λαύδασσος χαλκὸς
3. Τ 241, χαλκὸς, ἀτείρητος, λαύδασσος χαλκὸς
4. Τ 26, χαλκὸς, δέκατος
6. Τ 40, ἀτείρητος χαλκὸς

But ὅ τε καὶ ἄτείρητος σιδήρου. Rare epithets are ἀτείρητος (1), αὐτοκτόνος (1), ἄργουρος (1), ὅ ἄτείρητος (1), ἀτείρητος (2).

87 A bronze Age parade weapon. The weapon, not the material, is the oddity from which he takes his title.

88 A bronze cult-wagon from an eighth-seventh-century context at Toprah Kaleh has iron axles. Przeworski, op. cit. pl. XII. Knowledge of such bronze cuves could have reached the Greeks through Al Mina, but any influence on Hera's chariot is improbable.

belongs to the same period. The paucity of native craftsmen, the gold and silver treasures imported, especially by Phoenicians, the occasional appearances of bronze shield faces, helmets (known in Myc. II–III but not typical), and (controversially, since the evidence is stylistic not archaeological) leather chitons reinforced by bronze plates, and the absence of bronze greaves, blazons, and any clear indication of hoplite armour, all suit the second half of the eighth century.

3. The only metal objects which appear to be later than c. 700 B.C. are the Gorgoneion of Agamemnon, the lamp of Athena, and the brooch of Odysseus. Since it is not the metal that causes the trouble, this is not the place to discuss them. They give no support for the introduction of a hoplite corset, and are hardly enough to suggest a free development of the epic tradition through the seventh century.

4. Bronze weapons, knowledge of iron-working and iron tools, and great wealth in gold never coexisted historically.

5. The Bronze Age characteristics are chiefly present in stock epithets and phrases which have a marked pattern, and which I call traditional. They are adapted when necessary, but the need seldom arises. Certain passages which are not stylistically distinguishable from descriptions of Iron Age objects describe things known to belong to the Bronze Age. Since the poets certainly took the traditional phrases from an established epic language, it is a fair assumption that they got their knowledge of the Bronze Age from the same source rather than from heirlooms or temple treasures, and this is supported by the perishable nature of the "lobster" corset and the boar's-tusk helmet, the improbability that inlaid shields were ever made, and the introduction of Iron Age features into the descriptions. The Iron Age elements occur almost wholly in the course of the narrative, often by unconscious implication, and especially in accounts of unheroic acts or practices known not to belong to the Bronze Age, and in similes and metaphors. We do not find misinterpretation of Geometric practices through seventh-century influences, as we do on seventh-century vases.

6. There is a curious connexion between iron, archery, and lack of clarity in the narrative. Pandaros has an iron arrow-head and a composite bow, and it is not clear how the poet supposed that he strung it or the horn-worker made it. In the Funeral Games the terms of the archery contest are absurd and the prize is iron. In The Bow Fight the bow is composite, the method of stringing is concealed under a simile from stringing a lyre, iron axes form the target, but their shape and the nature of the shot are obscure. Unlike the Hittites and their neighbours to south and east, Troy VI and VIIa were not more advanced in iron working than the Mycenaean world. In the Iron Age the Greeks certainly knew only the European self-bow until they met the more formidable Asiatic weapon, and they may have collected Anatolian stories in which archery figured and retold them without complete understanding; in that case, they would naturally introduce them into the knowledge of iron-working which, so far as we know, they took with them. More evidence is needed.

7. The Odyssey, as would be expected of a poem of travel and domestic life, contains more of the Iron Age and less of the Bronze Age than the Iliad. There is, however, no substantial difference between the poems in the material from each period. Although this is certainly an argument against supposing a long interval between the composition of the two poems, metal is not a good criterion, because the main changes took place before 700 B.C. There is nothing that makes it impossible that the two poems had the same author, but there are small differences in apparently similar contexts which make it unlikely. Anomalies increase suspicion of some short passages but provide no evidence for problems such as the authorship of the Doleus, or for the larger question of the existence of an historic Homer.

8. New practices created a new traditional language, as the phrases describing cremation show; things known from tradition may be reproduced or elaborated; and traditional phrases may be used for untraditional doings. In πεδόκηρος S' ἔρει χαλκᾶ (ε 244) the use of χαλκᾶ does not prove that there was a stock description of raft-building. To keep the old phrases needed no effort of conscious archaizing, and to innovate meant the invention of new groups of metrical units. Moreover, the language itself preserved knowledge of the past, and no doubt poets elaborated by analogy, as the bronze in Homer produced the conception of four ages. Nonetheless, the coincidence of Bronze Age practices with traditional and of Iron Age practices with untraditional behaviour in a matter where differences are clear shows that the criterion of style, applied cautiously to broad categories and groups of categories, may be used to establish a probability, and especially to decide between two possible archaeological parallels; and one of the chief difficulties is the number of things common to the thirteenth and eighth centuries.
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D. H. F. Gray
A RELIGIOUS FUNCTION OF GREEK TRAGEDY: 1

A Study in the Oedipus Coloneus and the Oresteia

When the Messenger in the Oedipus Coloneus looked back, he saw that Oedipus had disappeared and that Theseus was screening his eyes with his hand. Then Theseus made adoration to earth and to the Olympus of the gods, both at once: ὄλυμπῳ οὐτόν γυῖν τε προσκυνούνθ' ἄμα καὶ τὸν θεὸν Ὀλυμπον ἐν ταὐτάτω λόγῳ (163,4 ff.). There was nothing strange about such a salutation. The Sausageseller in the Knights was bidden to ‘adore earth and the gods’ (ἐφέστα τὴν γυῖν προσκυνοῦντος τούς θεοὺς, 156), and did so, presumably with the same familiar ritual gestures which Theseus used. But the phrasing in the Coloneus is emphatic (ἄμα... ἐν ταὐτᾷ λόγῳ) 2 and Jebb has one of his percipient notes: ‘The vision which [Theseus] had just seen moved him to adore both the χάνθοι and the ὅντοι. This touch is finely conceived so as to leave the mystery unbroken.’ The mystery, that is, of the passing of Oedipus. οὐ γὰρ τις οὐτόν οὔτε πυρρόφως θεοὶ κεραυνοῦς ἐξέπτεσεν οὔτε ποντία ἡκαλλινὶ κινήσασα τὸ τότ’ ἐν χρόνῳ, ἢ ἄλω ἢ τις ἐκ βεδών πομπός, ἢ το νεκρέων ἔννους διασταύρῳ γῆς ἀλόμπετον βάθρου.3

The purpose of the following remarks is to suggest a close relationship of thought between the Oedipus Coloneus of Sophocles and the Oresteia of Aeschylus; to suggest, further, that both dramas performed, in terms of the same conceptions, a religious function which tragedy was peculiarly fitted to perform.

Of all Greek tragedies none perhaps awaits a satisfying interpretation more than the Coloneus. It is not difficult to lay the finger on one of its central problems. At the end of the play the gods take Oedipus to themselves. After all he has suffered at their hands comes an act of grace and goodwill which could be regarded as in some sense a compensation for those sufferings.4 But the peaceful, if awe-inspiring, end of Oedipus is preceded by the curse which, in a paroxysm of rage, he lays upon his sons. There is a mystery in the juxtaposition of that frantic curse to the unearthly solemnity of the following scenes—a mystery which is only partially, if at all, explained by the fact that Oedipus speaks his curse on the threshold of ‘heroisation’.5

However that may be, θυμος—a passionate anger—is certainly a fit characteristic for one who is about to become a hero; and the whole course of the play up to the final imprecation is marked by a crescendo of θυμος in Oedipus.6 This passion is grounded, not in considerations of abstract justice, but in human motives and resentments. For it is one of the apparent contradictions which complicate the interpretation of the play that the awful figure of Oedipus, superhuman from the start, is yet drawn with realistic human psychology. It would be agreeable, but irrelevant to my present purpose, to trace in detail how Sophocles has ensured that we shall judge Oedipus, not only as a potential hero, but as a man.7

Human judgments on his θυμος are indeed forthcoming, from Theseus and from Antigone.

---

1 A lecture delivered before the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies on 27th February, 1891. Footnotes have been added and some changes made in the text.
2 ἐν ταὐτῇ λόγῳ: “in the same address” (or prayer). 3 Jebb. This seems doubtful, since preσκυνής was often, if not always, silent (as in the Knights), and a suggestion of words is inappropriate to the picture here.
3 The scholiast’s Δήμητρος is on the whole preferable to Διόππος, which may have been suggested by the following line, where, however, the γάρ is adequately justified by τοις. A word of darkness is admirable here, and the contrast εἰναὶ... Δήμητρος can be compared with the enigmatic γυῖες τοῖς ἀρχαῖοι Σάκτου (106). See n. 17 below.
4 The raising of the fallen Oedipus: 394 L. 1365 ff. That the Chorus see in this a kind of justice is implied by τοῖς in the latter passage, but the notion of compensation is not expressed. This line of interpretation is acutely criticized by I. M. Lindforth, Religion and Drama in Oedipus at Colonus (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. 14, No. 4) toto B., whose general conclusions, however, I am unable to accept.
5 I cannot accept Bowra’s view (Sophoclean Tragedy, 349) that, at the end of the play, ‘no unresolved discords remain, no mysteries call for an answer’. He rightly emphasizes the importance of the ‘heroisation’ of Oedipus, but this does not solve the mystery: it merely transfers it to the conception of those chthonian powers, the heroes. Weinstock (Sophocles 202) calls attention to the juxtaposition of curse and peaceful end, and regards it as evidence ‘dass antikes Gefühl an diesem Vater keinen Anstoß nahm’. But should it be confidently assumed that Oedipus rather than Antigone represents antikes Gefühl, or that this sentiment was unambiguous?
6 It is one of the functions of the scenes with Creon to raise this passion to a higher pitch before the entry of Polynice.
7 I will merely call attention to two themes. (i) When Ismene first speaks of his sons, before ever he hears her news, Oedipus breaks into a diatribe against them for their neglect. Neglect of his maintenance. The theme is introduced at 330 with τρόμοι, followed by τρόμοι (330), τρομίζεται (341), τρόμος (346), τρόμον (352), τρόμος (352). Though not every occurrence relates logically to the maintenance of Oedipus, the notion is thus kept insistently before the hearer. (This could, I think, be shown to be a characteristic Sophoclean use of words.) Thus Sophocles brings out, not only the offence of the sons, but the preoccupation of one who has lived for years at or below the level of subsistence. (ii) Then comes the news of the oracle. ‘They say’, says Ismene, ‘that their power (πάρμη) is coming to be in your hand (ἐν ᾧ).’ Old emotions stir in the masterful king of the Tyrannus (435 χρηστεύεται ἡ λέξις). Sophocles now bashes the ears of his audience in κρότος and κράτος—a theme first introduced at 373, repeated at 399, 400, 405, 408. But the hope of restoration is dashed: it is a matter of Oedipus coming under the mastery of Thebes and not even finding a grave in Theban soil. So he moves from the bitter grumble of his earlier speech (337 ff.) to the first tentative curse. ‘May the gods not quench their fatal strife, and may the decision (διάκομι) concerning this their warfare come to be in my hand,’ for ἐκ ... γυῖες (392). If the mastery cannot be his in one way, then let it be in another.
The important passage is in the speech of Antigone at 1181 ff., but it is prepared by certain remarks of Theseus (592 ff.), to whom the attitude of Oedipus at first seems obstinate and unreasonable. οἱ μὲν δὲ, θυμὸξ εἰ ἢ κακοὶς οὐ έξήμποροι. Oedipus replies: ὅταν μᾶκης μοι, νονέτει, ταῦτα θεία. He has suffered cruel wrong on wrong, and he does not mean ‘the ancient calamity of the race’. ‘What then’, asks Theseus, ‘is your trouble that surpasses human measure?’ The suggestion of criticism is not pursued, as it is not in the context. But, when she pleads with her father to give Polynices a hearing, Antigone returns to the same point. ‘Let him come. Other men also have bad children and a quick temper, but they listen to advice and their natures yield, charmed by the spells of friends’ (1192 ff.). Antigone’s καθότους γονεῖς κακοὶς in effect picks up the τὰ γὰρ τὸ μείζον ἢ κατὰ ἀνδρόπον νοσεῖς; of Theseus.8 But to Oedipus the behaviour of his sons is something so outrageous as to justify the cruelldest retaliation. Antigone continues: ‘Look not to the present, but to the past—to all you have suffered through father and mother. If you look upon those things, you will understand, I know, that evil wrath comes to an evil end (κακοῦ δὲ ἥλουν τήμενον ὠς κακοὶ προσηλυγεῖται). No slight cause have you to meditate who are bereft of the sight of your eyes’. The self-inflicted blindness of Oedipus is thus seen by Antigone as the great symbol of his θυμός; and Sophocles could not have suggested more clearly that the self-blinding and the cursing of the sons were actions of the same order and significance.9 ‘Passion’, says Creon (954 f.), ‘knows no old age till death comes’. This is true of Oedipus. Yet, when death came, the gods took this man of wrath to themselves. Is there no mystery here?

What has been said so far is preliminary, but an essential preliminary, if we are to see Oedipus and his fate in true perspective. It is particularly important (if obvious) to note how the wrath of Oedipus is grounded in his past experience. It is provoked by suffering; and it issues in retaliation. The theme of retaliation is perhaps more prominent in the Colonus than has been observed.

Oedipus proclaims and argues his innocence on three separate occasions.10 His main plea is that of ignorance: έιδιξι καὶ τῶν θυμών (548). But the first argument he employs on the first occasion is different. Speaking of the killing of Laius, he says: ‘Even if I had acted with knowledge, I should not have been found at fault, since I was but requiring a wrong’ (271 f.). The Greek expression here used is παθόμενοι... ἀντείστρων.11 There is an implied reference to the narrative in the Tyrannus of the meeting between father and son, when Laius aimed the first blow. At the end of the third passage (with Creon and Oedipus wrangling before Theseus), when the argument seems already closed, Oedipus turns on Creon and says (991 f.): ‘Answer me this one question. If, here and now, someone should come up and seek to kill you . . . would you ask if the killer was your father or retaliate forthwith?’ I think, as you love your life, you would retaliate’. (The word here is τίνος.)12

Reasonable enough—in law, in recognised Greek morality, and in common sense. And we should be making altogether too much of this ground of Oedipus’s defence, were it not that the theme of retaliation is otherwise prominent in the play, and that it has tragic implications of the first importance.

It is particularly prominent in the scenes with Creon.13 Justifying himself before Theseus for his assault on Oedipus, Creon says (951 f.): ‘This I would not have attempted, but that he was calling down bitter curses on me and on my race; when, having so suffered, I deemed it right so to retaliate (ἀνθ’ άλλοι πεπονθός έχεις τῶν αντείστρων).’ He continues with that remark about θυμός which has already been quoted. But Creon misrepresents the facts: the curse came after, not before, the threat of violence.14 It was Oedipus who (not for the first time) suffered and retaliated—with the words which were his only weapon: ἔργον πεπονθός λίμοι γενόμεθα (873). Still, Creon’s quibble signifies little. For the two old men are striking blow for blow, as each can, in the same spirit of wrath. Oedipus cursed Creon, as he had cursed his sons and as he was to curse them again. But between the scene with Creon and the scene with Polynices comes the speech of Antigone already quoted, in which many threads meet. ‘You are his father,’ she says (1180 ff.), ‘so that, even if he is doing you the most impious of foul wrongs, it is not right that you should retaliate evil upon him (ς ὡς μηδὲ έργον έχεις τῶν κακοτῶν δυσεξαίροντι), κατά τεμπεῖρ, έβεις σι' έλευς κείνον αντείστρων κακοῖς).’ Antigone’s argument that a father, of all people, should not retaliate upon a son, for whose φύσις he is responsible, has an importance independent of the general theme of retaliation, which, however, it underlines. And Oedipus does retaliate with a final curse. Having done so, he then goes on, at the command of heaven, to assume the status of a hero.

I have said that the theme has tragic implications. Retaliation was, of course, regarded by

---

1 The two passages are further linked by θυμός (592, 1193) and by τοποθετησαν (593, 1193).
2 Compare Oedipus’s own comment on the blindness: καθότις τῶν θυμῶν δέχομαι μοι μέγας καλατήρια τῶν πόλεων ἡμαρπακίων (438 ff.). In bringing the binding the curse into close relationship Sophocles is following Aeschylus (Sept. 792 ff.).
3 266 ff., 518 ff., 969 ff.
4 A slight, but perhaps significant, modification of the claim Vol. LXXIV. (266 f.) that his actions (ἐγγείοι) were a matter of suffering rather than doing (πεπονθός ἐστι μέλισσα ή διατροφότα). The student of form in Greek tragedy will observe with interest how the total defence of Oedipus is, as it were, framed by the repetition of this theme.
5 To bring it out is another function of those scenes (cf. n. 6).
6 The threat. 860. The curse: 864 f.
the ordinary Greek as a right, if not a duty.\textsuperscript{15} Whether Sophocles, as a man and a citizen, accepted this morality is beside the point. What matters is how he saw retaliation as a tragic process. An offence is committed. Someone suffers, and retaliates. By his act, the first doer suffers; and this suffering, in its turn, evokes retaliation (by the sufferer or by his representative). And so there is set up a chain of action and passion which appears to have no end. Offence and retaliation; crime and counter-crime. It is nothing short of a formula for tragedy. It is certainly the formula to which the Oresteia of Aeschylus is constructed. Το παθοῦσα θανάτον in the Colonus corresponds δράσαι τινα θείων in the Choephoroi. The two principles are complementary and between them give perfect expression to the lex talionis. Now the divine powers which, in the Oresteia, preside over this apparently interminable series of crimes and punishments are the Furies, the ἔριντες. There are Furies also in the Colonus.

When Oedipus learns that he has come to a grove of the Eumenides, he recognises that he has found his final resting-place. Thereafter the grove, as the visual background of the piece, must have compelled the attention of the spectators, like the palace-front of the Atridae in the Agamemnon. The goddesses are called Eumenides, for that was their cult-title at Colonus, though, as the villagers says: 'in other places, other names find favour'. At Colonus, however, and generally throughout when Oedipus hears their name, he prays (44): 'Graciously then may they receive the suppliants (ἀνήλτα γλωστόν τοις λειτούργοις το κάπητα δίκαιον'). He thus anticipates the prayer which is later dictated by the Chorus (486 ff.): 'Pray that, as we call them Eumenides, so with hearts of good will (ἐνεπεμονον στέρησεν) they may receive and save the suppliants.' These prayers are answered, in the end, by the divine grace which summons Oedipus to take his place among the powers that dwell in the earth.

But the matter is not quite so simple as that. The name Eumenides is paradoxical; it is presented as a paradox in our play.\textsuperscript{17} Contrast the quiet beauty of the grove, as described by Antigone, with the terror it inspires in the villagers. Shortly before the entry of Theseus, the Chorus-leader tells Oedipus how to make sacrifice and prayer to the Eumenides. It is instructive to observe where Sophocles has placed this quiet and harmonious passage, which possesses a beauty corresponding to the natural beauty of the grove. It comes between the first curse\textsuperscript{18} of Oedipus upon his sons (ἀνήλτα γλωστόν τοις λειτούργοις το κάπητα δίκαιον) and the cruel cross-questioning to which the curiosity of the Chorus subjects him (δεναι μονο το πάλαι καίμανοι ἕθη κοινον, ὁ ξίντω), ἐπετειχόμενον δομος ἐκραομαι πυθόμεθα). It comes, that is, between the tragic future and the tragic past. Now both that past and that future were determined by the action of ἔριντες. In between future and past come the details of ritual and the prayer—already quoted—to the Eumenides to justify their name. And they did justify it, when they took Oedipus to dwell among them as a chthonian power. In some sense they show themselves, they are Eumenides; and—could Sophocles have emphasised this more clearly than by the sequence of scenes to which I have just referred—that did not save Oedipus from a life-time of suffering or Polynices (and for that matter Antigone) from the consequences of a father's curse. The mystery of the destiny of Oedipus thus merges into the mystery of the Eumenides and the paradox of their name.

With this latter mystery Aeschylus dealt in the Oresteia—a work which we may suppose Sophocles to have understood better than we can ever hope to do. I am sure that we cannot understand the Oedipus Colonus without reference to the Oresteia.

Aeschylus dealt with the mystery of the Furies, for it was he who dramatised the transformation of the Eumenides into Eumenides. The scene in which the Furies are so transformed, under the persuasion of Athena, takes up the last quarter of the Eumenides. Regarded merely as the close of a single play, it might be liable to some of the obtuse judgments which have been pronounced upon it. But it is in fact the close of a trilogy. As such, the transformation of the Furies will justify its position, if (and only if) the main theme of the trilogy—transcending the fortunes of the house of Atreus, transcending the great social issues which are raised—is a religious theme, and moreover concerns, above all, the place of the Eumenides in a world-order controlled by a just Zeus.

Few will deny the paramount religious interest in all extant Aeschylean tragedy. The drama, as the religion, of Aeschylus (and the two are quite inseparable the one from the other) is centred

\textsuperscript{15} See the passages quoted by Bowra, \textit{op. cit.} 320. But we can assume too easily that Euripides, Socrates, and Plato were isolated voices. Plato, \textit{Protagoras} 324 a, may be instructive: the view that vindictive punishment is bestial and irrational is put into the mouth, not of Socrates, but of Protagoras, who affects to regard it as a commonplace. Nor should we be too ready to contrast Greek morality with our own. The Greeks, paying lip-service to the principle of retaliation, no doubt acted frequently with magimmnitude and restraint. We, who pay lip-service to Christian ideals, commonly act, as individuals and as nations, on the principle of retaliation.

\textsuperscript{16} "uxtaposed" twice; the speaker in each case being Polynices. At 1209 ἐν τῇ τῇ ἔριντα means the Fury which pursues Oedipus and his race, for the son knows nothing yet of a father's curse; by 1434 the ἔριντα of Oedipus have acquired a fuller meaning.

\textsuperscript{17} That being so, it is not necessary to consider whether the title was originally a euphemism nor indeed, since Sophocles clearly accepts the equation of Eumenides with Erinyes, what was the pre-Aeschylean character of the former (see \textit{op. cit.} above, \textit{n. 34} below). For an early statement of the paradox see the prayer of Oedipus at 106 ff. " Cf. Linforth, \textit{op. cit.} (above, \textit{n. 4}) 111.

\textsuperscript{18} Not pronounced in the form of a curse, but later regarded by Oedipus (1375 f.) as having the force of one. Cf. Linforth, \textit{op. cit.} (above, \textit{n. 4}) 111.
in Zeus; and Zeus is conceived as the upholder of a just moral order. Aeschylus has been called the prophet of Zeus. But when we ask what was his distinctive contribution to Greek theology (if the term may be used), the question is not so easy to answer. That he gave Zeus an unchallengeable pre-eminence among the gods? But this Zeus already has in Homer. That he insisted on the justice of Zeus? But Hesiod so insists. That he displayed that justice as working slowly, but certainly, throughout the generations? But this conception we find in Solon. 

Neither can we find the contribution of Aeschylus in proverbs such as τίτκει κόρος ύβριν ου ενεν τα τόσού μάθεις: Aeschylus is not Herodotus. Does his greatness, then, reside, not so much in originality of thought as in the intensity with which he felt and the poetic power with which he expressed notions derived from traditional beliefs or earlier thinkers? I suggest, rather, that he faced problems implicit in the theology that he found and worked out their solution with rare and original insight, using for this purpose symbols which he bequeathed to Sophocles.

During the Parodos of the Agamemnon, the Chorus make their famous affirmation of faith in Zeus (160 ff.). Ζεύς, δας τον ἑστιν, η δ' αὐτῷ φίλον καθελμένοι, τοῦτον νη προσεχθήσομεν. οὐκ ἔχω τί ἑποτάκιμος, πλὴν Δίας, εἶ ἐν τῷ μάκτω ἡροτιδὸς ἄθρα προαίτητοι, τὰ κράτος ἐνεκρινείτο. Nothing save Zeus, if one is to cast away the vain burden of care from the mind in very truth.

With this confident assertion compare the cry of the Chorus during the lyric scene with Clytemnestra (1483 ff.): ὥσ τε γίνεται συνεποῦς τοῦ τούτου τοῦ ἡγεμόνα. Τί καὶ θεοτοικοδομεῖται τό τόλμος. For the thought of Zeus, which was then proclaimed as the sole ground of force, is now the source of terror. Why? Because the accomplishment of the will of Zeus has led to the murder of Agamemnon and is leading, as the Chorus begin dimly to see, to the matricide of Orestes. But if we return to the Parodos and read on, there already we find complication. The Chorus go on to sing that Zeus has led mankind upon the path of understanding by his ordinance that learning shall come by suffering (πάθος μάθος). They suggest that this suffering may be a grace or favour (χάρις) conferred by divinities who exercise their awful sovereignty by means of force or violence (βιωσις). 

χάρις clashes with βιωσις: the combination almost constitutes a paradox. It is not, however, more inharmonious than the context in which it lies. 

The stanzas of the Hymn to Zeus interrupt the narrative of the events which preceded the sailing of the armada against Troy: they lie between the omen of the eagles and the hare and the sacrifice of Iphigenia which that omen portended. This is a bold and significant stroke of construction. Significant, because the sacrifice of Iphigenia can now be seen in the light of the Hymn to Zeus. But significant also because the Hymn to Zeus (and its affirmation of faith) must now be interpreted in the light of the sacrifice of Iphigenia. The context is inharmonious; and the disharmony lies in the contrast between the crime committed against Iphigenia and the despatch of the Atridae to execute justice upon Troy. Thus we are taken a step farther back in the Parodos. Ζεύς... ὑπέρτοιον πέμπτο παρακήνθεν Ἐρίνην, σύνον τ' Ἀτρέας παῖδας ὁ κρείσσους ἐν τ' Ἀλεξάνδρου πέμπτη Ξιλος Ζεύς (56 ff.). Agamemnon went against Troy as an Erinyes, sent by Zeus—the first of many Erinyes in the trilogy. But if this is the first mention of an Erinyes, it is also (apart from a passing Δίας) the first mention of Zeus. So, from the start, Zeus and Erinyes are brought into relationship; and it is a relationship upon which the poet will insist again and again. Perhaps we can now see why Aeschylus phrased the end of the Hymn to Zeus as he did: why he used the vague plural διάμορφος and the epithet συστροφίς, as well as the adverb βιωσις.

The action of the Oresteia consists in a series of acts of justice, which have one thing in common: they are all emanate from Zeus and are expressions of his will. They have another thing in common: they are all—but all the last, the act of acquittal—carried out by Furies, by Ἐρίνης; and to this agency they owe their peculiar character. To establishing the character of the Trojan war, for instance, Aeschylus devotes resources which would perhaps be disproportionate, if it were merely the background of Agamemnon's fate, but not if it illustrates the functioning of an Erinyes. The war involved the suffering of the Trojans—naturally—but of the guiltless young as well as of the guilty old. It involved the suffering of the Greek avengers, on the battlefield and in their desolate homes, no less than the suffering of the Trojan sinners. First and foremost, it involved the sacrifice of Iphigenia, without which the expedition could not sail; and Iphigenia becomes (among other things) a symbol of all the innocent victims on both sides. Already, then, before the second long speech of Clytemnestra, before the Money-changer chorus, before the speeches of Agamemnon's Herald, we know what this war was like—we know what the justice of Zeus upon Troy involved in indiscriminate suffering and in new wickedness. 

---

19 It is the value of a study such as F. Solmsen's Ἡσιόδος καὶ Ἀισχύλος that it enables us to isolate the characteristic thought of Aeschylus. In my review of that work (Gnomon XXIII, 414 f.), I have already developed some of the notions of this article.

20 βιωσις must certainly be retained, if only because it pulls the structure of the sentence together. If we read βιωσις (Turnebus), the clash of ideas is unaffected, but οὐκ ἔχω συμφωνών Νέλιου becomes an appendage, a quasi-decorative epithet, not at all in the Aeschylean manner.

21 The disharmonics of the Parodos are well brought out by E. Frenkel, Aeschylus, Agamemnon II, 111 ff., 146 f. On χάρις and βιωσις see his comments: 'Between these two contrasted phrases there is an interplay like that between μάθος and μάθεις, between δόξα and εὐδοξία. ' See also K. Reinhardt, Aischylus als Regisseur und Theologe, 20 ff.

22 The principal relevant passages are as follows: (i) 60-7, esp. πολλα παλαιοτάτα... διώκοντο. (ii) 320-57, esp. 326-9, which describe the plight of the Trojan women and children. At 328 μαίνας γνώριστοι must, by all means be retained, for reasons given by Frenkel, ad loc., and for another which will appear. (iii) 355-62, where the great net which was cast over Troy catches, not only the great (who are guilty),
I have illustrated my point in some detail from the earlier phases of the Agamemnon, but the fabric of the Oresteia is so closely woven that it could be illustrated almost equally well from many other portions of the Agamemnon and Choephoroi. The same principles hold good: the action of Zeus executed by Furies; the act of justice, since it is carried out by Furies, breeding new crimes and so apparently perpetuating the evil which it comes to chastise. Justice upon Troy involved the sin of the conqueror, for which he in his turn must be punished: τοιν πολυκτόνοι γάρ οὖν ἀσκοτοί θεοί. καλαίναι Ἐρινύς χρόνον τυχρόναν δυτ' ἀνεῖ δίκαια παλαίτερα τριβὰ βλου πτεῦσ' διμοῦρν (461 ff.). Clytemnestra, avenging the blood of her daughter, swears by Ate and Erinys, αἰτιοῦν εἰς τήν ἑγοῦ ἐγώ (1433) and proclaims an act of justice (e.g. 1406). She is an incarnate Fury; she is the embodiment of the δίκαιον διάκτωρ, of the Daimon that had haunted the house of Atreus since the Thystean banquet. For there is a second train of causation leading to the death of Agamemnon, from his father's sin. This, too, is conceived in terms of Fury-action, for it was as a 'tuneless chorus' of 'kindred Erinys' that Cassandra's prophetic vision (1186 ff.) saw the children of Thystes. Alastor and Daimon, Erinys and Arai: they are all the same power, working through Clytemnestra and Aegisthus to punish Agamemnon for the deeds which he did and did not do and, no less inevitably, working towards the return and matricide of Orestes.

It is impossible here to examine all the complexities of this theme. I content myself with a single fundamental point—the insistent association of Zeus and his justice with the Erinys. One is tempted to say, with some slight exaggeration, that, in the Agamemnon, every reference to Erinys is associated, textually, with Zeus, every reference to Zeus with Erinys, express or implied. Instances have already been quoted from the Parodos. In the first stasimon the mention of the καλαίναι Ἐρινύς (462) is followed by: βάλλεται γάρ δισαίον διάκτωρ κεραυνόν (469). Clytemnestra calls on Zeus τέλειος to accomplish her prayer (973), and the hearts of the Chorus at once chant 'self-taught, the lyre-less dirge of the Erinys' (990 ff.). In the long lyric scene between Clytemnestra and the Chorus there are two important references to Zeus. The first (1485 ff.), already quoted, is preceded by the Daimon, qualified as βαρύμνης. The second (μῖν εὔ μίμωντος ἔν χρόνον Δίος παθεῖ τὸν ἔριστον, 1563 E.) is followed by: τίς ἄν γοναν δραχείον ἀρπαλν δαιμόνια.

In the Choephoroi the interweaving of divine responsibilities is more complex. It is complicated, in particular, by the role of Apollo and the dilemma of Orestes, threatened with Furies if he fails to avenge, and with Furies if he does avenge, his father. This is no doubt a reason why Orestes is not spoken of (like Clytemnestra) embodying an Erinys, and why the Fury-character of his act is indicated often by oblique means. But Zeus still presides over the events, and his relationship to the Erinys is still a prominent issue. It is brought into prominence, particularly, in the great Kommos. The introductory anapaests, which imply but do not mention the Erinys, are discussed below. The three stanzas 394-409 present a striking symmetrical arrangement. Electra begins with Zeus and ends with Γαῖρ χρόνων τε τιμω (the Chorus state the law of retaliation and associate it with the Erinys); Orestes begins with νερτέρων τυραννίδας καὶ ἀρπα, but ends with Zeus. This passage is preceded (382 ff.) by the appeal of Orestes to Zeus to send up from below 'a late-punishing doom'. To those lines also we shall return.

From this conjunction of Zeus and the Erinys certain consequences follow. In the first two plays associations of cruelty and violence gather about the Erinys, until, when we see their hideous aspect and hear their truculent speech, we feel that this is indeed how Furies should look and speak. But since, at point after point, the poet has insisted that Furies are the ministers of the justice of Zeus, it follows that our conception of that justice and that god must be correspondingly affected. It follows that, when, after the acquittal of Orestes, the Furies still threaten, unappeased, Aeschylus could not leave them so, unless he was prepared to admit that the faith which the Argive elders had expressed in Zeus was one which contained as much despair as hope. Finally, it follows that we should look in the closing scene of the trilogy, for a solution of the enigmatic relationship between Zeus and the Furies, which will also be a commentary on the mysterious phrasing of the Hymn to Zeus in the Agamemnon. That is indeed what we find.

but of ῥεῖος (who are not). Aeschylus did not use ῥεῖος four times in seven lines through inadvertence: by contrast it brings into relief ῥεῖος τε, which should remind us of 328 (and perhaps of the still grimmer fate of Iphigenia).
(iv) 429-55: the sufferings of the Greeks at home. (v) 555-74: the sufferings of the Greeks before Troy. Even in his first speech the Herald cannot help striking a sinister note, e.g. at 506 f., 509 f., 517 (cf. 506 f., 573). (vi) 626-80: the sufferings of the Greeks on the homeward journey. This passage (the importance of which is rightly stressed by Reinhardt, ἁ. cii. 80 ff. and H. J. L. S., 186-96, which also contains the). The two passages describe the two limbs of the δίκαιον (343 f.). The Greeks suffer famine on the outward journey, drowning on the return.

23 See also Νεανίον loc. cit. 419, n. 1, on the notion of χρόνος.

24 'Μήδος and Ἐρινύς belong closely together', as Fraenkel (96, cii. 112 ff.) observes on 154 ff.—the passage immediately preceding the Hymn to Zeus. Compare 699 ff.: τοιν ἑγοῦ, Μήδος . . . πραγματέων ἀπίστων ὑπερ εὐσεβείς καὶ τείνετον Πρωτέων προσκυνεσα, followed by the more explicit ποταὶ Δίος διακατεκλειδασ τοιοῦτον Ἔριν (748 f.). This means that to the enigmatic relationship of Zeus to the Furies is added the equally enigmatic relationship of Apollo to the Furies (on which see CR XVIII, 97 ff. and JHS LXVIII, 141, n. 93) and of both to Zeus. Note the sequence: 246 f. (Zeus); 246 f. (Apollo); 288 ff. For Reinhardt also (96, cii. 125 ff.), from a rather different point of view, calls attention to the complication of divine responsibilities in this play.
In brief, the Furies are reconciled. Not only so, but they are, in some sense, transformed—they become Eumenides; they take on a role in the good new order which Athena has established in her Athens. The new order: for, in the immediate context of the Eumenides, the issue presents itself as between the old and the new. The Furies claim that their administration of justice has been secured to them by ancient dispensations, over which younger deities have now ridden roughshod. Their system of justice had led, in the present case, to a revolting impasse; but in any case it was bound to lead to a succession of violent crimes. Athena had substituted for it something new and better, through the intervention of the state upon the blood-feuds of the clan. This innovation the Furies are induced to accept. They are induced by the persuasions of Athena, in complying with which they pay tribute to Zeus as παγκρατής (918). These Furies have never claimed to derive their authority from Zeus, but from a power more primitive—from Μοίρα; so that, when the reconciliation is effected, it can be said that Zeus and Μοίρα have come to terms (1045 f.).

Yet how is it possible to separate the Erinys of the Eumenides from the Erinys who function as the agents of Zeus in the earlier plays? The later, the visible, Erinys are more limited in their interest, as befits the social themes which occupy the later stages of the trilogy, but in their fundamental nature they are the same, and the picture of an Erinys which culminates in a visible horror is being built up from the first reference in the Agamemnon. Primarily, first and last, the Erinys are the embodiments of the law of retaliation. This is given its clearest expression in the lines which introduce the Kómmos of the Choephoroi (306 ff.) Δόξα τοι ἠμαθίᾳ πανσώμενη ὅτι δίκαιον ἴσαν τιμήν, ὃς ἀσέβες συνάντησεν ἄνα (314.), as the Thriá (318-320). The combination of elements is striking: the Μοίρα, Zeus, Justice, retaliation (which is an ancient principle). The justice that is embodied in the lex talionis and administered by the Erinys is already here associated both with Zeus and with the Moirai. Yet, in the Eumenides, a conflict develops requiring a resolution which is not only a reconciliation of the Erinys with the daughter of Zeus but a coming together of Zeus and Moira. What does this mean?

It can only mean that Zeus was in the old order, as he is in the new. The πρωτότοκος δόξα does indeed express his justice: μήμεν δὲ μίμοντος εἰς βρόντην Δόξα παθέν τόν ἔρπταν τοις Ἀγαμέμνον (Agam. 1563 f.). The doer suffers, and the sufferer retaliates, and a kind of justice is done. But violence breeds violence, and evil perpetuates itself even in the process of its own punishment. If Zeus were in the old order only, then the prospect for mankind would indeed be grim, and the Hymn to Zeus would contain little reassurance. But Zeus is also in the wisdom of Athena (φρονεῖν δὲ καρδὶς Ζεὺς ἐδοκεῖ οὐκ θάνατος); and, after she has reconciled the Erinys by her persuasions, she ascribes the victory to Zeus Agoraios. When the Erinys take their place in the new order, a fresh light is thrown upon the χάρος of divinities who exercise their awful sovereignty by violence, and the stage is set for the solemn, but intense, rejoicing with which the trilogy ends.

I have suggested that Aeschylus in the Oresteia and Sophocles in the Oedipus Coloneus were performing, in the same conceptions, a religious function which tragedy was peculiarly fitted to perform.

Let us return to Theseus, moved (in Jebb’s words) to adore both the χάρος and the υγιεία. The Coloneus begins with the arrival of Oedipus at the grove of the Eumenides, daughters of Earth and Darkness: it ends (or almost ends) with the passing of Oedipus to become himself a chthonian power. To this destiny he is summoned by the thunder of Zeus. ἐκτίνυμα, ὅρα τοι, ἔτοιμον ἄρθρον, κτύπησε μὲν Ζεὺς χάρος (1606). In this and in other ways, Sophocles establishes an indissoluble, if mysterious, relationship between Zeus and the earth powers—a relationship which is symbolised by the joint act of worship performed by Theseus.

For Sophocles, I suggest, as for Aeschylus, the fundamental religious problem with which tragedy had to deal presented itself in this form: what is the relationship between Zeus on the one hand (and along with Zeus the other bright gods of the heavenly Olympus) and, on the other hand, the dark, primitive, infernal powers that dwell in the earth?

26 Cf. 150, 162, 172 (πλαγιώτερος καὶ μύρος φίλος). 333 f. (τοῦτο γὰρ λάθος βουμάτων Μοῖρα ἐπίκολου ἀντικειμένως δικαίων), 391, 778 f. (τὸ ἄτυχον, ἡς καταπιπτόμενη, 837 f.

27 Limited, that is, to interest in the blood of kinsmen. But in the Agamemnon any bloodshed may evoke Erinys (461 f.). A murder and another crime besides murder (748 f., cf. 60 ff.). I suggested (Gnomon loc. cit. 418) that the point at which the conception of the Erinys, which has been narrow for dramatic purposes, broadens out again is the ode Eum. 490 ff., where the language of the Agamemnon is recalled.

28 The detailed interpretation of δίκαιον . . . μεταβάλλει involves difficulties, which do not, however, affect our present point.

29 When the principle is restated in narrower form at 400 ff., there is specific mention of an Erinys.

30 Such would be the condition which he lays down for Zeus granting her good. (The uncertainties of the text do not affect this essential point.)
The distinction between the χάνοιον and the ὀφέλιον ("Оλομπιον, ὑπάτοι") is well known and clearly marked; the line between them has indeed recently been described as "the one fundamental cleavage in Greek religion". χανοιον They were distinguished by many details of cult, but equally by the emotional attitude of the worshippers. The cult of the Olympians was cheerful—the sacrifice was a festival, in the benefits of which the worshippers would share. The worship of the χανοιον was attended by a fear which nothing illustrates better than the attitude of the villagers of Colonus towards the Eumenides: δε τρέμοντες λέγουν και παραμένοντες θ’ ἀδερφόν (128 ff.). Clearly the Greeks worshipped the Olympians in the hope of good, the chthonians in the fear of evil. There is a passage in Isocrates—and who could be better evidence for conventional Greek attitudes?—in which he divides the gods into two classes: 'those who are the cause of good things to us and are called Olympians; those who are in charge of disasters and punishments and bear less agreeable names'. Not that this distinction was absolute, that the Olympians were never conceived as the source of evil, the chthonians (for that reason) never as the source of good. The total facts are complex, just as the nature and cult of the Olympians prove on examination to be complex and to retain anomalous connexions with the earth. But, broadly, a distinction holds good, which is also the distinction between light and darkness, between day and night (the respective seasons of Olympian and chthonian sacrifice), between hope and fear, between good and evil.

Upon the tragedians, certainly, this contrast forced itself with a unique insistence. The terror which attended the worship of the χανοιον derived no doubt from association with the dead. The earth was the dwelling-place of the dead; the powers of the earth were the representatives of their interests and influence. Now the Greek tragic myths tend to deal with violent deaths and with the consequences of such deaths. For those who died by violence did not rest in the earth, but their spirits demanded vengeance, their ἐργασία secured it; and this was a form of justice. But the tragedians (in the first instance, Aeschylus) inherited also a conception of Zeus as the supreme ruler of the universe and as the upholder of moral order. Therefore he must stand in some relationship to the powers of the dead, though his bright home in the sky was the very antithesis of the nether gloom. Indeed, according to one early formulation, the latter was not part of Zeus’s realm at all: it belonged to his brother Pluto or Hades, who might also be called the nether Zeus (Zeus χανοιον). For Aeschylus, however, and equally for Sophocles, there could not be two Zeus’s, but only one Zeus; so that the relationship between Zeüs ωφέλιον and Zeüs χάνοιον is another form in which the problem can take, and does in fact take both in the Oresteia and in the Colonean.

There was a further complication. In Homer, alongside Zeus, appears the mysterious power of μοῖρα—portion, allotment, or dispensation. This concept (gradually emerging into personification) stood for what was rigid and inescapable, in nature and in society, in life and in death. Above all, perhaps, in death, since this power was most strikingly manifested in the term set to each human life. Μοῖρα represented an order, breaches of which were punished by the Erinyes, powers of the dark world.

In his world there could not be a divided responsibility for good and evil: Olympians against chthonians, one Zeus against another Zeus, Zeus against Moira. If the world, human and divine, was to be understood, it must be understood as a whole, the dark with the light, the evil with the good. For this task tragic poetry, and perhaps tragic poetry alone, is fitted; and Aeschylus, the creator of tragedy, apprehended from the first this function which it performs.

So far little more has been done than to state a religious problem inherent in the very structure of the Oresteia and the Oedipus Coloneus, in terms of which the dramas should be interpreted. But a brief article such as this can only aim at prolegomena to an interpretation. I will end by making a few suggestions and asking a few questions.

23 V. 117.
24 The chthonian...have two primary functions: they ensure the fertility of the land, and they preside over, or have some function or other connected with, the realm of the souls of the dead." Guthrie, op. cit. 218.
25 Aeschylus makes use of this double function in the closing scene of the Eumenides; in fact, in stating Erinyes and Eumenides he seems to be equating two sets of chthonian powers in which the one and the other function predominate respectively. (See also Reinhardts, op. cit. 154 ff.) For the Olympians as a potential source of evil a general reference to Homer is perhaps sufficient.
26 All three antitheses are prominent—are indeed of structural importance—in the Oresteia.
27 This function of the Erinyes is clear, whether we accept or reject the view that in essence and origin they were the vengeful dead. (For a recent discussion see E. K. Dodds, The Greeks and the Irrational, 7, 21.)
28 For the Colonean see above. At Agam. 1385 ff. Clytemnestra, with grim irony, associates the title σοφρίη and the 'third libation', proper to Olympian Zeus, with δὲ καὶ χάνοιον Zeus. (Engler's δάσες, as Fraenkel says ad loc., is clearly right.) It is in the light of that passage that we can read the implications of Cho. 577 f. (φῶς δ’ ἄρ’ ἐπούς δ’ ἑπεξεργάζομαι ἐν ὀλυμπίᾳ καὶ παρθάνῃ τοὺς νόμους). Cho 583 ff. has already been mentioned. Orestes prays to Zeus to send up from below ὑπερτός τόν τόνος (the epithet recalls Agam. 58). The phrase (κράτοις ἐπιτύπωσε) suggests that the nether Zeus is addressed. At 395 f. Zeus is once more Olympian, since κράτος διαγείρει implies the thunderbolt, but is associated in a way characteristic of the trilogy with Earth, chthonian powers, Erinyes and Arai. Is it possible that ὑπερτός ("the exact meaning of the epithet cannot be determined", Fraenkel, op. cit. III 523) hints at the 'ambivalence' of Zeus, operating with power in both worlds, both σοφρίη and χάνοιον?
29 Cf. Dodds, op. cit. 6 ff. Zeus, χάνοιον, and Erinyes are associated in a famous line of Homer (II 19, 87)—a line which may well have stimulated the thought of Aeschylus.
30 It is surprising that philosophers and theologians, in their debates on good and evil, have so neglected the evidence of tragedy, though tragedians are experts in the nature of evil and its place in the world order.
A RELIGIOUS FUNCTION OF GREEK TRAGEDY

The trilogy of the Oresteia ends with joy. To attribute this merely to the establishment of an Athenian cult or to the celebration of an Athenian festival is altogether too narrow. The joy derives from the sure hope of good, now at last replacing the fear of evil which has brooded over the trilogy, and the Chorus of the Agamemnon, and their prayer was mocked by events. But now good does prevail, and to mark it the syllable of resounds again and again in the closing lines. Words, themes and symbols, in the early stages of the trilogy, have gathered sinister significance now reappear in the context of reconciliation and joy. It is as though Aeschylus were affirming a faith that the divine government of the world leads to the triumph of good over evil and to hope for mankind. And this is symbolised above all by the reconciliation and transformation of the Erinyes, which also means that Aeschylus can say: Zeus and Moira have come together. But when we ask into what the Erinyes have been transformed, the question is not simply answered—though it must be asked, if we are not to convict the poet of facile optimism or dramatic sleight-of-hand. What is certain is that the Erinyes have not ceased to be fearful; they still dwell in the earth; they are still ministers of punishment: μέγα γὰρ δύναι μόνταν 'Ερυμνός (and these are the words of Athena) . . . τοις μεν θεοῖς, τοις δ' αὖ δικαστῶν μίοι σφιγνώσκων παρέχωσι (956 ff.). The great law of the Erinyes—that we must suffer for our actions—has not been abrogated. The divine powers still exercise their awful sovereignty, if needed be, by force or violence. But to this principle has been added another—the principle of persuasion, embodied in Athena. θέρατος and θεοί: the antithesis is as fundamental to the thought of Aeschylus as it was natural to the Greek mind. The significant fact is that here we see the divine persuasion applied to the very representatives of divine violence. To pursue this train of thought in any adequate fashion is beyond the scope of this article, and I must content myself with suggesting that it was this transforming, reconciling power of persuasion and reasonableness that made the difference between primitive Argos and the new Athens of Athena, and that it was because of this difference and the revelation of the divine nature which it implied that Aeschylus was able to end his trilogy with a confident faith in the victory of good.

When we turn to Sophocles, we find what perhaps we should expect to find. Both Greeks, both tragic poets, both confronting the same world of good and evil, it is not surprising if the tragic thought of both shared much in common. The Furies are Eumenides at Colonus, and they show their goodwill towards Oedipus in the end. The transformation of the Furies is, in some sense, assumed—and their transformation at Athens. More than once in the play, Athens and the Furies are significantly linked. If the poet saw some special meaning in the fact that the Furies were worshipped in Attica under that title, we must find that meaning in the role of Theseus. Unlike the Chorus, Theseus shows no fear either of Oedipus or of the goddesses. Ruling in a city where law prevails at home, which respects the rights of others, practises fair dealing (τὸ ἐμπεδὸς), and keeps its word, perhaps he has no need to fear them. His pity springs spontaneously from his humanity and, when he uses force, he does so without passion. In defence of the weak. Theseus in the Colonus preserves what Athena in the Oresteia had ordained. Goddess and king, both represent an ideal for Athens; and the more nearly it was attained, the less had Athens to fear the harsh retributive forces and the more would the Furies justify the title under which they were worshipped at Colonus.

But Theseus, being an ideal, is a little remote. He acts towards Oedipus with humanity, but is not really involved in his tragedy. There is a characteristic difference between the two dramas we are considering. In the Oresteia Orestes is a shadowy figure. Relieved of anxiety about his fate, the audience can forget him in the metaphysical debate which follows. But Oedipus is present almost to the last—the blind, the vituperative Oedipus, visible and insistent evidence of the sufferings to which he was bred and which he beared. He came into the world under a curse and he left it cursing. His curse was roughly just and wholly effective: it was too effective. Having
pronounced it, he could not limit, could not even envisage, its full effect. He imagined that he had provided for the welfare of his beloved daughters by entrusting them to Theseus, but the play ends with Theseus promising Antigone safe-conduct to Thebes. So in the end the Colonus leads back into the Antigone, and Oedipus destroys the daughter he loved along with the sons he hated. 50

It is the mystery of the Sophoclean Oedipus that he seems to earn his place among the chthonian powers by administering that kind of blind and passionate justice, based on the principle of retaliation and involving the innocent with the guilty, which we associate with the earlier phases of the Oresteia rather than with the closing scene of the Eumenides. Does Sophocles here diverge from the thought of Aeschylus? Not necessarily; but certainly he places the emphasis differently—perhaps because he was a different man, perhaps because he had lived through half a century which had belied the promise of Aeschylean Athens. Certainly the Furies might become Eumenides: Theseus shows that Athena had not persuaded in vain. But the story of Oedipus and his children involves the defeat of the attempt to persuade the Furies. 51

For any consideration of the Oedipus Colonus should end, as Sophocles ended the play, with Antigone. Caught, like her father and brothers, in the harsh workings of destiny, she has the function of mitigating the harshness. It is her triumph that she (along with her sister) has evoked a great love from the embittered soul of Oedipus. 52 It is her failure that, at the grand climax, she cannot prevail with him. Antigone represents the power of persuasion towards mercy, and she fails: fails with the Chorus in the Parodos, fails with her father, fails with Polynices, fails (as we know) in the task which she set herself at the end of the play. 53 She fails to prevent terrible events, but by her love and pity mitigates the gross evil of them. Perhaps that is one of the things Sophocles meant to say: pity is too weak, but triumphs even in defeat. 'Zeus himself', says Polynices (1267 ff.), 'in all that he does, has Mercy (Alòs) for the sharer of his throne'. But Oedipus claims (1380 ff.) that his curses prevail, 'if indeed Justice, proclaimed from of old, sits with Zeus according to primeval laws'. 54 Which of them is right? Can the statements be harmonised? What is the standing of Antigone's pity in Zeus's world, which also contains the Furies, reconciled or unreconciled?

Antigone goes to her death, but not until after Theseus has performed his solemn joint act of adoration to Zeus and the chthonians. Or we can reverse the statement. Theseus is moved by the passing of Oedipus to adore Zeus and the chthonians, but that does not save Antigone from going to her death. Until we can say which version of the statement better represents the thought of Sophocles, we can hardly claim to have satisfactorily interpreted the play. But I suggest that it must, at all events, be interpreted with reference to the Oresteia and in terms of the relationship between Zeus and the chthonian powers, particularly those great symbols of tragic process, whether they are to be called Erinyes or Eumenides.

King's College,
London.

50 1769 ff. The theme of the Antigone has already been suggested at 1465 ff. It may be observed that the destruction of Antigone is also involved in the fulfilment of the curse which Oedipus lays upon Creon (868 ff.).

51 Nor can Aeschylus, for that matter, have conceived the reconciliation and transformation of the Furies as a event which had happened, once and for all, at a fixed point of mythological time—rather as a process continuing, intermit-tently and with variable success, throughout human history.

52 The degree of the triumph can be judged by contrasting 1617 ff. with 520 ff. (esp. 809 òvòs). They, no less than their brothers, were fruits of the incestuous Fury-haunted marriage.

53 254 ff.: she moves the Chorus to pity only. 1181 ff.: despite her limited success in obtaining audience for Polynices, Oedipus remains unmoved as a rock in the sea (1299 ff.) and the force of her arguments (esp. 1189 ff.) is lost. 1414 ff. 1770 ff.

54 With πατριστός, ἀρχαῖος of Cho. 314 and the claims of the Erinyes in the Eumenides (see n. 26).
THE HISTORICAL CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE PEACE OF 311

The question as to whether Seleucus was included in the Peace of 311 B.C., when the allied coalition came to terms with Antigonus the One-Eyed, has been frequently discussed. Droysen's opinion that he was not seemed to be confirmed in a conclusive manner by Munro's discovery at the end of the century of the Scipios inscription, in which Antigonus, in an official letter to the city of Scipios in the Troad, sets out the terms of the peace treaty and the names of the participants; for, as in the brief passage of Diodorus dealing with the same event, there is no mention of Seleucus. Nevertheless, Beloch and others were unconvinced, and supported their dissenting view by pointing to the fact that the historical record showed no clear trace of fighting between Antigonus and Seleucus immediately after 311. Subsequently, however, it was established that such fighting did take place at that time by the discovery of fragments of a Babylonian chronicle relating to the Successors. This new evidence also made it clearer than ever that Seleucus had not been included in the Peace, by showing that the chief motive of Antigonus in making peace then was the wish to be left free to combat Seleucus, who had just re-established himself as an independent power in the eastern satrapies of the empire. The correct interpretation of the evidence would seem to be that given, for example, by Rostovtzeff: that Seleucus was excluded from the Peace, because Antigonus insisted upon this condition; that Cassander, Ptolemy, and Lysimachus acquiesced; and that war was at once waged against him by Antigonus.

Not all scholars have been able to reconcile themselves to this straightforward explanation. Some find it more probable to suppose that Seleucus was a party to the Peace, not indeed in the same way as the others, but by means of a secret agreement or tacit understanding. Their solutions range from Niese's hypothesis that Seleucus, by a purely verbal agreement at the time of the Peace, was to be allowed to retain his post of Babylonian satrap until Alexander IV came of age, to an important article by Momigliano, which followed up a series of attempts by other Italian scholars. These latter sought to read into the description of the peace terms in Diodorus the suggestion that Seleucus was to be in some way safeguarded in his tenure of the Babylonian satrapy while recognising the over-lordship of Antigonus as ruler of Asia. Momigliano, after denying the possibility of a separate peace between Antigonus and Seleucus, declared that the condition of Seleucus was similar to that of Lysimachus vis-à-vis Cassander; Lysimachus, however, being in friendly relationship with Cassander, was able to participate in the treaty, whereas Seleucus, because of the recognition of Antigonus as lord of Asia (ἀρχής Ασίας ἰδίως), was unable to do so, at any rate directly; at the same time the Peace guaranteed the autonomy of Seleucus, and for the moment he was satisfied with this arrangement.

I shall return to this argument later.

Further light can perhaps be thrown upon this problem and related questions by a consideration of the negotiations that led up to the Peace, a matter which has received only slight attention from historians. It is true that the accounts given by Diodorus (1) of the meeting between Antigonus and Ptolemy at Ecregma in 314, and (2) of that between Antigonus and Cassander on the Hellespont in 313 are both very brief; since, moreover, the outcome on each occasion was inconclusive, it is hardly surprising that they should have been neglected. But when the circumstances in which they took place are investigated and brought into relation with other passages in Diodorus and the Scipios inscription, they seem to have an important bearing on the Peace of 311 itself, and they certainly help to fit that agreement more securely into the historical framework.

Before Tyre fell, and before Antigonus's naval preparations were complete, there took place, as the outcome of an incident in the harrying warfare being carried on by Ptolemy and Seleucus off the coasts of Asia Minor, a private meeting between Antigonus and Ptolemy at Ecregma, a barren piece of land near the easternmost part of the Nile. This meeting is commonly ignored by modern writers, yet it deserves to be mentioned. It is true that no details are given by the only writer who reports it, beyond the bare facts that a meeting took place and that Antigonus would not agree to Ptolemy's demands; but more can be extracted by considering the circumstances in which the meeting was held and the probable views of the participants.

The facts are as follows: Polycletus had been sent out by Seleucus from Cyprus in command of a naval squadron. Leaving Greece, where he was no longer required because Alexander, the
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1 Droysen, Geschichte des Hellenismus II (1877–78), 1, 63, 67. 
2 Munro, JHS (1899), 330 fr.; OGIS V = Welles, Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period (1944), no. 1. 
3 Diod. XIX 105, 1 (omission by Diodorus could have arisen through his abbreviation in Hieronymus, as Beloch points out; see following note). 
4 Beloch, Griechische Geschichte IV (1926–27), 1, 133; ib. IV, 616. 
5 Smith, Babylonian Historical Texts (1924), 124 ff.; for Smith's much revised historical commentary see Rev. d'Assyriologie (1925), 179 ff. 
7 Niese, Geschichte der griechischen und makedonischen Staaten seit der Schlacht bei Chaeronea 1 (1893), 304. 
8 Studi ital., dì filol., class. VIII (1900), 83 ff. 
9 See Corradini, Studi ellenistici (1909), 16 ff., where the earlier articles of Costanzi and Depauli are summarised; cf. Bengtson, Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit I (1937), 118 n. 3. 
10 Momigliano, loc. cit., p. 86. 
11 Diod. XIX 64, 8; ib. 75, 6. 
12 Diod. XIX 64, 8. 
13 Diod. XIX 64, 8. 
14 Diod. XIX 64, 4 ff.
son of Polyperchon, had gone over to the allied side, he sailed along the coast of Pamphylia as far as Aphrodisias in Galicia. He disembarked his troops at this place, and first ambushed a land force under Antigonus's general Perilaus, and then completed his victory by capturing intact a fleet that the soldiers had been escorting. This fine achievement was duly honoured by Ptolemy when Polyceites and his men reached the Egyptian port of Pelusium; for not only was the victory an important one in itself, but it also emphasised the strength of the allies at sea, and was, therefore, a serious discouragement to Antigonus, who was then engaged in building up a fleet to match theirs.

The meeting between the two dynasts arose out of negotiations for the release of Perilaus and some of the other prisoners. It seems that the suggestion for the meeting came from Ptolemy rather than Antigonus, for the latter's delegation concerned itself exclusively with ransom the prisoners. Since there is no mention of the payment of ransom money, it is conceivable that Ptolemy released the prisoners without ransom. Now it was a general practice to lead up to regular peace negotiations by conciliatory gestures of this sort. We may then assume that Antigonus acceded to Ptolemy's request for an interview at Ecregma on the frontier between their territories.

This meeting between Antigonus and Ptolemy was followed shortly afterwards by a similar meeting on the Hellespont between Antigonus and Cassander. Here again our account is very brief, merely noting the meeting and its inconclusive outcome, the two men being unable to reach any agreement. In this case we may presume that it was Antigonus who took the initiative in calling the conference; but it is reasonable to suppose that Cassander also was interested in the possibility of a peace settlement, and this is supported by the continuation of Diodorus's narrative, which tells how Cassander, 'giving up the idea of a settlement' (ΠΡΟΣ ΚΑΣΣΑΝΔΡΟΥΣ), decided to resume his operations in Greece; and the mere presence of a dyast at one of these interviews denotes some degree of readiness to consider terms of peace, so that it can be misleading to suppose that only the man who takes the initiative has any interest in the outcome; a certain amount of reciprocity must be assumed.

These, then, are the two sets of negotiations which preceded the Peacemaker of 311. The prologue of the Scipio letter, with its reference to the breakdown of the peace of 311 on the Hellespont in 313, provides the obvious starting point for a discussion of the relationship between the Ecregma and Hellespont negotiations of 314-13 and those leading up to the Peace of 311. Of course it is by no means impossible that other negotiations, of a similar type to those that led directly to the conclusion of peace in 311, actually took place in the intervening years through envoy sứs sent from one side to another; that a record of them should have been lost is not surprising when we remember their secret character and the reluctance of any individual dyast to let it appear that he was deserting his allies for his own advantage, not, at any rate, before he was assured of an agreement to his own liking. (This, it will be argued, is indeed what did happen in 311 and, later, in 302 B.C.) Whether Hieronymus passed over any such meetings is uncertain, perhaps unlikely; but Diodorus has severely abbreviated Hieronymus in many places, and this explains much omission. At all events, the discussion is perforce limited to the three known sets—Ecregma, 314, Hellespont, 313, and those of 312/11.

Now the outstanding fact given by the Scipio letter is that Cassander and Lysimachus negotiated with Antigonus in 312/11, drew up an agreement, and made a peace with him that did not include either Ptolemy or Seleucus. Only after this separate peace had been settled did Ptolemy begin to negotiate for inclusion in it. This is, of course, Antigonus's own account, and, since other parts of the letter can be shown to be misleading propaganda, doubt has been thrown on this (the crucial passage). Yet it is surely inconceivable that Antigonus in an official letter would venture upon a downright falsification, which is what this theory postulates, as distinct from a propagandist colouring of true facts. It is far more probable that the existence of a separate peace with Cassander and Lysimachus was the incontrovertible fact upon which Antigonus built the superstructure of propaganda found in the following lines, where he boasts of his forbearance in not taking advantage of the isolated Ptolemy, the reason for which, so he claims, being purely a desire to spare the Greek cities the suffering entailed by a continuation of the war. It is perfectly sound procedure for the historian to reject this as hollow pretence and to expose the strategic considerations that determined his decision, but, equally, it is thoroughly unsound to sweep away the foundation of truth without which the superstructure of propaganda would be senseless and completely ineffective. But apart from these considerations of Antigonus's technique and the name 'Polemarus', Antigonus's nephew, who was at this time operating in Greece against Cassander (so Wilcken and Dittenberger). It does not matter which correction is adopted, or how the mistake is explained, so long as we exclude the possibility that Antigonus could have contradicted himself in an official letter.

18 Diod. XIX 75. 6.
19 Diod. XIX 75. 6; the same expression is used in the account of the Peace of 311 in the Scipio letter: OGIS 5. 10 (ΟΙΣΙΠΠΟΣΙΟΣ) and 30 f. (ΟΙΣΙΠΠΟΣ).

9 See Baeur, Die Heidelberger Epitome (1914), pp. 15 ff., where many examples are given; cf. Schubert, Die Quellen zur Geschichte der Diodoricenzeit (1914), 272 ff.; Jacoby, FGrH II BD, 545.

10 OGIS 5. 26-31; consequently the word Polemarus in 1. 91 must be a slip on the part of the stone-cutter. Either he should have written 'Lysimachus' (so Cavaignac, Hist. de Penth. III (1914), 25), or he inscribed an incorrect form of the
credibility of what he says in particular parts of the letter, the supposition that Ptolemy was not included in the original draft of the Peace fits in excellently with the whole course of events both before and after the Peace of 311. Not only does it help to explain why Seleucus was excluded from the Peace, but it also gives one of the reasons for the open hostility between Ptolemy and Cassander in 309. The lack of co-operation, amounting indeed to a hidden (or open) breach, between Ptolemy (and Seleucus) and Cassander (and Lysimachus), which goes back to the earliest years of the coalition and which continued up to 302, is illustrated in the most striking fashion. Incidentally, Kochler thought the non-mention of the Ecregma meeting in the Scepsis letter pointed a little to the non-inclusion of Ptolemy in the first draft; but this seems a very fragile argument.

During these years (315/11), as well as later, Antigonus was fighting an imperfectly united opposition, a fact that gave him the diplomatic and military initiative. It will, therefore, be most profitable to observe Antigonus's own attitude and possible proposals at the different negotiations, and to study those of the other dynasts as they fall into place with his, the most significant and influential policy of the time. It is generally recognised that Antigonus took the initiative in making peace in 311, where the desire to have a free hand against Seleucus is the decisive motive; it would only be natural if his thoughts at Ecregma and on the Hellespont had run along similar lines, so that his object on each occasion, whether he called the conference or not, should have been the conclusion of a separate peace with one or more of the dynasts, in order to be left free to deal with an isolated opponent in another direction. Long before 311 the failure of the war to reach a crisis must have made him realise the impossibility of winning a quick victory, even if he had not (as is more probable) seen from the start the great difficulties involved in any attempt to win control of the rest of the empire in one great blow. Indeed, from 315 onwards Antigonus seems to have resigned himself to fighting the war piecemeal. Thus we have the posting of a defensive army on one front, while the main forces take the offensive elsewhere, a strategy illustrated, for example, by the defensive role allotted to Demetrius in S. Syria before Gaza, in contrast with the offensive operations of other generals, such as Docius and Polemaeus in Asia Minor and Greece, at the same time. This is of course normal strategy, but it may also denote a deficiency in strength, and in any case was only justifiable if the offensive wing was in sight of victory; otherwise the establishment of a defensive army in the south of Syria simply meant the wasteful idleness of a large body of soldiers. Perhaps Antigonus had this consideration in mind when he met Ptolemy at Ecregma.

A reconstruction of what passed at the Ecregma meeting can only be guess-work; but it is unreasonable to suggest that the talks broke down over Ptolemy's insistence that Seleucus's right to the Babylonian satrapy be recognised as the sine qua non of a separate peace between Antigonus and himself, and that Antigonus was then, as later, unshakably opposed to this, and so had to reject Ptolemy's condition point-blank. Seleucus was a close friend of Ptolemy, and had influence with him: this is well attested; and the outbreak of the war in 315 was, to some extent, the consequence of the expulsion of Seleucus from Babylon by Antigonus, just as one of the principal allied demands, the rejection of which by Antigonus constituted the formal cause of war, had been the restoration of Seleucus to his lost satrapy. Had Antigonus given way to Ptolemy's demand for the restoration of Seleucus, a separate peace with Ptolemy would probably have been arranged at Ecregma, since Antigonus was presumably ready at that time to agree to Ptolemy controlling Cyprus, a situation he could not then effectively challenge. For his part, Ptolemy probably understood that there was no longer any serious danger of Antigonus winning a quick victory over the allies, and a truce between Antigonus and himself would leave Cyprus, his most important overseas possession, intact; whilst the future of the island had now become uncertain with the fall of Tyre and the coming into being of Antigonus's fleet. The local victory by Polycletus gave him an opportunity to get out of the war on tolerable conditions by concluding a separate peace with Antigonus. Yet the talks at Ecregma failed to bring any kind of understanding: why? The circumstances being what they were, we must assume either that Antigonus was completely intractable, or that Ptolemy over-played his hand by demanding the restoration of Seleucus; the latter is the more probable explanation when we take into account later events, but the other cannot be entirely ruled out.

After the breakdown of the Ecregma conversations, Antigonus turned north and tested the possibility of an agreement with that part of the hostile coalition represented by Cassander and Lysimachus. Talks took place 'on the Hellespont', i.e. on the frontier between the territories of Antigonus and Lysimachus. Cassander and Antigonus were the main participants, but Lysimachus may also have been present. The object of Antigonus must have been the same as at Ecregma—to keep one group of dynasts out of the war while he concentrated against another group or against a single opponent (as immediately after 311). As for Cassander, he had been sickened by his recent failure in Caria, and was perhaps not unwilling to be freed from the Asiatic entanglements into which the alliance with Ptolemy had drawn him, especially since Ptolemy and Seleucus were not

11 Diod. XX 37. 1 f.; cf. Beloch, sq. cit. IV, 1, 145 f.
12 loc. cit. 1069.
13 Diod. XIX 56. 1; ib. 80. 3.
15 ib. 56, 57. 1.
16 As Niese suggests (op. cit. 288 n. 5). It may be inferred from the close collaboration between Lysimachus and Cassander in countering the subsequent threat of Antigonus to invade Europe. Cf. Diod. XX 106. 3.
conspicuously active even in this, their own sphere. Ptolemy was certainly following a selfish policy, designed to win for himself certain narrow local advantages (as on Cyprus), to the neglect of the war as a whole; and this calculating and selfish behaviour is characteristic of his action throughout the period. Cassander may also have reflected that he had been brought into the war in 315 largely through the clever scaremongering of Seleucus, now a mere protégé of Ptolemy, and must have been very discouraged by the way in which a possibly unnecessary breach with Antigonus had brought about a crumbling of his formerly well-established position in Greece. No one will suggest that Ptolemy had sought permission from Cassander before going to Eregma, and this lesson in unilateral action and self-help cannot have been lost on the latter. At any rate the rift between Cassander and Ptolemy is clear enough in the events after 311, and no doubt it goes back as far as 313 or earlier; there is no need to insist upon it further.

Nevertheless, Antigonus failed to reach agreement with Cassander on the Hellespont in 313. Why was this? The Scepsis letter ascribes the breakdown of the talks to the malevolent intervention of some unspecified persons, but there can be little doubt that this vague phrase conceals the true reason for the failure. The more natural explanation is that the terms offered to Cassander by Antigonus were exorbitant, or, conversely, from Antigonus's point of view, that Cassander demanded excessive guarantees for the security of his position in Europe. I believe the former explanation to be the more probable for the following reasons: (1) what Antigonus claimed before Gaza must have been stiffer terms than any he could ask for after Gaza; (2) that the terms of the Peace of 311, in spite of Antigonus's complaint that he had to make great concessions to bring it about, do not seem to have been notably disadvantageous to him. In fact, the Peace of 311 amounted to a guaranteed maintenance of the status quo. It is true that Antigonus secured the inclusion of a clause promising autonomy to the Greek cities everywhere, but this was simply propaganda and did not imply any change in the existing situation, either in Europe or in Asia, as both parties tacitly recognised. Antigonus in his letter to Scepsis is, however, naturally intent upon boasting of the advantages he had brought to the Greek cities, both by securing the insertion in the peace treaty of the autonomy clause and, more generally, by relieving them of the burden of the war and the contributions he was compelled to levy for its prosecution. Indeed, he goes so far as to claim that this was his sole reason for foregoing a great strategic advantage.

This passage, of course, cannot supply the answer to our problem. Yet it may suggest a clue as to why the terms asked by Cassander and Lysimachus in 311 were described by Antigonus as burdensome, and further, why they were so much more unpleasant than those offered by Antigonus in 313. The main advantage to Cassander in the Peace of 311 was not that he was allowed to maintain himself in Macedonia as co-ruler of his father and as guardian of Roxane and Alexander IV. This was certainly a considerable achievement for the man who only a few years before had been dependent on the subsidies of Antigonus. Antigonus had vigorously denounced Cassander's usurpation, including his illegal detention of the boy king and his mother, at the Tyre assembly in 315. Now, when Antigonus's overbearing and intransigent temper is taken into consideration, it seems by no means impossible that in the negotiations of 313 Antigonus actually demanded that Cassander submit himself to the decisions taken by the Tyre assembly and place himself under his authority, perhaps in somewhat the same way as Polyperchon had done not long before. By agreeing to this Cassander would have reverted to his former position of a mere subordinate of Antigonus.

Though such demands appear almost too excessive to be conceivable in the situation of 313, it is instructive to compare the position in 302. Then Demetrius, having overrun the whole of southern Greece, was marching north through Thessaly to do battle, at the head of the army of the reconstituted Hellenic League, together with strong forces of his own, with Cassander. Alarmed, Cassander approached Antigonus for peace terms; he must have been shocked when he learnt that Antigonus's terms were unconditional surrender. He then awoke to the full gravity of the situation, got into touch with Ptolemy and Seleucus, and, working closely with Lysimachus, laid plans for vigorous counter-action. This incident proves that Antigonus had a tendency to impose harsh terms wherever the situation allowed. It has a further value for us—it shows that the dynasts of the coalition were ready to negotiate individually with Antigonus, and so confirms the suggestion already made that neither Cassander nor Ptolemy scrupled to desert the other as they saw fit.

Such a regulated submission on the part of Cassander as I have suggested would also have carried with it important concessions in Greece (the evacuation of Mynchias and other of Cassander's garrisons, for example). That would have represented a real victory for the cause of Greek autonomy as opposed to the empty achievement of the autonomy clause in the Peace of 311.

---

27 Their help to Asander in Caria had been too little and too late: Diod. XIX 62. 2. 5.
28 Ib. 56. 3.
29 Welles, op. cit., no. 1. 7 ff.; see below.
30 Diod. XIX 105. 1. It is impossible to enter here into the many interesting questions concerning the policy of Antigonus and the other Macedonian leaders towards Greek states.
31 Welles, op. cit. no. 1. 1 ff.; 12 ff.; 21 ff.; 42 ff.
32 Theoretically, only until the latter attained to his majority, so that Cassander in this respect was worse off than the others (Diod. XIX 105. 1: cf. Bengtson. op. at. 89).
33 Diod. XVIII. 54. 3; ib. 68. 1.
34 Diod. XIX 61. 1 ff.
35 Diod. XX 110. 2 ff.
36 Diod. XX 106. 1 ff.
37 For allied disunity before Ipsus cf. Justin XV 2. 15.
In return Cassander might have been permitted to remain as Antigonus's general in Macedonia (Polyperchon was to be excluded from the treaty\(^{38}\)), but would of course have had to surrender the guardianship of the young king and his mother to Antigonus as regent. As further baits Antigonus may have offered to respect the position of Lysimachus in Thrace, an important matter for the future security of Cassander's own position.\(^39\)

Naturally, in the absence of sufficient evidence this reconstruction is quite hypothetical and is merely offered as a suggestion. But, whatever the correct solution, it will have to take account of two considerations: (1) Antigonus's position in 313 (before Gaza) was more favourable than in 311 (after Gaza), irrespective of minor changes in Greece, such as the defection of Alexander, son of Polyperchon, and the inconclusive campaigns of Polemaeus and Telesphorus; (2) for that reason he would, on the earlier occasion (313), be inclined to impose harsher terms, and Cassander, in turn, be more likely to accept them than after Gaza. Moreover, the likelihood that a demarche regarding Greek autonomy was made by Antigonus at this time can scarcely be denied. The campaign for Greek autonomy had been the chief article of his policy ever since the Tyre decree of 315: it had rendered him good service during the fighting in Asia Minor, and had undoubtedly won him many friends in the Aegean and in Europe; the Bocotian and Aetolian alliances, in particular, are good evidence of its success.\(^40\) In 311 he insisted upon the insertion of a clause guaranteeing Greek autonomy, for his own propaganda purposes rather than in hopes of securing a strategic gain thereby; and the whole of his letter to Scepsis provides ample proof of his keen interest in this aspect of the political situation. Briefly expressed, his argument is that he made peace to his own disadvantage in order to secure Greek interests, and, if the results are disproportionate to his boast, one can sense running through this remarkable letter the suppressed idea of how much more he would have done for the Greek cities if circumstances had allowed.\(^41\) Yet, more favourable circumstances had in fact presented themselves in 313, and he himself declares that he pressed their case on that occasion.\(^42\) The letter is tendentious and must be used with the greatest care, but the exploitation of the autonomy slogan by Antigonus is too well attested in our literary sources for us to doubt that it was as prominent as ever in the Hellespontine negotiations of 313.\(^43\) On the other hand, we are by no means obliged to accept a claim made a few lines later in this same letter, to the effect that there was substantial agreement between Cassander and Antigonus on the Greek question before the talks were broken up by 'certain meddlers',\(^44\) any more than we need assume that this unspecified interference played any part in Cassander's rejection of the terms proposed.\(^45\) All in all, we may say that the 'considerable concessions' offered by Antigonus on the Hellespont appeared in quite a different light to Cassander, and that the proposed alleviation of Greek distress in Europe was no less objectionable to him than the other terms put forward by Antigonus, whatever they were.

That Seleucus was not included in the Peace of 311 is the main argument of this paper. Further evidence in support of this belief will be adduced below, but at this point it may be permissible to work backwards from the assumption to see how well it fits the known facts. Assuming the fact, then, it is an irresistible deduction that Antigonus's object in concluding peace at that time was to crush Seleucus, newly restored to Babylon as the result of the defeat of Demetrius at Gaza. The record of Antigonus's hard but unsuccessful campaigns against Seleucus after 311 has been largely lost, and the Babylonian documents which attest them cause considerable difficulty to those who attempt their elucidation.\(^46\) Nevertheless, the fact of Seleucus's isolation and abandonment by his former allies is plain. Most of the blame for this desertion falls on Ptolemy, his closest friend and the man who sponsored his return to Babylon. But, when the case is examined dispassionately it is clear that Ptolemy had hardly any choice. Refusal to adhere to the terms of the Peace would have left him isolated and exposed to a full-scale, concentrated attack upon his Egyptian stronghold by Antigonus. Such a prospect naturally alarmed him, for the failure of Perdiccas in 321 did not prove that Egypt was impregnable; indeed, earlier history proved that it was not. Conversely, the diversion of large portions of Antigonus's armies to the eastern satrapies would ease the tension in the west, and so provide a welcome relief. Admittedly the position of Seleucus seemed desperate, and his overthrow merely a matter of months. Ptolemy perhaps thought that Seleucus would be able to hold his own; at any rate Seleucus had decided to take a great risk after Gaza, and there is no reason to think that his gamble was dependent upon Ptolemy continuing at war with Antigonus and refusing to sign a separate peace with him. For all that he owed to Ptolemy Seleucus would not have been so ungrateful as to embarrass him in that fashion; it
\(^{38}\) Welles, \textit{op. cit.}, no. 1, 39 ff.
\(^{39}\) Perhaps the concessions referred to in Welles, \textit{op. cit.}, no. 1, 2 f.
\(^{40}\) Dio, \textit{XIX}, 75, 6.
\(^{42}\) Welles, \textit{op. cit.}, 1 f.
\(^{43}\) On Antigonus's anxiety to win the confidence of the Greek cities by a sincere application of his autonomy policy, see Dio, \textit{XIX}, 74, 1; ib. 78, 2.
\(^{44}\) Welles, \textit{op. cit.}, 7 f.
\(^{45}\) This is clearly recognised by Welles (\textit{op. cit.}, 9). Tarn thinks that Ptolemy intervened (\textit{Camb. Anc. Hist. VI} (1927), 486). No doubt he would have hindered a separate peace if he could have done so, but it is hard to believe that such intervention, if it occurred, determined Cassander's decision. Koechler (\textit{SB Berlin} (1901), 106) thinks that friends of Cassander are meant; he does not accept that Ptolemy is meant.
is far more likely that a general agreement existed whereby each should act primarily for himself but with regard for the other man's position.\textsuperscript{47} Excluded from the Peace, the position of Seleucus certainly appeared desperate, but it had been his own choice, and his estimate of the possibilities was proved correct in the outcome. Unfortunately, the defectiveness of our records for this period makes it impossible for us to give a final and satisfactory verdict on this question. How Seleucus overcame what to all appearance were insuperable dangers with an army composed in the main of Asiatics remains one of the most exciting lost chapters of history. It is at least possible to make out that the failure of Antigonus to crush Seleucus in the eastern satrapies was the turning point in his fight for the empire.

After the signing of the Peace Antigonus must have been congratulating himself on having outmanoeuvred Ptolemy by his separate agreement with Cassander and Lysimachus, whereby he had forced Ptolemy to sacrifice Seleucus.\textsuperscript{48} It is true that Antigonus's diplomatic skill was matched by the cunning of Ptolemy in using the autonomy slogan against its author, when he fomented (or sought to foment) disaffection among the Greek cities in Antigonus's own territory,\textsuperscript{49} but those movements can have had but little effect on the course of operations further east. The decision of Antigonus to admit Ptolemy to the Peace does not indicate any great strategical sacrifice on his part; he had chosen to take the offensive in the east and not in the south, a deliberate choice and strategically correct. The Peace by isolating Seleucus gave Antigonus a great strategic gain, or so it must have seemed at the time.\textsuperscript{50} Naturally there is nothing about this in the letter to Scepsis; there is only the vague reference to the sacrifice involved in admitting Ptolemy to the Peace.\textsuperscript{51} But, after all, it is not to be expected that Antigonus should take the Greek cities into his full confidence. Nevertheless, the conclusion cannot be avoided that this and other passages in the letter are strikes examples of dissembling, even of hypocrisy, on his part. This diplomatic shrewdness is one side of the man's character, the other being his arrogance and ruthlessness, disfigurements that spoilt the skill of his diplomacy by making him insist on excessively harsh terms from Cassander in 313 and 302, and perhaps also from Ptolemy in 314 (at Ecregma).

\textbf{Summary and Conclusion.}

Since Antigonus had already agreed on terms of peace with Cassander and Lysimachus in the agreement drawn up in 311, before Ptolemy made a belated adhesion to them also, it seems certain that Cassander and Lysimachus had sacrificed Seleucus before Ptolemy had time to make representations on his behalf. If the explanation given above is correct—that the Ecregma negotiations had broken down on Ptolemy's insistence that Seleucus be covered in any settlement between himself and Antigonus—the isolation of Ptolemy and a speedy coming to terms with Cassander and Lysimachus were natural objects of Antigonus's policy. In this way Ptolemy was presented with a \textit{fait accompli} in the form of a peace agreement the terms of which were already fixed, and he was given no room for manoeuvre; the draft had to be accepted as it stood or not at all. Ptolemy was compelled to admit his military inferiority to Antigonus and give up hope of securing the inclusion of Seleucus. Seen in this light, the exclusion of Seleucus from the Peace was the direct result of the allies' failure to negotiate as a united body, the reasons for which have been already considered.\textsuperscript{52}

There is, then, no need to assume that the phrase \textit{ἀργυρεύσα τίς} \\'Ασίως πατης implied the possibility of Seleucus maintaining the right to occupy a subordinate position under Antigonus, the acknowledged strategos of Asia, still less that the clause had been deliberately so worded under the influence of Ptolemy.\textsuperscript{53} The correct explanation is that which is also the most natural: Seleucus was formally excluded from the peace treaty, in so far as the omission of his name from the text amounts to that. Antigonus's immediate attack on him was, therefore, in no sense a violation of the peace treaty. This is confirmed by the fact that when Ptolemy wished to bring aid to his hard-pressed friend by a diversionary attack on the southern coast of Asia Minor, the best excuse that he could think of for breaking the peace was the somewhat unconvincing charge that Antigonus had disregarded in his territories the fifth clause of the treaty,\textsuperscript{54} which guaranteed autonomy to Greek cities, a charge that completely overlooked the tender susceptibilities of Cassander on that subject, for Cassander throughout this period was the most persistent oppressor of Greek liberty. And so this incident too provides us with a good indirect proof that Ptolemy had not been consulted

\textsuperscript{47} It was probably a relief to both of them to be separated. A man of Seleucus's calibre could not continue as a subordinate indefinitely, and Ptolemy had a short way of dealing with dangerous men (c.f. his treatment of Polemaeus in 309 (Diod. XX 27.3)).
\textsuperscript{48} Diod. XX 19. 3 f.
\textsuperscript{49} Cf. Keelher, loc. cit. 1665.
\textsuperscript{50} Welles, no. 1. 32 ff.
\textsuperscript{51} Corradi's statement (\textit{Studi ellenistici} (1929), 18) that the allies conducted the war in full accord is at variance with the facts of the separate negotiations on the Hellespont and at Ecregma; when he says that there is no authority for supposing that they concluded peace separately he flatly ignores what is said in Antigonus's letter to Scepsis (reproduced correctly, e.g. by Tarn, \textit{Camb. Anc. Hist. VI}, 488).
\textsuperscript{52} As Memigliano does (see above p. 25); c.f. Bengtson, \textit{op. cit.} I, 117 f.; Heuss, \textit{Hermes} (1938), 133 n. 9. The whole idea of a secret or silent agreement to protect the interests of Seleucus seems unacceptable for the simple reason that the uncertainty created would have more or less invalidated the treaty from the start. The test case shows that Ptolemy on renewing the war could not plead the violation of any such agreement by Antigonus (see below).
\textsuperscript{53} Diod. XX 19. 3 f.
by Cassander in the negotiations that led up to the Peace. Cassander had neglected his feelings and interests in 311; what more natural than that he should neglect those of Cassander in re-opening the war with an agitation on behalf of Greek autonomy? 54

The general result, as I see it, is as follows. Antigonus by the Peace of 311 was able to secure as great a strategical gain as was possible by diplomacy alone. All that remained to do was to crown diplomatic victory by a forcible elimination of the isolated Seleucus, and so undo the unfortunate consequences of the defeat at Gaza in 312. This, the essential consummation of the Peace of 311 (to Antigonus its raison d'être), proved beyond his powers. The ultimate failure of Antigonus’s fight for the empire was not the result of political or diplomatic weakness (in those fields he was far ahead of his opponents); in the strictest sense it was a military failure, and the most momentous and also the least expected failure of all was that against the weakest of his enemies in the years following 311. 55
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54 Ptolemy had made an autonomy proclamation in 315 in imitation of Antigonus (Diod. XIX 67, 1). There is no reason to think that Cassander was consulted then. For Ptolemy, with scarcely any Greek cities in his own territory, it was a cheap tactic.

55 Cf. the penetrating remarks of Rostorff in the same sense, Soc. Ref. Hist. of the Hellenistic World (1941), 13 ff. Tarr’s view of all these events seems to be similar to that expressed in the present paper, though he is forced to deal only briefly with each development (Camb. Anc. Hist. VI (1927), 486–95).

Droysen, working without the Scepsis letter or the Babylonian evidence, recognised part of the truth. He believed that the allies had been compelled to make peace on surprisingly unfavourable terms because of their lack of co-operation; he even believed in a separate peace preceding the combined peace, but supposed that it was with Ptolemy (the wrong way round). Above all Droysen has the merit of recognising clearly that Seleucus was not included in the Peace and that Antigonus made peace in order to attack Seleucus (op. cit. II 11, 61 ff.).
KLEOMENES, MARATHON, THE HELOTS, AND ARKADIA

Plato says that the Spartans arrived one day late for Marathon because they were at the time engaged in a war against Messene, and he hints that they had other difficulties too. As there is no mention of this revolt of the Messenians in Herodotos or Thucydides, or in any later historian, it is generally supposed that Plato (whose historical references are notoriously inaccurate) was simply mistaken about it. Nevertheless, two curious facts seem to support him: Zankle was seized about this time by Anaxilas of Rhegion and renamed Messene because, says Pausanias, Messenians fleeing from the Spartans after an unsuccessful revolt formed the bulk of his forces; secondly, Strabo says that the second Messenian War was the one in which Tyrraios was engaged, and that there were two later wars between Messene and Sparta—the last of these, the fourth, was presumably the one which followed the earthquake of 465; the third may then be Plato's war in 490. These two supporting indications have not convinced most historians, for Thucydides gives a different explanation of the renaming of Zankle,4 and Strabo does not clearly and definitely refer to a revolt in 490. It has also seemed surprising that no authors earlier than Strabo and Pausanias should have preserved the tradition of the war. The question has often been discussed, most recently and fully by Jacoby, who decides that the revolt is a fiction.5

I wish to suggest that the case for a Messenian revolt in 490 has been considerably strengthened by two minor facts, both based on contemporary evidence, which have recently been established with some degree of probability by papers in this Journal: the date of the siege and renaming of Zankle by Anaxilas (and the Messenians) has been shown by Mr. E. S. G. Robinson to be 489-8,6 and it has been shown by Miss L. H. Jeffery that the Spartan dedication at Olympia for victory over the Messenians 'in their second revolt' (IG V.1, 1562) is probably earlier than 465 (the date hitherto usually assumed for it), that it indeed should belong very early in the century.7 We thus have contemporary epigraphical evidence (not entirely certain) that there was a helot revolt early in the fifth century, and numismatic evidence (highly probable) that 489 is the date when Zankle was renamed Messene. The two arguments are quite independent of each other and of the passage in Plato; they are accordingly strong additional reasons for believing that there was a helot revolt in 490.

This revolt, if it occurred, was, probably, as Dickins long ago maintained,4 provoked or assisted by the exiled Spartan king Kleomenes, for he was in Arkadia at the time, vigorously engaged in stirring up trouble for the Spartan Government.9 He probably succeeded, as I shall try to show, in forming an anti-Spartan League among the cities of Arkadia. It has been considered surprising that Kleomenes' activities in Arkadia, which are usually treated as abortive, should have so alarmed the Spartans that they recalled him to resume his duties. If, however, Kleomenes had both stirred

---

1 Laus iii 692d, and, especially, 696a: βοστην ανάδειξην ἱδέαν πλήρη γε ᾽Ακατασκόμιον ὁποῖον ἐν ὑπέρ τοῦ πρὸς Μέσσην ὁποὺς τὸ πόλεμον καὶ ἐς τὴν εἰκασίαν ἄλλος σώματος—οὕς γε τούτος γεγονότας εἰς ὑπέρ τοῦ τούτῳ τοίνυν γιαχομένου μὴ εἴμαι. Does the vague reference to other Spartan difficulties perhaps refer to the formation of the Arkadian League (see below), or, more generally, to their difficulties with Kleomenes?

2 Pausanias iv 25: After the capture of Ira in their second war with Sparta (with Pausanias dates to the 28th Olympiad—668 B.C.) the Messenians who had not been captured by the Spartans decide to found a colony, and accept the invitation of Anaxilas of Rhegion (who was tyrant there from 494 to 476) to help him conquer Zankle; they do this (in the 29th Olympiad) and change the name of Zankle to Messene. The chronological confusion was pointed out by Bentley in the Dissertation on the Epistles of Phalaris, etc. (1867, enlarged edition 1899). See also Diodorus xvi. 66; 'τοῖς δὲ ἣς ᾽Εκκλησία Μέσσην τὴν ἐκ τῶν εὐθείων ὁμοιωθέντην καταφέρσαντας.'

3 Strabo viii 4, 10: ἵπτε μνή σοῦ τοῦ Τυρταίου δέσποτας ὑπήρθε πόλεμος; τρίτον δὲ καὶ τέταρτον συναφῆς φαίνεται, ὡς καὶ κατασκευή τῆς Μεσσηνίας.

4 Thuc. vi 4, 6: τοῖς δὲ Σάμοις Ἀναλέξεις Ῥηγίος τύραννος ὁ πόλεως δέσποτας ἐκβάλλει καὶ τὴν πόλιν ὄντος εύμετρος ἀνακάμπτει Μέσσην ἀπὸ τῆς ταύτης τοῦ ἀρχαίου πατρίδος αὐτών. The reason is different, but not incompatible.

5 Frag. Gr. Hist. IIIa (1943), pp. 109-81. With some difference I make the following general remarks about Jacoby's discussion. There seems to be no guarantee that 'A' is the only intermediate source used by Pausanias, or that Rhianos and 'the vulgarra' plus some Myron were 'A's only sources. Moreover, if Pausanias' sources are as thoroughly mixed in his narrative as Jacoby holds, it is obviously difficult to feel certain about their identification and to know exactly what comes from which. Jacoby's argument seems to depend on the assumption that our information about the sources available to Pausanias, and used by him, is approximately complete.

6 The attempt at Quellenforschung must, of course, be made, and Jacoby's analysis is very attractive; it is still a question how much real confidence one can have in the results in detail. But when every allowance is made for the uncertainties, Jacoby's conclusion that Rhianos dated the revolt of the Messenians led by Aristomenes to the early fifth century seems highly probable. It means that none of the much longer clear that this early fifth-century revolt must be pronounced a fiction in toto. Whether the Messenian revolts were two or three in number is surely a literary rather than an historical question—there must, in three centuries of oppression, have been more than that, although perhaps only two or three of them could properly be called 'wars'. Both Plato and Rhianos put a Messenian revolt early in the fifth century, and it is surely more likely that they had some tradition of an inscription at that time to go on than that they had none. This a priori consideration is supported by various definitive indications, especially now by the date of the change of name at Zankle, and by the probable date of the Olympia dedication: see notes 6 and 7 below.

7 Rhianos, Zankle-Messana and the Samians', by E. S. G. Robinson, JHS LXVI (1936), pp. 13-21. Robinson shows good reason to believe that the Samians who seized the town in 494/3 struck only five numbered and probably annual issues of coin before being ousted by Anaxilas, an event which will thus have occurred in 489, or possibly in 488.

8 'Comments on some archaic Greek inscriptions', by L. H. Jeffery, JHS LXIX (1949), pp. 25-38, and see pp. 26-30. Miss Jeffery shows that the letter forms of the inscription can hardly be dated as late as 465; thus the dedication should not be related to the revolt which followed the earthquake. The letter forms certainly seem too early for a date near the middle of the century, but unfortunately there is little comparative material available.

up a helot revolt and succeeded in organising an anti-Spartan Arkadian League, the Spartan authorities may well have felt that the first step in dealing with the situation was to entice him back to Sparta and do away with him. Many scholars have believed that Kleomenes was murdered; 10 the motives for such a murder were stronger than has been realised.

There is perhaps no need to discuss again in detail the credibility of the helot revolt of 490—the coins and the inscription should help to convince the sceptics—but it is worth while to present the numismatic evidence for the contemporary foundation of an Arkadian League, since it has never, I think, been given its proper weight. What little is known about the history of Arkadia in the late sixth and early fifth centuries is soon recapitulated. About the middle of the sixth century Sparta had been successful in a long war against Tegea, which was followed, apparently, by the reduction of Orchomenos and the rest of the Arkadian towns or cantons. These places retained an at least nominal independence, and two of them, Heraia and Mantinea, issued coins in their own names before the end of the century. Probably in 490 Kleomenes (who had fled from Sparta some time in 491, about a year before the battle of Marathon, and had retired at first to Thessaly) came to Arkadia and united, or at least tried to unite, the Arkadians against Sparta—νεωτέρα ἐπήγαγον πρήγματα, συνιστάσας τοὺς Ἀρκαδοὺς ἐπί τῇ Σπάρτῃ—binding their chief men to him by terrible oaths (Her. vi 74—5). Strangely enough, this incident, though mentioned by R. Weil in the first of his two important articles, 11 has never been connected with the beginning of the Arkadian issues, of which it is so obvious an explanation—Herodotos says that Kleomenes united the Arkadians, and the coins show that the league he formed was effective and lasting.

The coinage of the Arkadians, inscribed ΑΡΚΑΔΙΚΟΝ (in full or abbreviated), was struck in small denominations only—tribols, mostly, with occasional obols and hemibols—but specimens are of frequent occurrence, attractive and varied in type, and well known to collectors and students. Imhoof-Blumer attributed them to the mint of Heraia, the early coins of which he was the first to identify, and as they fit very neatly into the long gap between the earlier and later issues of this small Arkadian canton, all later scholars have followed him in this. Weil has considered the coinage at some length. He was originally inclined to hold that the coins were only temple, sanctuary, or festival issues 12 (the idea is vague, and it is hard to find a word for it), but he later came to emphasise the economic and political implications of the ‘panarkadian’ coinage; 13 he explained our lack of information about the ‘altarkadische Gemeinwesen’ by Sparta’s ‘Vorherrschaft’ in the Peloponnesos and her unwillingness to recognise a league among states which she preferred to deal with individually. He nevertheless stopped short of considering the league as a fully political entity, and emphasised the fact that the Arkadian cantons sent individual contingents to Thermopylae (Her. vii 202), and appear widely separated in the inscription on the Plataia tripod. Later scholars have stressed the religious aspects as opposed to the political aspect of the coinage; Babelon is the most explicit of them: ‘Les Héraéens,—les monnaies nous l’attestent,—devenus présidents des jeux Arcadiques, firent frapper des monnaies dont la légende appelait le complément suivant: Ἀρκαδικῶν ἀγώνων σήμα (οὐ κόμισα, οὐ χρακτήρ) οὐ Ἀρκαδικῶν ἀγώνων εἰμὶ σήμα. . . . La légende ΑΡΚΑΔΙΚΟΝ ne doit pas s’expliquer autrement; il serait contraire à l’histoire de supposer, par exemple, l’existence d’une ligue politique arcadienne qui eût fait frapper ces monnaies auxquelles on reconnaîtrait ainsi un caractère fédéral. Une parcellité confédérée n’a pu exister au ve siècle.’ 14 Gardner in 1918 said that the hemidrachms of Heraia were probably struck in connexion with the festival of Zeus Lycaeus at Lycosura, and passed among the Arkadians as a sort of religious coinage; 15 they were succeeded by the coins inscribed ΑΡΚΑΔΙΚΟΝ, which seem to show that Heraea was regarded as the leading city of Arcadia. 16 And Selman in 1933 called the Arkadian issues ‘priestly rather than civic, . . . religious and agonistic in character’. 17 Head, too, treats the coins as evidence of a religious but not of a political federation, although he says of the early coinage of Phokis that ‘like the archaic money of Arcadia it is distinctly federal in character’. 18 The numismatists have hesitated to attribute coins to a league which the historians did not recognise, and the historians have naturally followed the numismatists in supposing that the coins were somehow struck for the festival of Zeus Lykaios or for the Arkadian games, 19 yet both illogically slur the

10 Beloch (Gr. Gesch. II. 1, 2nd ed., p. 96) says: ‘Wahrscheinlich haben ihn die Ephoren aus dem Wege gebracht, im Einverständnis mit seinem Stiefbruder, Leonidas und Kleombrotos.’ Similarly, Mitchell and Caspari (George Grote, A History of Grote, ed. M. & C., London n.d.—1907, p. 176) say ‘it may be suspected that Herodotus’ account of Kleomenes’ death covers a piece of foul play on the part of the Ephors’, and Monro expresses the same suspicion in CAH IV, pp. 261—2.
12 JfN IX, p. 20: ‘Da ein politisches Centrum in Arkadien vor der Erbauung von Megalopolis nicht existiert hat, muss der Prägert der arkadischen Landesmünzen während der älteren Zeit gesucht werden bei einem der gemeinsamen Stammekeiligthämer des Landes.’ That coins were struck for, and somehow put into circulation at, religious festivals is a frequent assumption of numismatists; money, however, is surely more often brought to fairs and festivals than carried away from them—it is the visitors who do the purchasing.
13 JfN XXIX, pp. 144—5.
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distinction, and slip into thinking of the Arkadian issues as somehow ‘political’ as well as ‘religious’.

Weil dated the coins early—roughly from 520 to 420—and was followed in this by Hiller (Sv. Arkadia in RE), by Six (NC 1865), and by Head in the first edition of Historia Numorum (1883); Seitzmann holds that the series begins ‘about 500’; Gardner says ‘about the time of the Persian Wars’; the dates usually accepted now are c. 490 to c. 417—60 Imhoof-Blumer, Babelon, Head in his second edition, etc. But the various dates suggested for the beginning of the series all rest on ‘style’, and are admittedly only approximate.

The decision of both numismatists and historians to regard the coinage as primarily ‘religious’ is partly due to the analogy of the ‘festival’ coins of Elis (which are of larger denominations and one small issue is inscribed ΟΥΜΙΤΙΚΩΝ), but chiefly to the supposed fact that the Arkadian League was first founded by Lykomedes in 970. Moreover, the complete lack of any reference to Heraia, either in literature or in inscriptions, between the time of her sixth-century treaty with Elis 19 and the beginning of the fourth century has naturally made scholars hesitate to assign her a leading position in Arkadia—Weil, in particular, recommends the cultivation of this matter of the *ars nesciendi*. Yet we know very little of any kind about Arkadia in the sixth and fifth centuries, ‘festival coinages’ are not well authenticated in the classical period except, perhaps, in the special case of Olympia, and the natural interpretation of the coin is that they were issued by an Arkadian League; this interpretation is supported by their small denominations and by the numbers in which they are found—small numerous coins are far more likely to have been issued to pay troops than to serve as ‘souvenirs’ for a sparsely attended festival. 20 When to these general considerations one adds the fact that we happen to know that Kleomenes did form some kind of Arkadian League at the very time to which the earliest Arkadian coins are in any case to be attributed, and that there are later traces of such a league, it seems foolish to resist, on an argumentum ex silento, the natural implication of the coinage.

It is surely no accident that we now begin to meet references to joint actions of the Arkadians. They formed part of the Spartan army at Thermopylae, and the *Αρκαδίων πάντες* were at the Isthmus under Kleombrotos later in the same year. 21 It is true, as Weil points out, that the contingents of Tegea, Orchomenos, and Mantinea fought separately at Plataea and were not listed together on the tripod (indeed the Mantineans were not listed at all): perhaps, as he suggests, the Spartans preferred to separate them. But some ten or fifteen years later Sparta had to fight a great battle at Dipaia πρὸς Αρκαδίων πάντως πάλιν Μαντιέων (Her. ix 35). 22 The fact that the Mantineans were not involved is only what we should expect, both from the long-standing enmity between Tegea and Mantinea, and from the coins themselves; for Mantinea is the one Arkadian *polis* which issues coins at the same time as the league—Heraia, Pheneos, Styphalos, and Tegea strike no coins between c. 490 when the league issues begin and late in the century when they come to an end, but all of these towns have their own coinages in the late fifth century. 23 It is hard to resist the conclusion that this obscure war was fought against Sparta by an Arkadian League (to which Mantinea did not belong) which paid its troops in its own coin.

Thus Kleomenes almost certainly organized an anti-Spartan Arkadian League, and it is

Monro in *CAH* IV (Cambridge, 1930), p. 261, etc. Grote merely says that Kleomenes ‘employed the powerful influence of his regal character and heroic lineage to arm the Arkadian people against the Spartans’, making no reference to a league. Grote’s editors, Mitchel and Casson, note that a nucleus for an Arkadian League existed in the common religious cult of Zeus Lykaon in connexion with which a federal coinage was issued at this period, but they seem not quite to believe in the league, and do not refer to it again; Caspari includes a brief notice of the Arkadian coins in his *Survey of Greek Federal Issues* in *JHS* XXXVII (1917), pp. 168-93, but he appears to accept Weil’s early date for them, and he does not mention Kleomenes.


19 The Arkadian games for which they were supposedly issued, though of great antiquity (Aristotle 49, schol. Aristides, p. 105, ed. W. Frommel, 1829, says that they were earlier than the Olympic), were not otherwise of great importance—the scanty testimonia (chiefly two or three references in Pindar, and the scholiasts ad loc.) are collected in W. Immerwahr, *Die Kleine und Mittlere Arkadien* (Leipzig, 1891), p. 5.

20 Her. viii. 71.

21 That Tegea, at least, had been hostile to Sparta for some time is clear from the fact that the Elean seer Hesiodotes took refuge there from the Spartans some time before Plataea (Her. ix 38), and that the exiled Spartan king Leotychidas spent perhaps ten years there, from 479/8 or 478/7 until his death in 462 (?)—Her. vii. 72. The best discussion of Arkadian history at this period is by A. Andrewes in *Sparta and Arkadia in the Early Fifth Century*, *The Phoenix* VI (1952), pp. 1-5. Andrewes distinguishes three stages in Tegean-Spartan relations

—the 480’s when Tegea was hostile to Sparta, the 470’s when Tegea was friendly but Mantinea was a ‘source of trouble’ (Sparta doubtless disapproved of her new, probably democratic, *synkolhes*), and the middle of the 460’s when Tegea was again hostile but Mantinea was friendly. We may perhaps equate Tegea with the Arkadian League, of which it was the strongest member. Then the ‘friendliness’ of the 470’s (or is friendliness too strong a word?) was due, at the time of Plataea to Spartan respect for the strength of the new league, and at the end of the decade to the League’s fear of the new Mantinea—Sparta found it necessary to treat the League with respect at the time of Plataea, while the League needed Spartan neutrality (and Sparta the League’s) as Mantinea and Elis grew stronger through synolism at the end of the decade. Perhaps the 470’s should be regarded rather as a period of wary co-operation; in the 460’s Mantinea exploited the essential hostility between the League and Sparta.

22 Similarly, when the Euboian League was founded and the Euboian federal coinage began in 411/0—the independent cities which composed the League struck no coins for a period of some forty years or more; when they did begin to strike in their own names again, about 405 (?)—Eretria did not do so—perhaps an indication that the league no longer had any real existence but was being maintained as a fiction by the city which had been its capital. I have discussed these matters in some detail in a forthcoming study of ‘The Euboian League and its Coinage’. The exact date when the Arkadian League issues came to an end, and the exact dates at which the individual Arkadian towns begin to strike again, are not, of course, known. Head in *Hist. Num.*, 4 assumed that there was an overlap; Weil considered that there was none.
obviously probable that he also had a finger in the helot revolt (if any); either he supported the revolt by forming the League or the League by stirring up the revolt; in either case the threat to their security is a more likely reason than religious scruples for the Spartans’ unwillingness to leave the Peloponnesos at a moment’s notice when Athens sent her urgent request for help. But somehow the threat was met, and part at least of the Spartan army marched.24 The revolt must have been suppressed, the Arkadians intimidated, and Kleomenes recalled before Pheidippides arrived, for the ephors were able to promise that help would be sent as soon as the moon was full—in a week or ten days. Why, then, did they delay at all? We do not know, but there are various possible reasons. If, for instance, considerable numbers of Spartans were still scattered about Messenia engaged in the duties of the κρυπτεῖα, it may have been clear to the ephors that it would take at least a week to collect an army, and they may not have cared to explain the real reason to the outside world. The Spartans undoubtedly had to deal with unrest among the helots more often than they wished the outside world to realise,25 and our uncertainty about this particular revolt is perhaps one result of their official secrecy.

The revolt was dealt with by force; Kleomenes was handled differently. He was recalled and reinstated on the throne—whereupon he immediately went mad and committed suicide.26 Herodotus’ whole account of Kleomenes is notoriously hostile and unsatisfactory—many historians have suspected with reason that the story of his death conceals a murder which the ephors had both arranged and hushed up. This seems even more probable if we are right that Kleomenes’ reasonable activities during his exile were not abortive, but shook the Spartan state.

W. P. WALLACE

University College,
Toronto.

24 It is unfortunately impossible to tell exactly how long an interval separates the Spartan refusal to march at once (as delivered in Sparta to Pheidippides) and the actual setting out of their 2000 hoplites. One difficulty is that there is no reason to suppose that any state’s calendar, in the early fifth century, was in step with the moon—see on this question W. K. Fritchett’s sensible remarks in ‘Julian Dates and Greek Calendars’ in CP XLII (1947), pp. 935–45, especially p. 938. Indeed, the probability is strong that all calendars were wrong to some extent, and some very wrong indeed. Thus Herodotus’ one actual date—Pheidippides’ arrival at Sparta on the ninth of the Spartan month—does not help. Plutarch’s thrice-recorded date for Marathon (and for the celebration of the victory), Boedromion 6, is often doubted (see Jacoby’s note 121 in JHS LXIV (1944), p. 62) but may well be right; if so, we have evidence that the Athenian calendar was out of step with the moon in 490/99, for Herodotus certainly implies that the battle was fought about the time of the full moon—the Spartans arrived at Athens three days after the full moon, marched to Marathon, and found the dead still unburied. As Herodotus also suggests that Pheidippides left Athens after the Persian landing at Marathon, that the battle occurred about a week after the landing, and that the Spartans arrived two or three days later, he appears to imply that the Spartans marched out about a week or at most ten days after Pheidippides’ arrival. His dates are not, however, explicit, and his relative chronology contains inherent difficulties (e.g. did Pheidippides really not leave for Sparta until Athens had received news of the Persian landing in Attica?—this difficulty is emphasised by Sotirides in Προε. ‘Αθ. VIII, 1933), so that no firm conclusions are possible.

25 There is evidence of unrest among the helots on some occasion prior to 465 in Thuc. I 128, 1, where the Athenians tell the Spartans to ‘drive out the curse of Tainaron’—οἱ γὰρ Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἀναστήσαντες πολλὰς καὶ τοῦ λαοῦ τοῦ Ποισιδίων ἅτον οἰκείον ἀπὸ Ταίναρον τῶν Ἐλλήνων λίτος αὐτοψηφίας ἐξέβαλον διὰ δὴ καὶ σπαραγμὸν ὡς ὑνήθη τῷ μέγαν σουτίμενον γαμαθόν Λακεδαιμόνιοι. It is possible that this incident was connected with the revolt of 490.

26 It is true that most historians are unwilling to accept Herodotus’ definite implication that Kleomenes’ death antedated Marathon (see Beloch, Gr. Gesch. II. 1, p. 36; Monro in CAH IV, pp. 261–2; A. Andrewes, ‘Athens and Aegina, 510–480 B.C.,’ BSA XXXVII, 1936–37, p. 4, etc.) for they feel that there is too little time between his coercion of Aigion (spring-summer 491) and the battle of Marathon, a period of rather more than a year, for his recorded movements and for a war between Athens and Aegina (Her. vi 87–93). Andrewes may well be right about the Aiginetean wars; but as far as Kleomenes himself is concerned, if his bribery of the Pythia was discovered in the summer of 491 and his flight from Sparta followed almost at once, his visit to Thessaly, his Arkadian activities, and his recall may surely belong to the autumn of 491 and the winter, spring, and summer of 490 without undue compression. Indeed, this rather close timetable shows that the helot revolt must have been suppressed very quickly, and helps to explain why it did not leave clearer traces in the tradition.
THE DURATION OF THE SAMIAN TYRANNY

Herodotus in the course of his description of Cambyses’ conquest of Egypt gives both the earliest and the only detailed account we possess of Polykrates, the tyrant of Samos. Thucydides makes a brief reference to him, also dating him to the reign of Cambyses (ἐν τῷ Καμβύςου), 530-522 B.C. Other references, as will appear, are late, scattered, and incidental. In attempting to determine the length of the Samian tyranny, Herodotus will, therefore, be our most important source of evidence. Although his interest is concentrated on the career of Polykrates, he provides enough information about Samian activities in the immediately preceding period to suggest that Polykrates is, in most cases, continuing a policy already initiated a generation before him. The difficulty of compressing into the brief period of Cambyses all that is referred to the tyranny of Polykrates is notorious, as is also the difficulty of reconciling with the usually accepted dates of Polykrates the chronological references to other people connected with the Samian tyranny. There is a similar problem about the dating of two of the great Samian works which Herodotus describes, the water tunnel of Eupalinos, and the Heraion of Rhoikos. The usual assumption that the Samian tyranny began with Polykrates’ seizure of power in the middle or late thirties is not, I think, adequate to explain the evidence. There are various indications that the Samian tyranny, or a régime at Samos which closely resembled the subsequent tyranny, had begun in the generation before Polykrates, and that Polykrates himself, because of his spirited resistance to Persia, has been credited with what was in reality the achievement of a continuous policy which had been begun earlier, perhaps by his father.

The date of Polykrates’ death can be determined with reasonable certainty. Herodotus prefixes his account of Orototes’ plot with the remark that ‘these things occurred about the time of Cambyses’ last illness’, thus fixing Polykrates’ death to ca. 522 B.C. The beginning of his power is dated by Eusebius ca. Ol. 62, 532 B.C., and many historians accept this date since Herodotus and Thucydides in putting him in the reign of Cambyses which began in 530 B.C., may be supposed to put the beginning of Polykrates’ reign little, if at all, earlier than that. Others, troubled by the difficulty of leaving a gap after the Phokaian thalassocracy, which must have ended with the capture of Phokaia by the Persians not long after the fall of Sardis, and also of accounting for all that is ascribed to Samos in this period, push back the beginning of Polykrates’ power to ca. 540 B.C. It is not placed earlier than this because Polyainos says that Polykrates and his brothers seized the tyranny with reinforcements from Lygdamis, tyrant of Naxos. Lygdamis himself had assisted Peisistratos of Athens in his final seizure of power at the Battle of Pallene, 546 B.C., and in return

1 Hdt. 3. 39-60; 120-5.
2 Thuc. 1. 13. 6. For the dates of Cambyses see R. A. Parker and W. H. D. R. Dubberstein, Babylonian Chronology 626 B.C.-AD. 45 (Chicago, 1942), 12.
3 Hdt. 3. 60.
4 Hdt. 3. 120. 1.
5 Eusebius, Chronici Canones, Armenian version ed. by J. Korsch, in Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller, Eusebius Werke, Band V (Leipzig, 1911); Jerome’s version ed. by J. K. Fotheringham, Eusebius Pamphili Chronici Canones Latine vertit ... S. Eusebius Hieronymus (Oxford, 1923). The dates given for the accession of Polykrates and his two brothers (as for many other events) differ by several years in the various MSS. of the Armenian and Latin versions; e.g. both a.a. Abr. 1481 (553 B.C.) and a.a. Abr. 1483 (532 B.C.) are found in the Armenian MSS. (Karst, op. cit. 169, n. 7). The reason for these discrepancies can easily be seen in the Bodleian MS. of Jerome, where the notice, apud Samum tyrannidem exercent tres fratres Polykrates Sylos et Pentagnostus, takes three lines, the first of which is above the line on which LIBYON is written. Some editors date the event in the last year of Ol. 61 (533 B.C.), others in the first year of Ol. 62 (532 B.C.). For the Bodleian MS., see The Bodleian Manuscript of Jerome’s Version of the Chronicle of Eusebius Reproduced in Colotype, with an introduction by J. K. Fotheringham (Oxford, 1905), Fol. 81.
6 Hdt. 3. 39.
7 Thuc. 1. 13. 6.
9 E.g. K. J. Beloch, Gr. Gesch. I. (Strassburg, 1912), 373; L. V. Hering, RE TA 2 (1909), col. 2214, who gives 540 B.C. as the date for the three brothers and 537 B.C. with a question mark for Polykrates’ sole power; P. N. Ure, OCD (Oxford, 1949), 711-12; E. L. Minar Jr., Early Pythagorean Politics (Baltimore, 1942), 2; T. Lenuchen, RE XLI 4 (1952), cols. 1727-8, argues for 538 B.C. and makes the tyranny of Polykrates coincide with a sixteen-year thalassocracy, 538-522 B.C. See below, note 31, for a discussion of the thalassocracy.
10 After Kyros captured Sardis he left Ionia for the conquest of Babylon, putting Tabalos and Paktyes in charge of Lydia and Ionia. The revolt of Paktyes followed immediately (Hdt. 4. 154). Mazarres was sent to subdue Paktyes, later he took Priene and the plain of the Meander, after which he died (Hdt. 1. 161). Harpagos was then sent to succeed him and directed a first attack on Phokaia. The Persian capture of Phokaia occurred, therefore, within one or two years of the fall of Sardis. J. L. Myres, Herodotus Father of History (Oxford, 1953), 163, places the fall of Phokaia after Kyros’ capture of Babylon (539 B.C.), but Herodotus (1. 177) seems to imply that Harpagos’ campaigns coincided with Kyros’ earlier campaigns in upper Asia and that the attack on Babylon was later. The precise date of the fall of Sardis is not known; Herodotus certainly places it later than the battle of Pallene (547/6), and his authority seems to me as reliable as any. For the variations and discussion of them see: A. T. Olmstead, History of the Persian Empire (Chicago, 1949), 49; Sidney Smith, Isaiah Chapters XL-LV, Literary Criticism and History, Schweich Lectures 1940 (London, 1944), 33-6; G. Busolt, Gr. Gesch. II, 460 and 502; H. T. Wade-Gery, JHS LXXI (1951), 219, note 38.
11 Polyainos, Stratēgikón I. 23.
12 Hdt. I. 61. 4; 64. 1-2. It is unnecessary here to argue the date of the battle of Pallene; Hdt. 5. 65. 3, ἕτοι γάρ ἂν ἄρηπαν ἐν τῇ καὶ τραγῳδίᾳ seem to be the crucial passage. For a three-year period of continuous tyranny prior to the expulsion of Hippodamus of Harkapiktai, 511/10 B.C., and thus dates the battle of Pallene in 547/6 B.C. See F. Jacoby, Attikis (Oxford, 1949), 188-86, and H. T. Wade-Gery, JHS LXXI (1951), 219.
THE DURATION OF THE SAMIAN TYRANNY

Peisistratos had subdued Naxos and handed it over to Lygdamis, depositing with him hostages of prominent Athenian families. Enough time must be allowed after Peisistratos finally established himself in 546 B.C. for him to set up Lygdamis, and then for Lygdamis to send aid to Polykrates. This is the reason why those who desert the Eusebian date of 532 B.C., supported as it seems to be by Herodotus and Thucydides, cannot put Polykrates much before 540 B.C. But, even if Polykrates is put as far back as this evidence will allow, it is not early enough to help materially towards a solution of the very difficulties which led to questioning the usual dates. We may, therefore, accept the chronographers' dates for Polykrates—ca. 532 B.C. for the beginning of his power and ca. 522 B.C. for his death—that is, as both Herodotus and Thucydides indicate, a period roughly contemporary with Kambyses of Persia (530–522 B.C.). The difficulties demand more drastic remedy.

A careful reading of Herodotus suggests that the same policy had been pursued in Samos since the time of Alyattes of Lydia and the early years of Amasis of Egypt, that is since the 560's at least. The most reasonable inference to be drawn from this continuity of policy is that the tyranny, too, had begun as early as the 560's. Ca. 525/4 B.C., when the disaffected Samian oligarchs of whom Polykrates had hoped to rid himself by sending them as his contingent for Kambyses' attack on Egypt asked for help to depose Polykrates, Herodotus tells us that Sparta was willing to assist them for two reasons: first, out of gratitude (εὐμεταξὺ δὲ ἔκτιμον), because the Samians had helped Sparta against the revolting Messenians; secondly, for the sake of revenge, because the Samians had stolen the bowl the Spartans were sending to Kroisos, and the linen corselet which Amasis of Egypt was sending to them. Corinth, similarly, joined in the attack on Polykrates because the Samians had intercepted the three hundred Corcyrean boys whom Periander had sent to Alyattes, a generation earlier and about the time of the seizure of the wine bowl. The natural interpretation of this incident is that the Samian oligarchs were able to claim Spartan gratitude for their help in the Messenian wars because Samos was under an oligarchy when the help was sent in the latter half of the seventh century; just as clearly were they able to appeal to the Spartan and Corinthian desire for revenge because the régime which had committed the thefts was the régime they were now wishing to overthrow, a tyranny which had been practising piracy since the days of Alyattes. It should be remembered that Herodotus, in describing Polykrates' career, says that he had a fleet of a hundred pentekonters with which he plundered all shipping, friend or foe, and that this piracy was the occasion of bitter complaints. It is clear that his policy was no innovation.

The significance of this incident has been overlooked. The Spartan and Corinthian willingness to help the Samian oligarchs is explicable only if the thefts were the work of Polykrates himself, or of a predecessor in a similar position, closely connected with him whose sins could justly be visited upon his head. The first alternative is difficult: Polykrates himself could hardly have committed either theft; the bowl was a gift on the occasion of the alliance made between Sparta and Kroisos shortly before the latter's fall, and Herodotus says that the theft of the corselet occurred the year before. The Corcyrean boys were a present from Periander to Alyattes, and must therefore have been sent at latest before the death of Alyattes ca. 560–555 B.C. This leaves the second alternative, that the thefts were committed under the same régime but by a predecessor of Polykrates. The obvious person would be the father of Polykrates, whose name Herodotus says was Aiakes, and to whom Suidas refers as ruling over Samos. It is true that Herodotus tells no anecdotes and gives no further information about Aiakes, but the argumentum e silentiis is particularly dangerous in the case of Herodotus, and should never be used to discredit other information he has collected. Herodotus' sources were oral tradition, which tends to gather about individuals, and often leaves gaps, even in the case of important persons and events. Moreover, his narrative is here concerned with Polykrates and his relations with Amasis and Kambyses, and a digression would be inappropriate. A similar and equally striking omission of all anecdotes or information about earlier or later members of a tyrant dynasty is to be found in the account of the Sikyonian tyranny, where two detailed stories about Kleisthenes are told, and his genealogy is the only mention of earlier members of the family; yet we know that the tyranny lasted a hundred years and that Kleisthenes had several predecessors and at least one successor.

It is therefore fortunate that we possess a monument of Aiakes which provides valuable informa-

13 Hdt. 3, 39.
15 Hdt. 5, 67–8; 6, 126–30. See Aristotle, Politics, 1313b, for the hundred-years duration of the tyranny; for the earlier and later members of the dynasty see Nic. Dam. Fr. 91; Oxyrh. Pap. XI 13655; P. Ryland 18 (Jacoby, FGH II A (Berlins, 1926), 393–60, 504–5).
16 An even more surprising omission in Herodotus, in view of the full information he has of Athenian history from the time of Peisistratos to the Persian war, is any account of the reforms of Solon, whom he mentions only in the story of his visit to Kroisos (Hdt. I. 29–33). And examples could be multiplied.
tion corroborating Herodotus’ account of Samian piracy. A headless seated statue, in style about the middle or last third of the sixth century, was discovered in 1905 in the excavation of the Samian Heraion. The statue itself, Buschor suggests, was of Hera. On the left side of the chair or throne on which the figure is seated is an inscription reading:

Αδάκης ἀνέθηκεν ὁ Βρούσωνος ὁς τῇ Ἡραὶ·

τὴν σύλην ἐπήρεον κατὰ τὴν ἐπιστροφήν.

‘Dedicated by Aiakes, the son of Bryson, who secured the booty for Hera while he was ἐπιστροφής.’ The inscription was thought by Curtius, who first published it, to be contemporary with the statue; but comparison of its letter forms with other sixth-century Samian inscriptions and the fact that it is written stoichedon have led to the opinion that the inscription was cut later, soon after 500 B.C. Dittenberger suggests that the younger Aiakes, son of Syloson, who was restored as tyrant of Samos by the Persians after the collapse of the Ionian revolt in 494 B.C., had the inscription cut on his grandfather’s monument. The younger Aiakes, reestablished by Persia on a reluctant Samos, may well have cut the inscription about his grandfather in order to stress the legitimacy of his own position and the fact that the power had been in the hands of his family for three generations.

The inscription makes three contributions to our knowledge of Aiakes. First, the use of the rare word σύλη found in the singular only in this inscription, and its reappearance in the unusual name of Polykrates’ brother Syloson, make it almost certain that this Aiakes is the father of Polykrates; secondly, it corroborates the fact that he pursued the same semi-piratical commercial policy as his son; and finally, the phrase κατὰ τὴν ἐπιστροφήν indicates the position Aiakes held while he exercised what later generations called a tyranny. In very few cases do we know the actual office which a tyrant held, although it seems probable that either a specially created office or a regular magistracy was usually used as the legal basis for a power in reality more far-reaching. That Aiakes called himself ἐπιστροφής is, therefore, of great interest.

Plutarch tells of the overthrow of the Samian aristocracy of γεωμόροι, ca. 600 B.C. by a faction under the leadership of the generals who had successfully defended Perinthos against a Megarian attack. He does not say, however, what type of government was then set up. There may well have been a period of stasis during which Aiakes found the opportunity to seize a predominating position which may have been inoffensively, even democratically, described as that of ἐπιστροφής. Polykrates, we know, had brothers to get rid of before he could establish his position. The very fact that Aiakes’ three sons share the Samian tyranny for a time is evidence in favour of an inherited rather than of a newly acquired power. Herodotus in two places uses the word ἐπιστροφής of Polykrates when he first tried to obtain control of Samos, adding in the second passage the detail that he had only fifteen hoplites to assist him. Polyainos gives a more detailed account of the festival of Hera during which the three brothers disarmed the citizens and seized the citadel of Astypalaea; Lygdamis of Naxos later brought the reinforcements with which their power was finally secured. How long the three brothers shared the rule Herodotus does not say; that it was a brief period is suggested by his narrative. After stating that Polykrates in the beginning shared the kingdom with his brothers, Herodotus in the same sentence recounts how, having killed Pantagnotos and banished Syloson, he held the whole island. It is not surprising that there should have been trouble both at the death of Aiakes and later between the three brothers, although it would be strange to have a coup d’état planned and carried through by three conspirators who were at odds with each other from the beginning. The use of the word ἐπιστροφής need indicate no more than that Aiakes’ power lapsed briefly on his death, and that Polykrates had to employ the stratagem which Polyainos describes to regain control for himself and his brothers. One need not press the word, as Bowra does, into meaning only a first seisure of power, and rule out thereby the possibility of Aiakes having been tyrant before his sons.

Herodotus mentions two other features of Polykrates’ policy which seem on examination to go back to the preceding generation, and which strengthen the probability that the tyranny began

---

20 L. Curtius, ‘Samiaica I’, Ath. Mitt. 31 (1936), 151–85, Pl. XIV; E. Buschor, Altamischen Stammbilder (Berlin, 1934), 41, with figs. 141–3. Buschor dates the statue about the middle of the sixth century. Miss Richter, Archiv Grecia Art Against Its Historical Background (New York, 1949), 169, places it on stylistic grounds a little later, in the last third of the sixth century.

21 For a full bibliography see M. N. Tod, A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions (Oxford, 1946), 10 and 296, No. 7. Dittenberger in SIG 1 (Leipzig, 1915), 9–10, No. 10; and 18–19, No. 20, agrees with Pontow about the early fifth-century dating of the inscription because of the stoichedon style and the letter forms, especially the straight-barred alpha. This is followed by Scheele, Arch. Berl. 1929, 3, 22 and Bilabel, Neue Heidelberger Jahrbächer, 1934, 133 IV. Ehrenberg, TH 71 (1937), 149, n. 7. Ehrenberg observes that Bilabel was the first to suggest that the word ἐπιστροφή denotes a political office rather than the position of a temple-guardian.

22 Hdt. 6. 25.

23 This brother of Polykrates is, so far as I can discover, the only person known to have borne the name: Pape and Benseler, Wörterbuch der Griechischen Eigennamen II, 1436–7, s.v. (Zieosos).

24 Cf. Pityakos of Lesbos who was ὕπατος, although Alkaios can call him ἱεροσις (Aristotle, Politics, 1259a, 9–10); Peisistratos of Athens had probably been polemarch in the wars with Megara, and was therefore a member of the Areopagites. His care to have members of his family and party hold the archonship and become Areopagites suggests that he worked through the Areopagites (Thuc. 6. 54. 6).

25 Plutarch, Greek Questions 57 (Moralia 303E–304C).

26 Hdt. 3. 39. 1; ἐν ψυχῇ Ἑμῶν ἐπιστροφής and 3. 120. 3; παρακείμενον for ἡμῶν ἑπεκείμενον in both cases, see my edition, p. 53.

27 Polyainos I, 23, 2.

then. The friendship between Polykrates and Amasis of Egypt is famous; yet, when describing Naukratis which Amasis made the Greek trading post for Egypt, Herodotus says that Samos was one of the three Greek cities which had separate sanctuaries there, the other nine cities which traded with Egypt shared in a common sanctuary, the Hellenion. This would seem to indicate that the Samian friendship with Egypt dates back to the period before the conquest of the Greek cities of the Asia Minor coast by Persia, when they were all trading freely with Naukratis and built both the Hellenion and the separate sanctuaries, probably in the 560's.

Like Samian friendship with Egypt, the beginnings of Samian sea-power should be dated to the generation before Polykrates; in all probability Polykrates inherited from a predecessor the fleet of a hundred penteconters which Herodotus says he had at the beginning of his tyranny and later replaced by triremes. The Thalassocracy List in Eusebius' Chronicon places Samos' sea-power after that of Phokaia. As was pointed out earlier, Phokaia must have ceased to command the sea when she was captured by the Persians soon after the fall of Sardis. The Samian thalassocracy must, therefore, have begun when that of Phokaia ended in the second half of the 540's, well before the time of Polykrates. In this the independent testimony of Herodotus and of the Thalassocracy List concur. In my opinion the Thalassocracy List cannot be used either to fix a more precise date for the beginning of the Samian thalassocracy nor to determine its exact duration. Since the List has been much discussed and attempts have been made to derive from it both date and duration, it is necessary at this point to digress and examine it.

The 'List of Thalassocracies', ascribed to Diodorus, appears in the Chronographia, one of the two books of Eusebius' Chronicon. It purports to give in order the seventeen powers that ruled the sea from the Trojan to the Persian War, with the years of the duration of each power. Only the Armenian version of the List is preserved, and this is defective. The name is omitted in the tenth place (Cares), and the years of duration are missing in places VIII-XI (Aegypti, Milesii, Cares, Lesbii) and again in XIII (Samii). Myres thinks that there was an early lacuna in the List at its middle point which involved damage to the name column as well. Working back from the end, where the years are preserved, the List can be reconstructed as follows: XVII Aeginetans (10 years), 490-480; XVI Eretrians (15 years), 505-490; XV Naxians (10 years), 515-505; XIV Lacedaemonians (2 years), 517-515. The Samian thalassocracy (XIII) ends, then, according to the List in 517; which is the time when the Persians captured Samos from Mihandros, Polykrates' successor, and set up Sylosos. No years of duration for Samos are provided by the List, nor is it possible to calculate the duration by working down from the earlier part, because of the lacuna in the middle portion; the Phokaian (XII) preceded the Samians with forty-four years, but for the Lesbians (XI), Carians (X), and Milesians (IX) no years of duration are preserved. The only information about the Samian thalassocracy in the List itself is, therefore, that the forty-four-year Phokaian sea-power (the dates of which are lost) was followed by the Samian and the Samian by the Spartan in 517.

The other book of Eusebius' Chronicon, the Chronicorum Canones or Canons, a chronological table extending from the birth of Abraham to the twelfth year of Constantine, is preserved in the Armenian version, a few entries in a Syriac version, a Latin version by Jerome, and quotations in Syncellus and other writers. The thalassocracies are entered here and there in the Canons, and attempts have been made to reconstruct the whole List with precise dates by combining with the List these thalassocracy-entries in the Canons. But, as Myres pointed out, the List is not treated as an organic whole and incorporated into the Canons with the same durations, nor even consecutively. On the contrary, there are both many omissions and many discrepancies between the List and the Canons-entries: e.g. in Jerome's version no thalassocracies are quoted after the Lesbian until the end of the List where the Aeginetans are given twenty years instead of the ten of the List; in the same portion of the Armenian version the Aeginetans (VIII), Milesians (IX), and Naxians (XV) are omitted entirely, and no duration is assigned to the Samians (XIII). These differences are so great as to suggest that the List and the Canons dates for the thalassocracies are derived from different chronological sources. The List should, therefore, be treated by itself and the evidence of the Canons added to it only where the two agree.

Neglect in observing this caution has produced a surprising result in the case of Samos where the entry of the Samian thalassocracy in the Armenian version of the Canons has been combined with the List in an attempt to secure precise dates. The thalassocracy appears in the Armenian Canons with the ordinal numeral XVI instead of the XIII of the List, under the year of Abraham 1486, 590 B.C.

For friendship with Amasis see Hdt. 2. 182; 3. 39-42; Naukratis, a. 178; C. Roebuck, 'Grain Trade between Greece and Egypt', CP 45 (1950), 236-47, discusses relations between the eastern Greek cities and Egypt in the sixth century. Hdt. 3. 39; 31; if. 44. 2. J. A. Davison, 'The First Greek Triremes', CQ 41 (1947), 18-34, argues convincingly that the forty triremes which Polykrates sent to Egypt ca. 505-504 B.C. were part of the first navy of triremes, and that Polykrates played an important part in the change from penteconters to triremes.

For discussion of the List see: J. L. Myres, JHS XXVI (1906), 84-190; XXVII (1907), 182-201; Herodotean History, 163, 193, 195, 196-9; J. K. Fotheringham, JHS XVII (1907), 75-89; W. Halbman, Re proceeded as to the Eginetans before F. Bork, Klio 28 (1933), 16-20; W. Kubitschek, RE XX (1919), cols. 2584-5; Kastor; T. Luschaut, RE XXI (1929), cols. 1777-34; S. Stobart; Polykrates.
Jerome's version throws no light on the corruption of the numeral; it names no thalassocrats from the Lesbians (XI) to the Aeginetans (XVII). Myres suggested that the numeral XVI had been transferred by mistake from the column of durations to the ordinal column and represented an attempt to calculate the duration numeral of the Samians by simple subtraction. A sixteen-year thalassocracy ending in 517 would begin in 533; i.e., about the date of Polykrates' accession which is noted in the MSS. of the Armenian version under a.a. Abr. 1481 (535) or 1484 (532). This has been regarded as a corroboration of Myres' suggestion, and the 'sixteen-year thalassocracy of Samos' has become a commonplace.

And this in spite of Myres' own insistence on the independence of the List from the Canons, and on the fact that from the Spartan thalassocracy upward we are thrown back so far as dates are concerned on external evidence.

It is clear, however, that the Phokaian sea-power was brought to an end by the Persian capture of the city at a date not exactly determinable, but soon after 546; the Samian thalassocracy followed upon it. The exact number of years for the duration of the latter is not given in the List nor can it be derived from the Canons, but it must be considerably more than sixteen since the period must extend from soon after 546 to the capture of Samos from Maiaandrios ca. 517. Aly, realising that the historical evidence pointed to this conclusion, suggested that the entry in the Canons was inserted in connexion with Polykrates at the middle point of the thalassocracy, and that an equal period before and after should be assumed. This complicated reckoning is itself unlikely, and is necessary only because of the assumption of the 'sixteen-year thalassocracy'. More serious objection can be urged against Helm's suggestion that the Phokaian thalassocracy lasted until the battle of Alalia and the expulsion of the Phokaions from Corsica ca. 535. Bork, on the other hand, assumed a corruption in the numeral XVI for the duration of the Samian thalassocracy and corrected it to twenty-seven years (544–517). This yields highly probable dates for the thalassocracy, but is mainly derived not from the List but from the narrative of Herodotus. Lenschau, in the latest discussion of the problem, reduces the period again by terminating the Phokaian thalassocracy with the battle of Alalia ca. 538, four years after the fall of Phokaia, and lengthening the Spartan thalassocracy to seven years, 522–515. He thus preserves the sixteen-year thalassocracy of Samos, 538–522, which he thinks coincides with the tyranny of Polykrates. A recognition that the List provides no date for the beginning of the thalassocracy other than its position after the fall of Phokaia, and no exact duration (certainly not sixteen years) would have rendered unnecessary these elaborate calculations and devious shifts to reconcile the supposed evidence of the List with the narrative of Herodotus.

Thucydides is probably referring to this period which later tradition included under the Phokaian and Samian thalassocracies in Book I, where he says: 'The Ionians possessed great naval strength in the reign of Kyros, the first king of the Persians, and of his son Kambyses, and while they were at war with Kyros for some time commanded their own sea.' Later writers also speak of war between the Samians and Kyros. It is not unlikely that both Thucydides and these later writers refer to resistance offered to Persia by Phokaia and Samos directly after the fall of Lydia. When Phokaia was taken and Persia occupied the Asia Minor coast, Herodotus says: '... and when the Ionians of the islands saw their brethren upon the mainland subjugated they also, driving the like, gave themselves up to Kyros.' This suggests that Samos made at least a token submission to Persia at this time, and that Persia which had no navy of account until the Phoenician and Egyptian navies came into its service on the conquest of Egypt did not protest against the Samian naval activity. The same situation still prevailed when Polykrates offered his services to Kambyses for the expedition against Egypt, begging him not to omit to ask aid from Samos. Over hostile action against Persia, and aggressive extension of Samian authority in the Aegean should be dated, as Parke has argued, only to the last years of Polykrates' life. What might be described as a policy of non-aggression characterised Samian—Persian relations during most of the period; it was initiated by Alakes and continued by Polykrates until he altered it, to his own undoing, after the trouble with Sparta.

Herodotus says that he has dwelt longer on the affairs of Samos because three of the greatest works in Greece were to be seen there: the tunnel, the engineer of which was the Megarian Eupalamos, the harbour mole, and the Heraion, the architect of which was Rhoikos. If the fleet, as seems likely, antedates Polykrates' accession, it is probable that the harbour and its mole are also earlier. The tunnel and the Heraion must have taken many years to complete, and the greater part of their construction should be attributed to the earlier generation of the tyrants. The tunnel is one of the most interesting engineering works of the sixth century. Its purpose was to bring water into the city of Samos from a spring on the north side of Mt. Ampelos. An underground conduit led from the spring by a tortuous course following the contour of the mountain for about...
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half a mile, and then entered the tunnel to be carried through the mountain for a distance of about 3300 ft. The water emerged inside the walls of the city, and was thereafter carried by another conduit, 1000 ft. of which can be traced, to a fountain house in the city the location of which is unknown. The purpose of the tunnel was to safeguard the water-supply of the city in time of siege, and perhaps also to provide a means of escape from the city in case of need. That it served both purposes we know from Herodotus. Samos was able to withstand a forty-day siege when the Spartans tried to overthrow Polykrates in 525/4 B.C., and later Maitandros escaped by the tunnel when Dareios came to seize Samos and make Sylosen tyrant. In a recent study by an engineer, F. R. Bichowsky, the period of construction for the tunnel is estimated as at least fifteen years. Bichowsky assumes, without discussing the question, that Aiakes was tyrant but was confused with his famous son Polyratites, and places the beginning of the construction within Aiakes’ reign. The estimate of fifteen years for the construction of the whole system is based on the time necessary for the cutting of the tunnel—ten years at the rate of 6 in. a day at each face in a bore 8 ft. high and 8 ft. wide—and five years for the rest of the work. Since the rock is ‘hard, somewhat bedded limestone’, the estimate is, so far as we can ascertain, conservative. The technical knowledge needed for the surveying was considerable, and Bichowsky suggests that Thales and his pupil Anaximandros may have been hired as consultants. If the tunnel was complete by the siege of 525/4, it must surely have been begun before 532, probably many years before. The project, then, was initiated and completed, in whole or in part, before Polykrates, and thus provides further evidence of the continuity of regime and policy in Samos.

The Heraion was likewise a work conceived on the grand scale so characteristic of tyrants. The earlier structure was a temple of the Ionic order, enormous in size (ca. 300 ft. by 150 ft.) and with a large number of columns (134 in all), rivalling oriental structures, perhaps especially those of Egypt, with which Samos had close connections. It was famous for the column bases, the channeling of which shows great precision and a variety of patterns unequalled in any other Greek temple. Buschor dates the temple, of which Rhoikos was the architect, to the middle or shortly before the middle of the sixth century. The date is determined by the stratification of levels. Dinsmoor follows Buschor in his analysis of the two successive temples, but dates the earlier temple to 575 rather than 560-555. His reason is given on p. 124, note 2. ‘But a slightly earlier date (there being no contrary evidence) seems desirable in view of the probability that Samos was the inspiration for the double façade colonnades at Syracuse and Selinus (see p. 75).’ On p. 75 Dinsmoor says that the temple of Apollo at Syracuse, the earliest of the Western temples to use double façade colonnades, dates perhaps from about 565 B.C. He assumes a ten-year ‘cultural lag’ between it and the Heraion at Samos. These dates are admittedly tentative and relative; even assuming that the Heraion was the inspiration of the double façade colonnades of the West, its construction need not be dated earlier than the first part of the decade 570-560.

This temple was destroyed by fire soon after its completion, and a new and still larger temple was laid out a tripe farther west but partly overlooking its predecessor. The bases of the old columns were used for the new foundations, and part of the superstructure was completed (e.g. the cela, pronao, and portion of the east peristyle corresponding to the pronao, three rows each of four columns); then the work was interrupted. It was finally completed in Hellenistic and Roman times, as was the Olympieion of the Peisistratids at Athens. Buschor dates to the time of Polykrates the destruction by fire and the beginning of the rebuilding. Rhoikos was perhaps again the architect, for the new temple and the old one were very similar in style. The Spartan attack of 525/4 B.C. may have been the occasion of the destruction; this would allow time for Polykrates to begin the rebuilding before his own death in 522 B.C., but not time for the work to proceed far. It is reasonable to attribute the cessation of the work to the political troubles following the death of Polykrates. Thus the Heraion in its two stages belongs to the same régime as the tunnel. Rhoikos, and Theodoros, whom some of our authorities associate with Rhoikos as joint architect of the Heraion, were the most famous Samian artists of the period. They were said to have invented the hollow-casting of bronze statues, and to have made many well-known works of art; e.g. Theodoros made the bowl dedicated by Kroisos at Delphi, and the emerald ring of Polykrates. Although both artists are often associated with Polykrates, the evidence of their connexion with the earlier Heraion, with

---

38 Hdt. 3. 54 for the Spartan siege; the Samians probably used the tunnel to make the sally from the ridge of the hill here mentioned. See Hdt. 3. 146 for Maitandros.


41 Pliny, N.H. 34. 89; 36. 90. Cf. Dioec. Laert. 8. 1-3; Mnesarchos, the gem-engraver, father of Pythagoras, was probably an older contemporary of Rhoikos and Theodoros. Charles Seltman, on the evidence of this passage, would include Pythagoras himself among the artists of the period, Num. Chron. Sixth Series, Vol. 9 (1909), 5-9.

42 Paus. 9. 41. 1; 10. 38. 5; 8. 148; cf. Pliny, N.H. 35. 152 where it is confused with clay modelling and the two artists dated to the period before the expulsion of the Bacchiads from Corinth. See also A. W. Byrce, La Statuaire en Bronze de Samos, Mem. Acad. 3rd series, 12 (1945) 318-19.

43 Hdt. 1. 51; 3. 41.
Kroisos, and with the Artemision at Ephesus suggests that they properly belong to the generation of Aiakes, and were still working at the time of Polykrates.

The dates given for three other persons connected with Samos, the poet Ibykus, and the philosophers Anaximandros and Pythagoras, present chronological difficulties due, it may be suggested, to a confusion between Polykrates and his father, and to the belief that the Samian tyranny was confined to the years 532–522 B.C. Suidas' note on Ibykus says that he came to Samos έτε αυτης ήρευ το Πολυκράτης αι του τυράννου πατή πο τον τράχος δέ ημ ουτος έτη Κροίους Όλυμπίς 6' 'when Polykrates, the father of the tyrant, ruled it; this was in the time of Kroisos in the 54th Olympiad' (564–561 B.C.). Eusebius' date for Ibykus is Ol. 61 (536–533 B.C.). Bowra rejects Suidas' entry on three grounds: that Eusebius gives another date, though he admits that the two dates are not incompatible; that the father of Polykrates is called by the same name, whereas his name was really Aiakes; and finally, that the father is made to rule Samos. Of these three objections, only the second lies any value. Schmid, commenting on the passage, emends Πολυκράτης to Πολυκράτους, and so removes the difficulty; the passage then reads: 'when the father of the tyrant Polykrates ruled in Samos'. But, even without this emendation, there is no need to reject the entry; Wilamowitz is on sounder ground in accepting the tradition that Ibykus went to Samos in the days of Polykrates' father, whose name is the one mistake and should be Aiakes. His interpretation of the forty-eight-line poem found at Oxyrhynchus, the last two lines of which are a compliment to a young Polykrates, as a personal tribute to the still youthful son of the tyrant is more convincing than Bowra's attempt to connect the poem with the son of Polykrates mentioned by Himerios, who says that Anakreon was brought to be his tutor.

The difficulty over Anaximandros concerns one passage only: Diogenes Laertios, quoting from the Chronicle of Apollodorus, says that in the second year of Ol. 58 (547/6 B.C.) Anaximandros was sixty-four and that he died not long afterward; then he adds that he flourished almost at the same time as Polykrates, the tyrant of Samos, ομοιοιστά τι μάν παρά κοινά Πολυκράτης τού Σάμου τύραννον. Diels and, following him, Jacoby transfer this last phrase to the life of Pythagoras on the ground of chronological impossibility. I suggest that this is as unnecessary as it is violent, that here there is a similar confusion between the names of Aiakes and Polykrates, and that the tradition is sound which places the άγαθος of Anaximandros in the period of the Samian tyranny.

Finally, there is the passage in Strabo on Pythagoras' sojourns in Egypt and Babylon and his departure for Italy, which should mean that some thirty-five years separate the beginning of tyranny at Samos and Pythagoras' flight from it on his return to Samos after travelling abroad. Strabo says, 'τούτου έτε under Polykrates) Pythagoras seeing the tyranny springing up (or growing, φυστον) left the city and went off to Egypt and Babylon to satisfy his love of learning; that when he returned, and saw the tyranny still enduring (τιμονον) he set sail for Italy and spent the rest of his life there. Since Pythagoras is elsewhere recorded to have spent twenty-two years in Egypt and twelve years in Babylonia, Strabo's notice has been regarded as chronologically untenable; as von Fritz observes, '... this would presuppose that Pythagoras already saw tyranny approaching in 571'. But that, far from being a reductio ad absurdum, fits the thesis of this paper very well. The only difficulty is that the figures for the years which Pythagoras spent abroad are suspiciously high and have little authority. It is worth while, I think, to suggest that he may have spent less long abroad, and have reached Italy a good deal earlier than the date suggested by his flight 'from Polykrates', for this phrase probably means no more than from 'the tyranny in Samos' — if Pythagoras hated tyranny, he will not have waited for Polykrates' accession to leave the island a second time. He may well have seen the tyranny growing in the early years of Aiakes, spent some years in travel, returned to Samos to find that he disliked it even more, and departed finally for the West, reaching Kroton in time to be responsible for the extraordinary 'incuse' coinages in the cities of South Italy which some scholars believed were issued to exemplify his philosophy of opposites.
That theory seems to be the most reasonable explanation yet proposed for these curious coinages, and if it is correct it shows that the tyranny in Samos was established before, and flourishing at the middle of the century. The uncertainties here are numerous, and little weight could be put on such an argument by itself; but it does not stand alone.

It remains only to sum up the argument. The testimony of Herodotus makes it clear that Samian policy is consistent from the early 560’s to the death of Polykrates: the seizure of the bowl and corselet, and the interception of the Corcyrean boys are evidence of the same sort of piracy as Polykrates continued; the Samian navy was built up before Polykrates, and the Samian thalassocracy followed the Phokaian shortly after the fall of Sardis. It seems reasonable to connect this with Aiakes and to see the establishment of the tyranny during his lifetime. Polykrates inherited the power after an interval of uncertainty at his father’s death and made the tyranny famous. Corroboration is provided by the building programme, especially by the dates of the tunnel and the earlier Heraion. Finally, the incidental references to the Samian tyranny, i.e. the date of Ibykos’ arrival in Samos, the flori of Anaximandros, and the probable date for Pythagoras’ final departure for Kroton, strengthen the suggestion that there was a tradition of a tyranny in Samos in the generation before Polykrates.55

Mary White

---

point out that the opponents of the theory have been influenced chiefly by the chronological difficulty, the fact that the accepted date of the first issues—about 550 B.C. or not much later—cannot be reconciled with Pythagoras’ arrival in Italy about 530. All those who discuss the coinages emphasise the fact that this peculiar and difficult ‘fabric’ appears suddenly in South Italy, and only there, and that the best coins are the earliest. Paul Naster, seeking antecedents for the unusual technique, points out the similarity of these dies to the core and mantle of ‘cire perdue’ bronze casting, a Samian invention of the same period (‘La technique des monnaies incuses de la Grande-Grèce’, Rev. Belge de Num., 1947, 1-17). I have discussed this point in some detail with W. P. Wallace of University College, Toronto.

55 I should like to express my gratitude for the generous assistance given by the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, and the American School of Classical Studies in Athens. The materials for this paper were assembled during the year I spent in these two institutions.
THE FAMILY OF ARGYRIUS

There are in the literary sources few examples of curial life extending over three generations with such a continuity of detail as is provided by Libanius in his references to the family of Argyrius. Yet in the more accessible works of reference, the student of the social life of the later Roman Empire will discover merely a shortened version by Ensslin (PIW. Suppl. VII, 680) of Seeck’s note on Obodianus (Briefe, 222). In addition, the index of the Teubner edition of Libanius presents much confusion between grandfather and grandson.

Towards the end of his life, Libanius addressed to the Emperor Theodosius an open letter upon the perios of the curiae at the time, contrasting their present hard lot with the state of things which had prevailed earlier in the century. In dealing with the recruitment of fresh blood into the curia, he cites as an example of previous practice the conduct of his own grandfather (Or. xiiii. 18). He, some years before his death in 324, had been instrumental in securing for a young foreigner named Argyrius an introduction into the curia of Antioch. This he had succeeded in doing, despite Argyrius’ alien birth, his youth, and lack of property, even against the opposition of the then governor and the then sophist of the city, Zenobius. Oddly enough, there was a family relationship between Zenobius and Argyrius, which Libanius mentions at a later time (Ep. 101).

After this introduction to the curia, Argyrius went on to perform the liturgies, and showed due gratitude for his social advancement. He became a firm friend of Libanius’ father, and upon his untimely death, did all he could to relieve and assist the family (Or. liii. 4), a service which in later life Libanius recalls with respect and affection (Ep. 381).1

In 332, when Libanius was eighteen, Argyrius was able to undertake the most respectable and expensive of the curial obligations in Antioch, the presidency of the Antiochen Olympiad (Or. liii. 4). It is clear that during these dozen or so years his fame and fortune had vastly improved. This was probably the result of his eloquence, since Zenobius had taken such pains to deny him room in Antioch. At any rate, many years after his death, Libanius can cite him as an example of a famous rhetor of curial rank (Or. xxxv. 10). As president of the Olympic games, he was responsible for an innovation which Libanius deplores. At his own expense, he doubled the seating accommodation in the Pilethrum, the centre for the Olympic contests. This mistaken spirit of service was, in Libanius’ eyes, the beginning of the breakdown of the religious purity of the festival. More spectators meant more disorder, and as succeeding presidents, including Libanius’ own uncle Phasagius, followed this example, the Olympic became more of a bank-holiday entertainment than a religious ceremony (Or. x. 9–11).

In 349, an Argyrius appears as praeses of a province (Cod. Th. iv. 13. 2). Ensslin suggests that he is likely to be the elder Argyrius of Libanius. Although such a suggestion can be neither proved nor disproved with finality, there are two arguments which render it less plausible.

(i) The argumentum ex silento. Usually, in his commendations of the sons of ex-magistrates, Libanius makes a point of mentioning their fathers’ rank. Nowhere does he suggest that Argyrius had held such an office. It does not appear in the various commendations of Obodianus (Ep. 112–14), or of the younger Argyrius (Epp. 970–1). Nor, as might be expected, is Argyrius cited as a past example of a sophist or rhetorical career culminating in the attainment of public office, in any of Libanius’ later complaints concerning the decline in the value of a career in rhetoric. On the contrary, he is mentioned specifically as an example of eloquence in the curia (Or. xxxv. 10).

(ii) In 359–60, Argyrius is described as a very old man (Ep. 113, 1, προς γοργας ἡμιων ὑπόσων ὀλθα καὶ παρἀγων φόβων ὑποίον εἰκός τῆς ταλαφρότητος), and he has retired from curial life because of his age (ibid. ἡ ἀπελέει τοῦ πώνου παρὰ του χρόου). If any coherent account can be made of the fragmentary Ep. 138, it is that he seems to behave with a forgetfulness which may indicate his years. In such a case he must have been praeites—a comparatively low stage in the official hierarchy—at the age of sixty or thereabouts. This is a late age to attain that rank, and if our Argyrius is the praeses mentioned, his object would probably have been merely to get out of the curia by attaining the office. Yet Libanius expressly states that his retirement from the curia was due to his age. Office is not mentioned.

Argyrius had retired from the curia, it seems, by the time Or. xxxi, ‘Pro Rhetoribus’, was composed. In this oration, Libanius addresses not Argyrius but his son Obodianus, and also Eubulus, in such a way as to give good reason to assume that Argyrius is still alive and, what is never stated in so many words, that Obodianus and Eubulus may have been brothers. (Seeck, Briefe, 222: Or. xxxi 47. Εὐβοῦλος, οι πρῶτοι ν ἔκρον καλεῖ. Αργυρίου καὶ ταῖ καὶ πατέρ, μίμηται τῶν πρεσβυτέρων).2

1 Pack (T. A. P. A. LXXII, 1951, p. 179, note 9) expresses the opinion that in 332 Argyrius may have undertaken the presentation of the Olympia in Libanius’ place.

2 Since the composition of this article, the identification of Eubulus as given above has been challenged by Wolf (Vom Schulwesen der Spätantike, pp. 93–6) in two particulars which are fundamental.

(a) He gives a fresh view upon the disputed identification
The family of Argyrius, Obodianus, was by the time of the ‘Pro Rhetoribus’ himself the elder brother of a schoolboy. As quite a young man, Obodianus had taken part in an embassy on behalf of his city, and had won the admiration of such a connoisseur of rhetoric as the Bithynian Aristaenetus for his eloquent address. This embassy seems to have occurred at some time about 350. In 358 he had already shewn such devoted public spirit that, in his son’s name, he was performing the liturgy of the baths, and in the next year was due to present the chariot races, although the son was below the statutory age for such obligations. For these shows he had received Imperial assistance in the shape of a couple of teams of Bithynian horses (Ep. 381. 2). This expensive career in the liturgies continued in 359/60, for then the younger Argyrius, though still immersed in the study of rhetoric under Libanius, was to act as choregos in 360 and to present the beast-shows at the Olympia, again at his father’s expense.

A generation later, the younger Argyrius is to follow, as decurion, in his father’s footsteps. After the performance of the other notable liturgies, in 390 he is found preparing the presentation of shows and games himself. Two of Libanius’ letters of commendation are to high officials at court (Epp. 970–1), requesting them to ensure that he receives adequate assistance from the praefectus praetorio, as his father had done thirty years before.

Yet in the year’s interval which had elapsed between the writing of Ep. 381 and Epp. 112–14, while he was fully engaged upon this career of civic service, Obodianus had been in considerable danger. Like numerous other Antiochenes, he had been implicated in the proceedings of the treason trial held at Scythopolis in 359 (cf. Amm. Marc. xix. 12), and he had escaped unharmed only because of the constancy which his friend Dorotheus had shown under examination (Ep. 112). Acquitted, he travelled to court in the winter of 359/60, again as the envoy of Antioch, bearing with him the loyal greetings of his city, a request that Constantius should consent to revisit it and the hope, evidently, of securing official assistance towards his latest and most expensive duty. The embassy seems to have been attended with much success. In the ‘Antiochus’ of 360, it is not unlikely that Libanius has such a one as Obodianus in mind when he speaks of the devoted services rendered to the city of Antioch by its decurions, and of their fluency and ability as rhetors (Or. xi. 133 ff.).

In 362, Obodianus is once more found acting as envoy for Antioch—now to Julian in Constantinople, presumably to offer a loyal address to him upon his accession to the throne. As far as Obodianus was concerned, however, the embassy was never completed. Near Ancyra, he broke an arm in a fall, and while the rest of the party went on, he stayed there for some time to convalesce, relieving the tedium with elevated discourses of a sophistic turn (Ep. 698). Shortly afterwards, upon Obodianus’ return to Antioch, Libanius sent letters of grateful acknowledgement to two decurions of Ancyra who had provided Obodianus with care and entertainment there on this occasion (Epp. 730, 733).

of the Phoenician, the sophist and antagonist of Libanius. Seeck (Briefe, 39 ff.) had identified him with Acacius of Caesarea; Foerster (Vol. X. pp. 760–1) identified him with Eubulus (the view taken above). Well’s suggestion is that the sophist is Acacius and that Eubulus is his patron in the curia, the two being friends. However, it is clear that the family relationships of the sophist Libanius and his uncle, the decurion Phasagianus. On this view, it is Acacius who leaves Antioch in the summer vacations for Phoenicia (i.e. Palestine), and is the consistent opponent of Libanius in the rhetorical competitions. Libanius’ position here is that between Libanius and his opponent and his surviving son must be referred to Eubulus not Acacius. This information reconciles the ἐπηγγείλαι 800 of Ep. 561 (cf. Epp. 439) with the εἰγείρεται 357 of Epp. 504, 559, 550) and the ἐγείρεται of Or. 1. 1163.

According to Well’s deduction made by Seeck (Briefe, 222) from the text of Or. xxxi. 47, that Eubulus is the elder brother of Obodianus, τοῦ πρεσβύτερου, he says, refers not to Eubulus just mentioned but to the elder Argyrius. Obodianus is thus bidden to follow his father’s example, a commonplace in the letters. This interpretation gains much from the fact that nowhere it is explicitly stated that there is such a family connexion between Argyrius and Eubulus. This by itself is not, however, an insuperable objection. Libanius’ silences about family relationships are at usual, as is his information; e.g. that between Argyrius and Zenobius is casually referred to in a commendation of a relative of Zenobius (Ep. 191); and nowhere in his letters to Modestus does Libanius refer to Argyrius’ brother to his face, though he does claim such relationship with Eumolpius (Ep. 75, 6), who is almost certainly the brother of Modestus.

Other points which could lend some support to Seeck’s view are:

(i) Argyrius and Eubulus are mentioned together as famous rhetors of the curia; in this context Libanius has just dealt with examples of rhetorical prowess provided by his own family (Or. xxxiv. 10).

(ii) Argyrius came from outside, probably from the south, since he has connections in Elusa. He was renowned as a sophist or a rhetor. Eubulus is a contemporary of Libanius, and, if son of Argyrius, would himself be born outside Antioch. Thus Phoenician, son and grandson of sophists (Or. i. 90) is not unsuited to Eubulus. Libanius can stress the alien origin in disapproval of the prodigal son while approving it in the case of his benefactor Argyrius.

In 355 the sophist’s father is still alive in circumstances similar to those of Argyrius in Ep. 113 three years later (Ep. 405, 9, ὁ δὲ ἐπήγειρε ὁ συνηγμένος ἄνδρα, ὁ δὲ πατὴρ συνηγμένος). Libanius must be referring to Eubulus. Libanius can stress the alien origin in disapproval of the prodigal son while approving it in the case of his benefactor Argyrius.

However, the division of family loyalties has its parallel in the case of Argyrius and Zenobius. In both cases the reason is connected with professional interests. The sophist immunity from curial obligations would probably hold some attractions for Eubulus. Other family feuds can be seen in Or. xxxviii (Silvanus and Gaudentius) and Or. xxxi (Olympius and Miccelus).

Wolf’s suggestion, though attractive, I do not find completely convincing.
In early 363 there occurs the last mention of this side of the family until the younger Argyrius makes his reappearance in 390. Argyrius the elder, a loyal pagan, was much shocked at the turbulence and disobedience with which Julian was met by large numbers of the Antiochenes and he was unable to hide his dejection upon the consequent disgrace which the city incurred (Or. xvi. 41).

If Seeck is right in his deduction that Eubulus is the elder brother of Obodianus, the fortunes of the family can be traced in some detail for a longer period (cf. Foerster, Libanius, Vol. X, pp. 760–1). In fact, his intrigues against Libanion form the background of Libanion’s career from his return to Antioch is 354 until 371. He seems to have maintained a much closer connexion with his native province than did the rest of the family. He had an estate in Phoenicia to which he had retired in the summer vacation of 353 (Or. i. 90), and again later. Libanion calls him a Phoenician, and it is not impossible that he was born before his father’s removal to Antioch. A decurion of Antioch (Ep. 529. 3), speaking only Greek (Or. i. 105), he practised in Antioch as a rhetor and sophist, drawing some salary (Or. i. 110). During Libanion’s first visit to Antioch in 353, he shewed himself to be a professional rival, and upon his permanent settlement there in 354, his opposition began in real earnest. Libanion professes to speak with contempt of his laziness and loose-living, which earned for him the nick-name of ‘Coccylion’ (Ep. 504. 4; Or. i. 109); but even he is compelled later to confess that his ability and reputation were high.

The cause of this rivalry was something more than ordinary professional jealousy. It seems to have been concerned with the succession to the chair of rhetoric then held by Zeno. Libanion. It would be natural for Eubulus, a rhetor in his own right, a man of mark in Antioch and possibly a family connexion of Zenobius, to aspire to the post which would have the added advantage of providing him with immunity from curial obligations. The connexion between them was sufficiently close for them both to be visited with the displeasure of Gallus or of his supporters (Or. i. 96–7). Gallus had Zenobius arrested, while the mob which he had incited against Theophilus went on to attack the mansion of Eubulus, when baulked of the persons of Gallus and his son (cf. Amm. Marc. xiv. 7. 6, Eubuli cuiusdam inter suos clari domum ambitiosam ignibus subdilis inflammavit; Lib. Or. i. 103.) Such being the close bond between them in the public mind, it is not unlikely that Eubulus had some such ambition for himself. Unfortunately, Zenobius had already half-promised the post upon his retirement to Libanion. This may explain his later reluctance to implement that promise, and the fact that the discomfits of Zenobius and Eubulus are closely connected in Libanion’s narrative (Or. i. 103–4).

The first move came in 354 from Eubulus. By means of a third party he attempted to get Libanion involved in a case of magic directed against the Imperial house. His responsibility for the charge leaked out, however, and the fact that Gallus did not adopt his usual summary method of handling such a case but referred it to the courts seems to indicate Eubulus’ unpopularity with the Caesars. The case collapsed and the plot misfired, but it was not entirely without result, for despite Gallus’ refusal to entertain the charge, it had attracted to Libanion a most undesirable type of publicity, and had raised enough prejudice against him to make his position in Antioch very precarious for some little time afterwards.

After the departure of Gallus, the antagonism between the two rhetors involved the intervention of successive Caesars. Eubulus attempted to curry favour with one after another, with a view to feathering his own nest, but with untoward results (Or. lii. 31). He found that he had usually been anticipated by Libanion. Interference from the administration was no new thing in Libanion’s career, but now he was to experience it on an ever-increasing scale. The first point to be settled was the appointment of a successor to Zenobius, who had died in 355. Here Libanion could count upon the influence of the new prefect, his friend Strategus, against all his rival’s claims, and he also gained much support from his successes in the sophistic competitions, besides parading his devotion to his old master by a couple of speeches in memory of Zenobius (Ep. 405). In 356 he claims to have the support of all citizens except Eubulus and the clique whose attachment he had bought (Epp. 529. 3; 537. 3). At all events, before 358, he could deliver his panegyric on Strategus in the Bouleuterion of Antioch, where he had already been practising for some time and which was to be his headquarters in future. A year or two later, he is known to be the ‘sophist of the city’, the position he held for the rest of his life (Jo. Chrys. P.G. 50. 560 Migne).

Meantime, Eubulus’ fortune and status had been much impaired by his rival’s influence and success. His ample wealth purchased him some support, for he was generous and lavish with his entertainment, and the support which Libanion received from the prefect was, it seems, to some extent counter-balanced by that which Eubulus received from Nebridius, Comes Orientis at the time and Libanion’s private enemy (Ep. 506. 3). A reconciliation between the two rhetors was effected by the good offices of Olympius in 355, and in these two years there are occasions when the two are found in agreement (cf. 434, 5), but it is never long before disputes flare up again. Both in 355 and 357 Libanion complains of his opponent’s lack of scruples in breaking his word (Epp. 439. 555). However, after the departure of Nebridius for Gaul in 357, Eubulus lost such support in official circles, for the new Comes Orientis, Modestus, was an ardent supporter of Libanion himself. The influence and services which he had offered to litigants, always for some suitable recompense, were
his no longer. Instead, Libanius himself could claim the credit for securing him an increased allowance, much to his chagrin (Or. i. 109–10).

In 358, Strategius gave up his prefecture, and his successor, Hermogenes, was not expected to be so favourable to Libanius. It was an ideal moment for Eubulus to try to smirch his rival's reputation, and he was quick to seize his opportunity. By judicious bribery of the copyist he interfered with the publication of Libanius' panegyric of Strategius, which was due to be sent round the cities as the swan-song of his prefecture. Artful changes in words in their contexts and other devices served to rob the oration of its point, and then Eubulus invited the prefect to come and listen to his version of what a panegyric really should be like. The trick was discovered, the copyist confessing what he had been bribed to do, so that the relations between Strategius and Libanius remained as cordial as before, despite Eubulus' efforts (Or. i. 113).

The advent of Hermogenes gave Eubulus fresh grounds for hope, but he was doomed to disappointment. Previous acquaintance with the uncle and friends of Libanius had predisposed Hermogenes in his favour, and when, in the curia, the new prefect greeted Phasganius as an old friend and sought the acquaintance of Libanius, Eubulus and his clique promptly threw up the sponge (Or. i. 116).

A very different complexion was given to the situation by the appointment in 360 of Elpidius as prefect. Libanius, depressed by his private griefs (Or. i. 117–18), and by his chronic ailments, was sadly out of favour, the more so as Elpidius was a Christian who had little sympathy with the tradition of pagan rhetoric. These are the lean years for sophists, as is shown by Libanius' appeal to the decurions of Antioch, Eubulus among them, to pay their rhetors a decent salary, as they had done in Zenobius' day (Or. xxxii). He had his own problems besides, for the upper classes of Antioch, his patrons and protégés both, had been sorely distressed by the treason trials of the previous year, his influence had vanished and, worst of all, his salary had been cut and his position impugned by the 'dunce' Elpidius (Ep. 740). In the meantime it is a fair inference that Eubulus' stock had risen in comparison. In 360, Libanius comments that despite the constant sniping by Eubulus ever since 354, he had suffered no serious harm. Though his own attitude had been most correct, though he had gone into mourning upon the death of one of Eubulus' sons and had made repeated overtures to the other, he had met with nothing but opposition from both him and his father (Ep. 173). In 361, however, he acknowledges that he has come off second best and ruefully asserts that Eubulus gets his own way in everything (Ep. 289: 3).

Julian's accession to the throne and, later, his arrival in Antioch in 362 raised Libanius from his slough of despond (Or. i. 119), and saw him restored to his old position and salary by the new prefect Salutius (Ep. 740). Simultaneously, Eubulus lost his lately acquired pre-eminence. His wife was recently dead; besides his only surviving son, his family consisted of daughters of marriagable age. To save his face he had given it out that he was retiring to supervise their welfare, and so had left Antioch before Julian's arrival (Or. i. 120). Libanius, however, found his triumph to be of short duration, for with the death of Julian, he was thrown upon the defensive and again lost his influence (Ep. 1154), being the object of murder plots under Jovian and of bitter hostility in the first years of Valens. Once more Eubulus profited by this opportunity. Emerging from his retirement, he again used his ample wealth to procure official support. Thus by lavish gifts and hospitality, he won over Festus, Consularis Syriae between 367 and 370, a man of notoriously expensive tastes. Festus, at the instigation of Eubulus—who was now confessedly seeking not the disgrace but the death of his rival—made two separate attempts to involve Libanius in cases of treason, even going so far as to approach Valens on the matter (Or. i. 156). Fidelius, also, one of the finance officers, tried to employ the same methods for the same reason. By good luck and some influence, Libanius succeeded in avoiding all the snares of magic and treason laid for him, and survived his rival (Or. i. 163). After 371, Eubulus appears no more in the narrative of Libanius except in retrospect.

The history of this family provides confirmatory evidence for several points which concern the social history of the time. First, there is ample evidence for the wealth which might still be acquired from the combination of the careers of rhetor and pleader. Libanius' complaints of the inadequacy of public reward to the exponents of the sophistic profession (e.g. Or. xxxi) lose much of their point when the success of the elder Argyrius is observed. He, entering the curia a comparatively poor man, could in about a dozen years undertake the most expensive curial office, and in addition provide more than was normal in the way of public works. He could leave enough for his son, Obodianus, to undertake a full list of liturgies between 357 and 360, and to act as envoy for his city. Eubulus, too, if indeed he is a member of the family, was well known for his wealth, as Ammianus confirms.

---

8 The date of Or. xxxi, Pro Rhetoribus. Wolf (pp. 94-96) re-examines the dating. Foerster (Vol. iii, 119) had originally dated it to 355, but later changed his mind, dating the speech to 390, and identifying the sophist in Caesarea with Priscus (Vol. xi, 660). Wolfr. in accordance with the suggestion of Walden (Universitas, p. 267), places it in the years 360/1. The speech is certainly before 394, when Arsenius is dead. In Or. xxxii, 47 he is still a student, as he was in 356/7 (Ep. 540). By the time of his death he had already entered upon the career of advocate (Ep. 1260: 4). The oration, then, is a year or two before 394. The sophist in Caesarea at this time was Acacius, and he had left Antioch before 361 (Or. xxxi, 42; Ep. 274: 289). The oration thus lies between 361 and 363. I would suggest that it is to be dated to the very end of 361 or the beginning of 362. Elpidius, who had cut Libanius' own pay, may still have been in the saddle, thus accounting for the comparative mildness with which Libanius deals with the recent coolness of the administration towards rhetoric.
His expenditure to secure support for himself was lavish and is often the cause of Libanius’ sneers; his high-living and licence were notorious: he could even entertain the gourmet Festus, in a manner suited to his taste. It seems that it was still as possible for a sophist and rhetor to make his private fortune in the fourth century as it had been in the second.

Equally noteworthy is the continued record of expenditure made upon social service. This family fortune has to stand the impact once in each generation of the accumulated expenses of the liturgies—the baths, the games, and shows of the choregia, the presidency of the Antiochene Olympia—and embassies to court besides. Libanius’ letters afford evidence for the severity of these financial duties, of growing curial discontent, and of reluctance to perform them without a firm guarantee of Imperial assistance. In 332 Argyrius voluntarily adds to his obligations as president of the Olympia. In 359/60, although the administrative worries of the office of choregos are said to be the chief burden for his son (Ep. 113. 2.), yet we find him in receipt of assistance from the central government. In 390 the shows which his grandson is due to present form a liturgy which Libanius describes as παντοβορεια, and he makes no bones about a direct request for financial aid (Ep. 979. 2.). Impoverishment of decurions by the performance of the liturgies was not uncommon (e.g. Seeck, Briefe, 193; Juliusian xvii), but such a record of expense by one family over so extensive a period is comparatively rare. In this case there can be seen a growing dissatisfaction with the burdens the decurions had to bear, and, as the century proceeded, an increasing tendency to solicit subventions from the exchequer for their performance. Here the family fortune was ample enough; others were not so lucky, and decurions were becoming increasingly chary of undertaking the job unaided. Such unrest among the curial classes was an added inducement for them to seek to escape from the doubtful honour of their rank, and an added reason for the rapid drop in the number of decurions, for which Libanius furnishes evidence during the later fourth century, and of which his own career is a good example.

Thirdly, there is from this narrative a peculiar insight into the conduct of sophists and rhetors in the management of their professional feuds. Hooliganism and physical assault on the part of a sophist’s supporters, though efficacious enough, were among the least dangerous of the weapons in the sophistic armory (cf. Or. i. 85). Zenobius has no qualms in bringing pressure from the administration to bear in his attempt to secure the removal of a potential rival, for all the bond of family relationship between them. Eubulus will go even further; despite all overtures and mediation, he will try to get Libanius permanently removed by bringing allegations of magic, disloyalty to the regime, or treasonable utterance, no matter whether they be true or false. Their rivalry affects their relations both with their fellow citizens and with the governors, who loom large in this account. Each rhetor tries to use them as pawns in his own game, yet the governor’s interference in the affairs of the sophists—in their appointment, pay, influence, or supersession—is all-pervasive. It is small wonder that panegyric forms such an important part of the rhetorical technique, for it is the best kind of insurance policy. For this reason, the note of criticism so obvious in Libanius’ later orations (e.g. Or. xxx; Or. xliviii) is all the more startling.

Libanius makes a commonplace of the decline of Greek rhetoric and the rise of the studies of Latin, law, or even shorthand in its place, but the assiduity with which both he and Eubulus cultivated the acquaintance of the prefect, the Comes Orientis, or the provincial consular shows that such complaints are exaggerated. All these officials were, and consistently remained, directly interested in the Greek rhetorical education.

A. F. Norman

University College, Hull.
'A BOOK TO KEEP'
(An address in commemoration of Professor R. R. Marett)

If what I am giving you this afternoon is little more than a series of rather conjectural reflections about well-known matters, my excuse is that I was tempted by an invitation from an old and highly valued pupil to speak in memory of an intimate companion of the distant days when I was young, a companion from whom I learnt much. Marett, like Frazer and Jane Harrison and others, used his knowledge of Greek as a bridge towards the study of anthropology in general. It is a specially helpful bridge, because the Greeks, with their extraordinary command of literary expression, have left articulate evidence about their thought and feelings and customs at a stage of development when other peoples had no literature. One is always surprised at the coexistence in Greece of the highly developed and the utterly primitive. Dr. Galton in a speculative guess at the intelligence quota of different human groups put the fifth-century Athenian about twice as high as the nineteenth-century Londoner; yet an Athenian army was reduced to terror by an eclipse of the moon, contemporaries of Thucydides worshipped at the Dia as an imaginary enormous snake, and while Aristotle was writing his treatise on dramatic poetry some of his contemporaries were introducing Ludi Scenici to Rome as a medicine against a pestilence.

The great essentials of poetic feeling and perhaps the great insolubles of philosophy seem to have existed in many primitive peoples, but somehow they did not preserve their poetry or inspiration as the Greeks did, they did not work it up into the same Cosmos or artistic perfection, as a thing of permanent value. We may remember the South Sea Island chief who discussed his poetry with Stevenson. When asked what it was mostly about he gave the admirable answer: 'Oh, sweethearts and the sea; not all-same true, you know, all-same lie.' He had the root of the matter in him, like Anacreon or Alcaeus, but it passed as the moment of inspiration passed; no one thought of preserving those songs. When a certain much-loved Governor of Papua died, delegates from a number of villages to the number of 8000 gathered in what the Greeks would have called a great Paeognisis. They fasted for thirty days, and then an old Headman made a long, formal, and really beautiful πρός τοῖς λογίοις. An English reporter happened to be present, and so we know about it; it would never have occurred to the author or his companions to preserve it. A parallel to Hesiod or Orpheus, again, can be seen in those Gilbert Island accounts of the origin of the world of which Sir Arthur Grimble has told us. Many varying accounts are current, but only one particular prophet-king can speak with real authority. What he says is the inspired truth, when he feels inspired to give it; and even he, so we are informed, does not by any means always say the same. Nothing apparently was preserved except in memory, nothing reduced to Cosmos. Not only had no Prometheus given to man in those places the gift of γωνιμος, 'the all-remembering instrument, whence every Muse is born.' They had not even formed, it would seem, the desire for such a gift, except for a few practical purposes. My real theme to-day is to study the growth of this conception of a Book as an artistic unity, a thing to be preserved for ever.

One may well apply to the whole process of Greek literature, and perhaps even of Greek civilisation, the famous phrase of Anaxagoras about the origin of the world, that 'all things were mixed up—a chaos, a confusion, what the Book of Genesis expressly calls a Tohubobu—until Nous, intelligence or mind, came and put them in order.' It is a gradual formation of Cosmos; a process of order, of coherence, of enlightenment and lucidity, an advance involving sometimes a loss which is hard to define, as we move from the Κόσμος to the realm of πνευματικης. one can see such a movement from the oracles of Heraclitus and Pythagoras to the definitions of Prodicus and Protagoras; from the poetry of Aeschylus, who, in the words of a great contemporary, 'did things right without knowing how', to that of a generation which knew all the approved rules of σοφια rather well and sometimes, like our own eighteenth century, wronged its own poetic genius by following the rules too self-consciously. There is a somewhat similar change from the imaginative ease and abundance of Herodotus' style to the artificial clarity of Lysias or Isocrates. It is a movement, in the happy phrase of Professor J. A. K. Thomson, from a Prophetic Age to a Classical, from an age which spoke from inspiration to one which studied and spoke from Sophia and books.

In actual philosophy, of course, the process is pretty clear. Heraclitus never argues, he reveals mysteries: 'All things flow.' 'The age—or the World—is a child playing.' 'Our life is a death of ψυχή, souls, their life is our death,' and so on. But even the Ionian group of philosophers, sometimes considered too aridly materialist, have, as Cornford has emphasised, a good deal of the prophet in them. Thales, too, pronounced that all things were 'full of gods.' Anaximenes proclaimed our souls to be air, and air the living soul of the universe. Anaximander saw all individual existence as an act of aggressive injustice for which every individual thing must pay retribution by returning according to the law of Dike into that from which it had emerged. Philosophy was brought to
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greater precision partly by the Sophists and Socrates, but also, I think, by the influence of two real sciences. First by mathematics, which implied and demanded exact measurement—always an embarrassment to prophets; and also, I would suggest, by the science of medicine, which in Greece developed surprisingly early and in the hands of Hippocrates rejected magic and tried to base itself on records of objective observation. There is significance in Thucydides' detailed account of the symptoms of the plague, nor was it for nothing that Aristotle's father was a professional doctor, trained to observe and record facts and symptoms.

The process is clearest of all in the realm of History, where Nous had to produce some order or Kosmos out of a most confused superabundance of tradition. Hecataeus, the first prose writer (fl. 520-516), knows his own purpose. 'I write as seems to me to be true, for the traditions of the Greek are πολλοί καὶ γένοισι, which here means, I would suggest, not merely 'numerous and ridiculous', but 'inconsistent and ridiculous'. There were many Logoi, or versions, about the same subject. What did Hecataeus really do? He was, according to Heraclitus, who paid few compliments, a man of great learning, though little sense. He knew a great quantity of ἀγορα and μύθοι and selected the versions that seemed most probable. He has much to say about the Cyprianian Boar, and the Argonauts and Deucalion, and he seems to have thought that, in some sense, the Ram of Phrixus really spoke. Yet he sometimes rationalises. Cerberus, the Hound of Hell, was a deadly snake so nicknamed, which infested the so-called 'mouth of Hell' on Mt. Tainaron. He makes intelligent criticisms; for instance, in noting the nationalist bias of the Athenian account of the expulsion of the Pelasgians from Attica (127). He observes that many of the legendary Kings were not Greeks, and that in very early times all Greece consisted of barbarian settlements. He gave valuable advice about geography to the Ionians at the time of the revolt. He made a map of the world, and was credited with a sort of Gazetteer containing masses of detailed information about remote peoples and places; though, of course, such a collection would never be left as it came from the hands of the supposed original author. Everyone who made a copy of it would extend and improve it.

Naturally this first bold creative effort had its weaknesses, as his successors were not slow to point out. Strabo says emphatically that he would sooner believe the poets. Herodotus in criticising Hecataeus' map, with its Ocean River encircling the earth, observes drily that he knows of no such river (ii. 19) and mentions with some malice the comment of the Egyptian priests on his claim to have had, sixteen generations ago, a divine ancestor. They had records going back to 345 successive priests, but no god had appeared during that time.

Herodotus' criticisms are well known. But the greatest flaw in Hecataeus' whole achievement was its terrible incompleteness and its lack of any clear chronology. The next step in reducing chaos to Cosmos was taken by Hellanicus. In the first place he made a much wider and fuller collection of logoi from all sources in the poets and in local traditions; then he made them into something like a complete story by dividing them into three classes, before, during, and after the Trojan War as a central date, and further by treating the whole story as a history of four great families, descended from Phoroneus, Deucalion, Atlas, and Asopus respectively. He followed his poets very closely, assuming that they were narrating real facts, but, as poets will, turning them into the marvellous. The miraculous fight of Achilles with the river god Scamander, for instance, was a real incident in which Achilles, going too far in advance of his troops, was cut off by a sudden flood of the kind that often occurs in that river owing to rain on Mt. Ida, but saved himself, just as Homer says, by clinging to an elm-tree. Similarly, the taking of Troy, complete with the wooden horse and the escape of Aeneas, is given in close detail, but explained and rationalized. Into this account, based on the poetic tradition, he introduced details gathered from local reports, such as the curious remark that the name 'Italy' came from the Latin word 'vitulus', bull; it was a cattle country into which Heracles went in pursuit of the herds of Geryon.

He seems to have carried on his record to events in his own lifetime, to have used Herodotus as a source, and even to have mentioned the Battle of Arginusae. Thucydides says he was not satisfactory about the Pentecontaetia between the Persian and Peloponnesian wars. But his great achievement was to record the great mass of early traditions, and reduce them to some sort of consistent order by forcing them into a chronological system. In some part of his work he made what was perhaps a new chronological device: he established an era for dating. The Priestesses of Hera at Argos went a long way back, and apparently their years of office were recorded. Hellanicus tells us, for example, that the Sicani were first driven out of Italy in the twenty-sixth year of the Priestess Alycne. For the most part, however, he worked out his dates by an elaborate scheme of generations. Codrus, for example, was furnished with a detailed genealogy up to Deucalion. Hesiod was in the tenth generation from Orpheus. The trial of Orestes before the Areopagus took place nine generations after that of Ares for the slaying of Halirrhothius, and six after that of Cephalus for killing his wife—the only Greek hero who committed, and that by accident, that fashionable modern crime. The trial of Daedalus for killing the giant Talos was three generations after Cephalus and three before Orestes. As for the taking of Troy, he was quite precise. He found it had occurred in the eighteenth year of Agamemnon's reign on the twelfth of the month Thargelion. He is conscientious in accepting the results of his calculations. Theseus, it appears, was just fifty years of age when he
carried off Helen, who was only seven; but we may well believe that he only took her into safe keeping to protect the precocious princess from less scrupulous suitors.

Hellanicus did indeed reduce a mixed multitude of things to an ordered Cosmos. One cannot be surprised that he formed the most convenient and most frequently used authority on early history for mythographers like Apollodorus and commentators on the poets; nor yet that sober historians like Strabo and Josephus speak of him as utterly untrustworthy and indeed 'worse than Homer and Hesiod'.

There has been much discussion about his various books. The article in Suidas says he 'wrote very many works both in prose and poetry'. But we do not really know what a book was in Hellanicus' day, particularly a prose book. It always needs an imaginative effort for us modern scholars to free our minds from the misleading conception of the modern printed book, published in a number of identical copies with the author's name attached and intended for private reading. I doubt if any such idea was even conceived much before the time of Aristotle, and in any but a limited intellectual circle even then.

About poetry the problem is clearer, provided we cling to one central guiding fact. Poetry was meant for recitation or performance. It was an épîθæs, an exhibition or show; it aimed, Aristotle tells us, πρὸς ἀνάγκαις τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ ἔργον αὐτῆς, at being read aloud or declaimed. That is what it is for. A bard might carry his material about with him in his handbook or his memory, as Xenophanes did, and vary the performance according to the tastes of his audience; but the poem performed on a definite public occasion had of necessity to be a finished unity, with a known author and a fixed text. An Epinikion of Pindar was a special poem with a fixed text, learned and performed by a Chorus for a particular victory by a particular man, and that was that. A drama of Aeschylus, similarly learned and performed by a Chorus at the annual Dionysia, was a definite unity, with a fixed text—unless, of course, it was performed again and might be altered. It was, as Wilamowitz says, the first book, and even a book with a name, though for some time apparently the name was not quite a title, only a description of the Chorus or the chief character. They spoke of Aeschylus' Suppliant Women, or his Οἰσματικά τοίχαι, or Aristophanes' Knights, Birds, or Lysistrata. There is never a name like Midsummer Night's Dream or As You Like It.

The greatest 'occasion' of all, at least for Athens and the Ionian cities was, of course, the quadrennial πανήγυρις of the Panathenaica; and for that, as we know, two special poems, made of old traditional material but formed into magnificent artistic unities, with a suitable heroic and pan-Hellenic atmosphere, grew to a generally recognised position of absolute pre-eminence and to something approaching a fixed text. True the great ἰδιαῖς ποιήσεως, 'poetry about Ηλίον', and the Οἰσματικά τοίχαι, 'poetry about Οδυσσέα', never obtained the same textual unity as an epinikion of Pindar. The Pindaric ode was performed once for all. It was not repeated at successive festivals. The Iliad and Odyssey was performed again and again at the recurring Panathenaica. The recitation was competitive, and we do not know how far an individual rhapsode might improve his text. But the poems were widely learnt by heart and recited for educational purposes and copied out for private use by individual literary men. The process led ultimately towards the fixing of an established text, but certainly offered constant opportunities for variety, as is proved by the ancient quotations, especially those in Aeschines and Aristotle, and confirmed by the early papyri.

Still the two great poems stood out from the rest in their respective artistic unities. They were accepted as more definitely the true work of the great Homer than all the rest of the tradition. What, then, remained out of the mass of traditional raw material out of which the Iliad and Odyssey had been hewn, and on which collectors like Hecataeus and Hellanicus had based the greater part of their histories? Most of it was presumably in epic verse, and easily capable of being recited in the form of lays—of which more later: much of it probably stored in the form of memoranda or catalogues; all of it in a very fluid state.

Collections were made which assumed the existence and common knowledge of the Iliad and the Odyssey, filled up the gaps before and after, and completed a sort of Cosmos or epic narrative. These so-called cyclic epics, though attributed to definite authors, do not seem to have had much unity in themselves. Their names, we should remember, are all collective: τὰ Κύρια έπη, 'The Aphrodite verses', ἡ μικρά Ήλιος ποίησις, 'The lesser Trojan poetry', and the like. The Κύρια έπη, or Verses about Cyprus, for instance, though centring on the Judgement of Paris and the action of Aphrodite, contain a great deal of other matter—enough, Aristotle says, for a great number of tragedies. It included, for instance, digressions as far apart as the legends of Oedipus, the madness of Heraclis, and the story of Theseus and Ariadne. Obviously 'post-Homeric' as they are, they are interesting as showing remnants of an older, ruder tradition. Like Attic tragedy they preserve some of the crudities and horrors which were expurgated from the Iliad when it was worked up into a mirror of chivalry and a central instrument of liberal education.

Besides this epic material, there must have been a quantity of current oral poetry, used for singing or reciting at banquets or else as an ordinary element of a full man's culture. Every educated man was trained in poetry, and although women, as we are told in the Medea, were not themselves poets, the myths and legends were certainly repeated or sung to them while at work at their spinning. Creusa's attendants in the Ion when examining the friezes at Delphi recognise with excitement the
various heroes whose legends they have heard at their looms. We can perhaps trace three stages in the reduction of the Chaos of traditional oral poetry into Cosmos. There are first what I may call the stores of raw material, the Logoi or legends, mostly in verse, the catalogues, the genealogies, the epic formulae like the descriptions of shields, forms of address to gods, maxims for agriculture or seafaring or general education. These are not meant for performance, or public epanideis, as they stand. They are only raw material for an epanideis. Then the opposite of these, real epanideis, poems produced in full dress for a special occasion, like the Iliad and Odyssey and, still more definitely, the Pindaric Odes and the Attic dramas. Thirdly, a sort of middle stage in which the raw material is somehow stuck together, artistically or inartistically, so as to make either a proper epanideis or at least a book with some pretence of unity. Good examples are in the collection of Homeric hymns or prooimia. Most of them (VIII—XXXII) are just what they say; preludes or proper forms of address for opening a hymn to a god or goddess. They would seem to us hardly worth recording, but we must remember that mistakes in such a matter were dangerous. The god must have his right epithet. But Hymns II—VI show a real ἱερός or lay, added to the opening and closing formulæ, and in some cases worked into real unity and beauty of form; Hymn III, again, shows obviously an attempt to combine two separate lays into a unity; Hymn VII, to Dionysus, is a pure lay without any opening or closing formulæ.

But the most instructive and unmistakable example of the process of manufacture which produces from the collected raw material a proper lay, suitable for Epanideis, is the Hesiodic Aspis, or Shield of Heracles. It starts undisguisedly by an extract from the Eoiai, or Catalogue of Women, beginning with the words ἤ κόσμη, ‘or like . . . ’; Or like Alcmena, when she left her home and land to follow her husband—Alcmena, who surpassed the whole race of women in form and stature, while in intellect no one competed with her.’ So on for fifty-six lines till we hear that she gave birth to Iphicles and Heracles. Then, ‘who also killed Kyknos, son of Ares’. Then from 57 to 122—less than sixty lines—we hear how Herakles and his nephew Iolaus saw Kyknos and Ares blocking the pilgrims’ way to Delphi, and Iolaus told Herakles to arm. Then in twelve lines we are told how he puts on greaves, thorax, spear and helmet, also club, bow and poisoned arrows—a very mixed and rather embarrassing accoutrement; then from 138 to 313 we find nearly 200 lines occupied with a description, obviously traditional and, so to speak, taken ready-made from store, of a great heroic Shield, like those made by Hephaestus for Achilles in the Iliad (18. 478-617) and for Menon in the Aethiopis. Descriptions of shields were like Prooimia, part of the bard’s stock-in-trade. It is worth noting that in one of the Homeric papyri (751) several lines here describing Herakles’ shield are attributed to that of Achilles. An echo of the tradition can be noted in the shields of the Seven against Thebes and that of Achilles in Euripides’ Electra. Then comes the battle with Kyknos, with what looks like an insertion from some other store about the wounding of Ares by a hero under Athena’s guidance—here by Herakles, as by Diomedes in Iliad V and by Odysseus in the Telegony. A competent but not inspired bard had just stuck together ready-made pieces of his traditional store by the help of a few lines of his own in the proper style and the correct Homeric metre. The necessary Cosmos is achieved. The poem is ready for performance.

Far more puzzling and interesting is the effort after Cosmos in Hesiod’s Theogony. There clearly is such an effort, some attempt at a selection out of an immense store. The imperfections of the Theogony itself imply the selection; the immense store is implied by the great number of works attributed to Hesiod, and the quotations by ancient authors, using phrases like ‘Hesiod, or one of those who have inserted verses into Hesiod’, or ‘the author of such-and-such’, or more vaguely still τὸ μετουσιόν (cf. Hom. fr. 87, 158, 163, 171, 174, 177, 188). The Theogony itself professes to be the work, in Professor Cornford’s language, of a prophet or shaman like that inspired chief in the Gilbert Islands, rather than a mere poet or διαγγελέα. It comes from inspiration. Hence it starts with a long appeal to the Muses, or probably a combination of at least two such appeals; this includes a brief but orthodox list of the Olympian gods (11-21, omitting such unpleasant persons as Ares). Then, having paid this tribute to the Olympians, we start upon the real origin of the world from Chaos; first came Earth and Tartarus, and Erôs; Earth out of herself produced the Sky, and we proceed with the progeny of Ouranos and Gaia. This leads to the sequence of Enneadai gods; an old Sky King who, wedded to Earth, produces a Young Sky King, who in co-operation with his mother Earth kills or removes the Old King and takes his place, till he in turn becomes an old King and is duly destroyed by his son with the same accomplice. The new Kings come and go with the years, but Earth the eternal wife and mother remains. The actual Ouranos—Kronos story occurs in 155—200, the Kronos—Zeus story in 454—506. It ought, of course, to continue with the overthrow of the Old Zeus by a Young Zeus, as it does in the Orphica, and so on for ever; but that, in the Olympian tradition, cannot be thought of. On the contrary, we have for some five hundred lines, from about 510 to the end of the poem at 1918, the stories of all the sinister or unwise beings who strove against Zeus and were defeated, including a short insertion about the defeat of the over-clever Prometheus. Then comes the War of the Titans; the episode of the three powers of Darkness, Kottos, Gyes, and Briareus, who had been released and forgiven by Zeus and thus became his policemen; then finally the Chthonian monster Typhon. It is all a prolonged battle between Zeus and his dark Enemies, and the ultimate victory of Zeus. It is a strange mixture; many lists,
muses, nymphs, rivers, etc., consorts of Zeus, etc., all of them imperfect; an attempted combination of the very personal anthropomorphic Olympians, and impersonal beings such as Earth, Sky, Darkness, Erebus, etc. What unity of theme can we find? Following a study of Cornford's and some suggestions in Professor Gaster's great collection of Semitic Nature rituals, I am inclined to see in the Theognis not exactly an independent poem, but a μῆθος in its special religious sense of τὰ θεϊκά ἑπὶ τοὺς δρωμένους. It seems to be the accompaniment or explanation of a great ritual pageant combining two distinct but well-known rituals: the regular eniautos series of Old Kings dethroned each year by Young Kings, and secondly, the battle of Darkness against Light, which we know from the Mummers Play. It is, after all, an ἐπιδείκτις, a performance at a festival, and thus has a right to be a book, a real σώμα σώματος, or consistent unity, made out of a selection from a mass of inconsistent local lore.

Apart from these public rituals, educated people evidently knew a great lot of current poetry by heart. Niceratus, in Xenophon's Symposium, mentions that he can still repeat the whole of the Iliad and Odyssey, which his father had made him learn ὅτις σύγχρος ἄνερ γένος. He is reminded, however, that all the professional rhapsodes can do that, and where can you find an ἡλικιωτέρον ἔρως, 'a siller tribe'. This criticism perhaps led to the collection of select passages. One might collect out of the poets the parts that were really calculated to make you good, such as the educational parts of Hesiod, and the moral precepts of Solon, Tyrtaeus, and Theognis. Hence arose educational handbooks, containing as much as the compiler could collect of the suitable elegiac material. Evidently it was often anonymous or its author was forgotten. Hence particular poets, in order to preserve their rights, imposed what they called a 'seal' or σφραγίς on their compositions. It might be a definite statement καὶ τὸν Φωκαλίκεο, or more artistically the advice or exhortation might be addressed to some special person. If to Kyros, you knew the author was Theognis, just as advice to 'the foolish Perse' was the work of Hesiod. This might protect the authorship of a particular couplet, but was no protection against interpolation. Another proof of the same uncertainty of authorship, or one might say the widespread indifference to that question, is afforded by the considerable number of passages in our Theognis collection which are elsewhere attributed to other elegiac poets. I suspect that the chief popular test of authorship was style; indeed, no objective evidence can have been easily available. When in doubt, love poems were presumably by Mimnermus, warlike poems by Tyrtaeus; political wisdom belonged to Solon, fierce oligarchic 'virtue' to Theognis, and floating verses of uncertain origin were apt to be distributed accordingly.

The collection that comes to us under the name of Theognis is in many ways instructive. We can see, roughly speaking, about what time it was made. Isocrates (Nicocles 43) says that people regard Hesiod, Theognis, and Phocylides as άδριστοι συμβολικοί τού βίου, but do not attend to them. 'And if somebody were to make a collection of the so-called Gnomaic of the most eminent poets it would be just the same.' Evidently the idea was in the air but still new. Again, Plato in the Laws (810e) criticises what he regards as the common view that the best education is for boys 'to be constantly hearing and learning' the famous poets till they are 'saturated'; whereas many educationalists make extracts and headings and whole speeches into a collection (ἐς ταῦτα συναχώγοιται) and set them to be learnt by heart. He himself thinks it would be much better if they learnt by heart good prose philosophy like 'the discussion we are now having'. Our Theognis is evidently just such a collection, based on Theognis and made by someone who shared that poet's strong opinions on democracy, but embracing a good many gnomaic of an equally elevating character without much care about their authorship. It is very interesting to note, as Mr. Barns points out in the Classical Quarterly for 1951, 1, that another type of anthology was also made, consisting not of harmonious gnomai but of contradictory gnomai; the student was to consider both Logoi, and presumably judge between them. This is quite in the spirit of the early sophists; they may well have noted a few such contradictory gnomai, but any large anthology of them must, I presume, be much later in date. Our Theognis collection was evidently a great success, and seems to have driven the rest of Theognis' poetry out of existence. Hardly anything is quoted from him by later compilers which does not come from this little book.

In poetry, then, one can see how a Cosmos, a work in permanent artistic shape, with a definite fixed text, arises out of a mass of μυθεαξομένων or μυθεαξόμενων. I leave aside for the moment the special songs, like those of the Lesbian and Boeotian schools, the skolia and the songs of Anacreon. But is there a similar process in prose? Of course there are lists and catalogues and memoranda, magical charms, contracts, Laws, and Treaties. They are preserved for their obvious utility. Also important speeches, both public and private, political and personal alike, tend to be preserved. Some are useful to the possessor; all are careful works of art recited in public on a specific occasion, in the same way as Pindar's Odes. But what about the ἐποτοθή or Enquiry of Herodotus, made into a book and called his 'Nine Muses'? They are clearly meant for recitation. Thucydides says so (I. 22. 4). The ancients generally assume it as a matter of course. Traditions speak casually of recitations at Thebes, Athens, Corinth, and what is more important, Olympia. He himself sometimes pauses to correct the scepticism with which certain of his statements had been received by previous audiences. He often refers to particular Logoi, and sometimes to Logoi that do not now exist. Sometimes he promises Logoi which he does not give. The book may not be quite finished; nevertheless, he has
out of most various materials made ἐν σῶμα σύμφωνον, 'one harmonious body,' just as Homer did. The whole was too long for ordinary performance; so were the Iliad and Odyssey. But, like them, it was not too long for some very great occasion; not too long for the quadrennial Panhellenic Panegyris at Olympia, as the Iliad was not too long for the Panonian Panegyris at the Panathenaea. Perhaps, like them, very suitable to be learned by heart, in long passages, such as ἀκόμη Μνημένα. A public which does not read is capable of wonderful feats of listening and of memory. And, as Longinus and other ancient critics remarked, Herodotus was recognised as Ὁμηρικότατος καὶ Πανηγυρικότατος, most Homeric and most suited for a Panegyris. The two adjectives, I think, are almost identical in meaning. The Homeric poems, clearly a great artistic unity, clearly composed for recitation yet far too long for an ordinary occasion, demand a great Panegyris. So does Herodotus, and he has the more impressive claim to it because he has not only made his great mass of material into a 'single concordant body,' he has also made his πέντε φρόνει όμοιαν τῇ κραστίστῃ ποιησί]. His prose language like the noblest poetry' (Dionysius vi. 865). He thus won for his book not only the title of The Nine Muses, but a place in permanent literature like that hitherto reserved for great poetry.

The one author who in Longinus' opinion deserves equally or even more the title of Ὁμηρικότατος is Plato. The ten Logoi of the Republic form a σῶμα σύμφωνον, just as Herodotus' Nine Muses do; his prose undoubtedly is 'like the noblest poetry,' and when we keep well in mind that recitation or reading aloud, ἀναγγελεῖσθαι or ἐπίθεσθαι, and not private reading, was the normal object of literature in antiquity, we cease to be surprised that Aristophanes in the Ecclesiazusae should have quoted and parodied in detail doctrines and phrases of the Fifth book of the Republic some twenty years before the Republic as a whole can have been what we call published. Evidently the part which we now call Book V, in some form similar to that in which we have it, had been read aloud, had received an ἐπίθεσθαι or ἀναγγελεῖσθαι to a select audience, a long time and doubtless many times, before the whole work as a 'single harmonious body' was ready for the public. No doubt a good deal of it was learnt by heart. Probably the Athenian speaker in the Lysis was quite serious when he recommended that the young should be encouraged, as a matter of education, instead of mere poetry, to learn by heart a good stretch of his own somewhat prolix wisdom.

Herodotus evidently made an epoch in Greek literature. Traditionally there were two kinds of composition which were recognised as works of art and worthy of preservation with a fixed text; poems such as dramas and odes and epics composed for some special epideixis, and prose speeches composed with high rhetorical art and delivered on some particular occasion. Other books were roughly speaking handbooks for information or professional use. Of course, historians and λογοτητοί read aloud extracts from their works as they moved about. They collected facts, but were hardly artists. Dionysius (p. 181) mentions twelve predecessors of Herodotus who all wrote in the same way, copying down their sources, and sometimes criticising them, but with no style, no διαίνεισις. Herodotus was quite different. He composed something that reminded people of the Iliad and was suited for a great Panegyris, something Ὁμηρικόν καὶ Πανηγυρικόν. He made his prose speech ὅμοια τῇ κραστίστῃ ποιησί]. His book was not quite finished, but it stood there as a great harmonious whole.

But what of Thucydides? He did not seem to fall into any recognised category. No one could call him πανηγυρικός. He was not at all suitable for recitation to a vast audience, only for a selected group of intellectuals. Yet he was full of ὑποθέσεως πανηγυρικά, 'subjects suitable for large public treatment.' Dionysius seems rather puzzled, not to say peevish, about him. He respects him as a historian, as indeed the greatest of historians; he has rejected the mythical stuff of the earlier historians, rejected their untruthfulness and hugum (γοντεία). He has seen that History is 'the priestess of Truth.' Yet even as a historian he has faults: his system of chronology by summers and winters of the war leads to terrible confusion, his speeches are not only interruptions to the narrative but are also tiresome (ἀνθρακί) to listen to (pp. 847, 910). His style too is full of archaisms, strange words, foreign turns of speech, and even solemnisms. He is sometimes so moving, sometimes so cold and indifferent (845). He is ἐποχή, constantly obscure, unintelligible, 'more twisted than any labyrinth' (913). The fact is he writes like a poet, parts of him are ποιητικά, parts are actually full of ἐπεισοδίων λόγων (869), parts even more like διήθησιμον (887). This is just what his fanatic admirers are most enthusiastic about, his grandeur and emotional power.

A critic in Marcellinus' Life roundly condemns Thucydides for writing stuff that is neither verse nor yet good prose. It has no ρήματική. Marcellinus answers that of course it is prose, not verse, but it is marked out 'by poetical expressions and metaphors' (ποιητικάς λέξεως καὶ μεταφράσεις), that, as for ρήματική, it is not a necessary quality in good prose; Plato does not use it, nor yet do handbooks of medicine. What these critics blame in Thucydides is really a sign of his extraordinary genius—his power and his high artistic ambition, δύναμις καὶ πλεονεξία. He is like Homer, too, in his ὄλοκληρον, that is, in the way in which he works a great and varied subject into a unity.

It is interesting to note that the ancient critics were almost as conscious as the moderns of the problems affecting the composition of the great book. They see that it cannot have been written at one go. He began, says Marcellinus, by making a very careful collection of facts, using his great wealth to pay groups on both sides to keep him informed—like the foreign correspondents of a
modern newspaper. Then, when in exile, he worked up the collection into an artistic whole. Then came the second war. A new conception was necessary. The introduction especially must have been written after all the rest. Some, we are told, divided his work into thirteen books; some into eight. In any case the last book was unfinished and left without speeches, not, as Dionysius thought, because he saw what a mistake the speeches were, but simply because he died before τὴν προθεσμίαν, 'the appointed day'. A curious phrase, taken apparently from the language of the theatre and meaning the day of the performance. Was there to have been some great Ἐπίδαιες? Difficult prose writing, divided by some into eight books and by others into thirteen, and not finished; only intelligible to a small and scholarly audience; it was yet, by some art of genius, ἐν σῶμα σύμφωνον, and in some strange way Ὀμηρικόν and παυληγυρικόν. It produced not mere παιδο like a prose speech, but like a great poem, ἐκπληξῖς, how shall we translate that word? L. and S. say 'consternation', which will not quite do here. Rhys Roberts says 'transport'. It leaves you 'amazed' or 'astounded'. Literally it 'knocks you out'. The greatest poetry need not particularly produce παιδο or παιδεία, persuasion, or instruction. It just produces ἔκπληξις, 'it knocks you out', or as Dionysius sometimes puts it, κατάπληξις 'it knocks you down'. Ἐκπληξῖς was considered a special characteristic of Aeschylus.

Genius cannot be analysed. It does not think much of mere σοφία or τέχνη or logic. It is not the same as Cosmos. Yet it was by means of Cosmos and in the search for Cosmos that it ultimately asserted its rights. The reciter must be ready for the occasion, for τὴν προθεσμίαν, the First Night. The thing produced must be a consistent whole, a unity; and for a very great occasion, a great whole. If it is prose it may be a speech which needs παιδώ, power of persuasion; if not, it is chiefly a vehicle of useful information, but it always needs some sort of Cosmos or arrangement. It is interesting to note that Thucydides based his claim to have composed not a mere ἐπίδαιες for recitation, but a κτίμα εἰς δεί, 'a thing to keep permanently', on its usefulness as a book of reference in case the same sort of thing as the Peloponnesian War should happen again. Did he suspect that he had made a κτίμα εἰς δεί in a much greater sense? He created 'an eternal possession' for the human race because, in addition to its Cosmos and its truth to fact, it had genius and produced ἔκπληξις, if not for ever at least for two thousand years, for instance in historians like Macaulay. Herodotus, Thucydides, Plato, these three more than any others seem to have produced the conception of a serious prose work which should, in addition to the accepted rules of Cosmos and Sophia, reach also by its own methods a power of inspiration or emotional effect akin to that of poetry.

After Thucydides we are well into an age which likes to analyse its art and seeks its effects by self-conscious τέχνη and σοφία. The next important step which it took was the style of Isocrates. He could see what Thucydides' faults were: we have just been through them—the strange words, the contorted sentences, the bewildering brevity; Isocrates would be normal and correct in language, use well-constructed periods, and insist on perfect lucidity, σαφνεία. He would study παιδώ and convince his audience. All these things he does. Furthermore, since the greatness of Thucydides and Herodotus was said to be due to their poetic qualities, he would have qualities still more poetical; cola and periods exactly balanced as in a lyric poem; plenty of echoes and paronomasias and parenthesis, and lastly, like real poetry, he would make his prose avoid hiatus between vowels. Then he would write a tremendous Panegyricus, like Herodotus, and a Panathenaicus, like Homer. What more could possibly be desired? Only the genius was lacking. There is not much ἔκπληξις in him or any of his followers.

Gilbert Murray
A BRONZE FROM DODONA

The bronze piece here studied is in the possession of Sir John Beazley, and it is at his invitation that I publish it. I must thank him both for his invitation and for enabling me to study the object repeatedly and at leisure. It was acquired in Paris.

The object is a thin, ovoid piece of bronze with a projection, representing the head of a snake, within the circle. The whole object is doubtless thought of as a coiled snake. The dimensions of the whole are: inner diameter from A of NAPOLEON to O of ANETHON, 0.065 m.; distance from tip of snake's head to opposite inner edge, between Σ and Τ of ΕΣΠΡΑΤΟΥ, 0.050 m. The bronze is of a regular width, save that it widens slightly behind the projecting head; normal

width, 0.008 m.; width behind head from outer edge to base of head, 0.010 m. Length of snake-head, 0.027 m. Average thickness, 0.003 m.; max. thickness of head, 0.005 m.

The piece, which is covered with a green patina, is perfectly preserved save for a narrow strip where the surface has been removed, which appears as a black streak on the photograph. This may be original, and due to a flaw in casting, since the dots of the inscription, which are in its path, appear to be undamaged by it.

The inscription, in dotted lettering, starts immediately to the left of the snake's head, the second letter of the first word being in the centre behind the head. The letters, punched on the surface, are mostly 0.005 m. high; omicron, 0.003 m. They are carefully executed, and set in the centre of the circular coil. The inscription reads: ΑΙΣΧΡΟΝ ΔΙ ΝΑΙΟΝ ΔΩΡΟΝ ΕΣΠΡΑΤΟΥ ΑΘΕΣΑΝ.

The dedication to Zeus Naios identifies the piece as an offering, or 'gift', to Zeus of Dodona, to whom and to whom alone this cult-title belonged.2 As regards style, the inscription is

1 I must also thank archaeological friends in Oxford, notably Dr. Paul Jacobsthal, for discussing the object with me.
2 For Zeus Naios, see Farnell, Cults 1, pp. 36 ff.; A. B. Cook, CR XVII (1903), pp. 78-86. The same epiklesis is also found at Athens [IG II, 4707; Acrop. Inv. 4897 (cf. lemma ad IG II, 4643); IG II, 4643; 5113; Σ, 274, lines 11, 20, 197, 225, etc.; of these only 4707 is a dedication to Zeus Naios; 4643 is a dedication to Zeus Naios and Dione, his consort, and the remainder refer only to Dione. The cult was evidently established by the fifth century, and continued into the Roman period, and at Delos (Bekker, Anes. Graec. I, p. 208, i.e. Ναίον Δώρος; δι την Διόνυσος, δι την Διόνυσος Ναίον Δώρος ὁμοίως; no documentary corroboration of this exists, so the cult can have been only of minor importance—if indeed the entry is not an error); in both places it doubtless derived from the Dodonaeian cult; cf. Cook, op. cit. p. 186.
closely akin to the inscriptions on the ex-votos and bronze plaques found at Dodona, and published by Caranops in 1878, and by reference to these it is possible to fix an approximate date for it. As regards technique, the dotted, drilled lettering, of which this piece is a particularly fine example, is paralleled by numerous inscriptions from Dodona. The use of dotted lettering is indeed common on bronze at all periods, and call for little comment.

Several of the proxeny-decrees and manumission-documents from Dodona are dated by the reigning King of Epirus and the Molossians. Of those so dated, the majority bears the name 

\[ \text{basileus 'Alexandros}. \]

One, however—a proxeny decree—is dated by \[ \text{basileus Neoptolemos}. \]

The interpretation of these inscriptions constitutes the thorniest problem of Epirote history at this period, and agreement as to the date of those in which reference is made to King Alexander has not yet been reached, opinions being divided between the first king of that name, who died in south Italy in 330 B.C., and Alexander II, the nephew of Pyrrhus, who died ca. 240 B.C. On the other hand, the identity of the King Neoptolemus, son of Alexander, is not in serious doubt: we know of only one king of that name, who reigned at the end of the fourth century, dying in 297.

The lettering of the inscription in which he is mentioned has been, as frequently in documents of this type, worked in dots from the reverse, thus appearing in relief on the front surface. In style it is thus closely analogous to, though not identical with, our piece, and a comparison of the lettering of the two inscriptions is permissible. This comparison reveals a close resemblance. Both have, in particular, the small suspended omicron and the splay omega, and in general the shape of the hands is very similar. The inscriptions referring to King Alexander seem to be of earlier date; the letters are far more rigid and less elegant, and for this reason I would be inclined to regard the Alexander as the first Epirote king of that name (ob. 330 B.C.). Consequently, a date ca. 300 B.C. would, on these grounds (and these are all there are) be a suitable date for our offering.

The dedication, like most of those at Dodona, is written in ordinary koiné. The word \[ \text{ἀνέθηκα}, \] found in our text, is also found in one of the two early (sixth–fifth-century) dedications, and is thus evidently to be attributed to the fact that the dedications were made by foreigners to whom such forms were natural. On the three dedications most closely akin in style, and no doubt in date, to ours, the form \[ \text{ἀνέθηκα} \] is constant. The contracted form \[ \text{Δι} \] is also found at Dodona from the

---


4 See, for example, C. xxii, 1, 3, 4, 6; xxvii, 1, 4, 5; all dedications; xxvii ff.: all documentary texts.

5 An epigraphical corpus of this material is badly needed. There is a useful list of inscriptions in bronze in Robert, *Coll. Froehner* 1, pp. 47–8.


7 The most important discussions of this are those of Nilsson, *Land Arisrskrif*, N. F. Age 1, Bd. 6 (1910), no. 4, "Studier zur Geschichte des Alten Epeiros", pp. 55 ff.; Beloch, *GG, III*, 2, pp. 161 ff.; G. N. Cross, *Epirus, 1932*, pp. 161–163 (a useful summary). The problem hinges mainly on the relationship of the κόσσιον of the Molossians mentioned in the documents which refer to King Alexander, to the symmachi of the Epirotes, which occurs in the decree which mentions King Neoptolemos. Nilsson regarded the Molossian κόσσιον as the sovereign community of the Epirotes which preceded the Epirote symmachi, primarily on grounds of the lettering (with which I agree, see below, note 15), and thus made Alexander the first Molossian king of that name. Beloch held that the κόσσιον was not a unit of the Epirote symmachi, and contemporary with it, but rather a kind of league between these two alternatives, although I favour the earlier date on epigraphical grounds (though this does not mean that Beloch’s explanation may not be factually correct). The argument of Cross, pp. 110–111, that the Achaeans were the first κόσσιον in the west, originating ca. 314 B.C., and that the appearance of the κόσσιον of the Molossians must be later than this, is untenable in fact (though it could be right in principle; but these conclusions are not involved here), and the normal engraved stroke lends itself less readily to slight curves. In spite of this I feel fairly confident that they are of the fourth century, and not the third, as would be necessary if Alexander II was the king in question.


9 The later date is favoured by Klotzsch, *Epirot, Gesch.* pp. 53, 173–74; *Cross, loc. cit.* For Alexander II see the discussion in *Cross*, pp. 124 ff.

10 For Neoptolemos see H. Berve, *RE*, s. v. Neoptolemos (4), cols. 249–454. (Neoptolemos I was the son of Alcetas (see *Berve, s. v. Neoptolemos* (3)), and does not therefore come into question.) *Cross, op. cit.* pp. 106 ff., argues that Neoptolemos was not the son of Alexander I, since if he had been then he must be presumed that he reigned as an independent monarch, while Arrian (*Forth* 156, 5 § 7) and Ctesippeus (ibid. 100, F 81, § 8) ‘both speak of Epirus as forming part of Antipatos’ government after Alexander’s death’. In fact, however, both Arrian and Ctesippeus refer to Epirus in terms of specific boundaries (Arrian says δι’ ἰταλίας διά τις δρῆς κατὰ νόμους ἀνέθηκα and οἱ Ἐλληνες συμμάχους Κροτστάρι καὶ Ἀντιπάτρῳ βουλήτι, while Ctesippeus has Ἀντιπάτρος ἔχει τὸν Εὔπρονον ἐνδοτικὸν σύμμαχον ὀσύκτωρον ἀνέθηκα), and though the implications of these definitions for political history cannot, in the absence of other evidence, be determined, they clearly admit the possibility that Epirus was only in part a Macedonian protectorate, while the rest of the territory remained, as it had been in the time of Alexander the Great, independent.

11 Compare, for example, the bronze plaques from Lusia, *JdO*, IV (1901), pp. 84 ff. Nos. 4–7 (16 V, 2, 392–395, and tab. v, 2; *KG*, Inst. Gs. pl. 21).

12 Facs. of *SGDI*, 1336: xxvii, 1.

13 Facs. of *SGDI*, 1334 in *AEOV*, p. 193; ibid. 1335, C. xxvii, 3; ibid. 1337; C. xxiii, 5; ibid. 1346; C. xxvii, 1. It should be noted that the first two of these four dedications are not involved here, and the normal engraved stroke lends itself less readily to slight curves. In spite of this I feel fairly confident that they are of the fourth century, and not the third, as would be necessary if Alexander II was the king in question.

14 C. xxvii, 2; cf. ibid. Texte, p. 40: ‘L’emploi des lettres longues e et o indique que Terpilaces est un Ionien’. A dialect form of the present tense occurs in *SGDI*, 1369 = C. xxvii, 1: Πελεάτης ταύτα ἀνέθηκα τῷ Δι καὶ χρήματα.

15 C. xxvii, 3; 5–6.
fifth century onwards, in one instance in the same document as the longer form.16 There seems to be no chronological distinction involved.

The general interpretation of the dedicatory inscription leaves room for some uncertainty. The phrase δώρον ἑργατοῦ is ambiguous. First the form ἑργατοῦ: this is hardly comparable to the common ἐστήλη for ἐστήλη,17 or ἔτωλ, found at Dodona itself for ἐτὺαλ,18 since the omission of the kappa of ἐκ is harsher than that of the easily assimilated νυ or μυ of ἐκ. We should, however, probably regard the form as correct, and not suppose that the kappa was omitted accidentally. This being so, how are we to understand the word ἑργατοῦ? Two obvious formal possibilities exist: it may be the genitive of the place-name Στράτος in Acarnania or it may be from ἑργατός, 'army'. But the latter alternative seems very unlikely. First, ἑργατός is itself a poetical word and out of place here; it would have to be understood in the sense of ἑργατεία, 'campaign', a usage for which there are no analogies. Secondly, if that were possible, it seems unlikely that this small object would be dedicated either as the spoils of war or for a safe-homecoming after campaigning. It is therefore preferable to interpret ἑργατοῦ as ἑ(κ) Στράτος 'from Stratos'.

The reference to the Acarnanian city causes itself in no difficulty, but the phrase still needs attention. Are we to take ἑ(κ) Στράτος closely with δώρον, 'a gift from Stratos', or does it go with ἀλογροφω, providing him with the ethnic qualification he otherwise lacks, equivalent to the normal Στράτος?19 Certain ethnic, and still more demotic, affinities, are, of course, expressed, by the prepositions ἐκ and ἔτωλ, but these follow immediately on the name of the person to whom they belong (giving, in the present instance, ἀλογροφω ἑ(κ) Στράτος), and, moreover, they are mainly found in connexion with a wider political or ethnic group,20 and are rarely used of a city as equivalent to the simple ethnic.21 It may be argued that such a dedication as this would not demand a strict documentary usage, and that we should look for parallels rather in the language of epigrams, where usage in this respect is naturally less stereotyped, but the natural run of the sentence certainly makes it preferable that we take δώρον ἑ(κ) Στράτος closely together, and the language of other contemporary and similar dedications at Dodona, in which we find the ethnic, if used at all, used in its normal adjectival form, points to the same conclusion.22 The ethnic of Aischron is, then, unrecorded, as in the majority of surviving Dodonaean dedications.23 The object will have been a gift from Stratos: the circumstances must remain unknown.

So much for the inscription. The elucidation of the significance of the object itself is not within my competence. I do not feel certain that it represents anything more than a coiled snake. It obviously bears some resemblance to a metal buckle, but it is far larger than surviving instances, and the head of the snake does not project right across the oval as a buckle-pin would do.

---

14 Thus Δι in C. xxiii, 1–2. The first probably of the fifth century, the second perhaps even earlier. C. xxvii, 1, where it also occurs, is probably of the sixth century. The latest instance with it is C. xxiv, 4, a double dedication (both clearly inscribed at the same time): Αὔγουστος ποῦ Ναι, Αὔγουστος ποῦ Ναι (sic; as often). This piece appears to be slightly earlier than our snake (note the sigma with widely divergent haste). Some of the early pieces of (C. xxiii, 3; xxiv, 5) and the majority of the Hellenistic ones (xxiii, 5–6; xxiv 1–5; xxv 2) have Δι. Both Δι and Δι occur in the oracular texts: Δι: C. xxiii, 3 = SGGI, 1557; C. xxvii, 3; Evangideis, op. cit. p. 255, no. 13: Δι: C. xxv, 2, xxvii, 5 = SGGI, 1564. Hoffmann’s interpretation of the form Δι in the oracular texts, SGGI, 1582 = C. xxiv, 3, as a variant of Δι is accepted by Bechtel, Gr. Dialek. ii, pp. 78 ff. but, as Salomun, De dialect. Epioriarnum, etc. p. 148, § 5, pointed out, the presence in the same text of Δι = Δι indicates that this is probably only an eccentric. (So also, 1 suspect, in the Corcyrean dedication, IG ix, 1, 718, where Hoffmann, ibid., claims Δι is Δι. This is a dedication in the koiné to Zeus Hypsistos.)

15 For this see Meisterhans-Schweyzer, Gramm. der att. Inschr. p. 111.

16 C. xxvii, 1 = SGGI, 1573 = Michél, 84 = Syll. 5 1164. Blass, Rh. Mus., XXXIV 1879, p. 160, considered that the mm had been omitted accidentally. But the omission is not uncommon in this position.

17 For instances of the normal ethnic Στράτος see e.g. Syll. 2 index, s.s. The Κτητόν Στράτος occurs as an ethnic in IG, IX, 19, 3A, line 95.

18 For example: Αὐτολόκος καὶ Νασίπου (Syll. 3 380: 492, line 8; 500, line 9), Αὐτολόκος τοῦ βοττοῦ (ibid. 417, line 11), Αὐτολόκος καὶ Μαρτύριοι (IG VII, 287; 2476a); Πτερίδα τοῦ Καρίου (IG VII, 1766), Πτερίδα τοῦ Μαρησίου (ibid. 450), Πτερίδα τοῦ Μαμπόλλα (ibid. 361), Πτερίδα τοῦ Θεοῦ (IG V (1), 926); Αὐτοκόλλος τοῦ Τιμωρίου (Syll. 2 417, line 5); Αὐτοκόλλος τοῦ Λυκηστάς (IG VII, 12); Μεκέας τοῦ Αἰγός (Syll. 3, line 192), Μεκέας τοῦ Εὐκάρως (Syll. 5 342; line 90), Μεκέας τοῦ Διονύσιου (IG VII, 248), Μεκέας τοῦ Εὐκάρως (Syll. 3 492, lines 30–9; IG VII, 295; 2482); Αὐχεὺς τοῦ Αὐχείρης (ibid. line 34); Αὐχεὺς τοῦ Αὐχείρης (ibid. line 34); Αὐχεὺς τοῦ Αὐχείρης (IG VI, 340); Αὐχεὺς τοῦ Αὐχείρης (IG VII, 345); Αὐχεὺς τοῦ Αὐχείρης (IG VII, 345). In any case, the words seem to be tautological (IG ii, 7973); Σκόπος τοῦ Τιμωρίου (IG III, 10293), Σκόπος τοῦ Σκόπος (ibid. 10292), Σκόπος τοῦ Καλλίποδος (ibid. 10291). Examples of this usage could, of course, be multiplied; cf. Reisch, Gramm. der att. Inschr. i. pp. 268–9.

19 Instances are: Βούδολος καὶ Κασσαρίον (Syll. 2 314, vi, line 38); τοῦ Χίου Γανναίου (ibid. 4444; cf. Reisch, op. cit. p. 269, § 4); Κρινίδα τοῦ Κρινίδα (IG II, 8836: here, however, the use of the normal ethnic to denote a clerus would perhaps be incorrect); Κοινίκη καὶ Καλέμας (IG III, 9009) – καὶ τοῦ Καλέμας (IG III, 9234). Here the form may be influenced by the more usual Αὐτολόκος καὶ Μαρτύριοι, for which see previous note. There is nothing to suggest that the individual thus designated possessed a lower status (e.g. that of a metic) than an individual designated by the true ethnic.

20 The ethnic occurs only in C. xxiii, 2, Φιλόλοκος τοῦ Λυκηστάς (ibid. 417, line 11), and C. xxv, 3, Δι: Νασίπου (ibid. Αὐτολόκος).

21 For e.g. C. xxiii, 2, Τιμωρίου τοῦ Δ. Νασίπου Αὐτολόκος: C. xxvii, 5: Στάμπαρος Αὐτολόκος Δι: Νασίπου: C. xxviii, 6: Διαρόβος Δι: Νασίπου Αὐτολόκος Αὐτολόκος Αὐτολόκος Δι: Νασίπου, and others.
THE PROGRESS OF GREEK EPIGRAPHY, 1950–51

The present bibliography, relating to the years 1950 and 1951, follows the same lines as those of former years. Books and articles which I know only at second hand are marked by an asterisk. My cordial thanks are due to those scholars who have lightened my burden by sending me copies of their works.

Death has inflicted severe losses on epigraphical studies. Adolf Wilhelm, who for more than half a century stood in the foremost rank of Greek epigraphists and maintained his tireless activity, despite increasing infirmity, until nearing his eighty-seventh year, died in Vienna on August 10, 1950. *Quis desiderio sit pudor aut modus tam cavi capit?* J. J. E. Hondius, founder and editor of *SEG* and Secretary of the Epigraphical Congress which met at Amsterdam in 1938, died suddenly at the Hague on November 5, 1950, in his fifty-fourth year; in him *epigraphy has lost one of its most devoted and tireless servants, and all scholars in his field will mourn his passing*. Among others who have recently died are G. M. Bersanetti, E. Capps, E. Hermann, M. Launay, G. P. Oikonomos, A. Olivier, A. Passerini, A. Stein, and N. Vulčič. Further tributes have been paid to the work of P. Jouguet, A. Rehm, and P. Roussel.

I. GENERAL

My summary for 1948–9 appeared, somewhat belatedly, in *JHS* LXXII 20 ff., and, so far as it relates to Egypt and Nubia, in *JEA* XXXVI 106 ff. J. and L. Robert have issued two further *Bulletins Epigraphiques*, even fuller than their predecessors and indispensable for any serious study of Greek inscriptions. T. Marouzeau and J. Ernst we owe two volumes of the *Année Philologique*, relating to 1948 and 1949, and to G. Reincke the *Archäologische Bibliographie* for 1944–8. Of the *Année Epigraphique*, edited by A. Merlin, the issues for 1948, 1949, and 1950 have appeared in the *RA* and also separately, registering many Greek inscriptions relative to Roman affairs, while brief summaries of epigraphical discoveries and discussions are found in the *Fasciculi Archaeologici* for 1948 and 1949. The *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* and *Biblica* contain useful epigraphical surveys confined to their respective fields, and Byzantine studies are dealt with in the bibliography for 1939–48, * Dix années d'études byzantines*. Among bibliographies of individual scholars I note those of G. M. Bersanetti, M. Cary, H. Grégoire, P. Jouguet, D. M. Robinson, and P. Roussel.

No new instalments of *IG* have appeared, but fresh fascicles of the Delian, Cretan and Syrian corpora have been issued and are noticed below in their appropriate places, as also the main contents of two further volumes of L. Robert's *Hellenica*, devoted almost wholly to Asia Minor, and of Hondius's *SEG XI* (1), which deals with Aegina, the Argolid and Spartia. S. Dow's review article on archaeological indexes is chiefly concerned with the Index to *Hesperia*, I–X, and Supplements I–VI, and Y. Réquien's *Index* to the *Revue Archéologique* for 1900–1945 is of some value epigraphically. R. Joly comments on the proper use of epigraphical texts in school teaching, and a short article on *Epigraphy* by M. N. Tod appears in the new edition of *Chambers's Encyclopaedia*.

To the student of Greek language and literature inscriptions offer constant supplies of fresh materials of unique value, since they can usually be located and at least approximately dated.

---

1 I call attention to the following abbreviations: *Ann. Ploëdio* = *Annuaire du Musée National Archéologique de Plovdiv*; *BCAC* = *Bulletino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma*; *BIAB* = *Bulletin de l'Institut Archéologique Bulgare*; *Bibl. Bibl.* = *Beiträge zur biblischen Landeskunde und Altertumswissenschaft*. *Jb. K. Forsch.* = *Jahrbuch für Kleinasiatnische Forschung*; *Par Pass.* = *Parola del Passato*; *RIDAN* = *Revue internationale des droits de l'antiquité*; *SO* = *Symbalae Orientalium*.


3 *Epigraphica*, XI 166.

4 P. M. Fraser, CR I (1951) 225.

5 *Os. 27*: *Epigraphica*, X 160 ff. (with bibliography).


7 *Os. 11*: *Anz. Allert III* 193 ff., *Hesperia* 1 515 ff.

8 *Rq. XXXII* (1951) 857 ff.


10 *AJA* LIV 254, *Gnomon*, XXII 315 ff.


12 *REG LXIII* 121 ff., LXIV 119 ff.


15 *RA* XXXIII 80 ff., XXXIV 171 ff., XXXVI 172 ff.


18 *XXXI* 12 ff.


20 See n. 5.

21 A Tribute to Professor Max Cary (Oxford, 1951), 17 ff.

22 *Mil. H. Grégoire*, II, 8 ff.


24 Studies presented to D. M. Robinson, I (St. Louis, Missouri, 1951), xxii ff.

25 See n. 16.


27 *AJA* LIV 41 ff., 54 ff.


29 *PLB* III–IV 111 ff.

J. J. E. Hondius edits 36 a selection of fifty-nine inscriptions illustrating the Achaean (Arcadian and Cyprian) and Aeolic (Asiatic, Thessalian, and Boeotian) dialects, and M. Lejeune examines 37 the extension of  

hoe to denote long e in dialect-inscriptions of Attica, Troezen, Lusi, Delphi, Chryetia, and Thasos. G. Redard studies 38 Greek nouns in - 


ti, -tii, including a large number of ethnics, and E. Laroche 39 words derived from the root nem-. On both these works J. and L. Robert make 40 full and valuable comments. D. J. Georgacou finds 41 in inscriptions almost all the available evidence for the endings -t, -t (for -t, -to), in later Greek, and E. J. Bickerman's article 42 on 'The Name of Christians' considers the meaning of χριστιανος in Acts, XXI, 26, which he interprets as denoting entry into a legal category, and cites many epigraphical parallels for the name Χριστιανος. A. Wilhelm studies 43 the phrase έλοι Μουσα, found in IG IX (1) 235, IOSPE II 482, OGG 1, 321 ff., and Sammelbuch, 3990, A. Christophopoulos examines 44 the legal use of δηνος, and P. M. Fraser corrects 45 the interpretation of δρυματικοτητα in Sammelbuch, 626, deletes from LSS the word δρυματικοτητα, and studies 46 the alternative forms προς (or συγ) κρυο - κρυο. K. Bulas publishes 47 an interesting tabula Tilia, now in the Metropolitan Museum, New York, bearing a general title at the head and scenes from the several books of the Iliad, of which those from books XVIII-XXIV survive. A. Wilhelm's article 'Zu griechischen Gedichten' 48 includes 49 comments on a number of inscriptions, indexed on p. 155. J. H. Oliver interprets 50 in the light of epigraphical evidence the puzzling phrase τοι δρυματικοτητα το σωμα υπανευς in Pericles' Funeral Speech (Thuc. II 42.4), and J. Delz's inquiry 51 into Lucian's knowledge of Athenian antiquities involves frequent reference to inscriptions. A. Wiggers's selection, made in collaboration with E. C. Colwell and R. Marcus, of Hellenistic texts includes 52 three inscriptions, that of Abarcius of Hierapolis, part of that of Antonius of Commagene (OGI 383), and the poem of Synmos of Nubia (CIG 5041), found at Talmis. P. Friedländer's Epigraphata (cf. JHS LXXII 20) is discussed by J. Poulouk 53 and A. M. Woodward, 54 and C. M. Dawson's article on 'Some Epigrams by Leonidas of Tarentum' contains 55 stylistic remarks on a number of inscriptions in Friedländer's work (nos. 249, 30, 44, 87, 111, 135, 154, 169). G. Pasquil offered 56 the conclusion of M. Guaruccini (cf. JHS LXXII 20; f.) regarding the authorship of an oft-repeated couplet stressing the sadness of an early death, and sees in Κερελλανος not a Cyprian poet, but one who bears the Latin name, Etruscan in origin, Caerellius.

Inscriptions play an invaluable role in the study of Greek and Graeco-Roman history—political, military, social, and economic. Valuable comments are offered 57 by J. and L. Robert on a number of articles in RE XVI (3, 4), and much use is made of Greek inscriptions among the materials for E. De Ruggiero's Dizionario epigrafico di antichita roman, continued under the editorship of G. Cardinali, of which vol. IV is now complete. 58 A further instalment of F. Jacoby's monumental Fragmenta d'griechischen Historiker includes many inscriptions, quoted in full or in part as Φ(ragmenta) of ancient historians or as T(estimonia) relating to them; among the former are the Archilocho-inscriptions from Paros, IG XII (5) 445 (502, 1), the Lindian Chronicle, Lindos, II 2 (532), the Pergamene Chronicle, OGI 264 (506, 1), and the record of the arbitration between Samos and Priene, To Priene, 37 (417, 2; 491, 1; 535, 3); Jacoby's Aththis 59 also appeals occasionally to epigraphical evidence, indexed on p. 425. R. Miegs and A. Andrews render a service to students of the Pentekontaetia by their new and radically revised edition 60 of G. F. Hill's Sources for Greek History between the Persian and Peloponnesian Wars, in which 124 epigraphical sources are collected on pp. 284 ff., while the Parian Chronicle appears among the literary sources on p. 141. To K. M. T. Chirimes's Sparta I refer below (p. 69). E. Bickerman examines 61 the concepts of ομοσποχα and ιπαμον in classical Greek, and A. Aymard continues 62 his study of the title Βασιλευ Μακεδον and the character of the monarch in Macedonia and elsewhere. The vexed question of double citizenship, Roman and local, in the Imperial period is discussed 63 by E. Schonauer with special reference to the views of Lewald and Visscher and the evidence of the Cyrenaic edicts and the Rhodos dossier. A. Stein's Die Praefekten of Aegypten in der römischen Kaiserzeit, 64 G. M. Bersani's article 65 on 'Legatus pro praetore', and H. G. Pflaum's 'Les procurateurs équestres

---

34 Tituli ad dialectos Graecas illustrandras selecti, I, Leydon, 1950.
35 REG LXIII 134.
38 REG LXIII 135 ff., LXIV 138 ff.
39 CI Phil. XLIII 243 ff.; cf. REG LXIII 134.
42 RID Ant IV 297 ff.; cf. REG LXIV 1296.
43 Chron. d'Et. XXVII 162 ff. but sec XXVII 290.
44 Bromus, XIX 110 ff.
47 Rhe Mus. XCV 277 ff.
49 Ci Phil. XLVII 153 ff.
50 Chicago, 1947, pp. 156 ff.; cf. JHS LXIX 96.
51 BCH LXIII 189 ff.
52 CI LXIV 17 ff.
53 AJP LX XII 280 ff.
54 Riv. Fil. LXXVII 351 ff.
55 REG LXIII 190 ff., LXIV 119 ff.
56 Fasc. 8-9, Rome, 1941-9.
57 338 1950.
60 RID Ant IV 90 ff.; cf. REG LXIV 120.
61 RID Ant IV 61 ff., REA LII 115 ff.; cf. REG LXIII IX, LXIV 126 ff.
64 Ant Class XXI 223 ff., AJP LXXIII 418 ff.
65 Dis. Epigr. IV 387 ff.
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sous le Haut-Empire romain also use the relevant inscriptions. J. H. Oliver collects the new evidence supplied by inscriptions for the Attic Panhellenion founded by Hadrian in A.D. 131–2 and examines its official documents (see below, p. 67); Hadrian’s precedent for his Eleusinian initiation was, he argues, afforded not by Philip II of Macedon, as stated in our text of the Vit. Hadr. XIII 1, but by Philopappus, H. T. Wade-Gery’s study of the fortunes of Miltiades starts from a late sixth-century plate in Oxford, and inscriptions play their part in J. Schwartz’s account of Ti. Claudius Balbillus, prefect of Egypt and Nero’s counsellor, and in the first part of the Prosopographia Ptolemaica by W. Peremans and E. van’t Dack, comprising 1824 items belonging to the civil and financial service, to which Peremans’ Prosopographische opzoeckingen betreffende Ptolemaïsche Egypte should be added. I do not know I. Biežunska-Malowist’s discussion of some problems of ancient slavery save through the comments of J. and L. Robert. W. L. Westermann examines the extinction of claims in slave-sales indicated by the edoikoseis-clause found in 390 out of a thousand Delphian manumissions. The professions of freedom recorded in Attic and Delphian emancipations are collected and discussed by M. N. Tod (see below, pp. 67, 71). H. Schaefler’s article on τάραχοι contains much epigraphical material, and L. Robert makes considerable additions to his corpus of sculptured and inscribed monuments of gladiators. A second edition has appeared of H. I. Marrou’s Histoire de l’éducation dans l’antiquité, and M. N. Tod deals with some laudatory epithets, especially χριστός and ἄνωτος, found in Greek epitaphs, with a view to determining the qualities most prized among the common people. F. Pringsheim’s The Greek Law of Sale makes constant use of inscriptions, which are conveniently indexed on pp. 545 ff.

L. Robert’s brilliant Études de numismatique grecque offers striking illustrations of the fruitful co-operation of epigraphy and numismatics. Chapter I (pp. 6 ff.) deals with the coinages of the cities of the Troad, especially Alexandria, Scæpsi, Cebren (temporarily renamed Antiochia), Berytis and Larisa, supplementing the evidence of coins by that of inscriptions for historical and topographical purposes, and ends with a survey of monetary circulation in the Troad. Chapter II (pp. 101 ff.) identifies as Alabandus a figure in the frieze of the temple of Lagina. Chapter III (pp. 105 ff.) proves that the Attic δραχμαί (τοῦ) στεφανοφόρου, or δραχμαί στεφανοφόροι, named in Attic and Delian records, are the ‘new-style’ drachmas first issued about 180 B.C. Chapters IV and V (pp. 136 ff.) deal respectively with the στεφάνοις τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος of a Milesian inscription (Milet, III, no. 32), which are shown to be states belonging to Apollo, not states of a special type, and with the Cretan community of the Ἀριστοτ. Chapter VI (pp. 143 ff.) examines a considerable number of coins mentioned in the Delian inventories after 166 B.C., especially those whose names end in -φόρος (e.g. θουκωνοφόρος, τουρηφόρος, βοτρυφόρος, πλανηφόρος), assigning them on numismatic grounds to their several mints. Chapter VII (pp. 179 ff.), dealing with the circulation of the coins of Histiaeia and its relations with Macedonia and Rhodes, starts with an examination of the impressive list of thirty-one Histiaeian πρεσβύν appointed in one year about 266 B.C. (IG XII (9) 1187). The invaluable indexes include a list (pp. 238 ff.) of epigraphical texts discussed in the work.

The subject of Greek religion, its inner meaning and especially its outward observance, is one on which inscriptions throw an ever increasing light, and they afford abundant and invaluable evidence for vol. II of M. P. Nilsson’s masterly Geschichte der griechischen Religion, dealing with the Hellenistic and Roman periods, as well as for P. Amandry’s La mantique apollinienne à Delphes, whose appendix of testimonia (pp. 241 ff.) includes six inscriptions from Delphi and Athens. We may note also P. P. Bourbouls work on Apollo Delphinios, in which the epigraphical evidence is marshalled on pp. 13 ff., H. Grégoire’s studies of the mole-god and the mouse-god in Greece and India, in which Asclepius is traced to a Thessalian origin with his home at Tricca, B. Hemberg’s account of the nature and cult of the Cabiri and cognate deities, G. Restell’s examination of the Dioscuri and of the forms in which their name appears in dialect inscriptions, and A. J. Festugière’s detailed discussion of the composition and significance of the aretalogies of Isis, for which, he argues, we need not postulate an Egyptian model, but rather a Greek prototype, perhaps of the early third century B.C. P. Merlat’s Répertoire des inscriptions et monuments figurés du culte de Jupiter Dolichenus includes some Greek inscriptions, indexed on pp. 395 ff. The ruler-cult of the Hellen-
istic art is studied by J. Tondriau in a series of articles on the assimilation of Alexander the Great to various divinities 91 (in which the epigraphical evidence is confined to the phrase τοῦ Βασίλεως in the paean of Philodamus), on "Démétrios Poliorcète, Neos Théos" 92 and on the cults of the Seleucids 93 and Lagids 94 while P. M. Fraser derives 95 the epithet of Ζεὺς Σελεύκικος in Lydian documents from the Seleucid dynasty, but in Alexandria from Seleucia Pieria. To the functions of the Attic ἕξιγνοι I refer below (p. 64). W. Otto's posthumous work 96 edited by F. Zucker, on the ἱεροδούλεια in Hellenistic Egypt is based mainly on papyri, but frequently refers to inscriptions from other lands (pp. 41, 48, 67, 73 f.), and C. G. Yavis' *Greek Amulets* 97 describes many inscribed amulets (see index, pp. 263 f.), but quotes only a single Milesian text (p. 156). Inscriptions also contribute to M. P. Nilsson's articles on the use of lamps and candles in ancient worship 98 and on Anatolian "pseudo-mysteries"; 99 the word μυστήριον, used for pagan initiatory rites, is discussed 100 by A. D. Nock, who regards its meaning as "secret" (as in the Old Testament), unrelated to the sense it bears in St. Mark (IV 11) and St. Paul. F. Halkin comments 101 on the letters alleged to have been passed between Abgar and Jesus Christ, of which epigraphical texts have been found in five places. Special attention has recently been paid to a curious feature of ancient religion, the use of amulets, often inscribed, of which the most comprehensive and authoritative study is C. Bonner's *Studies in Magical Amulets, chiefly Graeco-Egyptian*, 102 in which inscriptions are carefully examined (pp. 167 ff.). The same scholar publishes 103 a Roman silver denarius, probably of Antaradus, re-used before A.D. 300 as a Christian amulet, whose inscription contains echoes of St. Paul's Epistles (I Cor. IV 3, Rom. VIII 28), and S. Ettrem deals 104 with a haematite amulet from Syria, now in Copenhagen, corrected by Bonner, and draws up a list of amulets against diseases. In an interesting article 105 A. J. Festugière summarizes Bonner's book and discusses a number of special points and problems, such as national elements and influences, solar and other types, the purposes of amulets, and their inscriptions, intelligible or cryptic. H. J. Rose reads 106 ὑγείας in place of ὑγειός in one of Bonner's amulets (op. cit. 87 ff., 276), and M. P. Nilsson examines 107 the snake-footed creature occasionally depicted on amulets.

In the field of art and architecture I note G. Klaßenbach's interesting lecture 108 on the relations between archaeology and epigraphy, G. M. A. Richter's *Archaic Greek Art against its Historical Background* 109 in which a number of inscribed monuments are studied (among them the Cypselid bowl from Olympia, Chares' statue from Didyma, and that of Aeacides from Samos, and the Kore of Antenor from the Athenian Acropolis), and O. A. W. Dilke's article 110 on 'Details and Chronology of Greek Theatre Caves', in which epigraphical evidence is used for the theatres of Piraesus, Thoricus, Rhamnus, Icaria, Orchus, Chaeonea, Mycenae, Epidaurus, Megalopolis, and Delos. I refer briefly to some vase-inscriptions published or discussed in works not primarily concerned with ceramics. To J. D. Beazley we owe expert notes 111 on twenty-four such inscriptions, of varied nature and provenance, and to J. H. Jongkees a valuable study 112 of price-inscriptions on Greek vases, in which he examines a r.f. kalpis in Utrecht University, defends his interpretation of its graffiti against M. J. Milne, draws up a list of prices attested before and after 470 B.C. (pp. 259 f.), and rejects Amxys' view that the numbers denote obols rather than drachmas. R. Lullies describes 113 some Attic b.f. pottery from the Ceramicus, including several inscribed vases, and M. T. Mitros 114 a Panathenian amphora of ca. 150 B.C. from the precinct of Pythian Apollo, bearing on its back the legend ᾱγωνοτέντος βα[σιλείας Καππαδοκίας; Ἀριστοκράτους πατρος καὶ ἐυσπουδούς. M. Robertson describes 115 a r.f. kylix of the Brygos Painter recently acquired by the British Museum, H. T. Wade-Gery 116 a r.f. plate in the Ashmolean Museum, dated 520–510 B.C., inscribed ΜΑΣΤΙΟΣ καλός, and A. D. Ure 117 a Boeotian kantharos, now in Reading, inscribed in retrograde script KΟΣΞ, the title, according to Hesychius, of the priest of the Cabiri. G. M. A. Richter reports 118 the rediscovery, in a private collection in Paris, of a fragment by Duris reputed to be lost, D. von Bothmer publishes 119 an Attic b.f. pelike, now in New York, bearing a καλός-inscription, and C. Boulter 120 the sherds of a white-ground krater in the Simple Collection at Cincinnati. M. Robertson deals 121 with Gordian cups found at Naucratis, among which are ten inscribed examples, and A. D. Trendall 122 with Attic vases in Australia and New Zealand, including two in Canterbury with καλός-inscriptions, one of doubtful authenticity. Other ceramic inscriptions are mentioned below in their geographical contexts.

---

91 *Ro Phil* XXIII 41 ff.
92 *BSA* AXLVIII 3 ff.
93 *Musée* LXI 171 ff.; cf. *REG* LXIII 132.
98 Op Arch VI 66 ff.
100 *Hare St* LX 201 ff.
103 *Harr. Thelos* Rev. XLIII 165 ff.
104 Ibid. 173 ff.
106 Ibid. 51 ff.
108 *BSA* XLV 21 ff.
109 *JdL* LXI–II 56, 58, 65, 60.
110 *JE* 1948–9, 5 ff.; cf. *REG* LXIV 155.
111 *BMQ* XVI 19 ff.
112 *JHS* LXXI 212 ff.
113 *JHS* LXXII 73.
114 *JHS* LXXI 120.
115 Ibid. 186, 193.
M. N. Tod publishes notes, mainly bibliographical, on the collection of Greek inscriptions in the Ashmolean Museum which came into the possession of Oxford University before 1763, and the Guide to the Danish National Museum: Oriental and Classical Antiquity refers to several Attic and other inscriptions and ten from Lindos, comprising the ‘Lindian Chronicle’. Lindos, II 2), the list of priests of Athena Lindia (ibid. 1), a law of A.D. 22 and 225, and seven signed statue-bases.

Recent discoveries have given a new impetus to the study of the history of writing and supplied it with fresh materials. The earlier stages of its development lie, strictly speaking, outside the scope of this survey, but since they belong to the ancestry of the Greek alphabet, I mention in passing some relevant books and articles. J. G. Février’s Histoire de l’écriture deals with all types of script and includes sections on the Cretan scripts, the Cypriote syllabary, the Semitic consonantal writing, especially the Phoenician alphabet, the Greek alphabet, its origin, characteristics and development, and the derived Anatolian alphabets. The Greek borrowing of the Phoenician letters cannot, he holds, be dated after 900 B.C. An appendix is devoted to numeral signs, but the Greek section of this is of little value; another appendix deals with the magical use of the alphabet.

Elsewhere Février discusses the light thrown by the excavations at Byblos on the date of the Phoenician alphabet. J. Bouïaert’s *Petite histoire de l’alphabet* I have not seen. H. Tur-Sinai traces in detail the origin and early evolution of the alphabet, holding that 

approximately at the beginning of the tenth century B.C.E. the Greeks adopted this early alphabet, i.e. the order and names of the letters as well as their shape, from the Canaanites of Phoenicia. A. Pratesi’s article on the origin and development of the alphabet and of separate letters contains bibliographical notes on some recent works on alphabetic history, and the subject is also studied by A. Jirku, who dates ca. 2000 the syllabic script of at least 75 signs used at Byblos, ca. 1800 the appearance of the first alphabet and Canaanite culture in Palestine, and ca. 1200 the creation of the Old Semitic linear script of 22 letters. Special interest has been roused by the discovery in 1949 at Ras Shamra of a tablet, apparently for educational use, dating from the fourteenth century and containing a cuneiform alphabet of thirty signs, of which the corresponding to the signs of the Phoenician alphabet occur in exactly the same order; the value of this new evidence is emphasized by R. Virolleaud and E. A. Speiser, of whom the last claims that 

one thing, at least, is now clear and beyond dispute: we are still a long way from fully understanding our ABC. W. F. Albright and R. Dussaud stress the value of the cuneiform biographical inscription on the statue of Idrimi found at 'Ashana by L. Woolley and published by S. Smith. D. Diringer’s account of the early Hebrew script contains a chart showing the evolution of the alphabet, and R. Demangel calls attention to the forms and meanings of the letters daieth and he. H. L. Lorimer’s Homer and the Monuments includes a chapter on ‘Writing in the Aegaean Area; the Age of Illiteracy in Greece’, in which tables of Semitic and Greek alphabets are reproduced from B. L. Ullman’s article and accompanied by notes contributed by him. P. Kretschmer’s article on the ancient system of punctuation deals with Etruscan and Greek punctuation, tracing one usage back to Phoenicia, the other to the Minoan script.

M. N. Tod studies the use in Attica of the alphabetic numeral system.

To recent research in the field of the Minoan scripts I deal very briefly, for their relation to the writing of historic Greece is still obscure. J. L. Myres’ monumental edition of the Cnosian tablets in Linear B appeared early in 1952, and so falls outside the range of this review. E. Sittig writes on the decipherment of the oldest European syllabic script, the Cretan linear script B, and claims that a comparison of the Cretan and Cyprian signs shows that the languages they express were similar in structure, and justifies the assignment of the same phonetic values to the same or similar signs in Cretan and Cyprian where general statistics support it. J. Sundwall examines a Cnosian tablet containing the double axe in postpositive position, (b) wagon-inventories, and (c) indications of hepatoscopy, and B. Hrozný gives a list of Cretan signs with the phonetic value he attributes to each, and also a summary of the scientific discoveries which he claims to have made; his work on the Minoan inscriptions is translated into French by M. David. V. Georgiev also publishes an essay on ‘Le déchiffrement des inscriptions minoennes’, and another on ‘Inscriptions minoennes quasi-bilingues’. K. D. Kistopoulos treats of composite words in the Minoan
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II. ATTICA

H. A. Thompson summarizes the epigraphical results of the excavations carried on in the Agora in 1949, including over a hundred inscriptions on marble and forty ostraka, and in 1950, when a Δημιοτρόπος, a ptytan decree and a number of clay tallies were brought to light, and reports on the Odeum in the Agora, in which many stamped roof-tiles of five types were unearthed. V. Grace continues her study of stamped jars from the Agora and elsewhere. M. T. Misios devotes himself to the rearrangement of the Epigraphical Museum, which in 1949 housed no fewer than 13,142 inscribed stones, and to the detailed study of its contents (below, p. 56). I. A. Meletopoulos' article on the antiquities of the port of Piraeus refers frequently to inscriptions, and the Piraeus Museum has been enriched by the gift of a number of articles, epigraphical and other, from his collection. The French excavation at Brauron has brought to light some votive bases, inscribed vessels and inventories, which still await publication. R. Carpenter's study of tradition and invention in Attic relief includes an examination of various inscribed votive and sepulchral stones. Of N. M. Kontoleon's work on the Erechtheum, in which numerous inscriptions are cited (indexed on p. 91), there is a useful summary by J. Pouilloux. J. H. Oliver's important work The Athenian Exponents of the Sacred and Ancestral Law deals with every aspect of the appointment and functions of the Ἐγγυται and contains a collection of 54 epigraphical references, mainly Attic, and an index of inscriptions discussed; new restorations are proposed in IG II² 3182, 39794, 4007, 4487, Hesperia Suppl. VIII 279 ff. and InOl. 612. The Ἐγγυται play a prominent part also in F. Jacoby's Athenis, where twenty-two items of epigraphical evidence, seventeen from Athens and five from Delphi (Delphi, III (2) 5, 6, 24, 59-60, 114), are quoted (pp. 8 ff.) and discussed (pp. 17 ff., 237 ff., 399). In an article on the processions followed by freedmen M. N. Tod examines the evidence of the catalogi paterarum argentarum (IG II² 1553-75), the list of names and professions appended to a fifth-century decree (IG II² 19), the fragment of that decree (IG II² 2405), and numerous epitaphs of the fourth or third century B.C. He also discusses the use of alphabetic numerals in Attic inscriptions.

In an article comprising 217 pages and 39 photographic illustrations W. Peek gives us a valuable series of 446 addenda and corrigenda to IG II and II, which include 86 unpublished inscriptions (of which nos. 15, 24-26, 29, 32, 46, 60, 79, 94, 212, 306, 309, 310, 327, 330 and 333 deserve special notice) as well as three new fragments added to texts already known. To a very large number of inscriptions (see the index, pp. 203 ff., which, however, does not cover pp. 209 ff.) Peek adds notes embodying corrections or additions to the descriptions of stones, revised readings, new restorations and miscellaneous comments, while thirteen texts included in IG II² are assigned to provenances outside Attica-Aegina (p. 213 nos. 8 ff.), Megara (no. 246), Oropia (nos. 269 bis, 361, 381), Boeotia (p. 214 no. 15), Carystus (no. 357) and Macedonia (no. 92).

[IG II².] Forty additional ostraka were found in 1949 in a pit in the Agora, and one beneath the Stoa of Attalus naming Socrates of Anagyrous, στρετηγός in 441-0 B.C. G. A. Stamires and E. Vanderpool discuss Callixenus the Alcmeonid, previously unknown, whose name occurs on 251 ostraka, 34 of which they publish, and A. Wilhelm examines the famous metrical inscription on an ostrakon given against Xanthippus, father of Pericles, in which he restores ὁκτάδδος.
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θείας ἄλητερδα τῆς ἀρχον τοῦ Ἀθηναίων. A. E. Raubitschek traces a large number of Attic vases of the late fifth century, four of them inscribed (nos. 1, 4, 58, 102), found in a well on the south slope of the Kolonos Agoraion, and I. Papademetriou edits an epigram of the late fifth or early fourth century, unearthed on the western foothills of Hymentus, commemorating Myrrhine, daughter of Callimachus (perhaps the archon of 446–45), τὴν πρώτην Νικήτας θεωπότελεσα νεον. We may also note an archaic votive statuette of Athena, perhaps of Peloponnesian origin, and a r.f. cup from the Acropolis with a καλλι- inscription, both added to the National Museum, and a late fifth-century epitaph from Chalandri.

B. D. Meritt, H. T. Wade-Gery and M. F. McGregor have issued the eagerly awaited third volume of The Athenian Treasury Lists, which sets forth the history of the Athenian fifth-century Empire, as revealed in the sources, epigraphical and literary, collected, arranged and restored in vols. I and II. The work falls into three sections, dealing respectively with 'The evidence of the texts' (pp. 5 ff.), 'The other evidence' (pp. 95 ff.), and 'The Athenian Naval Confederacy' (pp. 183 ff.), and will be followed by a further volume containing the indexes essential to the maximum utility of the work.

In a second edition of the Archaike Marble Sculpture from the Acropolis of H. Payne and G. Mackworth Young several inscribed monuments appear (IG I 469, 485, 589), but, though the photographs are superb, the epigraphical references leave much to be desired.

Other inscriptions in IG I 2 which call for notice are the following:

5 (SEG X 3), 6 (SEG X 6). In an addendum to his Legees Graecorum Sacrae L. Ziehen restores Εὐαρεις (fl. 5) Ιετα in 5.5 and μένειν β' ἑπτά τοῖς γέρ. Ιεται in 6.113 ff.

10–13a (GHI 29, SEG X 11), 18 (SEG X 8), 22 (SEG X 14). In a study of the use of garrisons in the consolidation of the Athenian ἐφορία before 431 B.C. A. S. Nease examines, inter alia, the decrees relating to Erythea (pp. 105 ff.), Aegina (pp. 103 ff.), and Miletus (p. 107).

26 (GHI 39, SEG X 18). A. Wilmth drastically revises the reading and restoration of this decree concluding an alliance with the Amphictyonic states, from which the Phocians and the archon Ariston disappear. I. Calabi discusses Meritt's restoration (cf. JHS LXII 26) of the decree, which attests a specific function of the Amphictyonic συνέδριον.

63 (GHI 66, SEG X 75). Y. Béguignon and E. Will study from the standpoint of Athenian institutions the reassertment-decree of 425 B.C.; they offer a new text, based mainly on ATL I and II, with critical notes (pp. 6 ff.), examine the role of the ἑλέων (pp. 14 ff.), and those of the polemarch and στρατηγοὺς (pp. 24 ff.) in the process of assessment, and support, against Nesselhauf and Kahrst, the restoration [νομοθέτηση] in l. 16.

77 (SEG X 40). M. Ostwald re-examines the 'Prytaneum-decree', restoring κοίται τῶν μάντων ἐκ τῆς Ἁριστοκρατίας in l. 9 and denying that it proves the existence of ἐξαντιάς πορεύσεως in the fifth century; the decree is also discussed by J. H. Oliver and by F. Jacoby.


320 (SEG X 291). J. and I. Robert comment on the meaning of αὐθάλιος in l. 10 of the list of Alcibiades' furniture.

530. J. Pouilloux suggests that the ἐξαντιάς of this metrical dedication (Raubitschek, Dedications, no. 121) was of Thasian origin.

609 (GHI 15). B. B. Shefton discusses in detail the votive epigram of the Callimachus Memorial (Raubitschek, Dedications, no. 13) and its 'posthumous addition', and records an alternative restoration proposed by Raubitschek. E. Fraenkel offers a divergent version, getting rid of the ποιησε, which, he claims, 'makes havoc of the language as well as the metre'.

763 (SEG X 404). W. Vollgraff deals with the second epigram relative to the battle of Marathon, which, in his view, commemorates those who died on the march from Marathon to Athens after the battle.

806 (SEG X 336). L. H. Jeffery restores this Elexinian discus-inscription Αλεξανδρεία μ' ἄλητερδα νεον, and dates it between 600 and 550 B.C.

945 (GHI 59, SEG X 414). A. Wilhlem gives a fresh reading and restoration of the first epigram in honour of those who fell at Potidaea in 432 B.C.
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174 Phoenix, III 102 ff.
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176 Por Pass IV 250 ff.; cf. REG LXV 150.
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179 BCH XLIV 200 ff.
180 BCH LXV X 96 ff.
181 BCH LXV II 149 ff.
182 Ibid. 164.
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185 JHS LXIV 25; cf. REG LXV 150.
The new Attic inscriptions later than 404 B.C. are considerable in number, but few of them are of special interest. Many mine-leases are edited by M. Crosby, and two mortgage stones by J. V. A. Fine in articles mentioned below. D. Hereward publishes 212 a base from the Roman Agora erected by the tribe Aiantis in honour of Tib. Claudius Atticus, similar to the five bases united in IG II² 2597. M. T. Mitosc adds 213 new fragments in the Epigraphical Museum to stones included in IG II² and publishes 214 for the first time a fragmentary decree of Carthaea (Cecos) inscribed on the back of 2455. With E. Vanderpool he publishes 216 ten new inscriptions from various sites in Attica: eight of these (nos. 4–11) are epitaphs ranging from the fourth century B.C. to the second or third A.D., one (no. 2) is a votive from the shrine of Aphrodite on the Sacred Way, and one (no. 1) a metrical dedication made to Pythian Apollo by a certain Xenophon, perhaps the famous historian. H. A. Thompson reports 217 the discovery in the Agora of a dedication for Q. Lucretius and a statue-base erected by Attalus II and Apollonis in honour of Theophilius, and R. S. Young announces 218 the epigraphical fruits (bronze jurors’ tickets, a fourth-century dēfiniti, and a mortgage stone of a workshop) of his excavation of a district adjacent to the Agora, probably part of Melite. G. A. Stamires publishes 219 31 new epitaphs collected since 1930, together with notes on 33 others previously known, T. A. Arvanitopoulos 220 three grave-stelae now in the Loverdos Museum, and C. Alexander 220 an inscribed marble lekythos in the Metropolitan Museum, New York, dating ca. 375–350 B.C. G. Ballind and N. I. Pantazopoulos discuss 222 an interesting and well preserved lease, dated 333–2 B.C., of a garden belonging to the ὄμοιον τοῦ ἱπποῦ (the shrine of the ἱππος ἱπποτος) for a term of thirty years at an annual rent of 20 drachmas. D. M. Robinson publishes 222 a new mortgage-inscription of ca. 325 B.C. from Icaria, and D. I. Pallas a fourth-century stele 223 with a relief and an almost wholly erased decree from Salamis, together with some Christian and Byzantine texts. 224 Two metrical epitaphs of the first half of the fourth century B.C. have come to light 225 in the deme Echelidai, and one, of the same century, at Charavati, 226 and several inscribed bases 227 in a basilica built on the site of the Olymposium.

Four articles by M. T. Mitosc embody a wealth of addenda and corrigenda relating to inscriptions housed under his care in the Epigraphical Museum, and especially to the ephedich and other lists collected in IG II². In one 228 he unites 2060 + 2155 + 2098, which may well be the lower portion of 2089 + 2289 + 2190 + 2290 + EM 3679, and shows that 2107 + 2174 + 2164 + 2276 belong to a single stele, as do also 2015 + 2094 and 23406 + EM 4275. In a second 229 he gives corrected readings, chiefly of personal names, in thirty-one texts between 1822 and 2474, including 2160 + 2159 + 2163, parts of the same text, restores 3732, and records further details of 4504. A third article 230 comments on numerous texts between 1696 and 2485, ranked among the catalogi in IG II², on and 1106 and 1109, which are shown to belong to 2485 and 2456 respectively (nos. 19, 25), and unites a large number of disiecta membra. Mitosc also publishes 231 a list of forty-two inscriptions whose inventory numbers (EM) are wrongly recorded in IG II², seventy-four whose EM-numbers are omitted, and forty-six whose presence in the Museum is not mentioned, beside stating the present location of fifteen, which are merely said to be ‘in Athens’.

C. Pelekides collects 232 inscriptions referring to the ‘Panathenaic Stadium’, including three (II² 794, 803, 1011) in which he restores the phrase. M. Crosby edits 233 in chronological order the thirty-eight extant mine-leases (including twenty-nine new texts and four fragments added to inscriptions already known), of which the earliest is Hesperia, X 14 ff., of 367–6 B.C., and the latest IG II² 1566. In a full introduction (pp. 189 ff.) she deals with the form of the documents, the names, locations and boundaries of mines, the classification, lengths and amounts of the leases, and the persons named in them, ending with a chart (pp. 286 ff.), a name-list (pp. 293 ff.) and an epigraphical index (pp. 296 ff.). J. V. A. Fine’s monograph 234 on ‘Horoi’ makes a valuable contribution to the study of mortgage, real security and land-tenure in ancient Attica: its eight chapters deal with (a) new mortgage-stones from the Agora, together with two new horoi from other sites and a re-edition of two stones from the Agora previously known, (b) published horoi from Attica and the islands, (c) horoi in general, (d) ὑποθήκη, (e) μίσθωσις οἰκοῦ, (f) ἀποτίμησις προικῶν, (g) πράξεως ἐπί λύσης (cf. JHS LXXII 21), and (h) mortgage and land-tenure. The views here propounded demand a revision of our ideas on many aspects of the social, economic and legal life of the Athenians in the sixth and fifth centuries (p. 207). J. H. Oliver challenges 235 Notopoulos’ view 236 that at Eleusis
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the hierophant and the ἔρωτος did not enjoy lifelong tenure of office, and gives a table of the great Eleusinian priests from A.D. 165 to 209. He also brings up to date 237 our knowledge of the Panhellenion established at Athens by Hadrian in A.D. 131–2, adds to the list of its members, examines their official records engraved at Athens (IG IP 1089, 1088 + 1090 + III 3985; cf. Hesperia, X 363 ff.) and rejects as irrelevant 1092 and 3194; he further studies 238 three documents important for the chronology of Commodus, supplementing or correcting A. E. Raubitschek’s recent article (Hesperia, Suppl. VIII 279 ff.). V. Laurent’s list of the bishops of Athens, in which use is made of Christian inscriptions of the Parthenon, I know only from the comments 239 of J. and L. Robert.

Special attention has been drawn to the following inscriptions in IG II 2, in addition to those already mentioned:

10 (GHI 100). M. N. Tod discusses 230 the professions named in the schedule added to this decree and in 2403, a fragment of the same document.

28 (GHI 114). In his study of Athenian garrisons in the ἄρχη A. S. Nease includes 241 an examination of this decree of 387 B.C. honouring Clazomenae.

33. J. Pouilloux shows 242 that the Ἐθραίοι named in l. 9 of this decree is probably of Thasian origin.

70. G. Klaffenbach restores 243 ςφηςια[ς]<μένον in l. 12 and ἐςφηςσαντο in l. 18, and supports the restoration ἐδοεν; Ὀψκερτιν in l. 20.

463. L. B. Holland examines 244 in detail ll. 52–74 of the specification appended to the decree of 307–6 for the reconstruction of the Athenian walls, denies that any part of them was roofed except the towers, and in l. 115 restores τῶν ἀναχω[ρίες, 'inclined props or struts'.

794. C. Pelekides restores 245 ἐν τῶι πανασθημαικώι σταδιοί τῶν in l. 4.

844. M. Guarducci denies 246 that this decree proves the existence of the Cretan Κόρων before 229–8 B.C.

893. Pelekides restores 247 ἓ[κ τ ού πανασθημαικώι] in ll. 6–7 of this decree.

1008. He discusses 248 ll. 21 f. of this ephoric decree of 118 B.C.

1009. J. and L. Robert restore 249 Σμβιδος in iv 105 of this ephoric list.

1011. In ll. 21 f. of this ephoric decree Pelekides restores 250 ἐν τῶι πανασθημαικώι.

1013. L. Robert explains 251 the phrase περίφορον δραχμάς in l. 31.

1027. Pelekides offers 252 a new restoration of ll. 24 f.

1028–30. L. Robert explains 253 the phrase δραχμάων στεφανοφόρου in 1028. 30, 1029. 24, 1030. 27 f.

1035. S. Dow comments 254 on this inscription in reviewing Jacob’s Αθήσ.

1243. Α. Christopoulos restores 255 δοματα for ἄκιστα in l. 7.

1324. This orogenic decree is now in the Piraeus Museum. 256

1533–78. M. N. Tod examines 257 the professional names found in the catalogi paterarum argenteorum.

1582–9. I refer above (p. 66) to M. Crosby’s edition 258 of the mining leases.

1629 (GHI 200). G. Vallet studies 259 the decree of 325–4 B.C. (ll. 165–271) in his account of Athenian relations with the Adriatic.


1824. He maintains 261 his view that the Αὐρχιλοι of l. 9 are Elagabalus and Severus Alexander, and criticizes Oliver’s dating 262 of the inscription (A.D. 216—211).

2403. See 10 above.

3451. M. Santangelo examines 263 the monument of C. Julius Antiochos Philopappus on the Hill of the Muses and its bilingual inscription.

3558. R. Placidiene comments 264 on Plutarch’s friends Ammonius and Thrasyllus.

3661. A. D. Nock discusses 265 the word μοισίρου in the poem commemorating the hierophant Glaucous, recently re-edited by J. H. Oliver (Hesperia, Suppl. VIII 252 f.).

3781 (SIG 666). H. A. Thompson reports 266 the rediscovery of the base of Carneades.

4258. A. Wilhelm analyses 267 the epigram commemorating Codrus’ death.

4356. O. Walter unites 268 a relief bearing five letters with this dedicatory epigram to Asclepius, dated by Peek 400–380 B.C. 237 Hesperia, XX 31 f.
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265 AM LXVI 149 ff.
MARCUS N. TOD

3347, 3359. M. T. Misos and E. Vanderpool show that these are copies of the same inscription.

928. J. and L. Robert suggest that Παλιούριον may be an error for Παλιοῦριον.

1049. M. Schwabe reads Βεύκους for Βευκός in this Jewish epitaph and discusses the word πρόσχελος, but Klaffenbach vouches for the reading Βευκός.

10930. H. A. Thompson regards this stone as marking a boundary of the gymnasion constructed ca. A.D. 400 on the area of the Odeum in the Agora.

11477. A. Wilhelm reads Χαράτων in place of χάρατων in l. 7.

11604. M. N. Tod discusses this metrical epitaph of the president of a tectotal society.

12147. D. S. Robertson independently reaches the reading αυτοτο δέ ον πάρα διήλθα in this metrical epitaph.

12696. M. T. Mitsos reads Συμ(εωκιν)ν for Συμ(εωκιν)ν and doubts the Jewish character of this epitaph, asserted by L. Robert (Hellenica, III 101) and Kirchner.

13172. Wilhelm studies the epigram on a warrior who had surpassed Leonidas and fell in battle against the Costoboci in A.D. 170 or the Goths in A.D. 269; J. Keill suggests (p. 376) an alternative restoration.

13320. Mitsos and Vanderpool revise the text of this memorial inscription from the shrine of Aphrodite on the Sacred Way.

E. Cavaignac summarizes Robert’s restoration and exegesis of the decree of the Acmantid tribe relative to Demetrius Poliorcetes, which he dates at the end of April, 303 B.C.; G. Daux regards 229 302 B.C. as also possible and challenges Cavaignac’s assertion that 304-3 was an intercalary year. I. Calabi discusses the πρόσκελτος of the League of Corinth and the office held by Adimantus of Lampacus, whom, proposing a new restoration of the Athenian decree in his honour (cf. JHS LXIII 33), he holds to have been στρατηγός rather than πρόσκελτος. T. B. L. Webster examines an Attic relief from Aexone bearing five comic masks above a relief of Dionysus and a satyr, which he dates at 340–39 B.C. In an article on Greek oath-formulae E. Benveniste studies the meaning of ὁρκον ὄμνυειν, ἐπικρατεῖν and ἐπικρατεῖν, and the procedure described in the ‘Plataean oath’ (GH II 204. 46 ff.; cf. JHS LXII 34). R. Flacelière discusses the Stoic poet Sarapion on the basis of his poem (Hesperia, Suppl. VIII 243 ff.) and references in Plutarch, J. H. Oliver questions Notopoulos’ dating of a list of deiōρτα in A.D. 190–1 (Hesperia, XI 35 no. 6), and D. M. Robinson adds some supplementary notes on his recent articles (Hesperia, XVII 137 ff.) on a new Hercules-relief and on three new inscriptions from the deme Icaria.

III. The Peloponnesse

[IG IV.] Of vol. XI of Hondius’ SEG, 291 planned to include all Peloponnesian inscriptions published or discussed since the appearance of SEG III, only the first half had been issued before the editor’s death. This contains 510 items, of which fifty-one belong to Aegina, one to Pythion, and 420 to the remainder of the area comprised in IG IV, especially to Corinth (nos. 51–221), Sicily (nos. 244–271), Argos (nos. 314–365) and Epidaurus (nos. 392–453). On nos. 11, 12 and 46 from Aegina J. and L. Robert comment, L. H. Jeffery examines a sixth-century Aeginetan δρος and seeks to locate the precinct of Heracles, and studies a seventh-century Protoattic stand (BSA XXXV 189 ff.), found in Aegina and now in Berlin, while P. Orlandini criticizes previous restorations of the Aphaca-inscription (IG IV 1580) and offers a new text, in which the lines begin [Ἐθνὸς] ἐστιν, [πᾶν] ἐστιν, and [καὶ] ἀπὸδότη] respectively.

J. H. Kent has been engaged at Corinth in preparing an appendix of over 700 inscriptions found there since 1927; meanwhile he has published a marble altar re-used as the base of a statue, probably of Constans II, celebrating his victory over the Bulgars at Corinth. O. Broncer reports the discovery in 1950 of three inscribed Hellenistic sherds, L. Robert interprets the ethnoc laven, found in Corinthian vector-lasts (Corinth, VIII (1) 146 96, 153 20; cf. SEG XI 61 ff.), as referring to Tralles, and S. Dow studies an epigram honouring an Athenian, Diogenes, Περικλῆιν αἰμα λευκόν (Corinth, VIII (1) 88), reading the final word as λαμπρών[η] in place of Λαμπρών[η].
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In his recent work on Mycenae A. J. B. Wace comments on the early second-century decree for Damocles of Sparta, and on \textit{IG} IV 494, and on the Hellenistic inscriptions found in the temple built over the palace ruins, and J. and L. Robert add an important note to a magical text from Argos (SEG XI 353), now in the British Museum. In an article on the Argive Theatre W. Vollgraf returns (pp. 7 ff.) to the \textit{aporia} inscription (cf. \textit{JHS} LXXII 34 ff.), in which he restores \textit{κατὰ} \textit{πάνω} ἰδιων in place of \textit{ἀπὸ} \textit{θεμέλιων}. K. Rhomahos has found an epitaph at Phnoméni in Cynuria, and U. Kahrestedt's geographical study of the Tyrephai takes into account the inscriptions of this region (\textit{IG} IV 676-8, \textit{Sphinx} XVII 440, 445). J. Marcade publishes the base of an equestrian statue dedicated to Demeter at Hermione, and P. Orlandini discusses two dedications to Demeter Chthonia (\textit{IG} IV 683-4), signed by Cresilas and Dorotheus respectively, re-edited by Peck (SEG XI 378-9), and argues that they supported cows rather than horses. At the Asclepieum of Epidaurus I. Papademetriou has carried out successful excavations, the fruits of which include an inscribed building, an interesting \textit{lex sacra} engraved stoichedon, an opisthographic fragment bearing building-accounts, two dedications to Apollo, and a third-century signpost inscribed \textit{ὑπὲρ ἀδελφον καὶ συμμαχοῦσας συναξίων}. I. Calabi's article on the \textit{προσδοχαὶ} in the League of Corinth includes a study of the constitution of the League as laid down in \textit{IG} IV 683-41 ff., F. Hiller von Gaertringen proposes to read \textit{Αγάλμα τὰ δύο} \textit{πάνω} \textit{τοῦ} \textit{πάνω} \textit{πόλεως} \textit{δίς} \textit{κτῆς} in the Paean of Ilyssus (\textit{ibid.} 128, 44 ff.), and H. Grégoire rejects Wilhelm's recent solution (cf. \textit{JHS} LXXII 35) of the problem presented by this passage. G. Gask's \textit{Essays in the History of Medicine} refers to the Epidaurian \textit{ἱεροῦ} (\textit{IG} IV 211 ff.) in the section dealing with the cult of Asclepius. Wilhelm illustrates a metrical peculiarity in a dedication from this sanctuary (\textit{IG} IV 529).

\textit{IG V.} The latter part of SEG XI (1), in the editing of which A. M. Woodward gave invaluable aid, contains thirty-eight items relating to Spartan public documents and official careers (nos. 454-89). A large number of Spartan inscriptions afford K. M. T. Chrimes her main evidence for an examination of the life and organization of Sparta, especially in the Roman period; these are indexed on pp. 526 ff. In his \textit{Notes on the Spartan σφαιρεῖς} Woodward publishes a fragmentary list of σφαιρεῖς, perhaps of the first half of Trajan's reign, tabulates the sixteen extant lists (\textit{IG} V (1) 674-88), discusses their chronology, and argues that the σφαιρεῖς were probably ball-players and not, as Chrimes maintains, boxers. A. Billheimer supports the view that the age-classes in Spartan education, often mentioned in agonistic records (\textit{ibid.} 252 ff.), relate to boys and youths from their eighth to their twentieth year. At Sparta R. V. Nicholls has unearthed four new inscriptions, one of them a fragment of an official list, and J. M. Cook publishes a text of the second century a.d. from Amyclae, in which the city and an individual friend honour a \textit{λευκοῦν} τοῦ \textit{ἀνθύγικτων} \textit{ἀγοραστικόν}. Several Spartan inscriptions have been emended or interpreted: A. D. Nock discusses the use of \textit{ωστήριον} in a curious epigram (\textit{IG} V (1) 361), A. Wilhelm restores \textit{Συμφιδ[τ]} in an honorary inscription (\textit{ibid.} 539. 15), A. J. Beattie examines and restores a text (\textit{ibid.} 792), known only from Fourmont's copy, in which he sees a sixth- or fifth-century \textit{lex sacra} relating to the cult of a goddess, probably Demeter, as affecting the \textit{ἀρχάλων}, a hitherto unattested one, and Wilhelm discusses the metrical epitaph of a Cretan (\textit{ibid.} 725), seeing in \textit{Οὔκοιν} a reference not to the \textit{Οὔκοιν} but to Olus. J. M. Cook reports on the British investigations at Kalyvia Sokhas, a few miles south of Sparta, where, \textit{inter alia}, an interesting series of Hellenistic and later dedications to Demeter and Kore, a fragment of a sacrificial calendar, an inscription honouring a \textit{θείος} \textit{τοῦ} \textit{φωτός} \textit{τῶν} \textit{διὸ} \textit{φωτετέρων} (sic) \textit{διόρισα} \textit{λαμπεύσα} \textit{με} \textit{καταν} have come to light; this leads to a \textit{φωτετέρων} for \textit{μαζεύοντες} in a brick-stamp from the same site (\textit{IG} V (1) 1515). U. Kahrestedt makes full use of the available epigraphical evidence in discussing Spartan's western frontier in the Imperial period, and an inscribed statue-base of Hadrian from Abia (\textit{ibid.} 1352) helps him to show that the \textit{reliquiae civitatis} in \textit{Achata} (Pliny, N.H. IV 22) did not form an administrative district and cannot have appeared in Agrrippa's survey of the Empire.

L. H. Jeffery regards the temple of Demeter Theosmia founded under Cyllene by the Pheneaeans (Paus. VIII 15. 4) as the probable source of the arcaic \textit{lex sacra} examined by A. J. Beattie. S. Accame gives a revised text and a translation of the Elatean decree recently found at Stymphalus (cf. \textit{JHS} LXXII 36) and discusses fully its significance for the history of Elatea; this...
IV. Central and Northern Greece


[IG VIII.] In an archaic dedication from Crisa or Delphi (DGE 316) A. E. Raubitschek reads 341 τόδε γ' Αθηναία δρομικάς Φανάριστος έθέκε, seeing in it a parallel to the drachma-inscription of Perachora (SEG XI 223), Milne’s interpretation of which (CR LVIII 18 ff.) he rejects.

R. Flacelière edits 342 twelve new texts of the Imperial period from the Temple Terrace at Delphi, including grants of ιωτεία to a καθιστός from Rhusos, a Corinthian architect and a doctor [nos. 1-3], and a series of inscribed bases of statues commemorating τοῦ λαοπέτρον τῶν ἀγαθών τέων, Soterius erected by Ἐρεβός κατὰ ὁδόμα τῶν ἀμφιρρικτός, the ‘sophist’ Philiscus, μέγαν ἐν σοφίᾳ, professor at Athens, and the Emperor Gordian III, honoured by τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν ἀμφιρρικτέων καὶ ἱερῶν Διελεχτικῶν πόλις ca. A.D. 240 (nos. 8-12). J. Pouilloux publishes 343 the dedication of a statue set up κατά χριστίανον by King Drocipon of the Paeonians (cf. SIG 394) in honour of his father Leon. P. Amandry devotes 344 careful studies, architectural and epigraphical, to the monument erected ca. 465 and re-engraved in the fourth century B.C., celebrating the victory of Taras over the Peucetii, and to the ‘Corcyrean bull’ 345 and a dedication signed by Theopompos of Aegina (Fouilles, III (1) 2), in which Πλατανίς should perhaps replace Κορυφαίος. M. Guarducci examines 346 a fifth-century financial record of the Labyad phryge (DGE 320) with an unpublished fragment, stressing the difficulties of the accepted reading, and seeks to solve it by reading τὼν [πόρος] in l. 2 and ἔτερον δημοτοῦ (averebro prilenato per tre volte) in l. 4. In his long account of Pelopidas’ career G. M. Bersanetti considers 347 the evidence of the Pelopidas-epigram found at Delphi (cf. JHS LXV 82), which he dates 348 in 363-2, after Pelopidas’ death.

T. H. Gaster’s Thespis: Ritual, Myth and Drama in the Ancient Near East 349 contains (pp. 435 ff.) a translation of the paging to Dionysus by Philodamus of Scarpa. W. Peck offers 350 new readings or restorations of some Delphian epigrams, including those relating to Agamemnon and Telephus (pp. 232 ff.; cf. JHS LXV 82), Theogenes of Thasos (pp. 240 ff.; SIG 36), Calliades (pp. 243 ff.; Fouilles, III (1) 510), the Liparaenses (pp. 246 ff.; SIG 142), Xenon and Diocles of Opus (pp. 249 ff.), Xanthippus of Elatea (pp. 252 ff., 260 f.; SIG 361c), Patron of Lilaea (pp. 262 ff., 270, Fouilles, III (1) 523), and the Arcadians (p. 268; Fouilles, III (6) 3), and revises (pp. 266 ff.) two graces of Πλατανίς (Fouilles, III (1) 202, 206). G. Daux estimates 351 the value of Sturzenbecker’s copies of Delphian inscriptions (cf. JHS LXVII 37), especially of SIG 779 D and Fouilles, III (1) 351. J. and L. Robert comment 352 on Daux’s two long articles published in 1949 (cf. JHS LXVII 37). J. Marçacé reports 353 on his examination of sculptors’s signatures at Delphi, and E. J. Raven studies 354 in the light of the treasurer’s accounts Fouilles, III (5) 48 ff., 67 f., the amphytieon coined at Delphi from 336 to 334 B.C. by melting down various coins, explaining the term πτερωτικόν used in this connexion (pp. 6 ff.), and calculates the amount minted (pp. 9 ff.) and its circulation, adding (pp. 20 ff.) a list of the surviving examples. E. Manni dis-
cusses 356 the Delphian archons who held office from 264 to 208 B.C., tabulating his results on p. 93, and claims that the influence of Aetolia on the Amphiictyony reached its maximum between 223 and 220. W. L. Westermann deals 358 with the nature, purpose and result of the 'approval clause' (εὐδοκησθαι) found in 390 out of a thousand Delphian manumissions, regarding it as a legal requisite in sales in which claims against the slave might later be raised, and M. N. Tod collects 357 from the same source references to the possessions of slaves emancipated at Delphi. Recent discoveries are briefly reported 357 pending fuller publication, and photographs of the base of Gelo's tripod and part of the Siphnian frieze appear in Le trésor de Delphes. 359 [IG IX.] L. Lerat has discovered 360 at Physcus (Malandrino) in Ozolian Locris a continuation of the manumission-records IG IX (1) 349-50.

S. B. Kouegas reports 361 on a manuscript collection, now in the National Library at Athens, of inscriptions copied by, or sent to, a Thessalian schoolmaster, A. Pezaros. Of its seventy-eight items eleven are from Athens (no. 5), Nauplia (no. 54), Macedonia (no. 76), or Scythia (nos. 1-4, 70-73); the remainder, including in some cases two or even three copies of the same text, are from Hestiaeotis, Pelasgiotis, Magnesia and Pheraea in Thessaly. Twenty-nine are regarded by Kouegas as unpublished (the most interesting arc 34 = 69 and 35), and some add fresh details of provenance, description and reading of texts already known, notably IG IX (2) 487, an arbitration-record from Phaytis (no. 22), 1110, a Magnesian decree regulating the cult of Zeus Akrakios (no. 40 = 61 = 75), and 1296 (misprinted 1926), a manumission-list from Azorus (no. 59). T. D. Axenides publishes 362 three new inscriptions of Larisa, (a) a third-century list of donors to some public purpose, headed by Philip V and including his son Perseus; the names, in the Thessalian dialect, are followed by patronymic adjectives; (b) a dialect decree inviting subscriptions for the repair of the gymnasium in view of the financial straits of the state, and (c) a fragment of a list of estates, with the area of each, probably given for some public or religious object, similar to IG IX (2) 1014; valuable comments on all three are made by J. and L. Robert. R. Goossen discusses 363 the term κέλτερα (ibid. 521. 26, 33, 35) independently of H. Frisk (SO XI 64 ff.) and A. von Blumenthal (cf. JHS XLII 67), regarding it as a movable dam used in river-fishing. A. Wilhelm reads 364 Σιμωνον την in a grave-epigram of Larisa (IG IX (2) 641) and μ[....]....[....]....[....] την μερασιν in one of Pagasae (ibid. 367. 9), and M. Schwabe comments 365 on the epitaphs of the Jewish diaspora in Thessaly. An altar recently discovered 366 at Larisa is inscribed Φιλιακον Αυτοκεφαλοι. A. S. Arvanitopoulos describes 367 twenty-five more painted stelae (nos. 251-75) from Demetrias-Pagaeae, all inscribed except nos. 251, 260, 267. J. Pouillyoux and N. M. Verdélis publish 368 two texts from the territory of Demetrias, (a) the latter part of a decree of Demetrias, dated ca. 117 B.C., honouring three ex-generals, and the opening lines of a proxeny-decree for a Calydonian, passed by the σωστος of the Magnesian κοινων, and (b) a dedication made by a Cretan, probably a mercenary, between 227 and 221 to King Antigonus Doson and his ward Philip, later to become Philip V of Macedonia. A phrase in the former leads J. and L. Robert to restore τριήμερον in a Magnesian decree (IG IX (2) 1102. 3 f.). L. Robert adds 369 to his collection of gladiatorial monuments the epitaph, accompanied by a relief, of a προδοκτωρ, probably from Demetrias.

V. MACEDONIA, THRACE AND SCYTHIA

G. Klaffenbach interprets 370 κατην οἰδώνως in l. 14 of the decree of the Pergamii in Epirus (Hellenica, I 95 ff.) as representing κατην ηρωινην αἴανον. P. E. Sestieri seeks 371 the ancient name of Klos in Albania, near Byllis (Gradista), where one inscription has been found, and decides in favour of Astaciae. J. and L. Robert call attention 372 to the presence in the Ankara Museum of a series of reliefs of Artemis from Apollonia in Illiria, and read Ταραύνα instead of Γαραύνα in a dedication to Artemis from that site. C. Edson, tracing 373 the course of the Via Egnatia in western Macedonia, considers the evidence of four milestones, one of which, found near Tserovo in the Kirli Derven defile, is new (pp. 4, 13), and favours the southern of the two possible routes leading through that pass. He also collects (pp. 11 f.) evidence from Philippi and Drama of a Macedonian road-system under the kings. J. and L. Robert summarize 374 and comment on two of Edson's recent articles, that on Olympias' tomb and that on the cults of Thessalonica (cf. JHS LXXII 39), and provide 375 a valuable account of the epigraphical contents of the fourth and final instalment 376.
of N. Vulić's collection of ancient monuments, sculptured and/or inscribed, from Serbian Macedonia; of special interest are nos. 53, 91, 354, 388-9, 404. In an article on Leibethra, Pimplea and Pieris, the home of Orpheus, near the Thessalo-Macedonian frontier, N. C. Kotzias publishes a dedication made by an ex-agoranomos Διονύσος και θείας. B. G. Kallipolites and D. Feytmans have found 378 in a fourth-century cemetery at Kozani a silver bowl of the early fifth century, inscribed Ἀδανίς: ἦσαν τῆς Μηγαραί, probably brought from Megara. Kallipolites also edits 379 a Christian inscription from Beroea beginning Τὸν παντοκράτεα συν καὶ ἁγιον Θεόν καὶ τῆς Τύχης συν τοῦ αἰεικῆτος βασιλέως, but his interpretation of it as an epitaph is questioned 380 by H. Grégoire. M. Andronikos publishes 381 nine inscriptions of Beroea, comprising seven epitaths (pp. 23 ff.; nos. 2 and 6 were previously edited by Makarons in Μακεδονικά, I 481), a fragmentary document, perhaps a decree, of the early second century B.C. (p. 32), and an important manumission-record dated βασιλευόντος Δημήτριου έβδομον καὶ ἑκάστου έτους, which raises a chronological problem on which J. and L. Robert comment 382 at length. Andronikos has also found a bronze strigil 383 inscribed δόρον, and the discovery is reported of the γυμνωσκοπικός νόμος 384 and of the record 385 of a gift to provide oil for the ephesies in A.D. 177–8. An epitaph of the fourth or third century B.C. has been found 386 at Vergina and brought to Verria.

C. I. Makarons publishes 387 a new milestone, the first from Thessalonica, with successive inscriptions of the late third and early fourth centuries A.D., found north of Salonica by the Langada Road, and maintains that the Via Egnatia did not follow the line of the present 'Όσσος Εγνατία through the heart of the city. H. C. Joutic points out 388 that in the testament of a Thessalian priestess (cf. JHS LXXII 39) δόοις does not mean 'with roses' but 'at the rosebush', when each θυσίωτις must bring a crown of roses to the ceremony, on pain of forfeiting his share of the legacy. H. Grégoire studies, 389 with a revised text and a translation, an edict of Justinian II, dated September 688, granting to St. Demetrius a διάκερα in recognition of the aid vouchsafed by the saint in his battles with the Slavs, and a late Thessalonian epitaph (Bull. Inst. Arch. Bulg. IV 126 ff.), dated A.D. 535, is explained 390 by V. Beshchevlich. Other finds are still unpublished. 391 In vol. XIII of his monumental report on his Excavations at Olynthus D. M. Robinson describes the vases found in 1934 and 1938, including an inscribed Panathenian vase (no. 11), some graffiti (nos. 719, 918–25), and many stamped amphora-handles (nos. 1081 ff.). D. Detchev publishes 392 six inscriptions, five Greek and one Latin, from the district of Scevi-Vrač on the middle Strymon, two of which are dated by the Actian era. P. Gollart edits 393 three Greek texts and one in Greek letters but Latin words, found in the neighbourhood of Philippi and interesting for the Thracian names they contain; three (nos. 2, 5, 6) are epitaphs, and one (no. 9) records a gift made to a member of οἱ πατέρος Ρώσιου [Σέπτα μνήμετα Βύρωνος Διονύσου]. D. T. Lazarides publishes 394 a dedication of the third century b.c. [Ἀρτεμίδι οἴνοποι] (for this epitaph cf. IG IX (1) 600), found at Neapolis (Kavala).

J. and L. Robert re-edit 395 an interesting record of a fishers' guild (IGR I 817), showing that it and the epitaph IGR I 819 belong not to Callipolis, but to Parium (see below, p. 79). A. Wilhelm approves 396 L. Robert's correction (Hellenica, XII 134 ff.) of ἐντορίῳ ἐντορίῳ in an inscription of Perinthis (IGR I 811) and comments on the history of another Perinthis stone (CIG 7019), once in Venice but now in Vienna, and V. Beshchevlich gives 397 a revised version of a Byzantine metrical building-inscription from Selymbria. J. and L. Robert publish 398 two herms in the Istanbul Museum, one dedicated to ἁγιαστής, θεός ἄντρωτος καὶ δέξισκος, the other, of the second or third century a.d., Ἀμαζοκότια, Καλλίτη τῆς Τύχης, Κόλλα Λαρά, Ὀμήρος, Ἀριές, Θέμη, Μεστώριος, Χεμύ, and discuss the cults of seasons, winds, etc., in the Greek world. A. A. Vasiliev examines 400 the monument of Porphyrius in the Hippodrome at Istanbul (cf. BSA XVII 88 ff.). C. A. Mango compiles 401 a bibliographical list of the Byzantine inscriptions of Constantinople from its foundation to A.D. 1453, including two unpublished texts (pp. 55, 65 ff.), and also a list 402 of Byzantine brick-stamps; another list is drawn up 403 by E. Mamboury, with a view of using them to determine the chronology of monuments of the fifth and sixth centuries A.D.

From the west coast of the Pontus there is less to report than usual. An epitaph from Deultum (Devlet), edited 404 by T. Ivanov, opens with the phrase θεοῦ κοσμίων. D. Detchev publishes 405 a stele from Mesembria, now in the Burgas Museum, bearing a proxeny-decree for a
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Roman officer, δ καδέταμενος ἢτι τῶν τόλιος ἦν ὑπὸ Μαδρίου Τερεντίου Μαδρίου [νυό]: [Λέκ]ολος αὐτοκράτορος ἐν 72 B.C during the Mithradatic War; on the back is a fragmentary document showing that Messembria had νομοφύλακες and ἐκλογίσται. A third-century epitaph is reported 406 from the same site, and another epitaph (ΟΥΗ XXVI 111 ff.) is discussed and illustrated 407 by R. Egger. M. Mitsos rebuts 408 L. Robert’s statement (REG LVII 217) that he had overlooked a Messenian decree for two Mytileneans (IG XII Suppl. p. 69, ll. 82 ff.). G. Mihailov offers 409 a revised text of a tantalizing votive epigram from Belogradchik, now in the Museum at Varna (Stalin), and corrects 410 a score of inscriptions from Marcianopolis (no. 2), Odessus (Stalin) and elsewhere, and publishes (no. 1) an altar-dedication from Aquae Calidiae, near Burgas. T. Ivanov describes 411 a statuette of Hecate from Odessus, M. Mirchev reports 412 on the late graffiti on a t.c. plaque found in excavations at Karama-teke, and publishes 413 five inscribed stones, three sepulchral and two votive, now in the Stalin Museum. G. Stefan deals 414 with four monuments of gladiators found at Tomi.

Thrace and Moesia continue to be prolific, especially in dedications and epitaphs, and Bulgarian scholars show commendable enterprise in the discovery, conservation and publication of the antiquities of their land. Among works which have reached an advanced stage of preparation are 415 G. Mihailov’s corpus of Greek inscriptions in Bulgaria and V. Beshevliev’s collection of Christian inscriptions, Greek and Latin. B. Gerov investigates 416 the northern frontier of the province of Thrace. D. Djontchev publishes 417 some new monuments of the cult of the mounted god, of which five (nos. 1, 9, 18, 19, 26) are unpublished; one (no. 18) is a thankoffering for recovery from the bite of a mad dog. I. I. Russu emends 418 Thracian names in inscriptions from Yambol and Serres, Nevrokop and Belitza, and Thracic personal names, for the most part epigraphically attested, are studied 419 by G. Seure. V. Beshevliev revises 420 ten inscriptions, several of them Byzantine, from various Bulgarian sites.

T. Gerasimov publishes 421 an architrave from Serdica (Sofia) bearing a building-inscription, dated by the name of the γραφομένης and λογιστῆς, of a house for the use of the local γερούσια, and C. Dremisiova’s account 422 of the collection of V. Avramov includes a fragmentary votive text, now in the Sofia Museum. T. Ivanov publishes 423 an epitaph recently discovered at Pančarevo, and G. Mihailov emends 424 the reading of a dedication from Sofia. Inscriptions aid D. Djontchev in tracing 425 the Roman road from Serdica to Philippopolis (Plovdiv) and locating Bessapara and Tugumer, which lay on it. L. Botucharova describes a Thracian grave-tumulus of the first or second century A.D., excavated near Bresovo and containing 426 a fragmentary dedication, and publishes 427 two inscribed marble slabs brought to the Plovdiv Museum from a late Roman grave at Kapitan Dimitriev. G. I. Kazarow’s study of many-headed deities includes 428 a marble horseman-relief from Plovdiv inscribed ἡ συγγενέω ἐκ τῶν εἰδών [νυὸ] εὐφρατὴς, and A. Aleksieva describes 429 eight stamped amphora-handles (six of them Thasian) found at Koprinka; Botucharova and D. Potchev publish 430 a stamped tile and a fragmentary inscription from this district. T. Ivanov reports 431 the discovery at Asenograd of two graves, dating from the fifth or fourth century B.C., bearing the owner’s name, I. Venedikov reports 432 a piscina dedicated to the Nymphs and Aphrodite at Kasnako, near Haskovo, and A. Wilhelm revises, 433 with the aid of a squeeze, several passages in ll. 36 ff. of the charter of the ἡμίφρον at Pizus (SIG 880; cf. JHS LXII 42). P. Dimitrov publishes 434 a column from Traiana Augusta (Stara Zagora), erected ἡ ἤρμη φιλίν Ἀρῆιν in recognition of the donor’s appointment as priest, and collects archaeological monuments and inscriptions of the city and its environs relating to the entertainments provided in the theatre and amphitheatre; the three inscriptions (nos. 3, 6, 7) were previously known, but to no. 6, the epigram of a mimograph, a new fragment is added. H. Rajkow discuses 435 a votive plaque of Zeus, Hera and Athena in the Stara Zagora Museum, and V. Beshevliev corrects 436 a late epitaph of the same provenance (BIAB VII 137). B. Gerov’s essay 437 on the Romanization of the territory between Danube and Balkans from Augustus to Hadrian is based largely on Latin inscriptions. I. Stefanova’s article 438 on ancient monuments of Nicopolis ad Istrum includes three Latin and three Greek inscriptions; one of the latter (pp. 87 ff.) is an epitaph of the third century A.D., another (p. 85) reads ἑυτοκοπιτῶν τῶν πρῶτος ἑστραφό πόλις, and the third (pp. 89 ff.) is an interesting text of A.D. 234, engraved on a statue-base of Julia Mamae, mother of Alexander Severus,

---

406 BCH LXXV 307; cf. Ann Plovdiv, II 63 no. 4.
407 Der Grabstein von Cekanelo, 25.
408 Πελαθερίν, IV 38.
409 REG LXIV 104 ff.
410 BIAB XVII 259 f.
411 Ibid. 258 f.
412 Ibid. 287 f.
413 Ibid. 268 ff.; cf. REG LXV 159 ff.
414 Cf. REG LXV 176.
415 Gnomen, XXIII 295.
416 BIAB XVII 11 ff.
417 ΟΥΗ XXXIX, Beilblatt, 203 ff.
418 Epigraphica, X 19 f., Ann Plovdiv, II 571; cf. REG LXIV XIV 146, 171, 176.
419 BIAB XVI 165 ff.; cf. REG LXIV 146.
421 BIAB XVII 252 f.
422 Ibid. 263 f.
423 Ibid. 393, 332.
424 Ibid. 293 no. 16.
425 Ann Plovdiv, II 69 ff.; cf. REG LXIV 174 f.
426 Ibid. 105.
427 BIAB XVII 247 f.
428 Ibid. 4.
429 Ann Plovdiv, II 185 ff.; cf. REG LXIV 124.
430 Ibid. 253 ff.; cf. 63 no. 2.
432 BIAB XVII 117, 115.
433 BIAB XVI 41 ff.; cf. REG LXIV 175.
434 Ann Plovdiv, II 201 ff., 247 ff.; cf. REG LXIV 175 f.
435 BIAB XVII 266 f.
436 Ann Plovdiv, II 63 no. 3.
437 * Ann. Univ. Sofia, XIV (4); cf. REG LXIII 175.
438 Ann Plovdiv, II 85 ff.; cf. REG LXIV 176. For Νασάνδρο, which puzzles the editor, I suggest Νασάνδρος.
VI. ISLANDS OF THE AEGEAN

[IG XI.] The publication of the first part of the Inscriptions de Délos, edited by A. Plassart, completes the corpus of Delian inscriptions save for (a) J. Coupry’s edition of the records of the Athenian Amphictyons of Delos, (b) the necessary addenda, and (c) the indispensable indexes, in the preparation of which J. Tréheux is engaged. The present fascicule, covering the periods of the Ionian and Attic-Delian Amphictyons, contains dedications, etc., in Cycladic scripts (nos. 1–35), votives, and leges sacrae in Ionian letters (nos. 36–70), and Delian, Spartan and Athenian decrees (nos. 71–88); but the texts far outnumber eighty-eight, since nos. 31–35 comprise some 211 inscriptions incised or painted on earthenware. On no. 9, the epigram of Micciades and Archermus, Plassart adds (p. 43) a reference to O. Rubensohn’s article proving that the base on which it is engraved supported the “Nike” of Delos, which he regards as representing the Πόλις της θηρι. L. B. Lawler discusses the γέφρανον-dance, to which there are frequent references, direct and indirect, in Delian inscriptions (e.g. IG XI 161 B 36, 61 ff., 164 A 51, 199 B 36), and sees in it not a ‘crane-dance’ but a ‘snake-dance’, a nocturnal maze-dance, probably of Minoan origin. J. Tréheux studies the meaning of ιαποζ, found only in IG XI 28; B 50, 54, and of the cognate terms ιαπουτης, κυλιους, τιφες, ιαπουτις, concluding that ιαπος is an alternative form of τιφες, and Rubensohn uses Inscr. Délos, 290. 229 ff., to illustrate the process of regilding statues. B. A. van Groningen interprets the puzzling ΑΠΙΤΥΡΩΣ of Maitistas’s poem in honour of Sarapis (IG XI 1290. 45) not as a proper name, but as a noun meaning vitia effigies patri, ‘a chip of the old block’; L. Robert identifies 459 many coins mentioned in the Delian inventories of the years after 166 B.C. (above, p. 61); J. Delorme explains the association of Heracles with the Delian guild of άθομπλεια (Inscr. Délos, 1713 ff.) as due, not to the consumption of oil in the palaistra, but to the fact that most of the άθομπλεια belonged to South Italy and regarded Heracles as their patron and protector, specially concerned with olive culture, and J. and L. Robert substitute Παλίδον δικ[άτος], sociorum decumae, for Παλίδον δικ[άτος] in Inscr. Délos, 1764. 5. S. Risom records his services in the identification and reconstruction of the Monument of Mitridates, but makes only passing references to its inscriptions (Délos, XVI 32 ff.). Some recent discoveries are reported, but await fuller publication.

[IG XII.] G. Pugliese Carratelli publishes twenty new inscriptions from Rhodes (nos. 1–15), Lallasus (no. 16) and the territory of Camirus (nos. 17–20); in one (no. 1) he ερά δωρικ ου κύκλου honors an άγωγος η της των μεγάλων άλεων και των ερα της Ελλαδος ολυμπω[ιον], another (no. 3) is an honorary inscription set up by Romans and bearing a sculptor’s signature, a third (no. 5) is an interesting list of victories won by a runner at various festivals, for which J. and L. Robert’s comments should be consulted, five (nos. 4, 12 ff., 15, 17) are dedications to Zeus Atabyrios or other gods, and the rest are epitaphs. The same scholar also discusses the appear-
ances of Bruttians and Lucanians in Rhodian inscriptions, and the part played by Alexander the Great in the formation of the Rhodian constitution, with special reference to decrees of Camirus and Lindus, *IG XII* (1) 694 (= *SIG* 339, which he dates in Alexander’s reign) and 761. L. Shoe examines *inscribed* Greek moulings of second-century bases at Rhodes (*Par Pass IV* 80 ff.) and Camirus, and A. Momigliano discusses *the* significance for Rhodian history of the record in *IG XII* (1) 58. In a posthumous article M. Segre edicts *nine* sacrificial regulations, most of the third century B.C., from Camirus, all of them new except no. 3, a re-edition of *Clara Rhodos, VI–VII 385* no. 3 (*Blinkenberg, Δράγμα Μ. Π. Nilsson obiatur, 110 no. 11*), and estimates their value for Rhodian cult-history.

G. Klaßenbach offers *66* suggestions for the reading and restoration of a number of Lindian texts (*Lindos, II* 211, 264, 384 b, 420 a); in *Lindos, II* 419, a decree of A.D. 22, he substitutes ήπιον ήρωι for Blinkenberg’s ενίον ερωι, which, he claims, *467* has an important bearing on the interpretation of the phrase έπιον έρωι in the Lord’s Prayer (*S. Matt. VI* 11, *S. Luke, XL* 3). J. S. Callaway calls attention to the mention of Sybaris in ch. 26 of the ‘Lindian Chronicle’ (*Lindos, II* 2).

In an article on the cult of Artemis in Lesbos B. G. Kallipolites publishes *459* two new inscriptions from Mytilene, an epitaph directing that a fine for violation be paid to Artemis, and an altar-base dedicated ‘Αρτέμιδε ευσκόροι. Klaßenbach shows *470* that a Mytilenean double altar (*IG XII Suppl. 49*) honours Augustus (not Caligula) and his grands, C. and L. Caesar, and was probably erected before A.D. 2. Two recent studies of the late cadastral survey from Mytilene (*IG XII* (2) 76–80) I know only through the comments *471* of J. and L. Robert.

M. Guarducci’s account *472* of the Cretan κανόνικον contains a revised text of the second-century decree of the κοινή recognizing the άδελφα of Anaphe (*IG XII* (3) 254 and Suppl. p. 83 = *Inscr. Cret. IV* 197 *†*), and I. Calabi, discussing the συνεδρίον of the League of Corinth, examines *473* the record of the Argive arbitration between Melos and Cimolos (*IG XII* (3) 1259 = *SIG* 261 = *GHI* 179).

L. Shoe publishes *474* a fourth-century base from Cos inscribed ΔΕΛΟΙΣ and G. Klaßenbach proposes *475* new restorations of II. 9–12 and 17–19 of the letter of Eumenes II to Cos (cf. *JHS LXXII* 44); he also revises *478* the restoration of three passages in a decree of Calymna honouring judges sent by Iasus, and C. B. Welles deals *476* with three manumissions of that island (*Mem. FERT III* 54 ff.) and studies the relation between manumission and adoption in the light of Babylonian practice.

A. Wilhelm restores *479* a metrical epitaph of Naxos (*IG XII* (5) 1017. 5), and N. M. Kontoleon reports *472* the discovery on that island of a dedication to Demeter, Kore, Zeus Euboules and Baubo, and publishes *479* a fifth-century *columna* from Paros inscribed ΔΙΟΣ Ε’Αστέρε, which leads him to suggest *this* epitaph (derived from ελόνω τοιούτου) in *ADelt XIV* παρ. 49 and *IG XII* (5) 1027, in place of ειδήσειον. He also reports *480* interesting discoveries relating to Archilochus and the foundation of the *Αρχελάχων*, made at Eritas, N. of Paros town. A. J. Gossage draws up *481* a *stemma*, based on *IG XII* (5), of the Parian family in which Prosthenes is the most frequent name from the third century B.C. to the first A.D., throwing light on the island’s history in a period of political and economic instability. F. M. Heichelheim appeals *482* to an inscription of Syros (*IG XII Suppl. 239*) as proving that Hadrian’s second acclamation falls between May and November 135, probably on August 11, and so helping to date the close of Bar Kokba’s War in Palestine. A. Wilhelm offers *483* a new and more satisfactory restoration of a metrical epitaph from Andros (*IG XII* (5) 784. 7). On Tenos two dedications to Poseidon and Amphitrite have come to light.

N. M. Kontoleon publishes *485* a group of texts from *Chios*, (a) an interesting Chronicle of the arrival of the founder, Oenopion, with his family and suite, as recounted by Pausanias, VII 4, 8, (b) a decree in honour of judges sent by Andros and Naxos, the text of which was independently published by D. W. S. Hunt in *BSA* XLI 45 ff., (c) a list of victors in a contest, probably the Theophania, and (d) a funerary epitaph, and re-edits a fifth-century boundary-stone (*ADelt XI* παρ. 23) containing the new word ερην. He further describes *486* a fourth-century stele in the Chios Museum representing the stern of a trireme and bearing the name Ελλάς. In an article on the counting of votes J. A. O. Larsen refers *487* to the early Chian constitution (*GHI* 1). E. Buschor examines *488* a
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group of nineteen Samian decrees granting citizenship to twenty-four persons, mostly from Asia Minor and the adjacent islands, who aided the Samians in their πυγή (365-322 B.C.) and after their κάδεσσα, and publishes one for a Cardian, passed about 310.

A. Wilhelm restores 489 a metrical epitaph (IG XII (7) 495) from Aegale on Amorgos, and the lost beginning of a decree (ibid. 226) has come to light,

490 together with other inscriptions. Twenty-five lines, ranging from the fifth century B.C. to the third A.D., unearthed in 1937 and 1938 in the Lemnian sanctuary of the Cabiri, are edited 491 by S. Accame, who stresses their interest for Athenian history and the Eleusinian cult; among them are honorary decrees (some passed by the δήμος or δήμος τῶν τετελεσμένων), dedications (no. 10, of the fifth century B.C., runs θεος πρόναυς σύλα καὶ λέξεις τινας ἀνεθήκε άθηνωσόρως Ὀμέων[5]), and muniments (nos. 14-16). In a third-century decree (no. 4) θεορεῖν οἱ ἀποστάλεται ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων τῶν Ἰμπερίου εἰς τὴν όψειν τοῖς Καβείροις τῶν ὤρατον are praised by the δήμος, and the same festival is named in no. 16 as the occasion of muniments. Wilhelm substitutes 492 the name Χαριτίσης for the epitaph χρηστής in a metrical epitaph of Imbros (IG XII (8) 93. 4). K. Lehmann reports on the progress of excavations in Samothrace; in one account he describes 493 inscriptions, mostly of only one or two letters, on bricks, clay or marble lamps, and pottery, including the earliest known Greek monogram; in the second 494 he speaks (p. 11) of new fragments of the dedication of the Arsinoeion (ibid. 227), masons' marks (p. 13), graffiti on vases (p. 29), and other finds, now in the Palaioopoulos Museum (pp. 29 f.). G. Downey edits 495 a mutilated building-inscription of the sixth century A.D. The French excavation of Thasos in 1948-50 has proved rich in epigraphical discoveries. 496 ranging from an early fifth-century boustrophedon decree dealing with the wine-trade to the hagiographical records of the Christian basilica, and including 497 a large number of amphora-handles: the preliminary reports whet our appetites for their speedy publication. J. Pouilloux discusses 498 the epigraphical and archaeological evidence for the temple of Demeter and Kore.

G. Daux, discussing dates expressed by the phrase μετ' εἰκώσας(5), explains 499 the date-formula of a decree of Eretria (IG XII (9) 207. 39), and I. S. Russu reads 500 Αὐσλεκάρως in place of Διαφείδας in the epitaph of a Sapaean buried there (ibid. 795). R. Harder illustrates 501 a fourth-century epitaph from Chalcis and discusses its script, and his edition of the Chalcidian aretology of Karpokrates (cf. JHS LXVII 116 f.) forms the starting point of Fesugièr's important study mentioned above (p. 61), as does a list of πρόξενοι from Histiaea (IG XII (9) 1187 = SIG 492) that of L. Robert's treatment 502 of the trade and currency of Histiaea.

[IG XIII.] M. Guarducci dates 503 in 217-6 B.C. the foundation of the Cretan κοινόν, criticizing the views of Mutters and van Effenterre, who advocate an earlier, but less precise, chronology; she maintains that, whatever be the meaning of κοινόν elsewhere, in Crete it indicates a tribunal of the κοινόν, created to settle disputes among the member-states, and rejects the opinion of Welles and van Effenterre that the word simply denotes a 'mixed tribunal'. In a posthumous work, the value of which is greatly enhanced by a series of useful indexes, A. Wilhelm discusses, 504 interprets and emends, with a wealth of parallel examples, twelve Cretan epigrams, of which two (nos. V, XII) are votive and the rest sepulchral; these come 505 from an unknown site (IBM 380), Polyhrenia (J Cret II xxiii 22), Cantanias (II vi 10), Brytacina (II x 3), Gortyn (IV 372 = SEG III 781), Lyttus (I xviii 177), Arcades (I vi 11), Olus (I xii 13), Lato (I vii 5, 73) and Itanos (III iv 37, 39. II x 19, wrongly assigned to Cydonia); he also deals incidentally with epigrams from other parts of the Greek world, the more important of which I mention elsewhere in this survey. B. D. Theophaneides' report 506 on his researches in W. Crete includes an archaic epitaph and a late Roman grave-inscription found in or near Canea, and from the province of Selinus two decrees of Elyres and twelve minor texts, mostly epitaphs, of which nos. 6 and 13 appear to be previously unpublished, and G. A. Stamires comments 507 on and corrects Theophaneides' recent article (cf. JHS LXII 45) on early Christian inscriptions from Kastelli Kisamou in W. Crete. N. Platon publishes 508 two epitaphs from Panormos, near Eleutherna, one fragmentary, the other commemorating a ψαλτής περιμένων τῶν ἄνευς Χριστοῦ ἄπαγγελος, and L. H. Jeffery edits 509 two contiguous fragments of a legal code, written boustrophedon, from the acropolis of Axos. By the issue of a fourth volume of the Cretan corpus, 510 devoted to Gortyn, M. Guarducci brings to a successful conclusion her formidable task, save for one further volume which, in addition to addenda and corrigenda, will contain testimonia relative to Crete as a whole, Cretan texts of unknown provenance, and full indexes. The present instalment contains 557 Greek and 25 Latin texts, classified
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as vetustiores (nos. 1-159) and recentiores (nos. 160-582), together with testimonia concerning Gortynian topography, history, institutions, cults, etc., and indexes of personal, divine and geographical names and of notabilia. L. H. Jeffery publishes a fragment of ca. 550 B.C. and a Hellenistic epitaph from Cnosus \(511\) and an epitaph \(512\) of Roman date from Lyttus, and among recent finds on this site is a boustrophedon inscription \(513\) containing two decrees. H. van Effenterre’s examination of the forts on the frontiers of Olus and Lato has brought to light \(514\) a series of Greco-Roman graffiti at Oξα and stes Pines; from the latter site come στάδιον καὶ τεῦχος ΔΔΠΠ and Ὑρκόο καλά, from the former Νῦκ̄α δικαίος[ςας] τῶν ναυμαχαν ἔπει, where it seems likely that νεκ[ρος] has been miswritten or misread. S. Eirem questions \(515\) Wilhelm’s interpretation of a votive epigram of Olus (I Cret I xii 13). At Itanos the French excavators have found \(516\) numerous inscriptions, notably a late votive poem ending στάσαντο, μακρα, ὀρθὰ μετὰ κατά σύν, Ἀγαθοκλῆς, τέμενος. E. Fraenkel’s note \(517\) on ‘The Pedigree of the Saturnian Metre’ points out that the Hymn of the Curetes (I Cret III ii 2) is pure Saturnian, both in metre and in the fact that the two metrical cola coincide with two syntactical cola.

VII. Italy and Western Europe

A. Ferrua’s collection of inscribed gaming-boards includes \(518\) several examples in which the legend is in Greek. S. L. Agnello publishes \(519\) a votive altar of 250-200 B.C. from Syracuse, inscribed Δῖος Σωτήρος ἐρείπων, probably Hiero II, and an epitaph \(520\) from Priolo Gargallo in the same district, and, with S. Calderone, the foot of a fifth-century skyphos \(521\) dedicated at Syracuse to Heracles. G. P. Carratelli discusses \(522\) the cult of the Παιάδες and Anna at Acræ, re-editing the six relevant inscriptions (GDI 5256-9, etc.), and S. Calderone publishes \(523\) a text from Herakleia, now in the Syracuse Museum, which he dates in the third century B.C. and reads [οι] ναι[ν]ο[ρ]ο[ι] ο[ι] ἔρπασαν; both date and text are questioned by J. and L. Robert. M. Schwabe studies \(524\) a fifth-century tombstone from Acracis inscribed ἄγορασσει ἵππασσος (CIfud 65.4). Calderone also publishes \(525\) eight epitaphs from Lipara, the earliest of which are of the third or second century B.C. while the latest is that of a Christian born in A.D. 409, who died in 470, and also one \(526\) found N. of the Palermo-Messina road, and an archaic text \(527\) in retrograde script on a cornice-block from Megara Hyblaea. From this site comes also a sixth-century κουρού, published \(528\) by G. P. Carratelli, with a retrograde inscription, votive or sepulchral, containing the earliest epigraphical reference to a doctor. P. Mingazzini records \(529\) graffiti on vases and Rhodian amphora-handles from Carales (Cagliari) in Sardinia.

We now pass to Italy. A. Ferrua restores \(530\) [σωματευτεὶς] του λουκάιου in an inscription from Rhegium, and L. H. Jeffery shows \(531\) that an inscribed loom-weight from Siris-Heracles supports the literary tradition of the foundation of Siris from Colophon. D. S. Marin offers \(532\) a new reading and restoration of a puzzling bilingual epigram from Lavello in Lucania (RivFil LV 226 f.), and a votive to Πολεμίδων Ἀρμαδάς from Elea is reported, \(533\) but not yet published. M. Guarducci edits two new texts from Posidonia (Paestum), (a) an archaic κιππός \(534\) bearing in retrograde script the name Χρίσων, which she regards as attesting a cult of Chiron on this site in the sixth century B.C., and (b) an epitaph \(535\) of the second or first century B.C., engraved with letters in relief, a rare, but, by no means unique, phenomenon. In an epigram of Neapolis Wilhelm reads \(536\) ἄμακρος, ἐς in place of ὀ μάκρος, and Guarducci examines \(537\) the various readings, restorations and interpretations proposed for a retrograde inscription on a bronze disk from Cyme (Cumae), which she takes as an oracular answer, Ἡρέσι οὐκ ἐστὶ ἐπιμαντεύεσθαι. The poem, now lost, from Ardea relating to Veleda (cf. JHS LXII 47) still excites interest and discussion. A. Grenier describes \(538\) the find, dated in the first or second century A.D., and suggests that Veleda may have been interred at Ardea, but thinks the extant letters ‘trop incomplets pour qu’on songe à les restituer’; J. Bousquet, however, claims \(539\) that we have here an oracle, not Delphic but due to a learned Roman Hellenist, couched in Hipponactean metre, restores [τι]’ν in place of [το]’ν in l. 7, and sees in Πηγοτότα τα παιδιά a play on this word. Of especial value is Guarducci’s re-editon, \(540\) based on an older and better copy, prefaced by a bibliography and a résumé of previous interpretations; the oracle, of unknown source and in Phalican metre, was, she holds, given to Vespasian, or possibly to Titus, and she restores the two puzzling verses (ll. 5 f.) ἕν οὶ Πηγοτότα σεβόμει, [ἐρυγγος] φιλίσσουτες χρυσῆς.
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Kepa[στιθένς], i.e. Aphrodite. She also studies 541 the influence of Pythagorean doctrine in three Ostian epigrams of the second century A.D., (a) that on a sarcophagus-lid (NS 1910, 15), (b) that on a mutilated marble slab (NS 1912, 327), and (c) that on three contiguous fragments here first published.

From Rome there is unusually little to report. A Greek inscription has come to light 542 in the Viale Ardecatino in the suburbs, G. M. Bersanetti discusses 543 the salary of the Imperial official a studii in the light of the cursus of L. Julius Vestinus, etc. τῆς σπαδεσσάς 'Ασπασσά (IG XIV 108 = OGI 679), G. Pallini restores 544 'Ασπασσά[στιθέν] on a statue-base in the Palazzo Spada (IG XIV 1139), rather than 'Ασπασσά[στιθέν] or 'Ασπασσά[στιθέν] or 'Ασπασσά[στιθέν] (as previously proposed, R. Egger comments 544 on an Orphic tablet of the second century A.D. (Olivieri, Lamellae aureae, p. 18), and G. Belvederi appeals 546 to some epigraphical evidence in his work Le tombe apostoliche nell’età paleocristiana. D. Facenna publishes 547 a magical inscription of the second century A.D. on a gold plate from Ciciliano in the Sabine territory, and E. Ferrario 548 a Greek metrical epitaph followed by a Latin inscription from the Basilica degli Apostoli in Milan commemorating Dioscorus, an Egyptian doctor, perhaps mentioned by S. Augustine in a letter of a.d. 428 (227; Migne); this is further discussed and emended by J. and L. Robert 549 A. Ferrua, 550 and W. Peck. 551

H. Rolland finds 552 the word ΠΥΥΥΕ scratch twice written on wall-plaster at Glanum (St. Rémy), and C. Picard reports 553 the discovery of a Rhodian amphora-handle at Ensérune (Hérault). M. Guarducci offers 554 a new text of the fourth-century eucharistic inscription of Pectorius (IG XIV 2955) from Augustodunum (Autun), of which the first three couplets may come from a second-century composition, restoring in 1. λευγντηθεν, 2. θεος άλλαξ, 3. άποστά Σώτερ, where άλλαξ is the mother’s name. W. Vollgraff maintains 555 (cf. JHS LXXII 48) the authenticity of an inscription found at Dijon in 1598 and then lost, accepted in CIG 679, but rejected in IG XIV 370 * and F. Cumont, Mystères de Mithre, II 179; he takes Μίθρης as genitive of the goddess Mithra (Mithra), Chyndonas as a Sarmanian devotee of Aphrodite Urania, of Bosphoran origin, and in the last line writes άφτερος άποστα Σώτερ, where άποστα Σώτερ is the engraved ring, which he dates in the sixth, or even the seventh century B.C. T. K. Kempf records 557 a fourth-century Christian graffiti from Trèves (Trier).

VIII. ASIA MINOR

Jeanne and Louis Robert continue their fruitful explorations and excavations in Asia Minor. They report 558 briefly on their journeys in 1932 and 1933 and on their joint expeditions in 1945-50, with lists of their publications, districts explored and museums studied, and outline their plans for the future; L. Robert gives a separate account 559 of his mission to Turkey, notably to Amasya, in 1949. Some results of their work appear in Hellenika, VIII and IX, which relate mainly, but not exclusively, to Asia Minor. In vol. VIII (above, p. 59) he edits 560 fifteen new texts in the Carian script and language (pp. 5 ff.) and makes fifteen additions 561 to his collection (cf. JHS LXXII 49) of memorials of gladiators, inscribed or sculptured (pp. 39 ff.), including unpublished epitaphs from Ancyra (no. 328) and Attilia (no. 331), a new inscribed relief from Cibyra (no. 332), and re-editions of epitaphs from Pergamus and Ephesus (nos. 335 ff.), together with further comments on nos. 90, 135, 197 and 315 of the series: the volume ends with addenda to vols. II (p. 80) and VII (pp. 72 ff.) and a summary of Robert’s courses at the Collège de France from 1939 to 1948, indicating which sections have been published and where.

In Hellenika IX J. and L. Robert present some fruits of the expeditions of 1946, 1947 and especially 1948, reaped in the museums of Manisa, Antalya, Ankara and Istanbul, together with plans for further volumes. The first section (pp. 7 ff.) contains 562 five inscriptions from Lydia, (a) a decree of Sardis, dating from Augustus’ reign, περὶ τῆς διοίκησις τῶν τῶν δυτικάς καὶ τῶν ἀναπτυξεῖσθαι προστασεῖσθαι, with a discussion of Sardis, VII 197 155 and the cult of Pergamum and Athena at Sardis; (b) the epitaph of an ἀρχιερεύς τοῦ σύμπαντος Σωτῆρ at Thyatira; (c) an addendum to an epitaph of Julia Gordius published in Hellenika, VI 94; and two inscriptions from the district of Philadelphia copied in 1886 by G. Radet, viz. (d) honours paid in 12-11 B.C. and A.D. 166-7 (dated by the Actian era, τῆς Καίσαρος χιλιάτης) to generous benefactors of the state and of a συμβολᾶς, and (c) a dedication to Asclepius from Gólde in Lydia. Next (pp. 39 ff.) come 563 three votive inscriptions copied at Attilia (Antalya), (a) an altar of unknown provenance, signed by the sculptor and bearing a long and interesting list of
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offers dedicated to Men; (b) a dedication ποτεχριοῦ Τιβερίου, and (c) an altar of the first or second century A.D. from Attalia inscribed Μοίρα τῶν βωμῶν Μνήμης καλοῦ Καλοκαιρίου Κλησίππου ποίησε νέο καλόν Καλοκαιρίον, which, with two herms from Byzantium (above, p. 72), leads to a study of the cults of seasons, winds, etc. (pp. 57 ff.). Section III (pp. 67 ff.) contains inscriptions and relics copied at Ankara in 1948, viz. (a) a dedication Δι Οὐρβερ Κυμή, chief god of Anazarbus in Gileia; (b) a Hellenistic dedication to Zeus Poarios, whose cult is attested only at Abanuteichos; (c) a relief of Artemis, which Robert traces to Apollonia illyria, where two similar reliefs (SGDI 3221, Patsch, Das Sandschak Berat, 186) have been found, and (d) a list of victories won by the runner Zeuxis, which throws light on the athletic contests of Ionia in the first century B.C. The last section (pp. 78 ff.) deals with the inscriptions of the Hellespont and Propontis, including (a) a sixth-century boustrrophedon building-record, said to come from the neighbourhood of Cyzicus and Lampasus; (b) a list of the names and functions of the members of an association of fishermen (IGR I 817) hitherto assigned to Callipolis, but regarded by Robert as 'la plus belle et la plus instructive des inscriptions de la colonie romaine de Parion' (p. 91), to which he also attributes IGR I 819 (p. 95), and (c) a Hellenistic dedication, here re-edited (pp. 94 ff.), set up at Cyzicus to Posidon and Aphrodite Pontia (Michel, 1225).

D. Magie's monumental work Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century after Christ comprises two volumes, of which the first contains the narrative, starting from the bequest of Attalus, and the second and larger the footnotes and tables, in which epigraphical evidence plays a very important role. J. Sundwall gives a supplementary list of Anatolian proper names together with an introduction to their study and some corrigenda to his standard work on Lycian names (Klof, Belhelt, XI), F. Steinherz examines some of the Carian texts edited by L. Robert (above, p. 78), and M. P. Nilsson deals with Anatolian 'pseudo-mysteries', especially those associated with the Dioscurei and Imperial cults.

The remaining material I present in geographical order, following that adopted in the CIG. A. Mogiellini considers the significance for Rhodian history of an inscription from Thysanus in the Rhodian Peraus honouring Domitian and Domitilla (SIG 819). An exploration of the Cnidian Peninsula by G. E. Bean and J. M. Cook has resulted in the location of the city and the discovery of nearly forty inscriptions. M. Gelzer discusses S. Acamme's interpretation (Il dominio romano, 93) of the phrase ἐρήμος καὶ νόμος in a letter of M. Antonius the triumvir to Plasara and Aphrodisias (OGI 453, 25). In his Greek Attars (above, p. 62) C. G. Yavis quotes a Milesian altar-inscription (p. 156). W. Peek proposes new readings and restorations of ll. 6, 9, 11 of the epigram from Priene extolling the wrestler Atenopolis (T 2678). W. F. Schelh argues that the φωτιστικός έρωμες 'Ἀττάλιους mentioned in Darius' letter to Gedatas, found near Magnesia on the Maeander (SIG 22 = GHI 10), were directly engaged in the cult of the god. L. Robert's account of the district of Tabae (Tavas) in Caria draws on still unpublished inscriptions, and he reports the discovery, between Tabae and Aphrodisias, of two dedications, Δι Πτεριανα ανδ βυζαντινα in a grotto of eastern Caria. J. Keil makes three valuable contributions to Ephesian epigraphy, showing that a building S.W. of the Agora must be a sanctuary of the Egyptian gods, as is indicated by a series of dedications, one of which refers to an ίωσις τος οι Ισταλος και ιοντος, and a second contains the phrase τού τε θεού μου Υπερειδος βουκολος, (b) accepting C. Praschneider's dating of the Mausoleum of Belevi in the fourth century B.C., but assigning it to Mentor of Rhodes rather than to his brother Memnon, and (c) editing a puzzling Pythagorean poem of the Augustan age, found in St. John's Church, dedicated to Artemis and setting forth the 'two ways' of life. C. Picard examines the much debated phrase υπέρ του σταυρου του έρωμεν in l. 4 of a fourth-century Ephesian decree (IBM 449 = Oliver, Sacred Gerusia, no. 1), and defends (with Bengston, against Rousell, Robert, Klaffenbach and Launey) the traditional interpretation, taking the nominative as το σταυρον του έρωμεν, not του σταυρου του έρωμεν. W. Hahland's study of the frieze of the temple of Dionysus at Teos involves an examination of inscriptions of Teos (SEG II 580), Magnesia (Irmagn 93, 100), Pergamum (Irmag 163) and Priene (Irmag 207 = SIG 1150), and A. Wilhelm discusses an epigram from Notium (SEG IV 573) commemorating an infant drowned in a well, and assumes the loss of a verse between vv. 10 and 11. J. Keil provisionally edits thirty-six inscriptions, five of them previously published, from the Agora of Smyrna, including documents relative to the dispute between Pergamum and the publicani.
(no. 1), the dedication of a building to Nemesis, all gods and goddesses, and the Emperor (no. 2), an altar dedicated to Nemesis by a σμυρνέας (no. 7), other dedications (nos. 3-6) and honorary inscriptions for Emperors and distinguished Romans and Greeks (nos. 8-16, 22-26), among them an ἄγαθος ἱεροσῶς φιλοπεπεμόσιμον ἡμερῶν πέντε τοις ὀλίγονοι (no. 16), agonistic records (nos. 17-21, of which no. 20 is specially noteworthy), and fragments relating to trade-guilds (nos. 34, 35). M. Hammond discusses 584 the letter addressed by M. Aurelius to the Dionysiac συνόδος at Smyrna (SIG 851). The foot of a seventh-century cup has come to light 587 there, bearing an inscription of great epigraphical interest. A. D. Nock calls attention 588 to the use of μουστήριον to denote a building in an inscription of Sardis (Sardis, VII (17), 5). In an article on 'The Problem of Octavia Minor and Octavia Maior' 589 M. W. Singer deals 589 with an honorary inscription from Pergamum (OGI 452 = IGR IV 323), and M. F. Nissen maintains 590 that the various gods to whom altars are dedicated in the sanctuary of Demeter are almost all closely associated with the mysteries of the Thesmophoria. A. Wilhelm studies 601 and emends a grave-epigram of Alexandria Troas, now in the Louvre (Kaibel, Epigr. 336).

C. Bosch's article 592 on the festivals celebrated at Nicaea in Bithynia collects and utilizes the evidence of inscriptions (pp. 80 ff.) and of coins (pp. 81 ff.). J. M. R. Cormack edits 593 a letter of the third or fourth century A.D., said to come from Claudiiopolis, now in the Reading University Museum, laying a curse on forty-two persons, whose names indicate their menial, probably servile status. G. Rohde publishes 594 the metrical epitaph, found near the Bithynian city of Crataea (Flaviopolis), of a soldier who died at the age of twenty-two after seven years' service in the army. L. Keil 595 a dedication of the Imperial period, now in the Vienna Museum, from Mount Dindymus in Phrygia, Γιώργος, and compares the Διόνυσος of a votive stele from Bahadinlar; L. Robert rejects 596 Keil's interpretation of the relief on the latter as representing the votary, not the god. G. Klaftenbach makes 597 two emendations in an honorary inscription from Apamea (IGR IV 791; cf. Robert, Gladiateurs, 276). For recent discussions of the famous edict of Antiochus III from Dodurga (Ezira) see below, pp. 83 ff. Two articles in Turkish, by W. Ruben and S. Onat respectively, relating to a number of inscriptions from the district of Iconium (Konya), of which one records the dedication of a τρίταξα, στοάς and τάμπορια to Zeus Soter by a veteran, I know only in the summary 598 by J. and L. Robert.

A second edition 599 of J. Gage's useful Res gestae Divi Augusti has appeared. A. Lauton's study 600 of the Latin text of the Monumentum Anxyanum regarded as a stylistic work of art deals exclusively with the Latin text, while F. E. Adcock discusses 601 the historical interpretation of ch. 34. 1. E. Mamboury publishes 602 a fragmentary text from the site of the temple of Rome and Augustus at Anicyra honouring a Roman Emperor, whom J. and L. Robert identify 603 as Marcus Aurelius or Lucius Verus. A. Wilhelm deals 604 with the metrical difficulties raised by the opening verse of a grave-epigram of Amasia in Pontus, and A. M. Schneider publishes 605 a reliquary-inscription of the sixth or seventh century from Sibaste (Sivas), and W. Ruben transcribes 606 in Latin letters twelve Greek texts, of which two are votive and the rest sepulchral, from Kirshehr in Cappadocia and its environs.

L. Moretti repeats 607 the text of the long and interesting decree (cf. JHS LXXII 52) from Araxa in Lycka, adds a commentary and discusses the date, which, agreeing with A. H. M. Jones and answering the objections raised by G. E. Bean, he places ca. 180 B.C., seeing in Moagete's tyrant of Cibyra and Sillyum whose fortunes are recounted by Polybius and Livy. J. and L. Robert devote 608 a long and valuable summary and discussion to the same document, preferring the early part of the second century to its later years and claiming that the chief interest of the inscription lies not in its date but in the detailed picture it presents of the life of S.W. Asia Minor, especially of the frontiers and the highlands, of the organization and activities of the Lycaean League and of the local tyrants; Moagete, they point out, figures as tyrant not of Cibyra, but of Bubon. R. Shafer has made a close study 609 of the Lycaian numeral system.

Pamphylia has proved unusually productive, especially Attalia, Perge and Side. A. M. Mansel and A. Akaraka publish 610 in Turkish with a full English summary, a report on their work at Perge; among its fruits are thirty inscriptions (all save one in Greek) on sarcophagi and a small grave-stele, mostly of the second or third century A.D., the main interest of which, emphasized 611 by J. and L. Robert, lies in the various terms used for the grave, formulae of ownership, provision
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for κοράκωσις, and penalties for violation. G. E. Bean publishes an inscription from Perga, in which the φυλή 'Ἑραίστου honours Hadrian, and suggests the same provenance for a medallion of Smyrna bearing the words φυλή ('Ἀνήνας (L. Robert, *Hellenica*, VII 196); he also emends the reading of an altar-inscription from Side (*JHS* XXVIII 190 ff.), recently revised by Wilhelm (*Stz., Wien*, CCXXIV (4) 59 ff.), consisting of a dedication, the words ἵδε τὰσα καὶ τα πειράματα. H. T. Bossert examines the script and language of Side in view of Arrian’s statement (*Anab.* I 26. 4) that the city was founded from Cyme in Aeolis, but that the colonists at once adopted a foreign tongue; he re-edits the first known bilingual and adds a second, found in 1949, a dedication to the πειραματα followed by a sculptor’s signature. The epigraphical fruits of the excavations carried on at Side in 1947 are published provisionally by E. Bosch; of forty-three Greek texts five are here re-edited, the rest are new and include some interesting honorary inscriptions (nos. 1, 2, 6, 7, 9–11) and one relating to a forum named after the Emperor Arcadius (no. 32). L. Robert confirms the fragmentary evidence the location of the Pisidian town Paralais in the modern Barla, and R. Schafer examines the contribution made by Greek inscriptions to the study of the Anatolian languages with special reference to Pisidian. S. and R. Werner edit a decree of 140 B.C. engraved on a stele of Parian marble found at Karatash in Cilicia (Magarsus-Antiochia), near the mouth of the Pyramus, in which that city honours Tarsus (*Ἀντιοχείας πρὸς τῷν Κυδωνίν*). A. E. Raubitschek’s edition of fifteen inscriptions, of which nine are epitaphs, brought to light by H. Goldman’s excavation at Tarsus; most of these are later than A.D. 350, and the most interesting is the epitaph (no. 8) of the vicarius of Asia, Musonius, and his staff, killed near Tarsus in A.D. 368.

To T. B. Mitford we owe three important articles on inscriptions of Cyprus. In one of these he studies the ceramic inscriptions from Kasizin, S.E. of Nicosia (cf. *JHS* LXXII 52), largely augmented by the finds made in 1949, so that we now know some 310 inscribed vessels or utensils dedicated on that site to the Nymphs, in syllabic script, 268 in alphabetic and 19 in both. The great majority, perhaps all, can be dated between 225 and 217 B.C. In another he publishes fifty new inscriptions (four of them Latin) of the Roman period, copied by him in 1936–39 on various sites, especially Salamis, Carpassa, Ceryneia, Lapethus, Soli, Paphos, Curiun, Amathus and Citium; thirty-one of them are now in the Cyprus Museum. Incidentally he re-edits or corrects many published texts, among them *IGR* III 952, 961, 993 (pp. 22, 75, 33), *SEG* VI 802 (p. 13), *SCE* III 623 ff. nos. 8, 9, 15 (pp. 35, 37 f.) and *IBM* 398 (pp. 80 f.). Of the new texts, mostly honorary, votive, building or sepulchral, we may note a fragmentary will from Carpassa (no. 7), first-century aqueduct-inscriptions of Ceryneia and Soli (nos. 9, 15), of which the latter gives us a new proconsul of Cyprus, an ephebic record from Lapethus (no. 12), a dedication to Aphrodite and Antoninus Pius from Soli (no. 17), an invocation to Zeus and Aphrodite from Arsinoe (no. 26), a dedication to Caligula from Paphos (no. 30), four milestones (nos. 32–34, 46), two honorary inscriptions from Curiun (nos. 36, 37), and a building-inscription dated A.D. 39–40 of unknown provenance (no. 45). In a third article, on which J. and L. Robert comment fully, Mitford deals with twenty-two new inscriptions, three of them Latin, of the early Christian period, copied on various sites, among them one recalling the Jewish community at Salamis (no. 3), a series of texts relating to the aqueduct of that city (nos. 4, 5), a new fragment of Justinian’s rescript (*LΒW* 2770) from Cytherea (no. 7), and building-records of the walls of Lapethus and a hostelry at Soli (nos. 10, 17); in a series of appendixes (pp. 165 ff.) Mitford discusses (a) two published inscriptions (*SEG* VI 841, *BCH* XX 340 ff.), (b) the early Christian inscriptions of Cyprus in general, (c) their letter-forms, and (d) the abbreviations and sigla used in them. The discovery near Kouklia of bases bearing dedications in syllabic script is reported. In his *Notes on the Etocypriote Inscriptions* T. B. Jones gives revised readings of the five major texts engraved in the Cyprian syllabic signs but in a non-Hellenic language, and states the results won by their re-examination.

IX. Syria and the East

A further welcome instalment of the *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie*, edited by L. Jalabert and R. Mouterde (though Jalabert died in 1943), covers the Amanus region and Antioch and comprises 290 inscriptions (nos. 699–988), of which nineteen are Latin and the remainder Greek; one Latin and 83 Greek texts are here first published. The chief sites represented are Alexandria (Alexandretta), Rhousus and Antioch, and the most important single inscription is the famous dossier...
from Rhousis, which is also briefly examined 628 by L. Wenger and plays an important part in E. Schönbauer’s discussion 629 (with special reference to the views of Lewald and de Visscher) of double citizenship in the Roman Empire and its influence on legal development. Some of the Antiochen inscriptions are used by G. Haddad in his study 630 of Aspects of Social Life in Antioch in the Hellenistic Roman Period. H. Seyrig continues to make valuable contributions to Syrian antiquities. In one article 631 he studies the eras of Antioch, Apamea, Epiphanias, Rhousis, Damascus, Berytus, Chalèce, Doliche and other cities, mainly on the basis of coins, but with occasional aid from epigraphic evidence (pp. 20 f., 31, 35 ff., 49 f.); in another 632 he deals with a number of inscribed weights from Antioch, Seleucia Pieria, Laodicea, Heraclea ad mare and Beroea; in a third 633 he publishes a dedication, probably from Damascus, dated A.D. 213–4, and thirteen inscriptions (one in Latin) from Emesa (nos. 1, 2), Jabruba (no. 3), Harran el-Awamid in Damascus (no. 4), Palmyra (nos. 5, 6), el-‘AI (no. 7), Heliopolis (no. 8), Berytus (no. 9) and Sidon (nos. 11–13), including dedications Διὸ Μουσῆς ἡ Ἱλίπολει (no. 1) and ἸΩΑΝΝΑΙΩΝ (no. 2), a memorial erected in A.D. 214. Φυλακεῖται ὑπὸ ἥσσος αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξηκνεῖται (no. 4), the dedication of a statue of Κύριάς Νέας (no. 6), the epitaph of a veteran of the first legion Παρθική Στρατιά (υφί) on his κόμαιν οἴκηαι, ἐν ὧν πανωταῖς ἄλογοι, probably the Parthenon Wars of Septimius Severus and Caracalla (no. 7), a tomb-epitaph (no. 9), and a metrical dedication Διὶ καρποδοτήρι (no. 10). Elsewhere he assigns 634 to a hitherto unattested Demetrias in Phoenicia six coins, three of them unpublished, and a leader weight in the Beyrouth Museum (Μέλ λύρ ΞΧΧΥ, 75 f.), dated 154–3, of which he gives a revised text; his revision 635 of other Syrian weight-inscriptions and notes on some signs and formulae common to numismatic and epigraphy I know only through the summary of J. and L. Robert A. Reifenberg publishes 636 a Judeo-Greek amulet from Syria ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας κύριας Μαρσίππας. F. Halkin collects and studies 637 the Greek inscriptions of Phoenicia, Syria, Arabia and Palestine which are of hagiographical interest, prefacing his account by a section on ‘fakos martyris et inscriptions pseudo-hagiographiques’, in which he rejects the accepted reading or interpretation of many texts, including IG XII (2) 644, SEG VI 73 and VII 327. R. Retumé’s report on his journey in the territory of Apamea includes 640 a number of epitaphs and lintel-inscriptions, pagan and Christian, chiefly of the second or third century A.D., a bilingual bath-inscription (p. 23) and a fragment of an Imperial edict of the fifth or sixth century (pp. 28 ff.). G. M. A. Hanlamm studies 641 three inscribed mosaics of Apamea depicting Socrates and six of his disciples, which he assigns tentatively to A.D. 350–375 and regards as valuable evidence for Syrian culture in the fourth century, proving the continued popularity of Socrates among the educated peoples of that period.

Among the Greek inscriptions of Palmyra published by Z. Ben Hayyim is one Greek text, 640 M. Rodison edits 641 a Latin, Greek and Palmyrene trilingual dated A.D. 52, and in an article 642 on the deity Genesia by H. Seyrig and J. Starcky special attention is paid to a stele from a rustic shrine at Khirbet-Semrin in Palmyrene (AA 1935, 627) bearing the name [K]έστρω and to one in the Louvre dedicated [θ]εω Γενεκχ πατήροος. The tenth fascicle of the Inventaire des inscriptions de Palmyre, 643 edited by J. Starcky, contains 146 inscriptions, 103 of which were unpublished, found in the Agora of Palmyra; an introduction (pp. 3 f.) deals with the thirty-eight dated inscriptions ranging from A.D. 30–1 to 218, and the annotated texts comprise 60 Greek, 32 Palmyrene, 37 Greek-Palmyrene bilinguals, and eight Latin or Latin-Palmyrene documents. J. Johnson illustrates and explains 644 two horoscopes from Dura-Europus, one of which is dated July, A.D. 176.

An article of A. Poidebard and R. Moutard on St. Sergius contains 646 a collection of inscriptions from Sergiosi (Resafa) and elsewhere relative to his cult. J. Lauffray’s account 646 of the fora and monuments of Berytus includes, in addition to Latin inscriptions, a new edition by Moutard of the fragmentary Byzantine fiscal tariff (pp. 78 ff.; cf. 31 f.), and H. Seyrig discusses 647 the masons’ marks on the stones of a portico at Beyrouth. A sculptor’s signature has come to light 648 at Heliopolis (Baalbek), and J. Sauvaget’s article on the ancient plan of Damascus studies 649 a date-formula engraved on a column of the eastern portico of the temple of Zeus.

F. Halkin collects 650 and comments on the inscriptions of Palestine which name saints, including those most recently edited in SEG VIII 1, 119, 187, 192, 199, 228 ff., 315. J. H. Illifé publishes 651 a Byzantine gold pectoral from Palestine and M. Schwabe’s numerous contributions to

---

628 Arch. Pahl. XIV 196ff.
630 Chicago, 1949, esp. pp. 95 ff., 104 ff.; cf. JHS LXX 93.
631 AJA LV 496ff.; AJPA LXXII 191ff.
632 Syria, XXVII 5ff.; cf. REG LXIV 196.
634 Syria, XXVII 229ff.
635 Ibid. 50ff.; cf. REG LXIV 200.
636 *Notes on Syrian Coins (Num. Notes and Monographs, 119); cf. REG LXIV 124.
639 Mél Beyr XXVIII 1ff.; cf. REG LXV 178.
640 Herm. St LX 205ff.
642 Syria, XXVII 137ff.; cf. REG LXIV 199.
643 Syria, XXVII 234ff.; cf. REG LXIV 199.
644 Damascus, 1949; cf. REG LXIV 199, Syria, XXVII 141ff.
645 Archaeology, IV 76ff.
650 Syria, XXVI 321.
652 QDAP XIV 97ff.
Palestinian epigraphy include a metrical epitaph, perhaps from Caesarea, of a freedman, once slave τοῦ βασιλῆων, either Emperor or Herod, which the editor dates cf. Α.Δ. 150 or a little earlier, the sarcophagus-inscription of a rabbi from Nave, and a Greek inscription from Ubadlye in Upper Galilee. J. Irsmrcher returns to the problem of the famous διάστασις Καισαρίου from Nazareth (SEG VIII 13), maintaining its genuineness, dating it between Α.Δ. 50 and 100, and regarding Sebaste in Samaria as its probable provenance. A. M. Schneider's account of Roman and Byzantine buildings on Gerazim includes a stamped tile and several inscriptions, mostly fragmentary, among them an epitaph of Α.Δ. 605–6 and a stone inscribed λίθος εκ τοῦ σύγχρονος Κρησού, i.e. Calvary. Three inscriptions from the synagogue at Caesarea are examined and restored by M. Schwabe, who also publishes a Jewish epitaph and the βούργος inscription from the same site.

P. B. Bagatti's *Il Museo della Flagellazione in Gerusalemme* (Jerusalem, 1941), which includes a number of amulets, rings, stamps and Rhodian amphora-handles, I know only through a review by H. Seyrig. C. N. Johns publishes a Christian fragment from the citadel of Jerusalem, S. Zeitlin comments on E. Bickerman's article on the 'warning-inscription' of the Temple, and the ossuary-inscriptions from Taliptal (cf. JHS LXXII 54), acclaimed in some quarters as the earliest epigraphical records of Christianity, are discussed by Bagatti and by H. L. Jansen, who reject the Christian interpretation given to three of them by Sukenik and O. Moe. M. Schwabe comments on two other ossuary-inscriptions from Jerusalem. M. Avi-Yonah reports on excavations at Sheikh Bader, a western suburb of Jerusalem, where an invocation addressed to Θεος τού αγίου Πατερησιου has come to light. Interesting discoveries of Christian graffiti have been made in a grotto at Bethany, dating from the fourth to the sixth century, one of which refers to the raising of Lazarus. The excavations at Khirbet en-Nitla near Jericho, described by J. L. Kelso, have revealed enigmatic mosaic-inscriptions in Christian places of worship, and A. Alt proposes to identify Borelia, named in a late epitaph from the Choziba Monastery near Jericho, with the village of Burra, 8 km. E.N.E. of Gaza, named in literature as Βορρά. N. Gueckel's explorations in Eastern Palestine have resulted in the discovery of Greek inscriptions on various sites, but their texts are not yet published. A. Wilhelm offers a solution of a metrical problem raised by an epitaph (Kaibel, Epigr. 440) from Namara in Batanae, O. Fiebigers studies the names Ευμένιος, Ευμένις found in an inscription of Α.Δ. 208 in the Southern Hauran (PUEAS III 223), and M. Dunand publishes sixty-four new inscriptions from various sites in Gideon Druze and Hauran, mostly Christian epitaphs and building-records, including a Christian adaptation of the apotropaic formula Ο τοῦ δώς πατα Καλλίνος Ήρικλίππος Εύρωδος κατεκόμην. Πηθύνη στρέμα κεκάμ (cf. SEG VII 819); two of them (nos. 314, 328), as well as some earlier members of the series (nos. 256, 289), are corrected by A. Alt. F. V. Winnett reports the discovery in N.E. Transjordan of 700 Sabaite, 100 Kufic and seven Greek texts, which still await publication. J. H. Iliffe describes a gnostic gem found in a Roman tomb at Philadelphia (Amman), J. Saller an eighth-century Christian inscription from Qaweisim, and P. Benoit an epitaph from es-Semakieh in the same district.

Of seven Hellenistic inscriptions found in Aramav (Armenia) I know only the account given by J. and L. Robert. F. Altmein studies, mainly from the linguistic standpoint, the bilingual epitaph of Serapis from Mcheta in Georgia (cf. JHS LXV 98, LXVII 126), and R. Ghirshman reports the discovery of Rhodian and Thasian amphora-handles at Susa. A. G. Roos makes contributions to the study of the προστάσιος of Antiocbus III, dated 193 b.c., of which a new and complete copy has come to light at Laodicea (Nehavand) in Iran (cf. JHS LXXII 54); the first, based on Claremont's edition of the document, deals with its historical significance, while the second takes into account Robert's edition, but maintains his view that a line was omitted and that we must restore τόστους, rather than, with Robert, τόστους, A. Yarm also deals in detail, on the basis of Robert's text, with the historical situation revealed in the edict, especially Antiocbus' repudiation of his wife Laodice in 193 or 192, the death of the younger Antiocbus, and the delay in the recognition of Scelucus and his association with the king, and stresses the length of the interval between the issue
of the edict and its publication at Nehavend and Dodurga. Robert gives \(^{685}\) critical summaries of Roos' earlier article and that of Aymard, and elsewhere adds \(^{686}\) a new fragment to the honorary inscription from Laodicea for Menedemus ἐπὶ τῶν Ἄρων ἄνω στρατηγῶν (Hellenica, VII 22 ff.), completing the first line and adding two letters to the second; it was Menedemus who communicated to Laodicea the royal πρόσταγμα, and the two inscriptions must therefore be roughly contemporaneous.

X. NORTH AFRICA

The Egyptian and Nubian sections of this survey, compiled by P. M. Fraser, are published in JEA XXXVIII 115 ff. Fraser also publishes \(^{687}\) an interesting, but unhappily mutilated inscription now in the Museum of CYRENNE, opening with a letter of Hadrian to Cyrene, dated 134–5, which mentions the ἄρχον τῶν Πολιτειῶν and the proconsul (Salvius) Carus, followed by excerpts from rescripts and edicts embodying the provisions made by the Emperor for the restoration of prosperity to the city at the close of his reign. J. H. Oliver comments \(^{688}\) on this document, especially on II. 2–12, draws up a list of names to be added to that of known Panhellenes, and deals with the publication of their official records at Athens; several points in Oliver's interpretation are questioned \(^{689}\) by C. B. Welles. To Fraser's article S. Applebaum adds \(^{690}\) a valuable appendix on Hadrian's work of resuscitation at Cyrene, attested by nine previously known inscriptions (five Greek, two bilingual and two Latin) and five (four Latin and one bilingual) here first published, as well as by two Greek fragments from Ptolemais mentioned below. A. N. Sherwin-White examines \(^{691}\) the SC Calvisianum (SEG IX 8, 83 ff.) in the course of an inquiry into the penalty imposed by the law de rebus repetundis, and the dossier of which this SC forms part (ibid. 8) affords valuable material for E. Schönbaumer's article on double citizenship in the Roman Empire (above, p. 60). S. Ferri discusses \(^{692}\) a puzzling phrase in the 'Decretals' (ibid. 72. 120 f.), supporting the restoration ἐπε[σ]κοιν and believing that a ritual death is in question. E. Weiss' essay 'Zur Stadtrechtsgeschichte von Kyrene' \(^{693}\) I know only through a review. \(^{694}\) S. Applebaum publishes \(^{695}\) two fragments from Ptolemais (Tellmeta), which may relate to Hadrian's policy with regard to the Cyrenaean gymnasium; one gives Hadrian's title and refers to the Ακαδημία, the other mentions an Ἀθλητήμαρχος and a gymnasiarch. J. and G. Roux examine \(^{696}\) two decrees of the πολιτεία Λουδέων at Berenice (Benghazi), dating from the first century B.C. or A.D., one (CIG 5361), now at Toulouse, honouring a Roman, the other (CIG 5362), now at Carpentras, in honour of a Jew who had adorned an ἀφιέταριον.

M. Guarducci publishes \(^{697}\) the epitaph, found at Leptis Magna, of a Cnosian who had lived for twenty-five years ἐν παρασυρίᾳ, and J. Ward Perkins' article on Tripolitania and the marble-trade records \(^{698}\) many masons' marks on capitals and column-bases of Pentelic marble in the Severan forum at the same site, supporting the conclusion that 'the whole vast programme of marble working was in the hands of Greek-speaking craftsmen'. J. Ferron studies \(^{699}\) three Greek epitaphs (one with a Hebrew addition) of Jews buried at Carthage, and C. Picard draws attention \(^{700}\) afresh (cf. JHS LXVII 127) to the Rhodian amphoras found in a tomb near Cirta (Constantine).

---

\(^{685}\) REG LXIV 200 ff.
\(^{686}\) Hellenica, VIII 73 ff.
\(^{687}\) JRS XL 77 ff.; cf. REG LXIV 211 f.
\(^{688}\) Hesperia, XX 31 ff.
\(^{689}\) AJLA 76 f.
\(^{690}\) JRS XL 87 ff.
\(^{691}\) Pop BSR XVII 14 ff.
\(^{692}\) Par Pass IV 254 f.
\(^{693}\) Scritti in onore di C. Ferrini, IV 232 ff.
\(^{694}\) J. Jura Porf IV 373.
\(^{695}\) JRS XL 90; cf. REG LXIV 212.
\(^{696}\) REG LXIV 281 ff.; cf. LXIV 212.
\(^{697}\) Epigraphia, X 74 ff.; cf. REG LXIV 212 f.
\(^{698}\) JRS XLI 91 ff., 103 f.
\(^{699}\) Cahiers de Byzac, I (Paris, 1951), 177 ff.
\(^{700}\) RA XXXVI (1950), 166 f.
NOTES AND INSCRIPTIONS FROM CAUNUS
(Continued from JHS LXXIII, 10–35, here quoted as Part I)

20. Two joining fragments of a stele found north of the harbour just inside the city wall. Combined height 0·16 m., combined width 0·22 m., thickness 0·05 m. The letters, cut between ruled lines, are of consistent height in each line, but vary from line to line between 10 and 14 mm. A small piece of the right edge is preserved in ll. 1–2; all other sides broken. Photograph Fig. 35.

[--- --- --- ---] [--- --- --- ---] ΑΩΝΑ [5 or 6] - 111
[--- --- ---] ἐμπεθῆ ἀπαντα τὰν ὑ-
[--- --- ---] λαμβ[α]νόμενον ἵθ[
[--- --- --- ---] ---] πρὸς τοῦτο ἄνηκ[ον]·
5 [--- --- ---] λαμβ[α]νέω τὸ ὄγδο[ν] μὲ-
[--- --- --- ---] σο[--- --- ---] 5 ἀργυρίου τ[5 or 6]
[--- --- --- ---] τῶ[ι]σαν ο[ι] άγο[ραν[ι]]
[--- --- --- ---] ---] κρινέτ[ωσαν --- ---]

Fig. 35.—Inscription No. 20.

L. 1 fin. Apparently Ill, perhaps ElI. L. 2 init. The fork of the upsilon is just visible. L. 6 fin. Τ or Π.
Too little remains to permit a reconstruction, but we have evidently a fragment of a regulation concerning catches of fish. (1 take it that ἴθων in l. 3 is collective.) There can be little doubt that we have here evidence of a dalyan at Caunus in antiquity as to-day. (See Part I, p. 14 n. 15.) The fish are principally of two kinds, κεστά and λέοντα, both excellent eating; in the summer and winter respectively they go up from the sea to the lake to spawn, and returning some two months later are caught in huge quantities. Wherever exactly the bed of the river may have lain in ancient times, there is no reason to suppose that the habits of the fish were any different then. For ancient fisheries in Asia Minor see Broughton, Economic Survey IV, 566, 799.
The date of the inscription I should suppose to be first century B.C.

21. Among the ruins close to M (see Part I, Fig. 3), now in the house of Ali Demir at Çandır, upper part of a stele with simple moulding at the top, 6·47 m. high, 0·30 m. in average width, 0·12 m. thick. Letters 13–16 mm. high, omicron generally small. Squeeze Fig. 36.

ἐπί ἱερεός Εὐνόμου
τοῦ Λεωνιδοῦ
Μηνύδωρος Σωσπήλευς
"Ιμπριος
5 ἀποσταλεῖς εἰς Πρέπειον
ἀνήγειρεν χρηστόν.
σόκαθι τύχῃ· ὁ δῆμος ὁ Καυνίων
ἐπερωτάτο τίνας θεοὺς
ιλακομένου αὐτοῦ καρπο[1]
For the demotic ἱμβριὸς and for the dating by a priest see Part I, No. 5. In l. 10 the grammar of γίνοιντο is questionable, but the reading seems beyond doubt.

This is the first recorded response of Grinean Apollo. For the functioning of the oracle (as distinct from the temple) of Apollo at Grineum there is in fact remarkably little evidence. Strabo XIII, 622 speaks of a μαντείων ἀρχαίον, which tells us nothing of his own time; otherwise we have only Apollo's command to Aeneas to go to Italy, and the remark in Philostratus that at some unspecified time the Apolline oracles at Grineum and elsewhere were eclipsed by the popularity of Orpheus. On this evidence Buresch doubted that the oracle continued to function in later times. The present inscription is therefore welcome evidence that it was in activity at least during the Hellenistic period.

The incompleteness of the god's response is to be regretted; it seems not to have been free from a certain oracular obscurity. The Caunians ask what gods they shall propitiate to obtain fruitful harvests: even their notoriously fertile country was liable to bad seasons. The reply begins straightforwardly enough: honour Apollo and Zeus; but the reference in l. 14 to glory and fetters bears on the face of it no relation to the question asked. It seems certain that ἄφησκετε in l. 15 must begin a new sentence, so that a single word after δεσμοῖς, presumably a verb, must complete

1 Apart from that given to Aeneas; see n. 2.
3 Kleros, 70 ff., quoted in RE s.v. 'Grineion'. Non vidi.
the sense. Within these narrow limits no great variety of interpretation seems possible. Should we suppose that Apollo takes καρποί figuratively, and promises that glory will take the place of servitude? The verb might then conceivably be οἶκειοι. But how are we to conceive the situation? ‘Servitude’ is suggestive of subjection to Rhodes, always intensely unpopular at Caunos; but the language of L. 1-7 seems clearly to imply that Caunos was independent at the time. Interpretation along these lines requires very special circumstances not easy to imagine. Alternatively, we might supply a verb in the past tense: ‘by honouring Apollo and Zeus you escaped from servitude to glory, for you are pleasing to them’—therefore continue to honour them, or the like. But I cannot find a verb to meet the case. I feel that a solution ought not to be unattainable, but must leave its discovery to the ingenuity of others.

The expression Λητοῦς Φοίβου is evidently adapted to the source of the inquiry; for the cult of Leto at and near Caunos see Part I, No. 13. The inscription dates, to judge by the style of the script, from before the period of Rhodian domination in the first century B.C. 6

22. Near the village of Okcular, about an hour and a half from Dalyan, among a number of ancient stones in Ismail Şahin’s maize-field, a block 0-95 m. high (but broken at the bottom), 0-43 m. wide, 0-48 m. thick. The writing seems originally to have covered the entire block (so far as preserved), but is completely worn away at the bottom and largely so on the right. The block is not a stele, but apparently formed part of a building. Various inscriptions, including a church and tombs, are reported in the vicinity; see also Nos. 53 and 54 below. Letters 8 mm. high. Squeeze Pl. I.

---

6 For οἴκειοι intransitive, ‘succeed to’, see LS² s.v., though nothing is quoted exactly like the present case.

6 Note also the addition of iota adscript even to the present indicative—though the same feature occurs also in No. 26, q.v.
L. 1. The name of the village (κώμη, l. 25) is very illegible. No demotic resembling Εὐξείνεως occurs in any Cauian inscription yet discovered.

L. 3. The restoration is hardly doubtful. Aristotle En.1160 a, speaking of κοινονία in general and alluding, among others, to demesmen, couples θυσίας and σύνοδος: θυσίας τε ποιούσας καὶ περὶ τῶν συνόδων. The whole section is indeed a commentary on the present passage. These 'gatherings' for religious and recreational purposes are, of course, to be distinguished from ἡ σύνοδος (ll. 12-13, 16-17), the village 'assembly'.

L. 4. β[ωμοί] is restored on the strength of the allusion to sacrifices in l. 3 and the fact that the official concerned with their repair is the hierocryx. In the first part of the decree, ending at l. 23, three tasks are provided for: (1) repair of existing altars, dealt with in ll. 8-13; (2) upkeep of a certain καλυφός, dealt with in ll. 14-17; (3) maintenance of a certain plantation, dealt with in ll. 18-23. The remainder, ll. 24-47, is a list of rewards to future donors of money, graded according to the amount subscribed.


Ll. 10-11. Neither hierocryx nor dicastae appear to occur elsewhere in village organisations. The former causes no surprise, but the duties assigned to the dicastae appear at first sight rather peculiar. They are, first (if l. 10 is correctly restored) the care of the communal treasury, and second (l. 14-15) the repair of the καλυφός. These are strange duties for 'judges'; but evidently the dicastae here are parallel, both in function and in name, to the brabeutae known in other villages of Asia Minor.

L. 14. The restoration στεγνος τροίσαν is, of course, doubtful, but I can find nothing more probable; the initial sigma is reasonably certain. στεγνοστροίσα, where it occurs, denotes the building of barracks or hutsments; here it would mean 'roofing' or 'rendering watertight'.

What the καλυφός may be is not very clear; the ordinary sense of the word, 'hut, cabin', is hardly satisfactory here. A 'sacred καλυφή' is known from a village inscription in Palestine (CIG 4591): τὸ κοινὸν τῆς κοιμῆς καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ την ιερὰν καλυφήν ἔκτεινε διὰ τὴν. There is no indication as to what this was. The present καλυφός may have been ιερός also, but there seems no particular reason for supposing so.

L. 17. For σύνοδος of the village assembly see Magic, Roman Rule, 1027.

L. 18. τῆς στερείας is assimilated in construction to τῶν μὲν βομαίων καὶ τῶν δὲ καλυφῶν above, but remains without grammatical government. I understand that anyone who plants at least three fruit-trees and maintains them in healthy condition for five years, shall thereafter for a further five years receive annually an olive-crown at the festival of the Katasporia. No festival of this name appears to occur elsewhere; but the word explains itself.

L. 24. The second part of the decree is not specifically related to the first part, but is a general appeal for subscriptions to the communal funds. It forcibly illustrates the emptiness of honorific terms even at this date: not only a man's rewards, but his virtues also, increase in direct ratio to the magnitude of his subscription.

L. 26. The sign for drachmae is, so far as I know, unique.

L. 30. διοχελειαν, 'of the weight of two obols', probably of gold.

L. 33-4. Of the eta only the left upright is visible; the xi in l. 34 is reasonably clear. Apparently an alternative gift of goods or property worth 100 drachmae is acceptable. It is evidently envisaged that cash to the value of 100 drachmae or more may not be readily available; so in the case of the larger sums below a testamentary bequest is a permitted alternative.

L. 36. 42. The name of the second festival is apparently irrecoverable. A harvest-festival would be appropriate, but no likely restoration suggests itself to me.

L. 44. The restoration is tentative. The reading διοχελειαν is not doubtful.

1 The evidence concerning village-organisation is now conveniently collected by Magic, Roman Rule 1026 n. 70.
2 References in Magic loc. cit. Cagnat on JCR IV 1304 observes: 'pogorum . . . annui magistratuis, qui sacra ritu celebranda et honores tribuendos communi pecunia curaverat.' In Ramsay, Studies in the Eastern Roman Provinces, 321, the dating is εἰς βοσθενείαν.
4 Second century B.C., as 1 should judge.
23. In the ruin-field behind M, a large base badly damaged; the inscribed face is concave. The inscription is complete at top and bottom. Letters 18 mm. high. Squeeze Fig. 37.

[ὁ δῆμος ὁ Καυνίων ἐπιστ[ει καὶ στεφαν[οί]]
[χρυσὸς στεφάνω, τιμὰς δὲ καὶ εἰκόνι χαλκῆ, Γάι]-
[ον Σκρίπ[ι]ονιοί Γαίου ὕλοι [Κουριώνα διὰ]
[τάξι] γεγανημένας [ἐνεργείας υπὸ Σκρί]-
5 [βα]νιοί Γαίου ὕλοι Κυρίωνος vac. ? ]
τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ.

Fig. 37.—Inscription No. 23.

24. Lying beside No. 23, a similar base with concave face, broken on all sides. The inscription is complete at top and bottom. Letters 18–20 mm. high. Squeeze Fig. 38.

[ὁ δῆμος ὁ] Καυνίων ἐπιστ[ει καὶ στεφαν[οί]]
[χρυσὸς στεφάνω, τιμὰς δὲ καὶ εἰκόνι χαλκῆ, -]
[- -]ν Γαίου Μεμμίου θυγ[ατέρα, γυναῖκα]
[δὲ Γαί]ου Σ[κ]ρίπιωνιοί Γαίου υ[Ι]ου Κουρίωνος, διὰ]
5 [τάξι] γεγανημένας [ἐνεργείας υπὸ Σκρί]-
[βα]νιοί Γαίου ὕλοι τοῦ [κηδεστοῦ? αὐτῆς].

Fig. 38.—Inscription No. 24.

Nos. 23 and 24 evidently formed a pair. The Scribonii Curiones who may come in question are: (1) C. Scribonius C. f. Curio, consul in 79 B.C., proconsul of Macedonia in 78–74. His wife was daughter of L. Memmius. (2) C. Scribonius C. f. Curio, quaestor of Asia in 55–54 B.C. His wife's name was Fulvia, at least after 52 B.C. (3) C. (?) Scribonius C. f. Curio, son of (2), killed while still a young man after Actium by Octavian, as a partisan of Antony.11

It appears highly likely that the Scribonius C. f. whose services are mentioned in the present inscriptions is the quaestor of Asia, (2); the honorand of No. 23 will then be his son, (3). The daughter of C. Memmius honoured in No. 24 is probably the wife of (3), honoured together with her husband for her father-in-law's services; alternatively, she may possibly be his mother,

11 In dealing with these and the following inscriptions I am indebted to the friendly help and unrivalled knowledge of Roman prosopography of Professor R. Syme.
an earlier wife of the quaestor of Asia. The C. Memmius in question may well be the consul sufectus of 34 B.C. or the tribunus plebis of 54 B.C. (if these are not one and the same man).

25. On the path close to M, a badly damaged block measuring at least 0.67 m. in height, 0.52 m. in thickness, and at least 0.70 m. in width. The inscription is apparently complete at top and bottom, worn away at both sides; but l. 5 is complete on the left. Letters 25–25 mm. high. Squeeze Fig. 39.

Fig. 39.—Inscription No. 25.

Μαγουλ[ην] in l. 2 is hardly doubtful. It is interesting to find this old Praenestine name here. A certain M. Maguinius M. f. occurs at Delos about 100 B.C. (CIL III, 7213), and may have had a hand in the transmission of the nomen to the mainland of Asia. The cognomen Νείκ — is evidently Greek.

Ll. 5–6. ? [πλοτεινης] άμενον.

26. Beside the path a short distance east of M, a statue-base partially buried in the ground; width 0.48 m., thickness 0.34 m., height at least 0.70 m. On top, two footholes 0.12 m. long. Letters 16 mm. high. Squeeze Fig. 40.

L. Afranius L. f., for whose services his brother Aulus is here honoured, is mentioned in an inscription of Magnesia (I. v. Magn. no. 143); he is probably son of the Pompeian partisan L. Afranius A. f., consul in 61 B.C. The honours decreed to the younger brother date, no doubt, to the last quarter of the century, with which date the spellings Λευκίου and έστων are, of course, consistent.

The phrasing in ll. 9–10 appears faulty. Either a second Λευκίου is omitted by haplography,
or more probably υλω is added in error by a reminiscence of ll. 3-5. There is no room at the end of l. 9 even for the improbable abbreviation Λ.

Fig. 40.—Inscription No. 26.

27. Just above the path near M is a massive statue-base 0.94 m. high, 1.78 m. wide, 0.88 m. thick, apparently in situ; on top are three pairs of footholes. The inscription is indifferently well cut and a good deal worn. Letters 20-24 mm. high. Squeeze Fig. 41.

ο δήμος ο Καυνίων
έπαινε και στεφανοί
χρυσός στεφάνων, τεμιβ,
δε και ηκον χαλκηί,
Γάιου Πούριου Γέμενου
τόν εαυτού πάτρωνα
και ευεργέτην.

Fig. 41.—Inscription No. 27.

Several C. Fufii Gemini are known (Pros. Imp. Rom.² nos. 509-511), the most familiar being the consul of a.d. 29. None of them is elsewhere mentioned in connexion with the East.¹²

Since the base originally carried three statues, it was evidently re-used for Fufii's benefit; the general appearance of the inscription, which is cut very shallow, is suggestive of an erasure. For the re-use of statue-bases at Caunus see below p. 109 n. 61.

28. In the woods just above M, a statue-base 0.65 m. high, 0.72 m. wide, 0.67 m. thick; two footholes on top. Letters 29-31 mm. high in l. 1, decreasing to 17-18 mm. in l. 6. Squeeze Fig. 42.

ο δήμος ο Καυνίων έπαινε
και στεφάνοι χρυσέωι στεφάνωι,

¹² Πούριος is certainly Fufius, not Pupius. The same form, IGR IV, 105 and 1077 have Φουφία. On the other hand, IGR IV, 105 and 1077 have Φουφία. occurs in a late epitaph in the Smyrna museum. On the other
P. Petronius P. f., consul susspectus in a.D. 13, proconsul of Asia for six years, probably from 29 to 35. His wife Plautia is mentioned in CIL VI, 6866: Sempronius Q. i. Christia et Hymenaeus Plautiae P. Petroni. She was presumably a daughter of A. Plautius, consul susspectus in 1 B.C., and so sister of the A. Plautius who served as Claudius' legatus in Britain. The close connexion of these two families is already well known.

In a field across the path from M, a base with concave face, 0·98 m. wide, 0·58 m. thick, the lower part buried in the ground, the upper part broken away. Letters 30 mm. high. Squeeze Fig. 43.

C. Antius A. Julius A. f. Quadratus, twice legatus to the proconsul of Asia, consul susspectus a.D. 93, consul ordinarius a.D. 105, proconsul of Asia ca. a.D. 106, is frequently mentioned in inscriptions. His sister's name, so far as I am aware, is not known.

The term δικαίωσις has been examined recently by J. A. O. Larsen in Class. Phil. 38, 3 (1943), 188–9. Apart from exceptional or obscure cases, the word appears to have two main uses: (1) to translate the Latinjuridicus; (2) as an informal title applied to governors of provinces. Of the latter usage Larsen observes that epigraphic examples seem confined to Lycia, and that the fact that in Lycia–Pamphylia the duties of the governor were no doubt primarily judicial, coupled with the high regard in which the Lycians held an honest judge, explains their practice of describing the governor less formally as δικαίωσις. He notes further that the title is used principally on monuments to members of the governor's family rather than to the governor himself. The present

---

13 Waddington, Fases, 695, no. 26, RE s.v. 'Petronius'.
14 Waddington, Fases, no. 114, RE s.v. 'Antius' no. 10.

---
30. In the woods behind M, a round statue-base, apparently in situ, 0·86 m. high, 0·66 m. in diameter; two footholes on top. Letters 15–20 mm. high. Squeeze Fig. 44.

ὀ δήμος ὁ Καυνίων ἔπαινει
καὶ στεφανοί χρυσᾶι στε-
φάνωι, τειμά δὲ καὶ εἰκόνι
χαλκῆ, Κοίντου Κασκέλλιου
Κοίντου υἱὸν Γέμεινον
εὐεργήτην καὶ σωτῆρα
καὶ πάτρωνα γεγονότα
τῆς πόλεως ἡμῶν.

Fig. 44.—Inscription No. 30.

The man in question seems to be quite unknown. The script (apart from the form of alpha) is strikingly similar to that of No. 28, and a similar date appears likely.

31. In the woods behind M, a rectangular base 0·67 m. high, 0·71 m. wide, 0·57 m. thick, damaged at the top. Letters 25 mm. high, decreasing to 19 mm. at the bottom. Squeeze Fig. 45.

Fig. 45.—Inscription No. 31.

[ὁ δήμος ὁ Καυνίων]
[ἔπαινει καὶ στεφανοί]
[χρυσῶν στεφάνων, τειμᾶ δὲ]
[καὶ εἰκόνα] ἧς χαλκῆ, ΜΑΡΠΗ[-]
[...]
5 ΚΙΟΥ τὸν ἔστοὺ

15 The expression δικαιοσυνήσαντα τὴν ἐπαρχίαν at Pergamum (IGR IV, 400, 401) may also be noted.
I cannot recover the man’s name. Not more than five letters are missing in l. 5, and hardly more than one or two at the end of l. 4, unless this line was considerably longer than the others. It seems impossible to restore more than two words, a name and a patronymic; for the date of the inscription (note χαλκή, ἐστοῦ) this is surprising, as the name must presumably be Roman. The man is apparently called by his cognomen only (Μαρτίνος or the like); the abbreviation Μ(άρκος) is very unlikely. The first preserved letter in l. 3 may be iota or upsilon.

32. In a field across the path from M, a block 0·93 m. wide, partly buried in the ground. The preserved part of the inscription begins close to the top edge. Squeeze.

ION ὁ δῆμος ὁ Καυνίω[ν τὸν] ἑαυτοῦ σωτῆρα καὶ εὐ[ερ-] γέτην vacat

33. Buried in the path near M, a large but badly damaged block, inscribed in letters 21–26 mm. high. Squeeze.

[ὸ δῆμος ὁ Καυνίων στεφανοῖ] [τὸν δείνα, εὐεργέτη] [και] [πάτρωνα γεγονότα α] [τῆς] [πόλεως ἡμῶν, χρυσῷ στεφάνω,] 5 [τεμ/α δέ καὶ εἰκ/ὸν χαλκή, ἀρετῆ[ς] ἐνεκε/ν καὶ εὐνωίας η[ς] ἔχου[ν] διατελεί εἰς τὸν δήμου ἡμῶν.

34. On the path near M, a large rectangular base, badly broken, 0·82 m. high, 0·56 m. thick, at least 1·00 m. wide, partly buried in the ground. The inscription is complete at the bottom, uncertain at the top, broken away at the top left, and worn away on the right. L. 6 is probably complete on the left. Letters 15–20 mm. high, widely spaced in l. 5, and especially so in l. 6. Squeeze Fig. 46.

[-------]ΥΕΝΔΗΜΟ[-------]
[-------]ΕΑΝ ἀνδρας ἀγαθον [ΥΕΛΟΜΕΝΟΝ και] ἐν[-]
[δόξως] τελευτήσαται ἄγω[ν] [ΙΙ] [μενον ὑπὲρ τῆς πα]- [τρις] ἐπὶ τῆς ξένης. [vac. ?] η δείνα]
5 [Ἀ]ριστοδήμου καὶ [ἐστησεῖν τὸν] αὐτῆς καὶ τω [ρα]

Fig. 46.—Inscription No. 34.

We have apparently the base of a statue erected by a wife to her husband who had died in battle abroad and received public burial; the restoration is, of course, exempli gratia. I scarcely know what -ειν may be in l. 2, unless it is the man’s alternative name, in which case the obvious [θεα] [θεος] [εμοι] [σις] in l. 1 would not leave room for the three names. Probably, then, ΔΗΜΟ is the beginning of the man’s name, e.g. [ὁ δῆμος] [θεος] [δημος]- [τοῦ δεινος του και] [-----] [ειν], ἀνδρα [αγαθου] κτλ. But one or more lines may be missing. The date can hardly be earlier than the first century B.C.
35. In a field across the path from M, a rectangular block 0·68 m. high, 0·65 m. wide, 0·54 m. thick; the inscription is badly worn, and appears to have continued on another block to the right. Letters 27 mm. high (34 mm. in l. 1). Squeeze.

Ll. 2, 5. \[Ελευθηρέωσι. \] Ll. 11–12. \[Ω τὴν ἑσπερεύτην ἐπιστάμενος. \]

36. In the rain-field behind M are two door-posts still standing, formed of re-used epistyle blocks. On one of them, in elegant letters 24 mm. high, spaced 0·14 m. apart, reading downwards as the stone now stands, is the single word

Γεια

On the other is an omicron only.

37. Horozlar, in a field just outside the village, a plain rectangular block 1·30 m. long, 0·60 m. high, 0·63 m. thick. Squeeze Pl. II(a).

(a) On the left; letters 26–28 mm. high.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[ὁ δήμος ὁ Καυνιών ἐτείμισεν;]} \\
\chiρυσῷ στεφάνῳ καὶ εἰκόνι \\
χαλκῇ \Deltaιον \, \chiοιάν \, 'Αγρεόφων - \\
tος τοῦ . . . ἱστοῦ Καυνίων, (leaf) \\
πατρὸς καὶ πρόγονον στε - (leaf) \\
\phiαυτιφόρῳ ἵ καὶ ἐνδίδωξον, \, 1-
\, ερασάμενῃ \, τῶν Σεβαστῶν \\
\, σεμνός καὶ φιλοτείμος Α'/ \\
\, 9-10 \, - \, ἤτοι, \, ἄρετῆς \, εἰν- \\
\, κεν καὶ εὐνοϊας \, τῇ \, ις \, εἰς \, αὑτῷ. \\
\end{align*}
\]

L. 7. After φιλοτείμως, \textit{alpha} rather than \textit{lambda}; the letters after this are very faint, but a triangular letter in the second place is reasonably assured.

(b) On the right; letters 22–25 mm. high.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[ὁ δήμος ὁ Καυνίων στεφάνῳ χρυσῷ;]} \\
\text{στεφάνῳ, \, τειμά \, δὲ καὶ \, εἰκόνι \, χαλκ[ή],} \\
\text{Ζήνων \, 'Αγρεοφώντος τοῦ \, 'Αντιπ[ά]-} \\
\text{τρού Καυνίων, \, ἄνδρα καλόν καὶ \, ἀγαθόν \, ἐκ \, προγόνων καλῶν καὶ \, φιλοδόξων,} \\
\text{πατρὸς \, στεφανιφόρῳ, \, στεφανηφόρῳ -} \\
\text{ρήσαται \, Βασίλεος \, τοῦ \, θεοῦ \, καὶ \, γυ-} \\
\text{μασιαρχήσαται \, ἐκ \, τῶν \, ἱδίων καὶ \, ιεροσάμοιον \, τῶν \, Σεβαστῶν καὶ \, στ[ρο]-} \\
\text{τηγήσαται \, ἐπί \, τῆς \, πατρίου \, πολιτε-} \\
\text{ῖα \, καὶ \, προσβέσαται \, δωρεάν \, πρὸς \,} \\
\text{Αὐτόκρατορά, \, ἀρετῆς \, ἐνακε \\ \\
\text{νεοὶς \, τῆς \, εἰς \, αὐτῶν; \, τὴν \, δὲ \, ἀνάστα-} \\
\text{σιν \, τοῦ \, ἀνδριάντός \, ἐποίησατο} \\
\text{ἐξ \, ἱδίου \, Διονυσία \, 'Αγρεοφώντος} \\
\text{ἡ \, γυνὴ \, (leaf) \, αὐτῷ.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

One line appears to be missing at the beginning of both (a) and (b), and no doubt stood on the tone above. A similar block to the left probably carried a third inscription and the left half of (a).

The honours recorded in both texts evidently issue from the city of Caunus; the designation of the recipients as Caunians is therefore somewhat unusual. As the same peculiarity occurs also
in No. 38, it appears that in Caunus at this period the use of the city-ethnic in the city was not abnormal.

The Stephanephoros of the god Basileus is mentioned again in No. 38, where his duties are of a purely secular character. But who was the god Basileus? It might appear natural to identify him with Zeus, who is occasionally called Basileus alone—though only, so far as I am aware, in dedications ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΚΑΙ ΚΟΥΡΙΟΝ. A cult of Zeus Basileus in Caunus would be nothing surprising. But our deity is called, both here and in No. 38, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ Ο ΘΕΟΣ, which is hardly the same thing; I am far from sure that this is an acceptable title for Zeus. A different interpretation is suggested by an inscription from Cos which has attracted less attention than perhaps it deserves. We read: ΦΙΛΙΓΡΑΤΟΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΕΙΩΝ, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΚΑΟΥΟΥ, ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ΠΡΟΣΤΑΣΤΟΥ, ΤΟ ΗΕΡΝ ΙΔΡΥΣΑΤΟ. The editors understand that Aristides, King of Caunus, was one of the many petty kings or tyrants who flourished in the cities of the Aegean during the latter part of the fourth century B.C., and they favour Rayet's suggestion that the god in question is Asclepius. It is in fact not impossible (see Part I, p. 18) to fit in a short-lived tyranny at Caunus between the end of Hecatomnid rule and the capture of the city by Antigonus in 313 B.C. But the term used is βασιλεύς, and this isolated appearance of a 'king' of Caunus is unquestionably surprising. I believe that this interpretation is mistaken. If the comma after ΚαούΟΥ be deleted, the meaning will be 'at the behest of King Caunus the God'—the same god who appears in the present Nos. 37 and 38. We have, I believe, in these three inscriptions evidence of a cult of the legendary eponymous founder and king, Caunus the son of Miletus. In Caunus itself his title is simply ΒΑΣΙΛΕΟΣ Ο ΘΕΟΣ, but on foreign territory at Cos his name is very naturally added. In this case, Phileratus is not a Caunian but a Coan, as indeed the Doric form of his patronymic suggests.

In (b) l. 9, the occurrence of the phrase ο ΑΤΡΙΟΥ ΤΟΛΙΤΑΙ of is interesting, as it confirms not only the period of Caunian independence in the first century A.D., but also its subsequent loss.

14 It was also normal in Lycia in the Imperial period (TAM II, passim).
15 L. v. Priene 186—Syll. 599, Hesperia XVI (1947), 87, no. 13 (Chios) and the notes ad loc.
16 See Mitsos' note in Hesperia, loc. cit.
17 Paton-Hicks, Inter. of Cos 106, no. 53, after Rayet, Inter. de Cos, 1, quoted above Part I, p. 18, n. 31.
18 His story is told in a fragment of Aristocritus (FGrH III B, no. 499, 3 = FGH IV 334, 2). A further story, attributed to Nicaeanus and Apollonius Rhodius (FGH IV, 313), gives the names of two other early kings of Caunus, Abchias and Basilos.
19 I had previously considered understanding βασιλεύς in the Coan inscription not as a king but as a religious official; on this use of the word see most recently F. K. Dörner, Reise in Bithynien (Ost. Akad. Wiss. Denkschr., 75, 1.), p. 14, no. 5. But to this explanation the addition of ΚαούΟΥ is fatal: βασιλεύς ΚαούΟΥ can, it seems, only mean 'king of Caunus'.
The present inscription was evidently cut not long after the loss of liberty, and should accordingly date to the latter part of the century.

38. Beside the lower path to Çandar, about a hundred yards from M in the direction of the theatre, are the ruins of a building about 8 m. long and something over 6 m. wide, constructed of large blocks, many of which are inscribed; these are now mostly thrown down. Of the inscribed blocks only E at present forms part of a standing wall, with the right-hand portion of D partially resting on it; the inscribed face is on the outer side looking towards the harbour. The existing ruins are beyond doubt those of the original building, on whose wall the inscription was cut—presumably the customs-house, for which the position, close to the ancient port, is obviously suitable. The inscribed blocks are for the most part very badly weathered and difficult to read; I give here photographs, from squeezes, only of the two most legible, B and C. Fig. 47 shows the present condition of the building.

A. On a block now lying 40 yards up the path towards the theatre, 1·51 m. long, 0·38 m. high, 0·43 m. thick; the writing appears to cover the entire block, but is now illegible at the top and on the right. Letters 25-24 mm. high. Squeeze.

(4 lines illegible)

5 [--- τού Ἑστιατού[ν] Καυνιου[ν] και Μενεστα[ν] το[ν] τρις Μη[---]
---[ους β' του Ἑστιατοου Καυνιου και κατα ΤΟΝΕΝΑ[---]ON[---]
---[ης οφαλμασα και κατα την η[ν διεγρα[φήν]
---[ηνων ....] ἄρχοντος του χρόνονυ
---[μηνος του ἑνεστῶτος ἐτους Α]
10 αγομενου πάντων και κατά γην και κατά θάλασσαν [---]
---[νομέουν ει το το δημοσιουκτο νομον εκκαθηνη τῆς τειχής[εος c. 7.---]

B. The text was on three blocks. That on the left is lost; that in the middle is 0·93 m. long, 0·46 m. high, 0·43 m. thick, and is now lying in front of E outside the building. The ends of the lines are on the left end of the block which carries F. Letters 24-24 mm. high. Squeeze (middle portion) Pl. II (b).

[--- ΟΜΕΝΩΝ ....] ΖΟΥΑΜΟΤΙΟΥ ....]ΑΥ[ ....]ΙΚΟΙ[ ....]
---[ Ἀγ ορφόντος του Μηνοφάνους β' του Ἑστιατοου Καυνιου[---]
---[ου Αγροοφόντος του Μηνοφάνους β' του Ἑστιατοου Καυνιου[---]
---[ΙΟΥ ....] διδοκενα υπερ της των Ισαγωγέουν ατελει[---]
5[--- ΑΝΓΕΛΙΩΣ δηλοτοι αργυρίου κε εξασκησυρία ΚΑΟ ....]ΕΣΩ[---]
---[ηνην άταγωμένης ενεπεκτά θεολογίων ομοίως φημονται[---]
---[ην διδοσα κατά τα το δημοσιοικτο νομον ναν ....]ετε η δε ίσαγωγη[---]
---[μεμβοιχειν της άηθης δυνης κατα τα πρωτοικει εναν ναν[---]
---[ναν ουδε των προδ οκολουθηνη η χρησης ενεκεν κατα των δημοσι[---]
---[ον ναν ....] η τετειχετο υπερ μονος πρασον ουν δε ισαγ[---]
10 ---[μη δε ενα δια της γης παραγωγης φοιτης εις ουν και του[---]
---[ατ ογραφης ναν ....] των δε ουτως υπό των καθως προγ[---]
---[ον η μη καταταλαμβανεν ένεθα και μη ατογραφη[---]
---[ομεν ναν κατα ομον των φοιτης στερεοις έτος τω τελωνη[---]
---[κατα τινον]

[---[ΕΙΤΕΝ ΣΩΤΕΝ ΣΟΤΕΝ ΣΟΤΕΝ ΣΟΤΕΝ ....]ΤΑΠΙ ....] κατα θάλασσαν, ενας τε χρονια[---]
---[νατοι η πιτραξωσι[---]
---[σι των ου ιουν των ορισμένων είνα υποτελών, μεθεμι σεισμοσιων τε[---]
---[λει το έλλειμιον ΙΙΟ ....] μη ισαγωνον εξουσια των το έλλειμιον μεμβαθομένω[---]
5 ---[μη ατογραφης προσετευει υπερ των Ισαγωγεν καθως εις ειδους διεξαγωνται, μητε α[---]
---[τριων των Ισαγωγεων λαβειν το τελειον η φιλανθρωπος ομοια εις Αρφεδετην μη[---]
---[εις εις εις εις της τατομευ έπογραφη[---]

vacat?

παντες δε οι Ισαγωνες απ[---] της έξοδης [---]ΟΥ[ ....]ΤΑΠΙ ....] κατα θάλασσαν, ενας τε χρονια[---]
---[ταυτοι η πιταξωσι[---]
---[σι των ου ιουν των ορισμένων είνα υποτελών, μεθεμι σεισμοσιων τε[---]
---[λει το έλλειμιον ΙΙΟ ....] μη ισαγωνον εξουσια των το έλλειμιον μεμβαθομένω[---]
5 ---[μη ατογραφης προσετευει υπερ των Ισαγωγεων καθως εις ειδους διεξαγωνται, μητε α[---]
---[τριων των Ισαγωγεων λαβειν το τελειον η φιλανθρωπος ομοια εις Αρφεδετην μη[---]
---[εις εις εις της τατομευ έπογραφη[---]

vacat?

οι προσπλέοντες έκεινα και πολυμονάς της, έχοντες και ταυτοι της τς άτελει[---]
---[ας ου ισαγωνους ανεσιν μετα το καταπλευσα, ος αν απο των εισεναχτων του[---]
10 ---[υπ] των αυτων και ης της γης τεθενων μεινα αυτοις άρατα, εντεθουμεν των[---]
---[αυτα το το πλοια και έξαγοντες αυτοι εν αλλαις ήμεραις είκοσι, ναν και οι δια γης[---]

vol. lxxiv.
δὲ ἵσκομισαντες τι ξενοὶ ἐπὶ τὸ πολησάτι τι, ὡσα ἂν αὐτοὶς μεῖνη ἀπρατὰ εξά-
γνυτες αὐτὰς αὐτὲς τι πάλιν διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν ἀν ἐστήγαγον δροὺς ἐν ἄλλας ἡμὲ-
ραις τρίκοντα, οὐχ ὑποκείμενα τι τοῦ τοῦ ἐνταγώγειλε τελεί ἡ φιλανθρωπία τι-
5 νός ἢ Ἀφροδείτης ὀνυματί. νακ. ἀπογράφομεν διὰ οὐτοὶ τὴ ἡμέρα μόνον διὰ τῶν
ἀρχείων καὶ τὸν τόπον δι' οὐ ιστήγαγον ἐπὶ τοῦ στεφανισφόρω Βασιλέως τοῦ θεοῦ
[με]τὰ τὸ [κα]πάσαγε[λ]ν ἐν ἄλλας ἡμέραις τρισαί, προσγράφομεν καὶ τὸν ἐπιγηγελθοῦν
D. The text was on two blocks. That on the left is broken, and the left half is missing; the remaining portion is 0.69 m. long, 0.615 m. high, 0.43 m. thick, and is wholly covered with writing, of which only the right-hand part is legible. The ends of the lines are on a separate block, otherwise uninscribed, 0.201 m. long, 0.615 m. high, 0.43 m. thick, now lying half-titled back with its left end resting on the right end of E. Letters 23-24 mm. high. Squeeze.

E. The text is contained on a single block 0.201 m. long, 0.62 m. high, 0.43 m. thick, still in position in the wall. Letters 23-24 mm. high. Squeeze.

F. The text is on a single block 1.53 m. long, 0.46 m. high, 0.42 m. thick, which carries also the ends of the lines of B. It is broken into two parts, now lying in front of the building; both parts, but especially the left-hand portion, are broken away at the bottom. Squeeze.
G. Block lying in front of the building, 1·32 m. long, 0·545 m. high, 0·43 m. thick. The block appears to be almost entirely covered with writing, but this is now almost completely effaced; I read only ΛΟΓ at the beginning of the second line.

It is, I think, possible to determine the original relative positions of the blocks in the wall with a high degree of certainty. E is still in position in the wall, and the blocks below and to the right of it are uninscribed; the column of writing is 1·76 m. wide (with slight variations). The block carrying the ends of the lines of D is now standing tilted backwards with its left end resting on the right end of E; it can hardly have come into this position unless it stood there originally, so that

D must have stood immediately above E. In C the column of writing is also 1·76 m. wide (0·43 + 1·33, again with slight variations), so that C no doubt stood higher up in the same column; almost certainly it stood immediately above D, since the opening lines of D, fragmentary though they are, seem well suited to complete the unfinished sentence at the end of C. In B the width of the column is uncertain, since the left-hand portion is missing; but from the continuity of the texts there can be no doubt that it stood immediately above C: before δημοσιωνκόν νόμον in C1 we expect κατά τῶν, and these words will neatly fill the gap at the end of B. Of A, now lying some distance away, the left-hand portion is again missing; but since the proper names in A 5–6 occupy exactly the same relative positions on the stone as the same names in B 2–3, the length of line was no doubt identical in the two cases, and A belongs also to this same column. Further, we know that there was no column of writing to the left of this column, because the block carrying the left-hand portion of C is otherwise blank; 23 it follows that A is in all probability the beginning of the entire document. Its contents, so far as they are intelligible, seem quite appropriate to this position. F, we know, stood immediately to the right of B in a second column, of which the width is 1·23 m.—considerably narrower than the other. G is of the same height as C, so presumably stood in the same horizontal course, that is immediately below F. This is confirmed by the only legible syllable ΛΟΓ in l. 2, which recalls the phrase ἀνά λόγον in F. The space to the right of D and E is known to have been blank, so that the document ended on block G. 24 One question remains. Is F the direct con-

---

23 Nor is there room for a column of writing between E and the apparent corner of the building.
24 The possibility that it continued in a third column on the right, of which no trace remains, seems altogether too remote.
tinuation of E, or did the inscription continue on the intermediate block above F and to the right of A? It might seem more natural that the two columns should begin at the same level on the wall, but in fact the preserved text appears to be continuous; not only is the subject-matter similar, but F 1-4 supplies grammatically just what is needed to complete the sentence beginning in E 18. I believe, therefore, that ABCDEFG, in that order, present a continuous text, complete at beginning and end, and stood originally in the wall as shown in Fig. 48.

This remarkable document calls for more exhaustive treatment than it can receive here. Its unique nature combines with the incompleteness and illegibility of the text to render many points obscure. First and foremost, I take it as certain that we have to deal with a decree of the city of Caunus concerning her own municipal taxes, not with any regulations issued by Rome in connexion with the Imperial portorium. This appears not only from the use of ἐν τῇ δημοσίωι και ἐν τῷ Καύνω, but also from the inclusion of goods imported by land into the city; such goods would not be crossing a frontier of the Empire, and would not naturally be subject to the portorium. Caunus must accordingly be added to the small number of civitates liberae which are known to have levied their own dues under the Empire.† The date of the inscription will fall in the period when Caunus was a free city as recorded by Pliny (see above on No. 37); this is confirmed by the style of the lettering, which may well be of the first century A.D. The fact that in A and B the persons mentioned are designated by the city-ethnic Καύνως need not be taken to imply that the document, or this part of it, emanates from outside Caunus, in view of the similar use of the ethnic in No. 37. In the second place, the present decree is obviously quite distinct from the city customs-law, δημοσίωι κατα, to which it alludes a number of times; it is, on the contrary, almost entirely concerned (in its intelligible parts) with the imposition but with the relaxation or remission of taxation. Before discussing further its general bearing, I take the individual sections separately.

A + B 1-5. This I take to be the beginning of the whole document, including probably a decree of the city of Caunus in honour of two citizens, descendants of one Hestiaeus, who had presented a sum of 60,000 denaria for the remission of taxation on imported and exported goods. In A 8-9 we have an allusion to a period of time commencing (apparently) from a certain month of the current year; on the question whether this is the period for which the new regulations are to be valid, see below pp. 104-5. The reference in A 11 to the ἔκοιστη is interesting; in the fragmentary state of the context it is impossible to be sure whether this was the rate of tax imposed by the Caunian δημοσίωι κατα, but this appears likely; if so, it is noticeable that this is double the Roman quadragesima Asiae. The new regulations are apparently described in A 7 by the term διαγραφή, a wholly appropriate word. [ἡ]διαγραφή in the same line would naturally denote goods seized or impounded, but how this fits into the context is not clear.

B 6-C 1. The new regulations begin, if I understand rightly, by enumerating (ll. 6-10) certain respects in which the existing regulations are to remain unaffected, or even to become more strict; namely, tax on slaves and salt shall continue to be paid in accordance with the δημοσίωι κατα, and in the case of foreigners there shall be no exemption even (οὔτε) for personal attendants (πρὸς ἀκολούθους) and goods intended for personal use (χρήματες ἑνεκεί). The following represents the general sense of the passage as I understand it:...
not always the case. If, as seems likely, fish was exported from Caunus in antiquity (see on No. 20 above), salt may have been of exceptional importance there. There are no saltpans at Dalyan to-day.

The incomplete state of l. 10-16 is much to be regretted, owing to the mention of goods intended for immediate re-export (l. 11) and not for sale in Caunus (l. 15)—that is, goods in transit. The expression here used, παραγωγὸν φόρτιον, appears to be unexampled, but its general meaning is hardly doubtful. It is certain that in ancient times, contrary to modern practice, customs were commonly levied on goods in transit both at entrance and at exit, and no clear evidence of any exemption has hitherto appeared.32 This was undoubtedly felt as a hardship by itinerant merchant-captains, and in the case of Roman Asia the matter was brought to an issue in 59 b.c. under the governorship of Quintus Cicero, who referred the question to the Senate. The latter's decision is most unfortunately not known, but Marcus Cicero gave it as his opinion, re consulta et explorata, that no tax ought to be paid.33 For the normal treatment of goods in transit by such free cities as levied municipal customs there is no evidence, and one would much wish to know what was done at Caunus; but so much is missing that restoration must be largely tentative.

The present passage must naturally be considered in connexion with the provisions of C-E below. From C 8-9, έχωντες καὶ αὐτοὶ τὴν τῆς ἐπελεῖας ἄνων μετὰ τὸ κατάπλευσα, it appears that the exemption begins only after berthing, and the following clauses refer to remission of taxation on re-export. Import duty was therefore presumably payable, and it seems likely that it was dealt with in B 10-14. It is further clear from [άπ]ογραφής in l. 14 and ἀπογραφ[ομέν]ου in l. 16 that the question of registration (declaration) also arises. Since έστω δὲ ἐπίσκεψις in l. 10 indicates a positive obligation rather than a concession, I take it that registration and payment of import duty are, at least in some cases, compulsory. The next point concerns [το]σὶν ἄγωσθαι. In l. 11. This must surely be a dative participle; but with the clause δφ᾽ ἕν καὶ καλ. intervening, it is awkward to join it directly with τοῖς ναυκλῆροις. I therefore believe that the participial clause denotes an exception, and that we must read [ἐν μὴ (πλην) τοῖς ἄγων]. The intervening phrase can hardly be other than δφ᾽ ἕν καὶ κατάπλευσα ἡμέρας or the equivalent, to be joined with συνήμερον ἡ τῇ ἐχομένῃ. At the end of l. 11, ἀπο- is no doubt the beginning of some form of ἀπογραφή. The mention of the ἐσχάλωμα will come in l. 13; it is to be paid only on a certain class of goods. The key-word defining this class is lost, but nothing seems more likely than 'goods for sale': ὑπὲρ μόνον τούτων ἄν ἐχω[ν προτάτῳ (παραγωγήν)]; these are the same as the goods ἐς τὴν γῆν τεθέντων in C 10. Goods which remain on board ship are not liable to duty. If I have understood the situation more or less correctly, the passage may be restored somewhat after this fashion:

[ταπλέων ἡμέρας, εἴ μὴ τοῖς ἄγωσθαι φόρτιον εἰς τὸ πόλιν αὐτὰ ἐθέσθαι ἐξαγαγοῦν, ἄπογραφ[ομένοις διὰ τῶν ἄρχειον] συνήμερον ἡ τῇ ἐχομένῃ, ὑπὲρ μόνον τούτων ἄν ἐχωΣιν προτάτῳ τὸ ἐσχάλωμα.]

In the following clause, l. 13-14, καὶ έάν appears to answer to τοῖς τε ναυκλῆροις in l. 10. This coupling of the clauses suggests that similar rules applied also to the παραγωγόν φόρτιον. My first idea was that the two clauses referred respectively to goods imported by sea (τοῖς ναυκλῆροις) and by land (Διὰ τῆς γῆς), but I now believe this is not so. In the first place, the subject of ἐχομένη would be unsatisfactorily vague: it ought surely to be the ship-captains. Secondly, in C 11, where the meaning is 'by land', Διὰ γῆς is written without the article in the natural way. Διὰ τῆς γῆς παραγωγόν φόρτιον means, I believe, goods imported by sea but intended for an inland destination beyond the limits of Caunian territory: 'cargoes for conveyance through our land'. These also were, as I understand it, required to be registered but not to pay import duty. The genitive ἄπογραφής seems most naturally explained as following χώρις or πλῆθυ: the text may be something like:

καὶ έάν Διὰ τῆς γῆς παραγωγόν φόρτιον ἐχομένη καὶ ταύτα ἡ ὑποκείσθω χώρις ἄπογραφής.

In the final clause l. 14-16, the significant word is στέρεσις, which is technical for 'confiscation'. I take it that the right of confiscation applies to goods not duly registered as required above, whether these are intended for sale in Caunus or not. Confiscation of goods not duly declared was standard practice.34 The restoration will be approximately:

τῶν δὲ οὕτως ὑπὸ τῶν καθὼς προγέφτητο εἰς-

32 Cagnat 151-2, de Laet 452.
34 Quintilian declam. 341: quod quis professus non est apud publicanos, pro commisso tenetur. Cf. ib. 359, Digest XXXIX, 4, 16 (quoted by Cagnat 129, de Laet 438).
If the above interpretation is anywhere near the mark, goods in transit at Caunus were divided into three categories. (1) Cargoes brought into Caunus and 'immediately' taken out again pay no duty and are not even registered. (2) Cargoes which stay at Caunus beyond the second day but do not leave the ship must be registered but pay no import duty. (3) Similarly, goods put on shore for transmission to an unlisted destination must be registered but do not pay import duty. In the last two cases, failure to register renders the goods liable to confiscation.

The form of expression στέρεσις ἢτο τῷ τελώνῃ κατὰ τὸν δημοσίωσις τοῦ νόμου shows that the proper distinction between δημοσίωσις, the Roman publicanus, and τελώνης, the municipal tax-farmer, is here neglected—as it is also, for example, in the Palmyra tariff.54 The phrasing further confirms the opinion expressed by de Laet 440, that confiscated goods went to the tax-farmer himself, not to the state.

C 2-7. Regulations concerning importation, whether by citizens or by foreign merchants.

Persons importing [chattels] from abroad by sea, whether for personal use or for sale in Caunus, shall not be liable to any payment of tax to the harbour [- - -], except upon such goods as have been specifically declared dutiable: the tax-farmers shall have no authority to exact any money payment upon the goods imported as shown in the official tariff, nor to seize any part of the goods themselves either as tax or as 'perquisite' in the name of Aphrodite or as any kind of 'declaration fee'.

I can neither read nor guess the word or words after ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας in l. 2. Some quite general term is wanted, as is clear from the language of l. 2-3; ποιήσας is hardly reconcilable with the traces, nor does it seem an appropriate word: we appear to be dealing here with goods and chattels of whatever kind which may have occasion to pass through the customs. The excepted categories, τὰ ὁρμηταὶ ἔστω ὠριστέαί, I take to be those mentioned in B above, namely salt and all goods imported for sale by foreign merchants. These pay the ἐγκατάλειψις, but apart from this nothing whatever shall be exacted by the tax-farmers in connexion with any imported article.53 ἐνδος in l. 5 is, as I understand it, the schedule of charges attached to the δημοσίωσις τοῦ νόμος: this is now superseded by the new regulations. The normal distinction between goods for sale and for personal use is abolished; see on B 9 above.

Li. 6-7 are specially directed against the various extra charges and 'perquisites' (φιλανθρωπία) which the tax-farmers were notoriously so ingenious in devising.55 Two of these are specifically mentioned here. The first is the charge made 'in the name of Aphrodite'. This goddess's connexion with the sea, from her birth onwards, is, of course, familiar; and the cult of Aphrodite Euploia is especially common in Asia-Minor.56 Nor is this her only appearance in connexion with the customs; in the τελώνῃ at Halicarnassus there was a shrine of Aphrodite.57 Presumably there was something similar at Caunus, and its upkeep was made a pretext for levying charges on imports and exports.58 The second exactio illicita is made εἰς ὁποιῳδήν. This I take to be something in the nature of a clerk's fee, demanded perhaps for transcribing the contents of the ship's manifest at the time of declaration.59 We have another mention of it in D 11, and probably also in D 4.

C 8-17. Regulations for re-export of merchandise by foreign merchants.

Foreign merchant-captains who call at Caunus and offer goods for sale shall also enjoy the privilege of exemption after berthing; and any of the wares imported and put ashore by them which remain unsold may be put back on board and re-exported by the merchants themselves within twenty days, without payment of export duty or any charge under the head of 'perquisite' or in the name of Aphrodite. Similarly, merchants who import goods by land with the object of selling them may re-export personally their unsold wares within thirty days by the same route by which they came in, without payment of any charge. These latter (that is, importers by land) shall be required merely to register with the authorities, within three days after entering Caunus, the date and place of entry; this shall be done in the office of the stephanophoros of the god Basilus.

This part of the document is almost free from difficulty. Its provisions are remarkably generous. Foreign merchants, once they have berthed (that is, after import duty has been paid on goods for sale), are entirely free from any further dealings with the customs, provided they leave within twenty days. Importers by land are even more generously treated. Nothing at all is required of them for three days;59 if they stay longer, they are still not required to declare their wares, but only the date and place of entry, and re-export is free within thirty days. They must, however—

53 ἐνδος evidently means 'on the same or the following day'. A shipmaster who leaves within this period is entirely unmolested; if he intends to stay longer, he must register before the end of the second day.
54 OGI 629 = IGR III 1536, Sections 1 and IIIA.
55 I cannot recover the word after ὁρμηταὶ in l. 4. I had thought at one time of ὁρμηταὶ to be explained by the allusion to Aphrodite below, but I am now convinced that this is wrong.
57 E.g. in the neighbourhood of Caunus, at Cnidus and Myela. Note also Aphrodite Limenia at Hermione (Paus. 2, 34, 11).
58 41 In P. Car. Zen. 59015, 40 and (7) 10, a customs charge in the port of Alexandria is recorded under the heading ὁποιῳδής. Edgar ed loc. suggests a tax for the upkeep of the Alexandrian lighthouse; in view of our present passage, it seems not impossible that the charge was made there also in the name of Aphrodite Euploia.
59 An exacting of a similar kind was apparently devised by Verres for his own benefit: scribae nomine de tota penna magnam quinquagesimam detrahabantur (Cic. Verr. III 78 (181)). Compare the seratus, mentioned with contempt by Cicero in the same passage.
60 As compared with two days in the case of merchants entering by sea (B 12).
and this is significant—re-export at the same point on the Caunian frontier by which they came in. They must, in effect, take their unsold wares home again. The new regulation is clearly not designed to provide a tax-free circumvectio by land, nor to offer in Caunus a free port for the export by sea of the produce of the interior; the purpose seems rather to encourage the manufacturers and farmers of inland Caria and Lydia to bring their merchandise to Caunus. The benefit would naturally be felt in the city in the shape of lower prices.

"The relief afforded by the exception": the expression is a little unusual. καταγαγέτις, corresponding to καταπλεύσως in l. 9, is strictly "bring their wares down to the coast". For the stephanophorus of the god Basileus see above on No. 37. ἑπτα, "before, in the office of" a magistrate, as often.

C 17—D 4. (Importers by land) shall register also the name of the man who has undertaken [---] they shall not be liable to (export) tax nor to [---] nor to any "declaration-fee".

There can be little doubt of the continuity between C and D (see above p. 99), but in the fragmentary state of D it is uncertain whether the sentence beginning in C 15 continues down to D 4, although this seems probable. I can offer no suggestion for completing the phrase after ἐπιγαλεύμου.

D 5—12. A new clause evidently begins in D 5. Too little is preserved to permit an adequate understanding of it; the significant point is the repeated mention of a panegyris. It is natural to suppose that special concessions were made to merchants for the occasion of the festival; if these were additional to those of C, they can hardly have been less than the total abolition of all taxation. Such immunity during festivals is in fact well attested.

D 13—E 3. I can make nothing at all of this passage. It seems unlikely that of ἔτος του- in D 13 is the grammatical subject of τελθεινητεν in E 3, since the intervening mention of goods for personal use is inappropriate to the subject-matter of E. I take it that a new clause began in the last lines from D 15 to E 2; but the remnants at the end of E 2 are particularly baffling.

E 3—14. Further regulations for re-export by foreign merchants.

--- they shall declare for valuation before the stephanophorus of the god Basileus in office at the time the quantity and nature of such of their wares only as are not prohibited under the monopolies. They shall offer for sale not less than one-third [of the goods so declared?]; if they desire to re-export the remainder personally, they shall re-declare and re-value it before the stephanophorus in office at the time, and they too shall not be liable upon this remainder either to export duty or to any charge as "perquisite" or in the name of Aphrodite on any pretext or in any manner whatsoever. And if a foreign merchant, having tried to sell the third part of his wares, is unable to do so (and this fact will be automatically clear from the second declaration and valuation), he shall pay only the export duty on such goods as he exports in excess of two-thirds, as shall appear from the second declaration.

These regulations relate to the same class of persons, namely foreign merchants, as those in C 8 ff., but the provisions are different. The natural explanation is that they apply to those who overstay the limit of twenty or thirty days. There is nothing to show that they concern only seaborne or only land-borne merchandise, and I take it that they apply to both.

The regulation, though expressed at some length, says in effect no more than that after the expiry of the twenty or thirty days only two-thirds of a merchant's wares may be re-exported duty-free. Export duty only shall be paid on the excess over two-thirds according to a simple mathematical calculation of the difference between the second valuation (made at the time of leaving) and two-thirds of the first valuation (made after twenty or thirty days). I take ἐκάλος in l. 12 to be intransitive, "this will be clear of itself", not an error for ἐκάλος. In l. 9, ὁδεῖς αὐτοῖς means, of course, "any more than those who leave within the time-limit".

The reference to the monopolies in l. 5 is interesting, but we have unfortunately no details whatever concerning them. The reading of this line gave me much trouble, but I believe it to be right; ὑποκείμενοι normally has the dative, as elsewhere in this document, but the genitive is not unparalled, and ὑποκείμενος fits the traces on the squeeze.

E 15—18. No tax shall be exacted either from citizens or from metrics or from foreigners who reside and do business in Caunus upon any vessels which they may build or import or buy and sell among themselves, except where [---] are sold by anyone.

πλοῖων in l. 17 is far from clearly legible, but seems unquestionably right; the same may be said of πιπρακτίκαι in l. 18. ἄγραφοι in l. 17 seems to have the general meaning "deal in": I know of no case where this verb means "to sell". Non-resident foreigners are quite naturally excluded from the benefits of this clause. The allusion to a sales-tax (ἐπων) on the purchase of ships is interesting, but in no way surprising; the tax on the construction of ships, on the other

144 ἀπογορευθέντα πρὸς is perhaps commoner in this sense; but there can be no question here of ἑπτα denoting a date, since the official is not named; ἑπτα τοῦ στεφανοφοροῦ as a future date would be especially futile. Moreover, the eponymous official at Caunus was a priest; see on Part I, No. 5.
145 E.g. at Sparta (IG V 1, 18), Cyzicus (IGR IV 144), Attaleia (IGR III, 785, cf. Wilhelm, Sitzb. Akad. Wien 224 (1), 22-3) and Amorgos (IG XII 5, 38, found on Naxos).
146 I translate as if ὁδεῖς . . . ὁδεῖς had the sense of ὁδεῖς . . . ὁδεῖς. This is, I think, probable, though only as an error due to the two preceding negatives.
147 τοῦ, l. 14—that is, no "perquisites" or other charges.
148 See LS9 s.v. The difference of construction perhaps corresponds to the difference of meaning: "lie under the ban of", as opposed to "be liable to pay".
hand, is remarkable and, so far as I know, unique. It is likely that a good deal of shipbuilding went on in the νεώρα at Caunus, with the pine-timber of Caria so conveniently at hand. I can offer no suggestion for filling the gap before πεδράσκωται in I. 18.

E 18–F 4. Remission of charges to foreign vessels using the port of Caunus for various purposes other than commerce.

Nor shall any tax be levied or any charge made as 'perquisite' upon any pretext or in any manner whatsoever on foreign vessels in general which are driven to shelter in Caunus, or undergo repairs, or winter here, or make alterations (?), or refit, or [- - -] become disabled [- - -] together with the merchandise (?) that each may have [- - -] in preparation for sailing, or upon any light craft whereassoever constructed.

On the continuity of this passage see above p. 99–100. ἀποκελίσειερόντων I take to mean 'turn off their course', under stress of weather or owing to breakdown of any kind. μεθαρματοῦντων in I. 20 seems a probable reading, but is not, of course, assured. ἀντισυσδιασχίζόντων (i.e. ἀντισυσδιασχιζόντων) I do not understand at all, but the reading seems beyond doubt. τῶν λεπτοὺχων αὐτοῖς, if right, means presumably 'the things they lack'; is the meaning perhaps that no tax shall be charged on materials supplied in the Caunian dockyards for refitting or repairs? The third word in F 1 might perhaps be [ἐ][ξ][ν]πορο[φ]ίκ[ο], that is, the immunity shall apply to the ships 'together with any merchandise they may carry'—though such a clause, taken in connexion with the other provisions of the decree, would appear likely to lead to abuses and difficulties in application. κατ' ἐξερήτωρις ὅσο πρὸς τὸ κόλπον (the reading seems assured) means apparently 'in preparation for leaving Caunus' after calling there for any of the above purposes. ἕκαρη is any light craft, here no doubt a ship's boat; if the refitting includes such an item, no tax is to be charged, whether the boat is built at Caunus or elsewhere: that is, in this particular respect the provisions of E 15–17 are extended to non-resident foreigners also.

F 4–G. Regulations concerning import and export duty on pitch and resin.

In the illegible state of the text a good deal remains doubtful. A distinction is probably made between pitch and resin imported by sea (ll. 5–10) and that imported by land (ll. 10 ff.)—at least if εἰσκομίσαω in I. 12 is used in the same way as in C 12. A further distinction appears to be made between liquid pitch and resin measured by the jar (κέρασον) and the solid substances measured by the lump (βαρος).

The substance denoted by πίσσα, Latin pix, is not mineral pitch (σφακλας), but was obtained by burning certain of the thicker kinds of resin. The division into solid and liquid pitch is well attested, and accounts here for the distinction between the jar and the lump. Measurement of pitch by the κέρασον is normal, but βαρος as a unit of measurement appears to be new.

The nature of the provision made in ll. 5–8 is not very obvious; presumably it took the form of a reduction of taxation. I can only suggest that there was in the δημοσιωνής χρόνος a reduced rate chargeable on twelve or more jars, and that this is here made applicable to smaller quantities also. The provisions made for solid pitch and resin in ll. 8–10, and for pitch and resin imported by land in ll. 11 ff., seem to be irrecoverable, but the mention of a 'general merchant' (παντωπολίς, assuming this reading to be right) is at least consistent with the suggestion that the legislators had small quantities in mind.

The unique nature of this document makes it somewhat difficult to form an estimate of its general significance. For example, are the new tax concessions intended to be permanent or only for a limited period? General probability would suggest they should be permanent: they were, after all, engraved on the wall of the customs-house, and were never erased. On this supposition, may we safely infer that the interest on 60,000 denaria was sufficient to reimburse the city for the loss of these revenues? It is not easy to calculate what the cost of these concessions would be to the Caunian budget in a year, but the interest on 60,000 denaria at 12% would be 7200 denaria.

Might the customs yield at Caunus be as low as this? There seems no reliable basis for answering

49 It is natural to suppose that these taxes had previously been actually in force at Caunus; in any case, they are evidently regarded as a possibility.
50 Strabo XIV, 651; Broughton 896.
51 I considered reading κεράσον [σε]σου in I. 5 and [κα]τά [δαι]ς [εἰς] τῆς in I. 11, but re-examination of the squeeze does not confirm this.
52 The reading βαρος in I. 8 is virtually certain. The only alternative would be θῆλος, which seems meaningless.
53 Plin. NH XXIII, 46, pescem meminisse deboem non aliud esse quam combustum resinum fluxum. Methods of burning, πυροσκαριτηρία, are described in detail by Theophrastus, HP IX, 3; they are remarkably similar to the methods still used for charcoal-burning. See also Edgar's note on P. Cai. Zeno 5658a, 8: analysis of a black substance used to coat the inside of wine-jars (evidently the wine mentioned in the text) showed it to be a true resin. Neither pitch (i.e. mineral pitch) nor βαρος tenui.
54 Dec. 1, 72, ἐν άριστῳ and ὑπὲρ; Plin. NH XXIV, 37, πικ . . .
55 E.g. οὐκ αἱ, 567, and in the accounts of the Delian hieroepoi, IG XII 2, 145, 154. In the later accounts (ib. 156 (292 B.C.), 161, 203 etc.) the apparently synonymous μεσαίος is substituted.
56 Strabo XVI, 743. quoting Eratosthenes, says that Babylonian δισβαρῆς was of two kinds, οὐδὲν δὲ καὶ, and speaks of βαρος megalos πρὸς τὸν σεμερομῖν ἐπιγραφήν, but βαρος here is evidently not an actual measure.
57 Twelve per cent is commonly considered by scholars as the normal rate of interest, but in fact this estimate is probably generous. It appears from Pliny (ad Traj. 54) that municipalities were not always able at that time to lend their money even at 9 per cent (duodecim annis, not 12 per cent, see Lassen, Class. Phil. XLVII (1952), 236), when this rate could be obtained from private lenders, and Trajan in fact authorised a lower rate.
this question, and it depends on too many unknown factors; but the figure does seem surprisingly small. It is to be noted also that we have in A 8–9 mention of what appears to be a limited period, which may possibly be that for which the concessions were (at least in the first place) to run. I therefore leave this interesting question open for the attention of economists.

It is hardly necessary to look for any special motive for the present benefaction, which could not fail to have a most stimulating effect on Caunian trade and result in lower prices in the city; it is not easy to see how a benefactor could bestow a more useful gift. Moreover, ancient economic policy was normally directed to securing adequate imports. Nevertheless, it is not unlikely that Caunian trade was in fact at this time in need of a stimulus. The silting-up process, as at so many places on this coast, was constantly in progress; the harbour was perhaps becoming difficult of access, and merchant captains may have begun to show signs of avoiding it; and the shipbuilding industry would suffer too. But these speculations are incapable of proof.

39. Marble block 0·22 m. high, 0·36 m. wide, 0·18 m. thick, said to have been found among the ruins of Caunus; later transported to the karakol at Dalyan. Letters 13 mm. high. Photograph.

Δημητρία Διοκλέους
χρηστή χαίρε

40. Block 0·63 m. high, 0·41 m. square, with plain moulding at the bottom, the top broken away, now lying some 20 yards to the south-west of the building shown in Part I, Fig. 9. Letters 19–20 mm. high. Squeeze.

[Ἀ]ρτεμίσια Ναπτολέμου
[χρη]στή χαίρε

As this is no place for a tomb, the block has evidently been re-used, like the column-drums and other blocks in the platform under the building. The lettering is very similar to that of No. 15.

41. At the south-east foot of the hill on which the long wall ends beside the lake is a built tomb of late date, now completely ruined. The inscription is on two blocks which, from the cuttings on them, evidently formed respectively the lintel and part of the right-hand upright of the door. (a), broken on the left, is 0·41 m. high, now 0·81 m. long, 0·48 m. thick; (b) is 0·46 m. high, 0·36 m. wide, 0·46 m. thick. Letters 30 mm. high, except in (a) 2–4, where they vary from 36 to 40 mm. Photograph Fig. 49.

(a) [M. Αύρ]η(λίου) Ἐπιγόνου τάφος
tοῦτο τὸ μυῖ-
(leaf) μεῖον Κλαυδίου (leaf)
Δείος
[μετὰ δὲ] τὴν τελευτὴν μου μεθέναι ἐξὸν εἶναι
[τεθύγας] εἰ μὴ τὴν σύνθην μου Ἀρτεμίσιαν
[καὶ Ἐπιγόνον τὸν λείπον μου αἰῶν δὲ ταῖς μετὰ τῶν
[γεγραμμένοις βίασα]ται νακατ

(b) δείκνυαι, δῶσι
τῇ πόλει
κ Φ

The epitaph of Epigonus, though in much the better script, seems to have been written round that of Claudiares Dicus, and must presumably be the later.

58 For example, de Laet 114, 448 refuses to attempt any estimate, even approximate, for the total yield of the Imperial portarium in Asia Minor.

59 As Professor Jones pointed out to me.
42. At Yankı, in the yard of a house near the foot of the hill on the side towards Köyceğiz, is the broken block shown in Fig. 50; its original provenance is not known. Letters ca. 30 mm. high in l. 1, decreasing to 20 mm. below.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{τούτο τὸ } & \text{ μουμιεῖο[ν κατεσκεύ-} \\
& \text{ασεν Мевεκράτης ιατρο[κλέους τοῦ] } \\
& \text{Μενεκράτους, ὁ κτήτωρ τ[οῦ χαρίου, ἡ]} \\
& \text{αυτῶ καὶ τῇ γυναίκι αὐτ[οῦ nomen] } \\
& \text{καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτῶν ιατ[ροκλεί καὶ ?]} \\
& \text{Μενεκράτει vac. Φαυ[--- c. 9 ---]} \\
& \text{‘Αγρεοφῶντι μόνοις[5. ἕαν δὲ τίς]} \\
& \text{ἐτερον χάμη χωρίς τ[ῶν προγεγράμ]}
\end{align*}
\]

5

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{μένου vac. ἐνοχὸς [ἐσται τὸ βάφμας]} \\
& \text{τῷ τῆς τυμβώρυχι[ας νομῷ vac.?]} \\
& \text{kai diastα(γ)μασιν [ois vac.?]} \\
& \text{Μενεκράτης vac. [Ιατροκλέους ?]} \\
& \text{διετάξας[ο]}
\end{align*}
\]

The restoration in ll. 10-12 is awkward, as more space is available than the text appears to require.

L. 11. The stone has ΔΙΑΤΑΕΜΑΓΙΝ. Menekrates is content to refer to the penalties prescribed in his testament and registered in the city archives, instead of inscribing them in the usual way on the tomb. On διετάξασθαι see Judeich, Alt. von Hierapolis, no. 119.

43. Caunus, over the door of a re-used rock-tomb at the west end of the series, close to ground level; the inscription is blackened by soot and partially illegible. Copy.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Θήρωνος δις τοῦ ΑΝΔΟΘΕΥΙΌΥ} \\
\text{ΟΥ}
\end{align*}
\]

The copy is obviously defective on the right.

44. Among the ruins of a built tomb on the path 50 yards south-west of No. 41, on a block 0.18 m. high, 0.59 m. wide, 0.42 m. thick, broken on the right. Late script of poor quality, letters varying in height from 17 to 28 mm. Photograph.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{τούτο τὸ ἡρώου [τοῦ δείνος τοῦ δείνος]} \\
& \text{kai γυναίκος αὐτοῦ [. . . ]ET[--- - ---]} \\
& \text{kai τέκνων αὐτῶν: ἐς ἀν ἐς [ἐτερον τινα]}
\end{align*}
\]

6η, δώσω τῇ γερουσίᾳ x πεν[τακόσια]

L. 4. 500 denaria, no doubt, as in No. 41, rather than 5000.
45. Fragment built into a well not far from the shore of Alagöl, half under water when I saw it, and very awkward to read. Copy.

Apparently εἶς δὲ θ[--- οι] ἐμοὶ κα[ῃροῦμαι].

46. In the woods behind M, lying under a good-sized tree on the slope below the ridge on which are the church and baths, a block of yellow stone 0.40 m. high, 0.58 m. wide, 0.175 m. thick, broken on all sides except the top. Photograph Fig. 51.

The text may perhaps be understood somewhat in the following fashion:

Fig. 51.—Inscription No. 46.

Fig. 52.—Inscription No. 47.

Traces of a fourth line are visible.

47. Lying with No. 46, a block of grey-black limestone 0.295 m. high, 0.46 m. wide, 0.17 m. thick, broken on all sides except the top, carelessly and irregularly inscribed. Photograph Fig. 52.

This text, whether by coincidence or otherwise, partially repeats that of No. 46.

48. Found near the ancient reservoir mentioned in Part I, p. 14, a fragment 0.18 m. high, 0.11 m. wide; letters 12-14 mm. high, fine and neatly written, with apices; complete at top and bottom. Squeeze.

49. In the same field as No. 32 is a row of assorted blocks, half-buried, not in situ; on one of these, reading upwards, I read

Apparently one of the comparatively few references to the boule at Caunus.

50. Near the north-east shore of Sülükü Gölü, among the ruins of a monument buried in a thicket, on a fragment of an epistle block in letters 0.04 m. high. Copy.

Nerva or Trajan.

51. At Çandır, built into a barn close above No. 8, the lower part of a base broken on all sides except the bottom. Above the moulding, in well-cut letters 0.022 m. high:

Nervan or Trajan.
52. At Çandır, in a wall of the house of Mustafa Şahin, a fragment 0.22 m. high, 0.12 m. wide; left edge preserved. Letters 18–20 mm. high. Copy.

εδο[ν δε]
τις [το]λ-
μης [η, χ]-
ποτε [ει]-
5 ει το [ε]-
ρωτά [το]-
tομε [ιω]

L. 8. The figure must apparently be τ' (not σ', which has its lunate form). The would be surprisingly high.

53. Okcular, at the house of Durduoğlu Mehmet, a broken block of limestone 0.30 m. high, 0.29 m. wide, 0.24 m. thick, complete on the right and at the bottom. Letters 24–28 mm. high (12 mm. in l. 3). Photographic.

[δ δεῖνο - ]ἀνθρώπου
[ - - - - ]κην
(in a crown) Νέμεα

In l. 2, possibly νικήσας followed by a type of contest ending -κην. No formula ending with [νι]κην occurs to me.

54. Kemaliye, near Okcular, at the house of Ali Yılmaz, a limestone fragment broken on all sides, 0.23 m. high, 0.31 m. wide, 0.28 m. thick; no edge is preserved. Letters 45–50 mm. high. Photograph Fig. 53.

We have evidently part of a cursus honorum. In l. 2, apparently [προσβεύετην αὐτοστράτη]χεν Κιλικας, and in l. 3, [ἐπίπτηροι]τον τὸ[ν Σιβαστὸν]. In l. 4 the last letter seems to be sigma.

55–57. Amphora stamps, found among the ruins of Caunus, now at the house of Ali Demir at Çandır. The stamps are on the wall of the jar, not on the handle.

55. Fragment 0.04 m. wide, 0.03 m. high; stamp on the convex face.

56. Fragment 0.12 m. high, 0.21 m. wide; stamp on the convex face in a cartouche 0.06 m. long.

Τυμνία

Fig. 55.—Amphora Stamp No. 56.

Tymn hostility calls Tyminus in the Rhodian Peraea.
57. Fragment 0.39 m. high, 0.34 m. wide; rectangular stamp 0.05 m. high, 0.09 m. wide, on the concave face.

Fig. 56.—Amphora Stamp No. 57.

Probably Kóteis[œ]u[s], a name found on Rhodian amphorae at Pergamum (I. v. Perg. 470, nos. 1110–1111).

58. Okcular, in a private house, not seen by me; squeeze and measurements kindly sent me by Muharrem Türközs. Round altar ca. 0.85 m. high, ca. 0.30 m. in diameter, brought from the island of Rhodes. Letters late and indifferently well cut, 22–25 mm. high; worn away at the top left.

[- 5 - 6 -]sos Kó-
[ας καὶ 'Αφροδι-
σης] Kóou καὶ
τῶν ποιητῶν
αὐτῶν

It is important to note that the inscription does not belong to Caunus, where foreigners from large cities are hitherto unknown.

L. 2. I have supposed that we have a husband and wife, but the placing of the wife's name first is unusual, and it is not impossible that Kóou should be read; -sos may be the end of some name like Ἀγαθόποδος or Ἀρτίτοδος, but it is more suggestive of a feminine name.

V. CONCLUSION.

It remains to consider the bearing of the new information now available, and to see what kind of a picture we are able to form of the city of Caunus in antiquity. It goes without saying that fresh discoveries may at any time cause opinions to be revised; we have still barely sixty inscriptions in all.

In the middle of the fourth century B.C. Caunus was still reckoned a non-Greek city. But from this time onwards, beginning probably with the cultural policy of the Hecatomnids, Hellenism clearly took a very firm hold, and in the following centuries the city is to all appearance thoroughly Hellenised. Politically Caunus has the normal features of a Greek city, and the personal names are exclusively Greek: not a single Caunian is yet known to have had an Anatolian name. The judges' decrees Nos. 7 and 8 at least vouch for the city's respectability in the second century. Nevertheless, my own feeling is that all was not well with Caunus' reputation; the impression is received of a city of doubtful status striving hard to be accepted as an equal of the Greek cities of the coast. Caunus, we know, was unhealthy, and this may account for a good deal; all the same, the total absence of honorific decrees for Greeks of other cities, and indeed of foreigners from any large or distant city in any capacity at all, is very striking. And conversely, honorific decrees for Cauniens in other cities, or indeed any mentions whatever of Cauniens, are scarce almost to vanishing point.60 Dio Chrysostom in the first century A.D. asked (XXXI, 125): τις γὰρ παρὰ Καυνίους γέγονε γεννάριος ἄνη; ἣ τί πῶς τοῦτο ἐκείνων ἐγέρθην τι πετούς; and for the Hellenistic era at least the facts do not contradict him.61 The Romans, on the other hand, apparently accepted Caunus at her own valuation; statues of patrons and benefactors with their families (Nos. 23–33) now become as common as previously they were scarce. The Cauniens were evidently eager to make the most of such social successes as came their way.

There can be no doubt that the Cauniens shared with the Lycians a passionate love of freedom. The periods of subjection to Rhodes were fiercely resented, and traces of Rhodian influence in the inscriptions are very few. In particular, we have no example of a dedication to a Rhodian governor or magistrate (στρατηγὸς, ἄγιου ἡράκλειτος), of the type found on other subject Rhodian territory,62 nor indeed to any Rhodian at all. It was no doubt this eagerness for liberty that led

60 CIG 2673 b is a proxeny decree of Isas for the Caunian Hestiaeus son of Boiscus (date early Hellenistic?). A few—very few—mention occur in Rhodian inscriptions; there is a single epigram at Athens (IG II 9094); otherwise (apart from Zeno) one has to look far for a Caunian.

61 Dio's other references to the Cauniens are equably uncomplimentary. XXXI, 50: τοῦτο ἐγέρθην τοῦτος Καυνίους; ib. 124: οἱ τῶν Καυνίων ἡμῖν ἐλεοῦν, σφήνα ὁ ὅργυνθος; ib. 125: δι' ὤπερβολήν ἄνοιας καὶ μεγάλης διομοίης παρέχονται τοῖς Καυνίοις κατακαμάκασθαι; XXXII, 92: διὰ Καυνίων μόνον ὄνομα παρεχόμενον (καὶ τοῖς ἀλλοῖς) διὰ τοῦ ἄνθρωπος, διὸ πάντας συνήθεως. In XXXI, 125 he implies that the Cauniens were in the habit of re-using statues with a fresh inscription; of this practice I have noticed only one clear example, No. 27.

62 Fraser-Bean, Rhodian Prosop., 82, 83, 86.
to the savage massacre of Romans at Caunus in the Mithridatic War. In the event, this action produced the result it was desired to avoid; but this lesson seems to have been sufficient, and henceforth the Caunians realised that freedom, if it was to be won at all, must be won by favour of the Romans.

On the economic side, we learn something (especially from the customs inscription No. 38) of the chief branches of commercial activity at Caunus. There is nothing surprising in the new information. Caunian salt was already known from Pliny, and slaves are a familiar item of exportation from Caria. The importance of ship-building, and of pitch and resin, is readily explained by the Carian pine-forests which are still a prominent feature of the country. The existence of a fishery at Caunus in antiquity (see No. 20) is an interesting piece of fresh knowledge; combined with the presence of salt pans it has the makings of a profitable industry. The importance of salted fish as an article of commerce in antiquity needs no emphasising.

G. E. Bean

Faculty of Letters,
University of Istanbul.

It is tempting to suggest that the development of this industry may help to explain the startling increase of Caunian tribute from half a talent to ten talents in 425 B.C. (see Part I, p. 18).
GROUPS OF APULIAN RED-FIGURED VASES DECORATED WITH HEADS OF WOMEN OR OF NIKE

The material here discussed is far from being exhaustive, since it seems to me that a careful study would yield further groups of vases of this class. I use the word 'groups' for safety; I am not sure that some of the pieces which I put together were not produced by a single painter.

Some of the vases are attributed according to the style of only a part of their decoration. Thus London F285 is attributed to the Stoke-on-Trent group because of the reverse, which has no stylistic connexion with the obverse and the head of Nike on the neck.

When I mention proveniences I rely on second-hand information, but I notice that vases which I put under the same heading because of their common style are often cited as having been found in the same area. In my classification of the vases according to shapes, when possible I follow Beazley in ARV.

I do not find it easy to decide on the date of these groups in the absence of external evidence or any information on the conditions in which they were found. Stylistically none of them could be earlier than 350 B.C., and as the extensive use of white-gold colour and the clumsines of the drawing could hardly have appeared earlier than the Darius painter, I should be inclined to place them late in the fourth century.

For a few general remarks on the representation of human heads by themselves in the last phase of Attic, Campanian, Apulian, and Etruscan red-figured vases see Beazley, EVP, p. 10.

THE STOKE-ON-TRENT GROUP

My list includes twenty-two vases:

1. Copenhagen inv. Chr. VIII 60. From Bari. CV VI, pl. 252, 3. A, head of woman; B, the like.
2. Vatican V 57. Trendall, Vasi Ital. II, pl. xxxvi, a and b. A, head of woman; B, the like.
3. Rhyno (the plastic part represents a boar's head). Carlsruhe, Badisches Landesmuseum 388. CV I, pl. 73, 6. Head of Nike.

STEMLESS CUPS

1. London F454. D'Hancarville, IV, pl. 98, whence Inghirami, Mon. Etr., V, pl. 22. Figs. 3-4. I, flying Eros; A, head of woman; B, the like.
2. London F456. D'Hancarville, IV, pl. 69, whence Inghirami, Mon. Etr., V, pl. 23, 1. I, seated Eros; A, head of woman; B, the like.

1 This article is part of a wider work on Greek South Italian vases which I carried out as a research student of University College, London. Some of the vases here discussed belong to Museums outside London, and I should not have been able to study them without the assistance of the Central Research Fund of the University of London.

My thanks are due to the Trustees of the British Museum, to Messrs. G. V. Bemrose, D. B. Harden, R. M. Cook, R. U. Sayce, C. D. Bicknell, J. B. Lowe, and to the Governors of Harrow School for permission to publish vases in—the Reading University Museum; the Hanley Museum and Art Gallery, Stoke-on-Trent; the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford; the Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge; the Manchester Museum; Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; Trinity College, Dublin, and the Harrow School Museum.

My thanks are also due to Mrs. A. D. Ure, Dr. W. D. Van Wijngaarden, Miss Margaret Pilkington, Professor R. D. Lockhart, Mr. W. Deonna, Mr. C. Kavli, and Mr. George Penrose for permission to publish vases in—the Reading University Museum; the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden, Leiden; the Whitworth Art Gallery, Manchester; Marischal College, Aberdeen; the Musée d'Art et d'Histoire, Geneva; the Kunstdrumsuseum, Oslo; and the Cornwall County Museum, Truro.

Professor A. D. Trendall kindly sent me photographs of vases, which he is publishing in the forthcoming second volume of his Vasi Italiani ed Etruschi a Figure Rosse in the series Vasi Antichi Distributi del Vaticano, and allowed me to mention those that are relevant here. I am very grateful to Professor T. B. L. Webster and Professor C. M. Robertson, who helped me with my work by reading my manuscript and discussing various problems with me.

Professor Sir John Beazley generously put his notes at my disposal, read my manuscript and saved me from many errors. I came to know the vases in Dublin and Melbourne from photographs in his collection.


2 So named from the plate in that town.

3 Since I wrote this note I added three other vases to the Stoke-on-Trent group: the Kantharo shape As London F445 and London Old Cat. 1661, and the cinnochae shape: London 1928. 1-17, 69. About a vase in Paris, the plate Louvre 178 (N2851), I know only from Mrs. A. D. Ure, who kindly writes to me that it is very much like the Stoke-on-Trent plate.

4 Dr. Garscha kindly informs me that the tusk, which are not clear in the Corpus Vasorum reproduction, are painted in white colour.

5 The three hydriai are of the standard Apulian shape, which originates from the Attic red-figured hydria; an unusual variant with a very short, upright foot in two degrees is the small vase Lecce 978, CV II, pl. 41, 10.

6 The fragmentary handles of London F454 are modern; the handles of London F456 are missing.

7 This far as I know, is the only existing type of stamnos cup in Apulian red-figure, and must be derived from such Attic stamnos cups of the early fourth century B.C. as those in Bonn and London by the Yena painter (ARV, 882, 45-49), that in Salonica (inv. 6, 152, Robinson, Olymphias V, 261, pl. 118), and those in Archena, which exist only in fragments (Beazley, Quadernos de Historia Primitiva, 1948, no. 1, pp. 45-8, e-8).
Fig. 1.—London F285.

Fig. 2.—London F285.
Fig. 3.—London F454.

Fig. 4.—London F454.
Dishes, Shape 1

1. Copenhagen inv. Chr. VIII 90. From Barri. CV VI, pl. 268, 2, I, head of woman.
2. Toronto 45. Robinson and Harcum, pl. LXXXIII, 1, head of woman.

Plates, Standard Type


Deep Askoi, Type A


Lekane Lids

1. Reading, University Museum 49. VIII, 2. CV I, pl. 39, 3. Two heads of women.

Pyxis Lid


Skophos, Corinthian Type

London 59. 2–16. 63. PL IV, d. A, head of woman; B, the like.

Oinochoai, Shape 1


Kantharos, Shape A

Carlsruhe, Badisches Landesmuseum B108. CV II, pl. 72, 5. A, head of woman; B, the like.

The vases London F285, F454, and F456 bear, in addition to the usual heads, other representations of different style and technique. The aedicula on the reverse of London F285 is partly reserved, partly painted in white colour directly applied on the clay surface; the youth and the drapery are also painted in white colour in the same way. Some details of the head of Nike on the neck of the vase are treated in relief line, and so are some details of the figure-work on the inside surface of London F454 and F456.

The heads wear kekrhaloi decorated with openwork embroidery, white or gold horizontal stripes, and, occasionally, one or several rows of dots.

Characteristics are the faces. The mouth and the eye are indicated in thinned glaze. The eyelids and the brow are usually treated in wavy lines, and the two lines of the upper eyelid tend, in some cases, to be assimilated into one. On the corner of the mouth there is often a vertical thick line, which sometimes looks like a blob.

Dots in groups of three are occasionally used as filling ornament.

\[8\] I have been able to distinguish two different shapes of Apulian red-figured dishes:

Shade 1 includes vases like Brussels R384, CV IV Db, pl. 5 (Berg, 86), 4; Copenhagen inv. Chr. VIII 34, CV VI, pl. 268, 1; Lecce 886, CV II, pl. 58, 1–2; London F454, and London F456. The handles of the last two vases show that the type is certainly derived from metal dishes like Naples no. 7373, Pernice, Die hellenistische Kunst in Pompeji IV, p. 11, figs. 11–12. These vases resemble the metal lavers represented on the Ptolemaic votive krater in Naples and the Medea volute-krater in Munich (see also the laver from Locri, NASA, 1913, supp. p. 28, fig. 34, 3), with the difference that the latter has three legs instead of the usual one-piece foot of the former. The similarity would make us think that the clay and metal dishes were, at least in certain cases, used as lavers.

Shade 2 includes vases like Würzburg 896, Langlotz, pl. 244, and is certainly derived from metal dishes like Berlin, Pernice, op. cit. p. 13, fig. 17. The handles recall those of the column-krater.

\[9\] There are many other types of Apulian red-figured plates, which I find difficult to classify with certainty. Here are some examples:

(a) Taranto, CV I, IV Dr, pl. 7, 1 and Taranto, CV I, IV Dr, pl. 9 (with this type cf. Catania, Liberrini, Museo Biscari 803, pl. LXXXVII and Lecce 1709, CV II, IV Dr, pl. 56, 15).

(b) The fish-plates Lecce 886–11, CV II, IV Dr, pl. 59, 3–6. This shape is very common. Unusual, if Apulian at all, is the fish-plate Bologna, Pellegrini FU 486, CV III, IV Er, pl. 6, 18, which resembles shape f.

(c) Lecce 583, CV II, IV Dr, pl. 57, 1.

(d) Toronto 46. Robinson and Harcum, pl. LXXXIV and Bologna, Pellegrini FU 706–704, CV III, IV Dr, pl. 34, 6.

(e) Würzburg 879, Langlotz, pl. 245. (see the plate Bologna, Pellegrini IV 579, fig. 141).

(f) Toronto 458. Robinson and Harcum, pl. LXXXIII (see the Attic plate Salonica inv. 348, 448, Robinson, Olympia XIII, 72, pl. 91).

\[10\] Scribner saw that this vase and the dish in Toronto are alike in style of drawing.

\[11\] On the shape see Beazley, EYP, p. 272 also Robinson, Olympia V, pp. 39–1, pl. 29, and XIII, p. 295, pl. 170–1.

This, so far as I know, is the only existing shape of Apulian red-figured askos, with the exception of the interesting variant Lecce 825, CV II, IV Dr, pl. 42, 9.

\[12\] The shape of the Apulian red-figured lekane seems to be essentially always the same; some lekanai have projections on either side of their handles imitating metal technique (cf. Michigan 2621. CV, pl. XXIX, 3 with Wilno, CV III, pl. 2 (Poland 125-3)). The elaborate knob of the lekanes Amsterdam, CV, Scheurler IV Db, pl. 6 (Pays-Bas 92), is unusual and requires further examination.

\[13\] The standard shape of the Apulian red-figured pyxis is that of London 1931. 2–4. PL IV, b. It is spherical, with a characteristic foot and a knob on the lid. Notice, however, that the handle of the pyxis lid Villa Giulia 17615, CV I, IV Dr, pl. 2, 1, is different. The Apulian red-figured lid Oxford 1930. 288 must belong to a vase which corresponds to the Attic pyxis, type D (Beazley, ARV, p. IX); variants of this shape are two pyxides in Taranto, one representing a youth, the other the head of a woman, which I know only from the notes of Sir John Beazley.

\[14\] For the shape see p. 116, n. 30.

\[15\] For the shape see p. 116, n. 29.

\[16\] See for example the heads on London F285, the Stoke-on-Trent plate or the cup London F456.
THE GROUP OF LONDON F339 17

Panathenaic Amphorae 18

1. Lecce 860. From Ruvo. CV II, IV Dr, pl. 45, 5. A, head of woman (on the neck, the like); B, the like.
2. Lecce 865. From Ruvo. CV II, IV Dr, pl. 46, 2. A, head of woman (on the neck, the like); B, the like.
3. London F339. Pl. V, a. A, head of woman (on the neck, the like); B, the like.

Barrel-amphora 19

London F340. From Apulia. Pl. V, b. A, Fig. 5, seated Eros; B, head of woman.

Mug (Oinochoe, Shape VIII B) 20

Lecce 864. From Ruvo. CV II, IV Dr, pl. 54, 10. Head of Nike.

Kantharoid Skyphos 21

Würzburg 863. Langlotz, pl. 245. A, head of woman; B, the like.

The amphorae are perforated, and the subsidiary decoration of those of panathenaic type is strikingly alike. All have a moulded ring round the neck, 22 which divides it into two areas. The lower area on the obverse has a white-gold tongue-pattern and a small head of woman growing out of rich plants and resembling the big heads on the obverse of the body. 23 Round the mouth the three panathenaics have a laurel wreath. The floral ornaments are alike, and consist of palmettes flanked by tendrils and by small incomplete palmettes. The heads are exceptionally clumsy. The line indicating the brow is usually curved, and the eye occasionally takes the shape of a right-angled triangle 24 with the hypotenuse—the lower line of the upper eyelid—slightly curved and often extending outside the triangle. The upper line of the upper eyelid is indicated only twice, 25 and the dot indicating the pupil occasionally touches the apex of the right angle. 26 The mouth is no more than a wavy line, and the nostril is omitted on most of the vases. 27

THE KANTHAROS GROUP 28

Kantharoi, Shape A2 29

1. London F447. A, head of woman; B, the like.
3. Cambridge, Museum of Classical Archaeology. Pl. VI, a. A, head of woman; B, the like.
4. Cambridge (G. 252). From Canosa. CV I, IV DE, pl. XLVI, 6. A, head of woman; B, the like.
5. Lecce 942. From Egnazia. CV II, IV Dr, pl. 54, 1. A, head of woman; B, the like.
6. Lecce 941. From Egnazia. CV II, IV Dr, pl. 54, 5. A, head of woman; B, the like.
7. Brussels A272. CV I, IV Db, pl. 7 (Belg. 88), 3. A, head of woman; B, the like.
8. Formerly Treben, Leessen. Kat. Leessen, pl. 4, 50. A, head of woman; B, the like.
9. Carlsruhe, Badisches Landesmuseum B73. CV II, pl. 72, 6. A, head of woman; B, the like.
10. Carlsruhe, Badisches Landesmuseum B72. CV II, pl. 72, 7. A, head of woman; B, the like.

Mugs (Oinochoe, Shape VIII B)

2. Manchester Museum IV C2. Fig. 6. Head of Nike.
4. Leiden, Rijksmuseum Van Oudheden, G.N.V. 109. Fig. 7. Head of Nike (one wing only).
5. Geneva, Musée d'Art et d'Histoire 12126. Head of Nike.

Oinochoe, Shape 1 30

1. Lecce 869. From Egnazia. CV II, IV Dr, pl. 49, 1. Head of woman.
2. Lecce 870. From Egnazia. CV II, IV Dr, pl. 49, 2. Head of woman.
3. Toronto 398. Robinson and Harcum, pl. LXXXI. Head of woman.

See Lecce 886 and Lecce 865.

See Lecce 865, London F340, and Würzburg 863.

The nostril is not omitted on Würzburg 863 and on the reverse of London F339; on the latter it is merely a dot.

I call the group so because many of the vases attributed to it are kantharoi.

For the shape see Caskey and Beazley, Boston, pp. 14–15, fig. 13; Caskey, Geometry, 164; ARV, p. IX. Most of the kantharoi in my list have plastic leaves at the bottom of the handles.

Apart from the mugs I know six other different shapes of Apulian red-figured oinochoe, which seem to be derived from Attic prototypes. I call them after Beazley's numbers of corresponding Attic shapes:

(a) Oinochoe, shape 1 : Bologna, Pellegrini PU 616, CV III, Dr, pl. 32, 12; CV Lecce II, IV Dr, pl. 47 and 48.
(b) Oinochoe, shape 2 : Carlsruhe, Badisches Landesmuseum B75, CV II, pl. 81, 3.
(c) Oinochoe, shape 3 : Taranto CV II, IV Dr, pl. 33, 1; Bologna, Pellegrini PU 611, CV III, IV Dr, pl. 32, 7; Brunswick AT309, CV, pl. 46, 1.
(d) Oinochoe, shape 4 : Bologna, Pellegrini PU 609.
GROUPS OF APULIAN RED-FIGURED VASES

9. Carlsruhe, Badisches Landesmuseum B65. CV II, pl. 70, 3. Head of woman.21

Pyxides, Standard Type

1. Brussels R252 bis. CV IV Db, pl. 8 (Belg. 89), 5. Head of woman.
4. Villa Giulia 17615. CV I, IV Dr, pl. 2, 1. Two heads of women. (The body of the vase is missing.)
5. Melbourne, National Gallery of Victoria 1793 (?). On the body, head of woman. (The lid does not belong.)
7. Carlsruhe, Badisches Landesmuseum B991. CV II, pl. 74, 2. Head of woman.33

Fig. 8.—Geneva 15021.

Thymiateria, Shape A

1. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College. Pl. VI, d. Head of woman; Eros.

Lekane Lids

1. Michigan 2707. ‘Presumably from Pozzuoli or Cumaec.’ CV IV D, pl. XXIX, 4. Two heads of women.
2. Oslo, Kunstdincerelyset O.K. 6226. Pl. VII, b. Two heads of women.35

Plates, Standard Type

1. Formerly Treben, Leesen. Kat. Leesen, pl. 6, 106. Head of woman.
3. Carlsruhe, Badisches Landesmuseum B231. CV II, pl. 73, 10. I, head of woman.36

CV III, IV Dr, pl. 32, 15; Sèvres 67, CV, IV Db, pl. 35, 2; Copenhagen inv. 375. CV VI, IV D, pl. 276, 2.
(e) Oinochoe shape 6: Geneva 15021 (Fig. 8).
(f) Oinochoe shape 10a: Bologna, Pellegrini PU 617, CV III, IV Dr, pl. 32, 11; Toronto 386, Robinson and Harcum, pl. LXXI (a variant of this is Lecces 672, CV II, IV Dr, pl. 51, 1).
(g) Oinochoe shape 10b: Bologna, Pellegrini PU 618, CV III, IV Dr, pl. 32, 14; Lecces 794, CV II, IV Dr, pl. 51, 7.

21. Hafner associated the two Carlsruhe oinochoai.
22. Unless otherwise stated the heads are drawn on the lid.
23. Hafner associated the two Carlsruhe pyxides.
24. Thymiaterion, shape A seems to be most frequent in Apulian red-figure, and should be distinguished from the type of Manchester Museum M.W. 1. 6952 (on loan from the Whitworth Art Gallery), which I call thymiaterion, shape B (see p. 118, Pl. VII, c). The former was rightly connected by Miss Lamb (Cambridge CV I, IV DE, pl. XLVI, 7, text) with the Canosan thymiateria Mayer, Apulien, p. 306, pl. 39, 1–2 and 40, 4–5. The latter must be derived from such Attic thymiateria as Athens N.M. inv. 2241 (Kourouniotis in Class. St. Cap., p. 212, fig. 19, 8).
26. I came to know this lid through Professor T. B. L. Webster.
27. Hafner saw the connexion between the two Carlsruhe plates.
The subsidiary decoration of the kantharoi differs little from vase to vase: the heads are often flanked on either side by a cross-like object, which may represent a torch, while fillets and incomplete palmettes are used in the field as filling ornaments.\textsuperscript{27} The mugs have often a laurel wreath round the neck and occasionally a wave-pattern below the figure-work. The oinochoai are usually decorated with a double horizontal line round the neck, a tongue-pattern below it, and a wave-pattern on the shoulder. The pyxides have often a laurel wreath or a wave-pattern round the upper part of the body.

In the treatment of heads the eyes are noteworthy. The lower eyelid and the pupil are usually represented by a single curved line,\textsuperscript{38} which joins the single or double line of the upper eyelid near the inner end.\textsuperscript{39} The scalloped reserved edge of the forelock is characteristic. The mouth is usually indicated by a dot, and two curls fall down the neck and cover the ear.

With the vases of the Kantharos group compare the following:

\textit{Kantharoi, Shape A2}

1. Leccce 940. From Egnazia. \textit{CV II}, IV Dr, pl. 54, 7. A, head of woman; B, the like.
2. Formerly Berlin, Baurat Schiller Collection. \textit{Zahn} 416, pl. 33. A, head of woman; B, the like.

\textit{Mugs (Oinochoai, Shape VIII B)}

1. Leccce 861. From Ruvo. \textit{CV II}, IV Dr, pl. 54, 8. Head of Nike.
2. Toronto 470. Robinson and Harcum, pl. LXXXIV. Head of Nike.
3. Cracow, Czartoryski Museum inv. 1454. \textit{CV II}, pl. 16 (Pol. 70), 2. Head of Nike. \textit{(The lid does not belong.)}

\textit{Pyxis, Standard Type}\textsuperscript{40}

Würzburg 868. Langlotz, pl. 245. A, Head of Nike; B, head of woman. \textit{(The lid is missing.)}

\textit{Dish, Shape 1}

Leccce 863. From Ruvo. \textit{CV II}, IV Dr, pl. 58, 3. I, head of Nike.

\textit{Deep Askos, Type A}

Leccce 970. From Ruvo. \textit{CV II}, IV Dr, pl. 49, 8. Head of Nike.

Connected with the Kantharos group are the group of Bologna 1366, the Brunswick group, and the group of Reading 51.7.13:

\textbf{The Group of Bologna 1366}

I include the Manchester thymiatier because of the head of Nike. The two heads of women are of different style.

\textit{Oinochoai, Shape 1}

Bologna, Pellegrini \textit{PU} 616. \textit{CV III}, IV Dr, pl. 32, 12. Head of woman.

\textit{Thymiatierung, Shape A}


\textit{Thymiatier, Shape B}

Manchester Museum M.W. i. 6952 \textit{(on loan from the Whitworth Art Gallery)}. \textit{Pl. VII, c.} Two heads of women; head of Nike.

\textbf{THE BRUNSWICK GROUP}

\textit{Oinochoai, Shape 1}


Greifenhagen associated the two vases, but wrongly connected them with Bologna 1366, Lecce 870 and 869, two oinochoai formerly in the Vogell Collection \textit{(Sammlung Vogell, pl. V, 14 and 16)}, and Lecce 826.\textsuperscript{41} Of these I attribute Bologna 1366 to the group of Bologna 1366; Lecce 870 and 869 to the Kantharos group; and the two Vogell oinochoai to the Stoke-on-Trent group. Lecce 826 seems to me entirely different from the other groups and from the Brunswick oinochoai with which Greifenhagen also connected it.

\textsuperscript{27} See Lecce 942 and the vase in Brussels.
\textsuperscript{38} See the Manchester mug.
\textsuperscript{39} On Lecce 942 the line of the lower eyelid joins the line of the upper eyelid at both ends.
\textsuperscript{40} Langlotz saw the stylistic connexion of this vase with Lecce 970, 861, and 863, but was wrong in connecting it with Lecce 864, which I attribute to the group of London F339.
\textsuperscript{41} See Brunswick AT307 and AT308, \textit{CV}, pl. 49, 7 and 11, pl. 49, 8 and 12, and text.
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THE GROUP OF READING 51.7.13

Panathenaic Amphorae

1. Reading, University Museum 51.7.13. Pl. VII, a. A, head of woman; B, the like.
2. Truro, the Cornwall County Museum. Fig. 9. Head of woman.

Fig. 9.—Truro, Cornwall County Museum.

Fig. 10.—Dublin, Trinity College.

With these compare the following:

Mug (Oinochoe Shape VIII N 48)

Carlsruhe, Badisches Landesmuseum B80. CV II, pl. 72, 10. Head of woman.

THE TORONTO GROUP

Stemless Cup

Brunswick AT 314. CV, pl. 41, 3-4. I, Eros; A, head of woman; B, the like.

Lekane Lid

Toronto 449. Robinson and Harcum, pl. LXXXII. Two heads of women.

Panathenaic Amphora

Toronto 395. Robinson and Harcum, pl. LXXXII. A, head of woman; B, the like.

The line indicating the eyebrow is almost straight, the upper eyelid is parallel to it, and the pupil is indicated by a line concave to the eye. The treatment of chin and mouth is peculiar and the nose is very pointed.

THE GROUP OF TARANTO 2996

This and the next group go together.

Panathenaic Amphorae

1. Taranto 2996. CV I, IV Dr, pl. 11, 6. From Ceglie del Campo. A, head of woman; B, the like.
2. Lecce 840. CV II, IV Dr, pl. 44, 1 and 4. From Rugge. A, woman in naskos; B, head of woman.
3. Bologna, Pellegrini PC 4522-41. CV III, IV Dr, pl. 4, 6. Head of woman; B, the like.
4. Dzików, Count Zdzislaw Tarnowski. Poland CV III, pl. 128, 6. A, head of woman; B, the like.

Plate, Standard Type

Taranto 3008. CV I, IV Dr, pl. 11, 5. From Ceglie del Campo. I, head of woman.

Oinochoe Shape 3

Brunswick AT 310. CV, pl. 49, 2 and 10. Head of woman.

Column-kraters

1. Reading, University Museum 87, 75, 32. CV I, pl. 30, 1. A, head of woman; B, the like.
2. Vatican 226. Trendall, Vasi Ital. II, pl. xxxvi, g and h. A, head of woman; B, the like.

The upper line of the upper eyelid is short and touches neither the lower line nor the eyebrow. Nostril and mouth are usually indicated. The earrings are mostly circular.

With the group of Taranto 2996 compare the following vases. Greifenhagen attributed the first to the painter of the Brunswick oinochoe:

48 For the shape see BSR XIX, p. 40, note 4.
Greifenhagen connected the Brunswick panathenaiac with the panathenaics reproduced in the Lecece Corpus Vasorum II, plll. 44 and 45, of which I attribute only one to the Amphorae group. He further connected the Brunswick panathenaiac with a few others, none of which seems to belong here. Greifenhagen rightly connected the Brunswick oinochoe with Lecece 979, which I include in my list, and with Bologna Pellegrini PU 613, which I place near it.

**Panathenaic Amphorae**

1. Lecece 842. *CV* II, IV Dr, pl. 44, 2–3 and 5. From Ruvo. A, woman in naissos; B, head of woman.

**Column-kraters**

2. Once Treben, Leesee. *Kat. Leesen*, pl. 1, 42. A, head of woman; B, the like.

**Oinochoai, Shape 3**

2. Lecece 979. *CV* II, IV Dr, pl. 41, 1. From Ruvo. Head of woman.

**Stemless Cup**

Dublin, Trinity College. Fig. 10, seated woman; A, head of woman; B, the like.

The heads resemble those on the vases of the group of Taranto 2966; the eyes, however, are treated differently. The upper and lower lines of the upper eyelid join and form an angle with the apex near the continuous line, which shows forehead and nose slightly convex to the face. The eyebrow is arched, and in one case touches the upper eyelid. The nostrils are mostly omitted and the mouth usually forms an obtuse angle.

With the vases of the Amphorae group compare the following:

**Oinochoe, Shape 3**


**Column-krater**

Vatican V59. Trendall, *Vasi Ital.* II, pl. xxxvi, c and d. A, head of woman; B, the like.

**The Copenhagen Group**

Five of the vases in my list are in the National Museum in Copenhagen. Four of them are said to come from Bari.

**Panathenaic Amphorae**

3. Vatican V65. Trendall, *Vasi Ital.* II, pl. xxxvii, h. A, head of woman; B, woman in aedicula. (Handle missing.)

**Hydria**

Copenhagen inv. Chr. VIII 111. *CV* VI, pl. 259, 1. From Bari. Head of woman.

**Stemless Cup**

Copenhagen inv. Chr. VIII 19. *CV* VI, pl. 267, 6 a–b. From Basilicata. I, woman; A, head of woman; B, the like.

**Dish, Shape 1**


**Volute-krater**

Vatican V56. Trendall, *Vasi Ital.* II, pl. xxxvii, f. A, youth in aedicula (on the neck, head of Nike); B, head of woman.

---

43 So named from the shape of the first two vases of my list.
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In shape, and in the decoration of neck and mouth, the two parthenaica amphorae are alike. Compare the patterns on the neck of the hydria with those on the lower part of the neck of the amphora no. 1 in my list.

The style of the heads of women drawn on these vases is easily distinguishable. The eye is drawn oblique, and the two lines of the upper eyelid join at the inner ends. The lower eyelid is short and does not meet the upper eyelid. The pupil is a thick vertical stroke pointed below, or just a dot touching the upper eyelid only. The treatment of the forehead, nose, and nostril is typical. For the mouth see especially the dish and the amphora no. 2 in my list.

The palmettes in the field and the floral ornament are usually decorated with rows of white-gold dots and lines.

THE GROUP OF LECCE 866

This contains two vases associated by Romanelli:

Panathenaic Amphorae

1. Lecce 866. From Ruvo. CV II, IV Dr, pl. 45, 4. A, head of woman; B, the like.
2. Lecce 867. From Ruvo. CV II, IV Dr, pl. 45, 6. A, head of woman; B, the like.

The two vases are perforated and have similar subsidiary decoration. Notice especially the treatment of eyes. The two lines of the upper eyelid form an angle, while the pupil and the lower eyelid are indicated by a single curved line.

This study has sought to establish a basis for the classification of Apulian red-figured vases decorated with heads of women or of Nike. The style, if poor, is nevertheless interesting, since it represents the last phase of development in a school, which, though colonial, started with such competent artists as the Sisyphos painter and the painter of the Birth of Dionysos, yet rapidly deteriorated to the point of producing vases like those here attributed to the Stoke-on-Trent group or the group of London F339.

Moreover, the vases of the above groups are interesting for their shapes, which often originate from Attic red-figured prototypes, and it is satisfactory to find that some of them, for example the skyphos of Corinthian type and the mug, retain part of their fifth century precision. The kantharoi often have plastic leaves at the bottom of the handles and the pyxides are spherical; the thymiaterion, shape A, seems to be derived from native prototypes, and the dishes, no doubt, can be connected with metal vases. I do not know of any Attic parallel to the Apulian barrel-amphora, which, like the late Apulian red-figured volute-krater, is unpleasantly overcharged.

One would be tempted to interpret the heads of women as representations of the birth of Aphrodite, but this theory, attractive as it is, seems to me highly improbable and I am inclined to believe that they are merely abbreviations of female figures. Noteworthy is the fact that heads of men are rarely represented on vases of this class; this I find difficult to interpret.

It is evident from the title of this article and the description of the vases in the text that I interpret the heads between two wings as abbreviations of a Nike, but the feminine features of these heads cannot be decisive in the matter, and the possibility that they may be abbreviated representations of Erotes of the hermaphrodite type, so frequent in this period, cannot be excluded altogether.

A. CAMBTOGLIO

University of Mississippi.
THE STRUCTURE OF THE ILLIAD, ILLUSTRATED BY THE SPEECHES

In a recent paper (JHS LXXII 1 ff.) is set out the distribution of speeches in the Odyssey, and the principles of their arrangement within its principal episodes. It is an obvious and necessary counterpart, to apply the same method of study to the Iliad. Though much has been done by Sir John Sheppard in The Pattern of the Iliad (1932), he has not made express use of the grouping of the speeches; and the present paper is designed to supplement his analysis of their contents by the special examination of their positions in the general design. I am still acutely aware of my debt to The Pattern of the Iliad; and it seems to me only possible to set out my own suggestions in full, at the cost of some repetition from a work so closely linked in its general theme.

Speeches in the Iliad (over 670) are more numerous than in the Odyssey (629 + 8 in Demodocus' second lay), but their distribution is similar:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Books with 15 speeches or less</th>
<th>Iliad 1</th>
<th>Odyssey 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;20&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;25&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;30&quot;</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;35&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;40&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;41 or more&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The largest number, fifty, is in Odyssey XVII; forty-five are in Iliad XXIV.

As in the Odyssey, more than twenty episodes in the Iliad are devoid of speeches; mostly bouts of fighting, with mere lists of names, sometimes introduced by an invocation (XIV. 508, XVI. 112). The significance of these must be examined later, as they frequently interrupt the schemes of speeches.

Like the similes, of which such valuable use was made in The Pattern of the Iliad, every speech is necessarily a distinct act of composition, interrupting the action. Sometimes it is interpolated into it, replacing a speech-word such as sometimes remains in our text, and ranks as a speech in the structure of the episode. Such speech-words are more frequent in the Odyssey (JHS LXXII 10/1). The most remarkable sequence of them is in the Laestrygonian episode (Od. X. 105-28), five speech-words. Examples in the Iliad are:

IV. 515. Athena ἀφόρος (of 541-2) between Apollo's speech (509-13) and a bout of fighting (519-44) which resumes the fighting which precedes Apollo's intervention. What seems to be intended is a pair of exhortations to the two armies, like XV. 717-41 (Hector and Ajax); XX. 354-72 (Achilles and Hector).

V. 899. Zeus ἀνώγειν.
X. 139. Nestor φεγγόςαμος.
X. 522. Hippoδον ἀνώγειν ἔταϊρον.
XIV. 275-80. Hera ἀμυνε.
XV. 377. Thunder.
XVIII. 35. Achilles ὁμωζεύ.

But in XXII. 294 where Hector ἱκάτε to Deiphobus, this is not reckoned as a speech in the structure. Nor are the occasional invocations so reckoned; to the Muses (XI. 218; XIV. 508; XVI. 112); to Menelaus (IV. 127); to Hector (XI. 299), and to Patroclus (XVI. 692); they are usually followed by mere lists of names, the unfulfilled programmes of bouts of fighting, like VIII. 273-4; and sometimes interrupt such fighting.

These and similar speech-words give the impression that, in some instances, speeches have been engrafted on narratives originally 'speechless', not always symmetrically; e.g. XI. 248-63 (where Coön wounds Agamemnon without speaking) is the counterpart of 138-42 in the composition.

Sometimes a gesture or other act may take the place of a speech. In I. 503-28 the structure is

Thetis—<Zeus is silent>—Thetis—<Zeus nods and thunders>

and as this passage is followed by another quatrain (540-67)

Hera—Zeus—Hera—Zeus

the thunder of Zeus is the centre-piece of a sequence of nine. Compare VII. 446-79:

Poseidon—Zeus—<Zeus thunders>
There are very few single speeches: Nestor (XV. 661-66) and Patroclus (XVI. 536-61) followed by bouts of fighting: Zeus (XVI. 667-75) ordering the burial of Sarpedon, preceded by long narrative, and the setting of the scales (638) which may be its counterpart in this long, irregular section (422-683). An anonymous speech (715, IV. 82-4), on Athena's descent from Olympus, may be the initial item in the composition which follows; if so, the centre-point is Menelaus' first speech (184-7) reassuring Agamemnon. Other examples in IV are Iris and Idaeus, and Hector in VIII. 497-541.

The length of the speeches varies greatly, even when there is not a formal digression, as in those of Nestor. But this does not seem to affect their significance. An example is the episode IV. 127-219 above quoted, where Menelaus replies in four lines to Agamemnon's twenty-eight. It may be inferred that the sequence of speeches was planned first, and its framework filled afterwards, and perhaps by degrees.

Sometimes the latter speeches in a composition are shorter than their leading counterparts. This has the effect of hastening the action, and compensating digressions (e.g. IX. 656-713). But in XI. 671-821 Nestor's story is in the latter half of the centre-piece, and his welcome to Patroclus (645-6) had been silent, following the description of his cup.

Speeches in Groups. But nearly all the speeches, as in the Odyssey, occur in groups. The simplest kind of composition is the couplet—question and answer, challenge and reply, pairs of exhortations (XIV. 470-85; XV. 718-41), and so forth (XX. 354-72). But this is rare, except as an element in a larger composition, where it may be balanced by another couplet.

Far more frequent is the triplet, ABA, ABB, or ABC. It is the central speech that is significant, while the third deals with a consequence. This arrangement, which I have described elsewhere as 'pedimental', may be compared with the 'heraldic' designs of gems, vase paintings, and temple-sculptures.

Based on the triplet are the still more elaborate compositions with five, seven, nine, or even eleven items, similarly grouped about a centre-piece, and elaborating its preliminaries and sequel. These are examples of the double couplet or 'quatrain' ABAB, or ABBA, and here it is the counter-couplet BA that is significant, or the couplet BB with some antithesis—in effect a twin centre-piece. IV. 155-97 (ABAA), V. 787-834 (ABCB). Both groupings are frequent in vase-painting.

In the very frequent group of five—or 'pentad' —the initial and final couplets may be counterparts. In the Quarrel-debate, I. 59-244, such a centre-piece of five is enclosed between triplets which are counterparts, and enframed between contrasted single speeches from Achilles as vassal and as rebel.

In I. 540-94 a 'sextet' has the pattern AB . AB . CA.
In II. 8-440 the scheme is

AB : CDC : EFG : G : HGI : GDC : GD,

where the lateral triplets enframe the long speeches of Nestor (D) and the second speech of Odysseus (G) is the turning point in the whole episode, between the goddesses (EF) who inspire Odysseus, and Thersites (H) his opponent condemned by the Common Man (I).

Occasionally a group of speeches is interpolated into a larger composition: in VI. 123-231 a triplet—Diomedes—Glaucus—Diomedes—interrupts the first half of the long episode of the Sapphian Women, where the centre-piece is Theano's prayer (305-11). A major insert may interrupt a balanced composition: in III. 250-323 the actual duel (324-34) follows the centre-piece (715—Piram—715; 298-332), whereas in XXII the fatal blow (325) precedes Achilles' speech 331-6. In VII. 242-72 the fighting interrupts the second half of the construction as the first half is broken by Nestor's story (124-60). In XVII. 789-817 Apollo's disarmament of Patroclus follows the central speech of Patroclus, and is partially compensated by the silent fight with Cepheus (725-30). In combat, word and blow were in fact simultaneous, and such dislocation was inevitable; but it reveals a certain incoherence, which we may find to be of some importance later.

Almost all these groups of speeches lie within one of the traditional books: an exception is the sequence XXI. 531-89-XXII. 8-20, where the speeches are: Priam—Agenor—(583-89) ||—Apollo (8-13)—Achilles. The larger compositions are also usually contained within a book; but the Deception of Zeus runs on from XIV. 190 to XV. 217, and XIV. 1-146 is in structure a prelude to this. And the Fight by the River in XXI is structurally included in the Battle of the Gods (XX. 1-514), of which XXI. 394-513 is the epilogue. On the other hand, a traditional 'book' usually includes two or more schemes of speeches, and sometimes a prologue which lies outside them all.

Date of the Speeches. At what stage in the growth of the Epic were speeches—and especially the groups of speeches—introduced? Limiting factors are as follows:

1 The frequent bouts of silent fighting, which sometimes occur within a composition, and sometimes interrupt it,1 are clearly drawn from a store of mere narrative, which must be assumed

1 Examples are:—XII. 329-42; 370-407; XIII. 332 ff.; 487 ff.; XIV. 489 ff.; XV. 301-43; 583-660; 673-725; XVI. 275-419; 569-607; XX. 393-418; 453-593.
to be prior, if not primitive, though continuously supplemented from local and personal sources.

(2) On the other hand, the most elaborate constructions are in the essential episodes of the poems—e.g. Books I. IX. XVIII. XXII. XXIV. Note, however, the sequence of ten in the Fight by the River (XX. 214–380).

(3) But much of the structure of the Iliad is on a rather small scale, in comparison with the Odyssey, where the larger composition of the whole poem is itself pedimental. The Deception of Zeus in XV and its sequel in XV, contain nothing larger than pentads, and the Battle of the Gods in XX consists of loosely linked triplets and couples, whereas the human interlude 354–504 contains seven speeches, including an irregular pentad (376–454).

(4) That the larger structure of the Iliad is of the same general type, has been already indicated in JHS LII. 280 (fig. 7); that some of its more tangled episodes have symmetry, in p. 278 (fig. 6); and that Book I, commonly supposed to be 'early', and Book XXIV, reputed to be 'late', are most intimately balanced, in p. 256 (fig. 8): both exhibit elaborate structure among their very numerous speeches—I has 36, XXIV has 45.

(5) The Lay of Dolon (X), sometimes considered (like XXIV) to be 'late', is fully provided with speeches, both in the night-adventure itself and in its elaborate prelude; yet at the end, Dolon's arms are dedicated to Athena silently (X. 570–3).

(6) The Destruction of the Wall (XII. 1–33) is outside the construction, and adjacent to much silent fighting (XII. 80–161, 173–210, 255–64, 278–90). The Building of the Wall only appears in an epilogue (VII. 446–63). Yet the long Battle at the Wall includes many structural episodes, as well as bouts of silent fighting.

(7) Only in XXIV. 334–467 is there the artifice of 'change-of-lead' between question and answer, which is characteristic of the pedimental stichomythia of Aeschylus. This may mark a terminal phase of development within the Epic.

(8) But at present the only conclusion to be drawn from the study of the speeches, is that Iliad and Odyssey stand rather close together in the handling of this class of material; and that in some parts of the Iliad, especially between XI and XIX, there is greater use of unschematised narrative, and less mastery of pedimental composition than in others, and than in the Odyssey. In the Odyssey, nevertheless, there are whole episodes devoid of speeches; and the Laestrygonian story is built on a structure of five speech-words.

This homogeneity of literary form, and this powerful instrument for articulation and memorisation, offer a fresh argument in favour of single authorship for the poems essentially as we have them. Though it is unlikely that early recitals of great deeds were without rhetorical and dramatic element, especially when they formed part of religious ceremonies—like the precursors of Attic tragedy—it may be that this artifice as a systematic structure may be one of those 'novelties', to which Miss Lorimer has lately drawn attention as characteristic of the latest phase of epic composition, which is another way of referring to a 'personal Homer'. And the more ambitious construction of the Odyssey as a whole, in any event, appears as a further and presumably subsequent development in that 'personal Homer's' art.

That in both poems there should be passages to which this rhetorical and schematic artifice has not been applied—or only partially applied—is, moreover, only what should be expected in so gigantic an enterprise.

**Detailed Structure and Analysis of Iliad I–XXIV**

In what follows, the speeches in the Iliad are set out in their structural relations, by the names of the speakers. Usually these triads or pentads do not occupy more than one line of print: where they do, the centre-piece (always in italic type) is printed lower than the ends. A few of the more impressive compositions, however, are set out more fully, as in the previous paper on the Odyssey (JHS LXXII).

In Book I there are two main episodes, the Quarrel (54–224), preceded by a prologue (1–42) and followed by an epilogue (252–303); and the Counsel of Zeus (321–594), a single composition, with brief prologue and epilogue (321–44, 573–94); but interrupted by the brief Visit to Chryse with a single couplet (442–56).

**BOOK I (a). THE QUARREL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prologue</th>
<th>Chryses to Agamemnon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17–21</td>
<td>Chryses to Agamemnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26–32</td>
<td>Chryses to Apollo 37–42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Debate

59-67 Achilles (as vassal) to Agamemnon

74-80 Calchas to Achilles (asks for protection)
85-91 Achilles to Calchas (protection granted)
93-100 Calchas to Agamemnon (restore Chryseis)

105-20 Agamemnon to Calchas (he will restore Chryseis)
122-29 Achilles to Agamemnon (reparation later)
131-47 Agamemnon to Achilles (reparation now)
149-71 Achilles to Agamemnon (he will go home)
173-87 Agamemnon to Achilles (he will take Briseis)

202-5 Achilles to Athena (threatens violence)
207-14 Athena to Achilles (dissuades)
216-8 Achilles to Athena (consents)

225-44 Achilles (renounces allegiance) to Agamemnon

Epilogue

254-84 Nestor [digression 259-74] to Agamemnon 275 and Achilles 277
286-91 Agamemnon to Nestor
293-303 Achilles to Nestor (warning)

The Quarrel is one of the most elaborate constructions in the Iliad. The Prologue (17-42) is exactly balanced by the Epilogue (254-303), in which Agamemnon again makes appeasement impossible, and Achilles, like Chryses, can only appeal elsewhere. The centre-piece (106-87) states the issue: Agamemnon must have reparation now, and at the expense of Achilles, whose proposal is rejected. This stands between the appeal of Calchas for protection from violence, granted by Achilles (85-91) and the threat of violence by Achilles himself; averted by Athena (207-14); all enframed by the contrast of Achilles as vassal (59-67) and as rebel (225-44).

BOOK I (b). THE COUNSEL OF ZEUS

322-5 Agamemnon to Talbybius
334-44 Achilles to Heralds (surrenders Briseis)

352-6 Achilles to Theis
362-3 Thetis to Achilles
365-412 Achilles to Theis (long speech)
414-27 Thetis to Achilles

442-5 [ Odysseus to Chryses: 451-6 Chryses to Apollo ]

503-10 Thetis to Zeus
(Zeus is silent)
514-6 Thetis to Zeus (central)
518-27 Zeus to Thetis
(Zeus nods and thunders)

540-3 Hera to Zeus (asks for information)
545-50 Zeus to Hera (refuses)
551-9 Hera to Zeus (Thetis has been here)
561-7 Zeus to Hera (warning)

573-83 Hephaestus to Hera (be patient) } balances 321-44
587-94 Hephaestus to Hera (warning)

The Counsel of Zeus (322-594) is a single large composition, between a prologue (321-44) and an epilogue (573-94) comparing the position on earth and in Olympus. The centre-piece, the converse of Thetis with Zeus (505-27), stands between her visit to Achilles (352-437) and the altercation of Hera with Zeus (540-67) which stresses the significance of Thetis in the whole story. This broad scheme, however, is interrupted by the Mission to Chryse, with two speeches (442-56) a far echo of the Prelude (17-42) binding the two halves of Book I together. Its precise position announces to Achaean and Olympus alike that the Plague is over and the Quarrel has begun: it also fills the interval till the return of the gods from Ocean (425, 493-6).
BOOK II. THE DREAM OF AGAMEMNON

Prologue
8–15. Zeus to the Dream
23–34. Dream to Agamemnon

56–75. Agamemnon to Chiefs
79–83. Nestor (the army assembles)
110–41. Agamemnon to the army
157–65. Hera to Athena
173–81. Athena to Odysseus
190–7. Odysseus (praise)
200–6. Odysseus (blame)
215–42. Thersites
240–64. Odysseus to Thersites
272–7. Thersites about Thersites
284–332. Odysseus to Agamemnon (speech of Calchas 323–9)
337–68. Nestor
370–93. Agamemnon to Chiefs

Epilogue
412–18. Agamemnon to Zeus (reply to Dream’s message)
434–40. Nestor to Agamemnon

441 f. The Army assembles:—no speeches

This is a single composition, and regular. Around the crucial speech of Odysseus, blaming the army, stand the power of good, Hera and Athena, and the power for evil, Thersites and the fickle multitude. Nestor’s speeches (79–83, 337–68) are counterparts, like those of Agamemnon (56–75, 371–93); and the final speeches of Agamemnon and Nestor respond to those of Zeus and the Dream (8–34).

BOOK III. THE OATHS: THE REVIEW FROM THE WALL: THE DUEL OF PARIS AND MENELAUS

Prologue
39–57. Hector to Paris
59–75. Paris to Hector (proposes duel)
82–3. Agamemnon (stays the battle)
86–94. Hector (proposes truce)
97–110. Menelaus (agrees to fight Paris)

130–8. Iris to Helen
156–60. The Old Men on the Wall
172–80. Helen to Priam
182–90. Priam (on Agamemnon)
192–8. Priam (on Odysseus)
200–2. Helen (on Odysseus)
204–24. Antenor (on Odysseus and Menelaus)
226–7. Priam (on Aias)
229–40. Helen (on Aias)

239–8. Idaeus to Priam (summons)
276–91. Agamemnon to Zeus (sacrifice)
298–301. Τίς (confirming oaths)
304–9. Priam (farewell)
320–3. Τίς (prayer to Zeus)

351–4. Menelaus to Zeus (states his complaint)
365–8. Menelaus to Zeus (his broken sword)

Epilogue
390–4. Aphrodite to Helen (374 Aphrodite saves Paris)
399–412. Helen to Aphrodite
414–17. Aphrodite to Helen
428–96. Helen to Paris
438–46. Paris to Helen

450–61. Agamemnon (resumes the battle), cf. 82–3

The structure is symmetrical. Between the prelude, in which the truce is arranged, and the epilogue, where Paris and Helen are reunited (each of five speeches), stand Helen’s visit to the Wall (seven speeches, of which the three central are about Odysseus—between Agamemnon and Aias), and the oaths and duel, before and after the farewell of Priam (304–9) flanked by two anonymous comments (298–301, 320–3). The second speech of Menelaus, followed by the rescue of Paris by Aphrodite, is the counterpart of the summons of Idaeus, though this summons also
balances the summons of Iris to Helen. These three speeches may perhaps be regarded as stational
ducations, of which there are other examples.
The speech of Agamemnon at the end (456–61) belongs properly to Book III, and is the stational
counterpart of 82–3 in the prelude. Menelaus has already reappeared, seeking for Paris (449–54).

BOOK IV (a). PANDARUS BREAKS THE TRUCE

7–10 Zeus to Hera and Athena
25–9 Hera to Zeus
31–49 Zeus to Hera and Athena
51–67 Hera to Zeus
70–2 Zeus to Athena
82–4 τε (trouble is brewing) outside the composition
93–103 Athena to Pandarus 〈Menelaus is wounded 127–47〉
155–82 Agamemnon to Menelaus
184–7 Menelaus to Agamemnon
192–91 Agamemnon to Menelaus
193–7 Agamemnon to Thalnibius
204–7 Thalnibius to Machaon 〈Menelaus is tended 218–19〉

This double composition (7–72, 93–207) is bonded by the anonymous foreboding, when
Athena descends like a star; a stational punctuation (82–4).

BOOK IV (b). AGAMEMNON’S REVIEW

Prologue
234–9 Agamemnon (praise)
242–9 Agamemnon (blame)
257–64 (a) to Idomeneus
266–71 Idomeneus replies
285–91 to Aias, Telamonius and Oileus
303–9 (b) Nestor to his men
313–16 Agamemnon to Nestor
318–25 Nestor to Agamemnon
338–48 (c) to Menestheus
350–5 Odysseus replies
352–63 to Odysseus
376–400 (d) to Diomedes (long story)
404–10 Sthenelus
412–18 Diomedes
422–508 〈fighting: no speeches

Epilogue
509–13 Apollo to Trojans
514–16 〈Athena to Achaeans: reported
517–44 〈fighting: no speeches

Between Prologue (234–49) and Epilogue (509–514) there are four episodes of three speeches each, some
composite. In the Epilogue one of the two speeches is only reported (514–16); and there are long
bouts of silent fighting (422–508, 527–44). There is a general impression of lax and inferior con-
struction, eked out with stock combat-episodes.

BOOK V (a). THE PROWESS OF DIOMEDES

31–34 Athena to Ares

35–83 fighting without speeches
395–100 wounds Diomedes

102–5 Pandarus to Trojan
109–10 Diomedes to Sthenelus
115–20 Diomedes to Athena
124–32 Athena to Diomedes
171–8 Aeneas to Pandarus
186–216 Pandarus to Aeneas
218–28 Aeneas to Pandarus
230–8 Pandarus to Aeneas
243–50 Sthenelus to Diomedes
252–73 Diomedes to Sthenelus
277–9 Pandarus to Diomedes
284–5 Pandarus to Diomedes
287–9 Diomedes to Pandarus 〈Pandarus killed 290–6
329–33 Aeneas rescued by Aphrodite who is wounded 330
319–327 Sthenelus captures Aeneas’ horses.
BOOK V (b)

348–51 Diomedes to Aphrodite
359–62 Aphrodite to Ares (353–6, 720)
373–4 Dione to Aphrodite
376–80 Aphrodite to Dione
383–45 Dione to Aphrodite (long story)
421–5 Athena to Zeus
428–30 Zeus to Aphrodite

BOOK V (c)

440–2 Apollo to Diomedes (warning)
455–9 Apollo to Ares (to avenge Aphrodite)
464–9 Ares to Trojans

472–92 Sarpedon to Hector
529–32 Agamemnon to Achaean
541–60 Diomedes
601–6 Aeneas is fighting
608–6 Hector is fighting
633–46 Tlepolemus to Sarpedon
645–54 Sarpedon to Tlepolemus
684–93 Sarpedon to Hector

BOOK V (d)

714–18 Hera to Athena (arming and chariot)
757–63 Hera to Zeus (asks leave to enter battle)
765–6 Zeus to Hera (gives leave to against Ares)
787–91 Hera (as Stentor) to Achaean
800–13 Athena to Diomedes
815–24 Diomedes to Athena
826–34 Athena to Diomedes
832–35 Ares to Zeus (in Olympus)
889–98 Zeus to Ares
899–904 [no speech: Pacon is ordered (διώμεν, 899) to tend Ares]
907–9 Hera and Athena return to Olympus

The Process of Diomedes consists of four episodes, with Pandarus, Aeneas with Aphrodite, Aeneas again with Ares, and Ares alone, as antagonists. The structure of the first is regular: two outer groups of four speeches separated from the centre-piece of four by two couplets (115–32, 243–73) introducing the two supporters of Diomedes, Athena and Sthenelus. The centre-piece introduces Aeneas, who takes the place of Pandarus in the second episode. But Aeneas is displaced, without further speeches (297–327) by Aphrodite, whose return, wounded, to Olympus, furnishes a seven-speech composition of which the centre-piece is the triplet of Aphrodite and Dione (373–415) with a digression on patience under injuries which has no counterpart.

In the third episode, a triplet prologue puts Ares into the foreground (440–69), but nothing comes of this (till 592–5 and 691) and the six-speech composition begins and ends with Sarpedon (472–92, 648–86). In the centre-piece Hector is fighting without speaking (608–32), Aeneas reappears (541–60), and Agamemnon and Tlepolemus speak. Much of the narrative is speechless, and there are lists of killed and wounded (677–8, 705–7): it looks like a gathering of stock-anecdotes. In the fourth episode Hera and Athena support Diomedes, who wounds Ares (856–63) and drives him back to Olympus. Central is the couplet of Athena and Diomedes: before it, Hera encourages the Achaean; after it Athena displaces Sthenelus and helps Diomedes to wound Ares (835–63).

In Olympus, the triplet (714–66) in which Hera and Athena obtain leave to intervene is answered only by a couplet between Ares and Zeus (872–98); but Zeus orders Paion to heal Ares, so a speech is missing here; and the goddesses return in silence (907–9).

The whole book, and especially the latter part of it, is untidy work; but the pedimental design is evident, and the silent sections seem to be supplementary, like the long speech of Dione. Between Aeneas and Ares, there seem to be changes of plan.
BOOK VI. ENTITLED ‘HECTOR AND ANDROMACHE’

1–36 (fighting: lists 20–36: no speeches)

Prologue
46–50 Adrastus to Menelaus
55–60 Agamemnon to Menelaus (kill Adrastus)
67–71 Nestor to Achaean (do not take spoils)

The Suppliant Women
77–101 Helenus to Aeneas and Hector (proposes embassy)
111–15 Hector (concurs in embassy)
123–43 Diomedes to Glaukos (Lycurgus story)
145–511 Glaukos to Diomedes (Bellerophon story)
215–31 Diomedes to Glaukos
254–62 Hecuba to Hector
284–85 Hector to Hecuba
305–10 Theano’s prayer (centre)
326–31 Hector to Paris
333–41 Paris to Hector
344–58 Helen to Hector
360–6 Hector to Helen

Hector and Andromache
376–80 Hector to Andromache’s women
382–9 Stewardess to Hector
407–39 Andromache to Hector (advice)
441–65 Hector to Andromache
476–81 Hector to Antigone
496–93 Hector to Andromache
518–9 Paris to Hector
521–9 Hector to Paris

VII. 1–16 (fighting: no speeches

The name-episode Hector and Andromache is not even central, and the structure of the whole book has been deranged. In its present form it is contained between two passages of inarticulate fighting, without speeches VI. 1–36 and VII. 1–16: the latter really belongs to VI. To the former succeed two small episodes, the Fate of Adrastus with two speeches (46–50, 55–60) and the single speech of Nestor. Both illustrate the growing tension which follows the divine encouragements in Book V: the code is to be strictly observed, as to prisoners and as to loot. Similarly, at the end, Paris is at last roused to come out and fight (two speeches: 518–9, 521–9). This, however, is not a mere epilogue, but the sequel of the visit of Hector to the home of Paris (four speeches: 326–68) wherein the centre-piece is the couplet between Helen and Hector which touches the heart of the Trojan tragedy.

But the Rousing of Paris took time, and the interval has been filled with the meeting of Hector and Andromache (three couplets), wherein the centre-piece brings these two face to face, like Helen and Hector already. Apart from the time lag above-noted, these two episodes are very close counterparts. Both illustrate on the Trojan side the growing tension and sense of imminent crisis.

This device for telling two stories at the same time is the clue to the earlier half of Book VI, and so to the structure of the whole. For the farewells of Hector to Helen and Andromache, were not the purpose of his return to the city; nor even his rousing of Paris, the last unexpended reserve of Troy. The centre-piece of the whole Book is the Prayer of Theano, and Athena’s unspoken refusal; and the earlier episode of which this is the outcome is a one-sided composition, in which the preliminaries to that refusal are to be balanced by Hector’s sole success, the rousing of Paris. Those preliminaries, too, needed time; and time is gained by the meeting of Diomedes and Glaukos, a regular triplet (123–231) enhanced by the pendant stories of Lycurgus and Bellerophon. This interlude is the structural counterpart of Hector’s meeting with Andromache. Tragically, the personal reconciliation—at whatever material cost—between Diomedes and Glaukos, is the human counterpart of what might have been—the reconciliation of Athena; for Helenus, if anyone, knew what was in the minds of the Gods,

βουλὴν, ἢ ἐκ θεοῦ ἐχθρὸν ἐφήμεραν μισσίωσι. (VII. 45)

BOOK VII (a). DUEL OF HECTOR AND AJAX. (b). GATHERING THE DEAD

1–16 (fighting: no speeches (conclusion of VI)

Prologue
24–32 Apollo to Athena
34–5 Athena to Apollo
38–42 Apollo to Athena (proposes a duel)

VOL. LXXIV.
(a) Duel of Hector and Ajax

47–53 Helenus to Hector (truce)
67–91 Hector to Trojans and Achaeans (challenge)
96–102 Menelaus (offers to fight)
109–19 Agamemnon (forbids Menelaus to fight)
124–60 Nestor (long story 132–60, Outside composition)
171–4 Nestor (proposes lots)
179–80 τίς: prayer to Zeus
191–9 Ajax (claims his lot) ← centre
202–5 τίς: prayer to Zeus
226–32 Ajax to Hector (boasting)
234–43 Hector to Ajax (boasting) ((duel 244–72)
279–82 Idaeus (stops the duel)
284–6 Ajax to Idaeus (Hector must begin)
288–302 Hector (proposes gifts) <303 gifts exchanged 313 feast

(b) Gathering the Dead

327–43 Nestor proposes to gather the dead
348–53 Antenor (give up Helen)
357–64 Paris (will give up spoil but not Helen)
368–76 Priam (offer these terms tomorrow) <night>
385–97 Idaeus (to Agamemnon)
400–2 Diomedes to Achaeans (refuse surrender of Helen)
406–11 Agamemnon to Idaeus (grants burial truce)
<417 burial begun 436 Wall

Epilogue

446–53 Poseidon to Zeus (complaint about the Wall)
455–63 Zeus to Poseidon (wait till the end)
<465 night: 467–75 market
479 <Zeus thunders all night>

The main composition, the Duel, is symmetrical, from the proposal by Helenus (47–53) to Nestor's proposal to gather the dead (327–44) which completes the symmetry beyond the two speeches of Hector (67–91, 298–302) in challenge and in appeasement. The centre-piece, between two anonymous prayers (179–80, 202–5) is where Ajax claims his lot (191–9).

Before this stands the Prologue, divine initiation of the duel (24–42, three speeches). After it, between Nestor's proposal (327–44) and the actual burial (without speeches) is a short but regular composition, The Debate in Troy, the offer of Paris to surrender the spoils but not Helen (348–78), the refusal of these terms by Agamemnon, and his grant of a burial-truce. This is consequent on the virtual defeat of Hector (270–2) and his offer of gifts (299) after the first encounter, and at first sight looks like an epilogue to the Duel.

But here there is a well-known anomaly, for together with the burial mound, the Achaeans built the famous Wall and Ditch. This roused Poseidon's wrath, and there follows a second Epilogue with two speeches (446–63 and night-long thunder from Zeus (479). Into this episode has further been intruded the Market on the Beach (467–75 without speeches).

Note throughout this book how the scheme of speeches overrides the sequence of the narrative. It is not the duel, but the choice of Ajax as champion that is central. Nestor's proposal is included in the main episode, and the offer of terms is spread over two days.

BOOK VIII. THE INTERRUPTED BATTLE (cf. JHS LII, 275–8, fig. 6)

Prologue in Olympus

5–27 Zeus to the Gods (refrain from battle)
31–37 Athena to Zeus (claims right to advise)
39–40 Zeus to Athena <41–77 Zeus goes to Mount Ida

Chariot Scene: Achaean retreat

80–86 <Nestor's horse>
93–6 Diomedes to Odysseus (to help Nestor)
102–11 Odysseus to Nestor
139–44 Nestor to Diomedes
146–50 Diomedes to Nestor
152–6 Nestor to Diomedes
161–6 Hector to Diomedes
173–82 Hector to Trojans
185–97 Hector to his horses

Centre-piece in Olympus: Agamemnon's Prayer

201–7 Hera to Poseidon (to fight)
209–11 Poseidon to Hera (caution)
228–44 Agamemnon to Zeus <Zeus sends eagle
281–91 Agamemnon to Teucer
293–9 Teucer to Agamemnon <Teucer wounded 328>

<75 thunder
<133 thunder
<170 thunder

<Zeus sends eagle
<Teucer wounded 328>
Chariot scene
352–6 Hera to Athena (to go to battle)
358–80 Athena to Hera <381 they go out
399–408 Zeus to Iris
413–24 Iris to Hera and Athena (to return)
427–31 Hera to Athena (let Zeus decide)

Epilogue in Olympus
448–56 Zeus to Hera and Athena
462–68 Hera to Zeus (claims right to advise)
470–83 Zeus to Hera (foretells his Counsel)
<486 night
497–51 Hector to Trojans <camp by shore 555–65

From an earlier analysis (JHS LII, 274) the sequence of episodes is here superposed on that of the speeches, showing how the incidents are punctuated by signs from Zeus. These are, however, not quite balanced: the first thunder (75) and the weighing of destinies (69) having no counterpart except the mission of Iris (399–408).

Central in structure and turning-point in the action is the prayer of Agamemnon (228–44) instigated by Hera and Poseidon (201–7) and followed by the momentary success of Teucer (281–99). His wounding by an arrow (328) recalls the fate of Nestor’s horse (80–6), but does not exactly balance it. The two chariot-scenes, however (80–111, 352–431), are counterparts, like the claims of Athena (31–7) and Hera (462–8) to aid by advice. The whole composition begins and ends with Zeus dominant in Olympus; and the night-encampment, with one speech from Hector as an interlude.

BOOK IX. THE EMBASSY

Prologue
17–28 Agamemnon to chiefs (advises retreat)
32–49 Diomedes to Agamemnon (he will stay). Cf. 697–709
53–76 Nestor to Diomedes
80–95 <guards set: feast
96–113 Nestor to Agamemnon (advises embassy)
115–61 Agamemnon to Nestor
163–72 Nestor to Agamemnon (send Briseis)

The Embassy <Embassy starts 183
197–8 Achilles to Embass
202–4 Achilles to Patroclus

<feast
205–23
227–306 Odysseus to Achilles
308–429 Achilles to Odysseus
434–605 Phoenix to Achilles [Meleager story 529–99]
607–19 Achilles to Phoenix
624–42 Ajax to Odysseus (Achilles is in the wrong 632–6)
644–55 Achilles to Ajax (conditional refusal)
656–68 <Achilles and Patroclus sleep: no speeches: cf. 905–93

Epilogue
673–5 Agamemnon to Odysseus (what will Achilles do?)
678–92 Odysseus to Agamemnon (Achilles will go home)
697–709 Diomedes to Agamemnon (ignore Achilles and fight again): cf. 32–49

The structure is regular and balanced, except that the Prologue is more elaborate than the Epilogue, and there is no farewell speech from Achilles in the Embassy after 655, as counterpart to his welcome (197–224). He had intended that the Embassy should stay as his guests till morning (620–2), so the departure is the more abrupt. This is the frequent device of shortening the narrative to quicken the closing movement of a long composition. In the centre-piece, the speech of Phoenix has been over-lengthened by the story of Meleager (529–99).

BOOK X. THE LAY OF DOLON

Prologue. (1) 37–71; (2) 80–136
37 Menelaus 43 Agamemnon 61–3 Menelaus 65 Agamemnon
82 Nestor 87 Agamemnon 103 Nestor 120 Agamemnon 129 Nestor

The Night Council: five episodes
130 (Nestor φθορῆσαν) 141–2 Odysseus 144–7 Nestor
159–61 Nestor 164–7 Diomedes 169–76 Nestor
192–3 to guards 204–17 to chiefs ← centre-piece
220–6 Diomedes 234–9 Agamemnon 242–7 Diomedes
249–55 Odysseus 278–82 Odysseus to Athena 284–94 Diomedes to Athena
This Book consists of two parts, the Night-Council of Achaeans, at which the adventure of Diomedes and Odysseus is arranged, and the Adventure of Dolon with the Slaying of Rhesus as a result of Dolon's treachery. There is a double prelude (1-130), and the second part has an epilogue (532-79). But as the first prelude is twofold (1-71, 72-136), the Slaying of Rhesus (469-521) should be regarded as an inner epilogue (and counterpart of 72-136); and is so noted in the diagram. Thus the absence of epilogue after 296 is explained, and the scene between Hector and Dolon becomes the centre-piece to the whole composition.

The Night-Council, dominated by Nestor, consists of a centre-piece (192-217) in which Nestor proposes action, between pairs of triplets, introducing Odysseus and Diomedes, and developing the project of Diomedes, with Odysseus as his comrade. The Adventure of Dolon is a single spacious dialogue, with Dolon's treachery at its centre (401-11).

In the Slaying of Rhesus there are only two speeches (477-81, 509-11), but Hippocon warned by Apollo, πέπυκας τ' ὑμηθαντε ἀπαθώς, and this unrecorded speech completes the triplet.

What is notable in Book X, which has been regarded as loosely connected with the rest of the Iliad, is that its structure is strictly and elaborately pedimented. This must be taken into account in considering the place of this literary device in the composition of the poem.

**BOOK XI. THE PROWESS OF AGAMEMNON**

*This Book might be better entitled the Wounding of the Chiefs*

**Prologue:** no speeches

1-36 The arming of Agamemnon 59-66 Hector and other Trojans
67-89 Comparison of forces 84-130 silent fighting

**The Wounding of Agamemnon**

131-5 Peisander to Agamemnon 138-42 Agamemnon to Peisander
163 Τρωις τοῖς ἓντες ἐπέστησαν 218 Ίταλος ἐπέστηκαν 299 The Trojans retreat to the city
186-94 Zeus to Iris (to warn Hector) 200-9 Iris to Hector
218 Ισχυρός ἐπέστηκαν 299 Invocation to Muses: silent slaughter
248-55 Κρίνω τοῖς ἓντες 305-9 Κρίνω τοῖς ἓντες 250-5 Agamemnon to chiefs (to carry on) 305-9 Agamemnon retires 263-79

**The Wounding of Diomedes**

286-90 Hector 299 invocation to Hector: list of fallen
313-5 Odysseus to Diomedes
317-19 Diomedes to Odysseus
396-60 The fighting: Zeus intervenes 401 Hector arrives
362-67 Diomedes to Hector (fails to wound him)
380-3 Paris wounds Diomedes
396-95 Diomedes to Paris 401 Diomedes retires: Odysseus alone 301

**The Wounding of Odysseus**

404-10 Odysseus (alone) 408-3 Socs to Odysseus
411-5 Odysseus to Socs (kills him)
301-5 to Socs (dead)

**The Wounding of Machaon**

465-71 Menelaus to Ajax (to help Odysseus)
450-5 Paris wounds Machaon: no speech
511-15 Idomeneus to Nestor (carry off Machaon)
523-30 Cebryones to Hector
544 Ζεύς ἡμέρας ἐπικάριος: long fighting

1 Casualty list following Zeus' inarticulate intervention may indicate an 'undeveloped' interpolation.
XI. The Prowess of Agamemnon.

The title-episode, interrupted by the wounding of Agamemnon, only occupies ll. 1–283. The arming-scene, without speeches (1–130), is followed by one couplet (Peisander–Agamemnon 131–42) and a speechless rout of the Trojans; then by a couplet (Zeus–Iris 186–209) warning Hector to bide his time; then Agamemnon, wounded by Coön without speech—the counterpart of Peisander’s end—orders the Achaeans to carry on, and himself retires.

The remainder of the book consists of episodes, in which Agamemnon, Diomedes, Odysseus, Machaon, and Euryalus are wounded—three of them by Paris—and finally Patroclus is introduced (604–41) in a more formal composition; and sent by Achilles to Nestor for news. This is the beginning of the tragedy of Patroclus, which only ends with the rescue of his body in Book XVII.

The second episode (286–401) contains six speeches; the centre-piece is the arrival of Hector and the intervention of Zeus (335); but the wounding of Diomedes by Paris follows the fourth speech, and effects his withdrawal, already planned by Zeus. In the third episode (401–62), which is central, Odysseus is left alone, and is wounded. The fourth (465–562) brings Menelaus and Idomeneus to help Odysseus and Nestor; but the speech of Cebriones to Hector is another episode, and is followed by long fighting, mainly around Ajax. Finally, a well-constructed episode with eight speeches brings news to Achilles, through Patroclus, who thus begins his tragic career.

BOOK XII. THE FIGHT AT THE WALL

Prologue

1–33 The Fate of the Wall: no speeches

The Advice of Polydamas


164–72 Aias to Zeus (in vain: Zeus favours Hector)

211–29 Polydamas to Hector (retire)

231–50 Hector to Polydamas <253> omen of wind

269–76 Aias (encourages Achaeans)

The Prowess of Sarpedon

310–21 Sarpedon to Glauclus <278> omen of shower of stones

343–50 Menestheus to Thoítés (calls for help)

354–63 Thoítés to Aias

366–9 Aias to A. Oileus (to help Menestheus)

409–12 Sarpedon to Lycians <fighting

Epilogue

440–2 Hector to Trojans: cf. XIII. 150–5

<fighting at the Wall>

This Book contains two distinct pedimental episodes (164–276, 310–412), both interrupted by bouts of fighting (80–162, 326–42, 378, 381, 442–71). The Fate of the Wall is a loose prologue; Hector’s speech an epilogue, both with more silent fighting.

BOOK XIII. THE FIGHT AT THE SHIPS

<Zeus looks north: Poseidon, disguised, enters the battle

Poseidon disguised

47–58 Poseidon 68–75 Ajax Oileus 95–124 Aias T.

150–4 Hector (attacking on the left)


Idomeneus and Meriones

249–53 Idomeneus 255–8 Meriones 260–5 Idomeneus

267–73 Meriones to Idomeneus

275–94 Idomeneus 307–10 Meriones 312–27 Idomeneus
Idomeneus and Deiphobus 347 l. Zeus intervenes
374-82 Idomeneus to Othrysoneus <387-92 fighting
414-16 Deiphobus (kills Hyrenor)
423-44 <fighting 434 Poseidon helps Idomeneus
440-54 Idomeneus to Deiphobus
493-7 Deiphobus to Aeneas
481-6 Idomeneus to Meriones and Antilochus
527-619 <fighting: no speeches

Aias and Hector
620-39 Menelaus to Peisander's comrades
<long fighting 675 fresh start on left
726-47 Polydmas 751-3 Hector
769-73 Hector to Paris 775-87 Paris to Hector
812-20 Ajax to Hector 824-32 Hector to Aias

Four separate episodes with regular schemes of speeches are interrupted by bouts of silent fighting. The isolated speech of Menelaus may mark the place for another such episode.

BOOK XIV. THE DECEPTION OF ZEUS

The full setting of this episode and the Awakening of Zeus in Book XV, begins far back with Poseidon's intervention (XIII. 47-58, 229-30, 292-8, 347) and does not end till Apollo restores Hector to the battle (XV. 280) for the attack on the ships (343-6). Both the Deception and the Awakening are interpolated in the continuous narrative of Poseidon's rally of the Achaean. The first episode rallies the Achaean leaders wounded and withdrawn in Book XI, and Poseidon restores them to action.

A. Prelude. The Wounded Leaders.
   3-8 Nestor to Machaon (he will return to battle)
   42-51 Agamemnon to Nestor (disconsolate): cf. XIII. 811-30
   53-69 Nestor to Agamemnon (keep out of the battle)
   [but XIII. 812-20 Agamemnon was speaking to Hector]
   65-81 Agamemnon to Nestor (prepare to embark)
   89-102 Odysseus to Agamemnon (rebukes him)
   104-8 Agamemnon to Odysseus (what alternative?)
   110-32 Diomedes to Agamemnon (return to battle)
   139-46 Poseidon (disguised) to Agamemnon (leads to attack)
   <Poseidon shouts: Hera sees him [contd. 364

B. The Deception of Zeus begins with three regular episodes of five speeches, wherein the oath of Hera counts as spoken (278-99), but note that the counterpart episode (XV. 104-41) has only four speeches.

C. Poseidon in Battle, with six speeches: central is the couplet for Polydmas and Ajax (433-74) preceded by the advance led by Poseidon (387-429) and the wounding of Hector. At the close (508) an invocation to the Muses introduces a long list of encounters.

* A. The Wounded Leaders return (see above)
   3-8 Nestor 42-52 Agamemnon 52-63 Nestor
   66-82 Agamemnon (prepare to embark) 83-102 Odysseus
   104-8 Agamemnon 110-32 Diomedes (rebukes him)
   139-46 Poseidon

B. The Deception of Zeus
   190-2 Hera 194-6 Aphrodite 198-210 Hera 212-3 Aphrodite 219-22 Aphrodite
   293-41 Hera 243-62 Hypnos 264-8 Hera 271-6 Hypnos 278-9 <Hera swears>
   298-9 Zeus 301-11 Hera 313-28 Zeus to Hera 330-40 Hera 342-5 Zeus

C. The Wounding of Hector: Poseidon in the Battle¹
   337-60 Hypnos to Poseidon 364-77 Poseidon to Achaean
   402-47 Ajax wounds Hector: no speech: cf. XV. 221-35
   454-7 Polydmas to Polydmas 479-84 Ajax to Polydmas <centre
   479-85 Acaen to Achaean 501-5 Peneleos to Trojans
   506 <Achaean rout
   508 <Invocation to Muses: cf. XVI. 112
   509 <Long list of heroes: Ajax still central

¹ In this section six speeches are in three pairs.
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BOOK XV. THE REPULSE FROM THE SHIPS

B'. The Awakening of Zeus: counterpart to XIV. 190–356

14–33 Zeus 36–46 Hera 90–1 Themis 93–9 Hera
104–12 Hera to Gods 115–8 Ares 128–41 Athena 146–8 Hera to Iris and Apollo

C'. The Healing of Hector: counterpart of XIV. 3–146, 357–509

221–35 Zeus to Apollo (restore Hector) 244–5 Apollo to Hector
247–52 Hector to Apollo
254–61 Apollo to Hector (restores him) 286–99 Thoas to Achaeans
300–96 long fight without speeches 327–42 list of names

These two episodes form a continuous composition with Book XIV: A, B, C, B', C'. The side-panels A and C being linked by their themes of returning leaders, and C, while related to C', being the central though transitory achievement of the intervention of Poseidon which links A with C.

BOOK XV (contd.). THE REPULSE FROM THE SHIPS

Hector orders the attack on the Ships

347–51 Hector to Trojans 372–6 Nestor to Zeus
377 Zeus thunders
399–404 Patroclus to Eurytius 425–9 Hector to Trojans

The Prowess of Ajax and Teucer (centre-piece)

437–41 Ajax 467–70 Teucer 472–7 Ajax

The Attack on the Ships

486–99 Hector to Trojans
502–13 Ajax to Achaeans 533–8 Hector to Melaippeus 561–4 Ajax
569–71 Menelaus to Antilochus (killed 576)
583–91 Hector counterattacks
592 long fight: no speeches
599 The prayer of Thetis is fulfilled

Epilogue. Fire on the Ships

661–6 Nestor to Achaeans
677 Ajax and the ship-spear 688 Trojans retire long fight 694 Zeus helps Hector
717–25 Hector to Trojans: calls for fire (centre-piece)
733–41 Ajax to Danaans.

The latter half of Book XV, from which it takes its title, is composed of three panels of speeches; followed by much silent fighting, and an Epilogue, also broken by long fighting, so that the last two speeches (717–41) form a pair of exhortations. The statement that the Prayer of Thetis is now fulfilled (599) is embedded in long narrative, as it were a note for further elaboration. This is one of the clearest examples of the partial superposition of speech-structure on bouts of silent fighting (592–660, 667–716). The first episode has only two speeches (372–404), but the thunder of Zeus is central, and seems to count as speech.

In the larger structure, Book XV is the counterpart of XIII the Fight at the Ships, which has similar loose construction, and joins with it to fill the interval between the departure of Patroclus (XI. 606–841) and his return to Achilles XVI. 2; while it is itself bisected by the Deception and Awakening; and these are separated by Poseidon in Battle.

BOOK XVI. PATROCLUS

The Armring of Patroclus

7–19 Achilles to Patroclus
21–45 Patroclus to Achilles (may he fight?)
49–100 Achilles to Patroclus
112 Invocation to Muses: fire on ships
126–9 Achilles to Patroclus (he sees fire on ships): — Patroclus shall arm (cf. 131–9)
155 Myrmidons called out
200–9 Achilles to Myrmidons
233–48 Patroclus to Zeus
264–74 Patroclus to Myrmidons
275–419 long fight: no speeches
The Prows of Patroclus

422-481 → Patroclus wounds Sarpedon
492-501 → (Patroclus wounds Sarpedon)
492-501 → Sarpedon "dies" to Glauces
492-501 → Glauces to Apollo
350-47 → Glauces to Hector (save Sarpedon's arms)
556-61 → Patroclus to Ajax (seize Sarpedon's arms)
569-607 → Patroclus to Ajax (fighting without speeches)
617-80 → Aeneas to Meriones
620-5 → Meriones to Aeneas
627-31 → Patroclus to Meriones (fighting without speeches)
658-5 → Patroclus carries off Sarpedon's arms
667-75 → Zeus to Apollo (send Sleep and Death)
676-83 → Apollo sends Sarpedon's body to Lycia

The Death of Patroclus.

707-9 → Apollo to Patroclus (warns him to retire)
721-5 → Apollo to Hector (to fight Patroclus)
743-4 → (Patroclus kills Cebriones)
745-50 → Patroclus (about Cebriones)
789-817 → (Apollo disarms Patroclus: Euphorbus wounds him 807)
830-42 → Hector to Patroclus
844-54 → Patroclus to Hector (Patroclus dies 855)
859-61 → Hector to Patroclus

The composition of Book XVI is simple: three regular episodes, of seven, eleven, and six speeches. But though Sarpedon is wounded in 481 he does not die till 505, and the remainder of the episode is concerned with the capture of his arms, by the help of Ajax (556-61). The appeal of Patroclus (556-61) is central; the triplet about Glauces (492-547) is balanced by that about Meriones (611-31) before the arms are carried off; and the couplet for Zeus and Hera (432-5, 440-57), by the deliberation of Zeus, and his single speech to Apollo (667-75), fulfilling (683) the request of Hera (453-6).

But this composition is interrupted by a long bout of silent fighting (569-607) and by another in which Zeus makes up his mind (644-56), and there is no final counterpart to the opening speech of Sarpedon (422-5) except the silent intervention of Apollo (676-82).

BOOK XVII. THE PROWESS OF MENELAUS

1-60 → Death of Euphorbus, who had first wounded Patroclus
12-17 → Menelaus 14-32
34-42 → Euphorbus 34-42

The Arrival of Hector

75-81 → Apollo (as Mentes) to Hector (pairing the horses): cf. 327-32
91-105 → Menelaus (soliloquy): 120-122 to Ajax: cf. 236-45
130-2 → Hector carries off the arms of Patroclus
134-7 → Ajax covers the body
142-68 → Glauces to Hector (reproaches)
170-82 → Hector to Glauces
184-7 → Hector to Trojans (to wait till he renews)
188-97 → Hector goes to rearm
201-7 → Zeus to Hector (he will not be allowed to return home)
210-14 → Hector rears
220-32 → Hector to Trojans (offers reward for death of Ajax)
236-45 → Ajax to Menelaus: Menelaus to Ajax (cf. 91-105)
256-318 → long fighting (balances 142-182)
327-42 → Apollo (as Peryphas) to Aeneas (to encourage)
335-41 → Aeneas to Hector
415-19 → long fighting (401-2 Achilles still ignorant)

The Rescue of the Horses

426 → (the horses of Achilles)
437-55 → Zeus to the Horses
450-72 → Alcmena to Alcmena (who wishes to stay and fight)
475-80 → Hector to Aeneas (seeing horses retreat)
485-90 → Hector to Aeneas (see horses retreat)
501-6 → Alcmena to Alcmena
508-15 → Alcmena to Ajax and Menelaus
530-9 → Automedon to Aretus (spoils)

542 → Automedon and horses retire
THE STRUCTURE OF THE ILIAD

The Rescue of Patroclus’ Body.

543  <Zeus sends Athena to help Achaean>
556-6 Athena (as Phoenix) to Menelaus
301-6  Menelaus to Phoenix (Athene): rescue Patroclus’ body
586-90 Apollo (as Phaenops) to Hector
595  <Zeus thunders, favouring Trojans>
597-620  <fighting
621-2 Meriones to Idomeneus  <Idomeneus retires>
699-47 Ajax to Zeus (prays for light)  <Zeus favours Trojans

652-5 Aias to Menelaus
669-72 Menelaus to Aias and Meriones
665-93  Menelaus to Antiochus (sent to Achilles)
769-14 Menelaus to Aias
716-21 Aias to Menelaus

722  <they carry off Patroclus
748-61  <in their absence, the Achaean are defeated>

XVII. This book only partly celebrates Menelaus, who recurs with Aias between other episodes and miscellaneous fighting. The death of Euphorbus (1-60) is the sequel of XVI. The long withdrawal and rearming of Hector centres on the warning of Zeus (201-7) between two interventions of Apollo (75-81, 327-32) and dialogues of Menelaus and Aias: the dialogue of Glaucus and Hector (142-82) is uncompensated; and the speech of Aeneas (335-41) marks the return of Hector, and a long struggle ends with a pair of anonymous speeches (415-22), recalling attention to the struggle for the body of Patroclus.

The Rescue of the Horses (423-542) is a regular composition, centred on the speech of Hector to Aeneas, a remote counterpart of Aeneas’ words (335-41).

The Rescue of the Body consists of two balanced compositions of five speeches (556-647, 652-721), the first broken by a sign from Zeus (595) and a spell of fighting (597-620); the second centred on Antiochus’ message to Achilles (685-93) which prepares for the actual rescue (722) and the rout of the Achaean (748-61).

Thus the larger structure shows the struggle for the body of Patroclus, interrupted centrally by the rescue of the horses; and some confused fighting (342-422). But the message to Hector (327-41) might have led to something more significant.

BOOK XVIII. THE MAKING OF THE ARMOUR

Prologue
6-14 Achilles (alone)  <18-21 Antiochus (news)>
33  <Achilles ϕωκευ (Thetis hears)>
52-64 Thetis to Nereids  73-7 Thetis to Achilles
95-6  Thetis to Achilles (prophecy)
96-126 Achilles to Thetis 126-37 Thetis to Achilles
138-64  <struggle for body of Patroclus>
140-4 Thetis to Nereids  <Thetis to Olympus
138, 145-7>

Achilles Shoots
170-80 Iris to Achilles  182 Achilles to Iris
184-6  Iris to Achilles  188-93 Achilles to Iris (no arms)
197-201 Iris to Achilles (‘shout’)  
263-42  <Achilles shouts: Patroclus rescued 231-37
285-309 Hector to Polydamas to Hector
324-42  Achilles to Myrmidons
357-9 Zeus to Hera  361-7 Hera to Zeus
369  <Thetis enters Olympus>

Thetis and Hephasteus
385-7 Charis to Thetis  392 Charis to Hephasteus
394-403  Hephasteus to Charis  to Thetis
424-7  <the making of the armour
492-67 Thetis to Hephasteus (her request)  463-7 Hephasteus
468-617  <the making of the armour>

XVIII. This book—apart from the description of the armour—is one of the most regular in construction. The prelatory speeches of Achilles and Antiochus are supplemented to a triad when Achilles ϕωκευ (35) and Thetis hears. The counterpart-epilogue is XIX. 1-36. Her reception of the news centres on her prophecy of Achilles’ death (95-5). The centre-piece in which Achilles emerges, and shouts though unarmed, centres on his reappearance and the rescue of Patroclus (203-42). The counterpart to his colloquy with Iris (170-201) is the reaction among the Trojans
(254–307) the Myrmidons (329–42) and the Gods (359–67). The visit to Olympus balances the visit to Hephaestus; and the description of the armour has its own symmetry, for which see my *Who Were the Greeks?*, 1930, pp. 377–79.

BOOK XIX. THE END OF THE FEUD

Epilogue to XVIII
7–11 Thetis to Achilles (gives him the arms)
21–7 Achilles to Thetis
29–36 Thetis to Achilles

Reconciliation
56–73 Achilles to Agamemnon
76–144 Agamemnon to chiefs (story of Heracles)
146–53 Achilles to Agamemnon
155–83 Odysseus to Achilles
185–97 *Agamemnon to Odysseus (Agamemnon will swear)*
199–214 Achilles to Agamemnon
216–37 Odysseus to Achilles
238–65 *Agamemnon (oath)*
270–5 Achilles ( oath)
287–300 Briseis to Patroclus
305–8 Achilles to chiefs (refuses to eat)
315–37 Achilles’ (lament)
342–8 Zeus to Athena (gives food to Achilles)
400–3 Achilles to horses (Achilles rears 364
408–17 Xanthus (horse) to Achilles
420–3 Achilles to Xanthus

The epilogue to the Arms 1–36 balances XVIII. 1–35. The centre-point of the *Reconciliation* is Agamemnon’s promise (185–97) not the actual oaths (258–75). The double scene which follows (287–423) is epilogue to the whole story of Patroclus and the Feud, and reconciles Achilles to the Gods (341–8).

BOOK XX. THE BATTLE OF THE GODS. (A)

1–12 <Zeus bids Themis summon the Gods>
16–18 Prologue. Poseidon to Zeus 20–30 Zeus to Poseidon
31–74 <list of gods on either side>
85–102 Apollo (as Lycaon) to Aeneas 87–102 Aeneas 104–9 Apollo
115–31 Hera to Poseidon and Athena 133–43 Poseidon to Hera

Achilles and Aeneas
178–98 Achilles to Aeneas 200–58 Aeneas to Achilles (pedigree)
<long fighting: cf. 344–52
293–308 Poseidon to Gods 310–7 Hera 332–9 Poseidon
344–52 Achilles to Aeneas (saved by Poseidon)
354–63 Epilogue. Achilles to Achaean 366–72 Hector to Trojans

Achilles and Hector
376–8 Apollo (warns Hector) 389–92 Achilles (to Iphition)
399–418 <long fighting>
425–9 Achilles to Hector 431–7 Hector to Achilles
435 <Athena diverts Hector’s spear: Apollo saves Hector>
449–54 Achilles to Hector
<more fighting>

The *Battle of the Gods* must be studied with its sequel the *Battle by the River*; for the centre-piece is the futile encounter of Achilles and Hector (XX. 354–455) and all that precedes is a complex alternation of divine interventions with the encounter of Achilles and Aeneas, preliminary to the formal challenges of Achilles and Hector (425–37), who are not yet allowed to fight in earnest.

BOOK XXI. THE BATTLE BY THE RIVER

1–33 <more killing by the river>

Lycaon and Asteropaeus
54–63 Achilles (seeing Lycaon)
74–96 Lycaon to Achilles
99–113 Achilles to Lycaon
122–35 Achilles to Lycaon (dead)
150–1 Achilles to Asteropaeus
153–60 Asteropaeus to Achilles
184–99 Achilles to Asteropaeus (dead)
205–10 <more killing>
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Achilles and Scamander
214–21 Scamander to Achilles
222–26 Achilles to Scamander
229–32 Scamander to Apollo (river-fight)
247–53 Achilles to Zeus
288–97 Poseidon to Zeus
308–29 Scamander to Simois
Hera to Hephaestus
357–60 Scamander to Hephaestus
379–80 Hera to Hephaestus

The Battle of the Gods. (B)
364–99 Ares to Athena
410–4 Athena to Ares
420–22 Hera to Athena
448–33 Athena to Ares and Aphrodite
456–60 Poseidon to Apollo
462–7 Apollo to Poseidon
472–7 Artemis to Apollo
481–88 Hera to Artemis
498–501 Hermes to Lato
509–10 Zeus to Artemis
512–3 Artemis to Zeus

This book, of which the Scamander fight is only the centre-piece, begins and ends with exploits of Achilles, which run on into Book XXII. It is also a sequel to the Battle of the Gods, with a formal tripartite composition (383–525), a counterpart to the affair of Lycaon and Asteropaeus (1–210) if that be regarded as the provocation to the Scamander. On the larger plan, the whole of Book XXI is the pendant to the earlier Battle of the Gods (XX. 1–352) before the futile encounter of Achilles and Hector (353–504) which—as its opening (354–72) shows—marks a principal advance in the plot. There are, however, passages of mere killing (XX. 156, 393–418, 455–504; XXI. 295–10). The last lines (after 526) really belong to XXII.

BOOK XXII. THE DEATH OF HECTOR

Prologue
XXI. 531–6 Priam to Trojans in flight
553–70 Agenor to himself (incited by Apollo)
583–9 Agenor to Achilles

XXII. 8–13 Apollo (as Agenor) to Achilles
15–20 Achilles to Apollo

Hector alone
38–76 Priam to Hector
82–9 Hecuba to Hector
99–130 Hector (alone)

(he race round the walls)

The Gods Decide
168–76 Zeus to Athena
176–81 Athena to Zeus
183–6 Zeus to Athena
186–7 Athena descends 186–7
216–23 Athena to Achilles
229–31 Athena (as Deiphobus) to Hector
233–7 Hector to Deiphobus (Athena)
239–46 Athena (Deiphobus) to Hector

The Death of Hector
250–9 Hector to Achilles
261–72 Achilles to Hector
287–88 Hector to Achilles
297–305 Hector throws 289
311–6 Hector to himself (sword)
331–6 Hector to Hector
338–43 Hector (dying)
345–54 Achilles to Hector
356–60 Hector (dies)
365–6 Achilles

Epilogue
373–4 Achaean τίς
376–94 Achilles to Achaean
395–403 outrage
416–28 Priam
431–6 Hecuba
450–9 Andromache (twice)
477–514
XXII. The structure is regular, and clear. The opening lines 1–24 continue the episode of Agenor (XXI. 526–611). The lead-in between Priam, Hecuba, and Hector (38–139) is answered by the Epilogue—Priam, Hecuba, and Andrromache (416–514). Between these, divine ordinance (168–246) balances human fulfilment (250–366) with Achaeans’ commentary (373–94) leading to Achilleus’ outrage on the corpse (395–403), which is supplementary; and the outrage itself (395–403) is beyond words. But this may be Achaeans’ counterpart to Trojan lamentation. There is no more for Gods to do till Book XXIV.

BOOK XXIII (a). THE BURNING OF PATROCLUS (1-261)

6–11 Achilles (summons to mourning)
19–23 Achilles to Patroclus’ ghost (Achilles promises offerings) *
43–53 Achilles (persists in mourning) †
69–92 Patroclus’ ghost to Achilles
94–107 Achilles to Patroclus
<108 pyre begins>
144–51 Achilles to Spercheus
156–60 Achilles to Agamemnon (to stay the mourning) †
<161–77 pyre finished>
179–83 Achilles to Patroclus’ ghost (preparations completed) *
205–11 Iris to Winds
236–48 Achilles to Agamemnon (gather the ashes)
249–61 (the tomb and the prizes)

BOOK XXIII (b). THE FUNERAL GAMES (262–897)

The Chariot-race
272–86 Achilles (invitation) 306–48 Nestor 403–16 Antilochus
426–8, 439–41 Menelaus to Antilochus 443–5 Menelaus to his horses 457–72 Idomeneus
474–81 Aias Oileus 483–7 Idomeneus 492–8 Achilles to Idomeneus and Aias

The Prizes
570–85 Menelaus 587–95 Antilochus 602–11 Menelaus
618–23 Achilles to Nestor 626–50 Nestor (thanks)

Boxing and Wrestling
658–63 Achilles 667–75 Epeius 707 Achilles (wrestling) 723–4 Aias T. 735–7 Achilles

Foot-race
753 Achilles 774 Odysseus 782–3 Aias 787–92 Antilochus 793–6 Achilles

Discus, Archery, Presents
831–33 Achilles 855–8 Achilles 890–94 Achilles

XXIII. The Burning is a regular composition, in which the centre-piece is when the building of the pyre begins (108). The Ghost of Patroclus is addressed twice, without reappearing. The narrative of the tomb building and the prizes stands outside the composition.

The Funeral Games consist of two compositions. (a) The Chariot-race, supplemented by the dispute about the winner (which is central), and the challenger of Antilochus and Menelaus, and the award to Nestor. (b) The foot-races preceded by boxing and wrestling and followed by Discus, archery, and supplementary gifts. The speeches of Achilles enframe the more explicit incidents, like those of Alcinous in the Phaeacian story (Od. VII–VIII).

BOOK XXIV. THE RANSOM OF HECTOR

Prologue
33–34 Apollo to the Gods 56–63 Hera 65–76 Zeus
38–39 Iris to Theis 90–92 Theis
104–19 Zeus 128–37 Thetis to Achilles 138–40 Achilles to Thetis

The Mission of Priam
144–58 Zeus to Iris 171–87 Iris to Priam
194–9 Priam to Hecuba 201–16 Hecuba to Priam
218–27 Priam to Hecuba (he intends to go)
239–46 Priam to Trojans 233–64 Priam to sons
287–88 Hecuba (farewell) 300–13 Priam to Hecuba

1 Observe the unusually formal correspondence within this section.
2 This duel completes a traditional list.
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Priam and Hermes
334–8 Zeus to Hermes 334–7 Herald to Priam
362–71 Hermes to Priam (why is he here?) 373–7 Priam (divine mission)
379–83 Hermes (is he leaving Troy?)
387–8 Priam (who is Hermes?) 396–404 Hermes (as Myrmidon)
406–9 Priam (where is Hector?) 411–23 Hermes (sale)
425–31 Priam (offers gift) 433–9 Hermes (refuses)
490–7 Hermes (reveals himself)

The Ransom
486–506 Priam to Achilles 518–51 Achilles to Priam
539–8 Priam to Achilles (asks for body) 560–70 Achilles to Priam (hands over body)
592–5 Achilles (to Patroclus' ghost) 599–620 Achilles to Priam (feast)
635–42 Priam (goodnight) 650–8 Achilles (puts Priam outside)
660–7 Priam (asks for truce) 669–70 Achilles (grants truce)

The Return of Priam
683–8 Hersens to Priam (to return)
704–6 Cassandra to Trojans 716–17 Priam to Trojans
725–45 Andromache
748–59 Hecuba 762–75 Helen
778–81 Priam (orders funeral) 804 funeral

This book consists of five compositions, the Council of the Gods, the Mission of Priam, the Escort of Hermes, the Ransom, and the Return of Priam. All are regular and balanced; but the centre-piece of (a) (1. 88–92) is of two short speeches only; in (e) the three laments (725–75) precede Priam's speech (778–81), which is crucial; and in (e) a new and rare device anticipates the technique of Aeschylus in his stichomythia. For though most of the speeches are in couplets, of question and answer, the 'lead' is twice changed (at 387, and 461), so that a couplet strides the centre (387–404), leaving Hermes' question (379–85) unanswered. It is characteristic that the centre-piece is neither the divine counsel, nor the transfer of the body, but the safe conduct by Hermes: once this is accomplished, the divine will find its fulfilment.

J. L. MYRES

(The Editors wish to express their acknowledgements to Mr. J. G. Griffith for his kind assistance in seeing the above article through the press.)
ARCHAEOLOGY IN GREECE, 1953

The pace set in the last three years has been maintained. Golden Mycenaean and Nelean Pylos again outshine the rest, but Eleusis has come to the front with the acclaimed Tombs of the Seven. Olympia has yielded the helmet of Miltiades and Argos amazing discoveries of eighth-century armour in a two-drachma burial. Important finds have been made in the islands, and among notable discoveries in Athens is a first-class fragment of an archaic boxer's stele and the epitaph of a Carian prince whose son fought with the Persian fleet at Salamis. The terrible earthquakes in the western islands wrecked the museums—not least those in Ithaca, which were filled with the rich finds from British excavations of recent years; much has been retrieved, but the tasks of reconstitution will be slow and costly. Work is progressing at the Acropolis Museum, and new galleries are due to open in the National Museum. There is again good progress to report from the provincial museums, especially in Crete. The indefatigable Prof. Orlandos and his associates continue their work of repair and restoration around the Acropolis, at the Aphaia temple, and among the Early Christian and Byzantine monuments; among the objects of their attention this year may be recorded the monasteries of Osios Loukas, the Meteora, and the Holy Mountain.

ATHENS AND ATTICA

On the Acropolis Orlandos and E. Stikas have continued the work of restoration on the SW wing of the Propylaea. After the completion of the stylobate and its supporting poros and marble members work was begun on the double anta, and now only the last of the eight courses and the capital remain to be set in place. The central pillar between the south wall and the row of columns opposite, which is now proved to have been a monolith, is being restored. On the Parthenon the beams and coffers over the rear porch are being replaced to protect the frieze below. The late bell tower or minaret in the SW corner, in which two columns are incorporated, is to be removed. In the Odeum of Herodes Atticus the restoration and completion of the marble in the lower part of the cavea has been accomplished, and the proedria have been restored at the expense of the Archaeological Society. In the front part of the Acropolis Museum, which is now nearly ready, exhibits are being mounted in their final positions for display. Iron clamps in the fragments of the Parthenon frieze have oxidised during the war and produced cracks: they have now been replaced by bronze.

From the Direction of the National Museum Dr. and Mrs. Karouzou report as follows. Reconstruction has progressed, and two new galleries displaying the youth from Antikythera and the Marathon Boy will be opened in the spring; one gallery is arranged as the interior of a shrine with theThemis from Rhamnous in the place of honour together with fourth-century votive reliefs from the Athens Asklepieion and elsewhere, the reliefs from the Mantinea basin, the third-century Asklepios from Mounichia, and the great relief of the same date found a few years ago figuring the horse with a negro groom. In the gallery of Protogeometric and Geometric exhibits, which is now ready, care has been taken to preserve in the display the original tomb-groups from the Areopagos, Pnyx, Kerameikos, and the Isis grave of Eleusis. New acquisitions include a small Roman funerary column, probably of the Augustan period, a head from the Parthenon frieze with the inscription ΕΠΙ ΑΓΑΘΟΣ ΑΝΩΠΟΙΟ ΜΗΡΩΝΕΙΟΥ, and on the other the relief of a girl with a dove recalling the lovely stele in New York. On each side appears a bird of prey. From Lakonia comes the fine relief of a bearded man seated to the right in a chair with a back. He holds a staff in one hand and in the other a kantharos in which a snake rears. Style and subject as well as provenance declare it Lakonian work of the fifth century reflecting strongly the figures of the seated gods in the Parthenon frieze. A fine bronze statuette, probably from Dodona, has been acquired with the help of the Psykhias Foundation. It represents a soldier, probably an officer, with breastplate and helmet and head inclined towards an object held in his right hand. This seems to be a griffin, the moment depicted may be that of sacrifice before or after battle. The type is still classical, probably of the later fourth century. From a forgotten box in a magazine have come to light some early Attic bronze mirrors. One has an Ionic capital at the top of its handle; another, a heavy mirror with a short handle of the type with disc and handle in one piece, is decorated with two spirals and anthemion and must be one of the earliest known Attic mirrors. The remainder of the Empedokles Collection has been added to the museum, including mainly sixth- and fifth-century vases from Attic tombs. Noteworthy is a white-ground lekythos with black figure decoration of two dancing satyrs who each carry shield and spear and wear a wreath; between them an ithyphallic companion plays the double flute: it is the work of the Athenian Painter of about 480, and may illustrate a lost Satyr play. With it is a red-figure lekythos (NM 18572) by the Ikaros Painter of about 470 figuring the familiar gynaikonitis scene but also a woman holding a pomegranate, identifying the dead woman 'at home' in the Halls of Persephone. Among the figurines is one of a woman on a bull, apparently Attic of the early fifth century. Finally, a fine rhyton terminating in a goose's head is
reported, and a large plain pyxis supported by three sphinxes and with a delicate relief on the lid of a protome surrounded by a net pattern.

I. Meliades reports a large number of finds in Athens, most of them the result of road repair and house building. In the course of the construction of the new building of the Archaeological Society a drain of terracotta slabs was uncovered 1 m. high and 0.50 m. across at its bottom: it is rectangular in section below and triangular above, as one in the Middle Stoa of the Agora. Near it a tiled grave contained two small red figure vases. In Odos Amerikes three tombs built of marble slabs yielded clay and glass vases and a small grave column with the inscription Εὐθυδίη Πασιλω... θυγάτηρ. In Queen Sophia Boulevard opposite Merlin St. a poros foundation was uncovered, but had to be buried again. At the junction of Apollo and Nike Streets an apsidal building with side walls containing three niches was discovered: before the apse a fine mosaic figured animal and plant life. The building may be a house of Roman imperial date or possibly a basilica. From the same excavation a triglyph of the Temple of Ares in the Agora was recovered. Building traces at least as early as the Hellenistic period have been discovered at Makriyanni. In the laying of a pavement by the west wall of the Library of Hadrian medieval walls were revealed and an epistle block with a fragmentary inscription δ ἰδεῖς ἐπὶ τῶν του... . . . . An extension of Odos Aphaias parallel to the

railway lines and near the bridge has uncovered part of a fourth-century tower and wall not marked by Judeich, running north towards the Dipylon. From the fill behind came part of the sandalled foot and of the plinth of a more than lifesize archaic statue. The same wall line has been traced in Odos Eryxithrones, and the circuit is to be explored further in this area; it was upwards of 3 m thick here, with faces of large stones and cross walls dividing the interior into compartments with rubble filling. This seems to be the Themistoclean line, though it clearly underwent repairs subsequently. The exact position of the Piraeus Gate has also been ascertained; it seems to have been a double gateway (Fig. 1).

I. Threpsiades has made further tests to determine the position of ancient city gates on the east slope of Philopappos and to the south of the Acropolis. At the first point an 8-50-m. stretch of the circuit, standing to a height of 2-60 m., has been uncovered; it is 3-60 m. thick, with faces of limestone blocks, and is dated to the middle of the fourth century B.C. At the second point the attempt to find the Diomeian Gate has not yet met with success, Roman houses being discovered instead. The most important finds came from the bastion of the Piraeus Gate. One is an incomplete late archaic statue base of marble, signed by Aristokles, the sculptor of the Arision stele. The epitaph beautifully inscribed, is of a Carian, perhaps Tymnes, the father of Histiaios of Termera; his father's name, of which the first letters survive, may be Skylax. The Greek version was followed by one line, no less beautifully cut, in Carian script. Sculptures found here include part of a koureos and a superb head from a narrow mid sixth-century stele of a boxer with bruised nose and ear and with

---

**Fig. 1.—Athens: Piraeus Gate.**
thongs wound round his raised fist (Pl. VIII. 4). From this sector also came painted architectural pieces, and a statue base of island marble with the inscription in fifth-century Ionic Αὐτὸς τοῦ Ζωίλου Σωμοί.

To the north of the city at the corner of Patisia Boulevard and Odos Kapodistriou three classical tombs came to light: one was a marble ossuary with lid containing burnt bones, by which was found a lidded bronze kalpis no doubt also once contained in it; another to its north was a marble sarcophagus with a skeleton of a woman, and held a bronze mirror, an alabastron, tweezers, traces of rouge, and fragmentary bronze pins. A little further north various tombs were found beneath the pavement: one of the late fifth century was a marble sarcophagus containing a bronze mirror, a lekythos, and a rouge pyxis; a Hellenistic tomb of limestone slabs held two bodies and a child in a pot without offerings; a Roman brick grave held three bodies, a small bronze disk, three glass perfume vases, a bone pin and two gold leaves from a wreath, and a Hellenistic conical stone ossuary held four small clay perfume vases and the urn containing the ashes. Above the tombs are traces of an ancient gravel-surfaced road running to the north. At the corner of Acharnai St. and H. Meletiou was found a Late Hellenistic Ionic marble column bearing at either end two bands of acanthus leaves like the famous acanthus column at Delphi. At the junction of Odos M. Vouda and Kolophonos three classical tiled graves yielded both white and red figure lekythoi and black glaze vases. A Late Roman house and tombs are reported on the east outside the ancient city. By Constantiople St. part of the Sacred Way of Roman period has been exposed with a thickness of 0.40 m. of trodden earth and small stones. It ran a little to the west of the modern Hiera Odos. Beside it and at a greater depth was found a terracotta drain of classical date, triangular in section, 1 m. high and 0.75 m. broad at the bottom.

In the spring and summer of 1953 the American School of Classical Studies carried out its eighteenth campaign of exploration in the Athenian Agora, on which Prof. H. Thompson communicates as follows. This season saw the completion of large-scale excavation in the area of the market square proper. Concurrently with the field work, a beginning was made on the actual reconstruction of the Stoa of Attalos for use as a permanent museum, conservation was carried out on several buildings previously explored, and plans were made for landscaping the area.

As in 1952, field work was concentrated in the southern part of the Agora. The south side of the square was cleared throughout its length and was found to have been bordered by five public buildings (nos. 7–8 and continuing on a line slightly south of east, Fig. 2). Although all five had been more or less exposed in earlier seasons, their date, function, and mutual relationship were greatly clarified by the work of the past campaign. Two of the five buildings, viz. the second and fourth from the west, are to be dated well back in the sixth century B.C. The third from the west was fitted in between its two earlier neighbours in the latter part of the fifth century, and the two at the extreme ends of the row appear to be of about the same period. The westernmost building in the series discovered in 1934, has clear traces of hydraulic installations along its northern front, showing that it served at least in part as a fountain house; it has been provisionally labelled the South-west Fountain House. The fourth from the west, cleared in 1952, was likewise an hydraulic establishment, and is now known as the South-east Fountain House.

The easternmost building comprised six rooms of various sizes, in which were found traces of two small furnaces and of several plastered water basins, all set in the floor. A clue to the nature of the industrial activity that went on in the building was provided by the discovery in 1953 at its NE corner of a small deposit of bronze, which proved on cleaning to consist of eight flans for the making of bronze coins and the tail end of a rod from which the flans had been painstakingly cut with a chisel. Since there can be little doubt that this material originated in the six-roomed building, it becomes highly probable that this building was the mint of Athens. The identification is strengthened by the discovery some years ago to the NE of the building of a marble inscription bearing a law of the late fifth century regarding currency, bankers, etc. (Hesp XIV, 119–122).

The building second from the west appears originally to have been a walled enclosure, open to the sky and entered from the north; in its final form it comprised a peristyle courtyard bordered by a row of four rooms on the west side. Various lines of indirect evidence suggest that the structure accommodated the Helaia, the oldest and largest of the law courts of Athens, and the one in which the most important cases affecting the state were tried.

The third building from the west, South Stoa I, is an early example of a ground plan comprising a row of rooms fronted by a two-aisled colonnade. The building contained a minimum of fourteen rooms and a probable total of sixteen. The dimensions of the rooms, and the fact that their doors are regularly off centre, would suggest that they were designed for dining-couches, although they were subsequently perhaps used as shops. The spacious colonnade may have been intended primarily to shelter the jurymen in case of rain, since the court of the Helaia is known to have sat under the open sky and to have broken off its sessions on the start of rain. South Stoa I was demolished in the middle of the second century B.C. to make way for South Stoa II (Fig. 2, no. 9), the latest of the three colonnades which at that time were erected to enclose what now appears to have been a

[* By courtesy of Dr. I. Threpsiaides, who communicated the above remarks pending his publication of the fragment.]
Commercial Agora and to screen the fringe of miscellaneous old buildings from the great northern plaza.

In the course of the past season much of the construction filling was removed from within the Middle Stoa, particularly toward its west end, where a broad expanse of the pre-Stoa floor of the Agora has come to light. A small private establishment that had flourished from the sixth into the fourth century B.C. was laid bare outside the NW corner of the Middle Stoa. Masses of iron hobnails found at the level of the late fifth and early fourth centuries indicate that the building was then occupied by a cobbler. He was perhaps called Simon, a name which was found scratched in the base of

A klyix picked up at the same level as the hobnails: a shoemaker of this name is described by Diogenes Laertius as an intimate friend of Socrates and the first to compose Socratic dialogues.

The work of rebuilding the Stoa was begun in the summer of 1953 under the general supervision of the Department of Restorations in the Ministry of Education but at the cost of the American School. By the end of the year the ancient foundations had been drained and strengthened at many points, reinforced-concrete piers had been erected within the basement storerooms, a large part of the limestone and a smaller proportion of the necessary marble had been quarried and delivered to the site. The opening of deep drains in the area of the Stoa brought to light a number of graves of the late Bronze and Early Iron Ages, clearly the eastward continuation of the extensive cemetery of those periods now known to have underlain virtually the whole of the Agora of classical times. Ten of the tombs, both chamber and pit graves, are of the Mycenaean period (L.H. III A-C), three of the
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Fig. 3.—Athens: Agora: (a) Mycenaean Vases from Tomb; (b) Deposit of Dicastic Ballots.

Fig. 4.—Athens: Agora, Model of North End of Stoa of Attalos.
Protogeometric. From them were recovered some interesting groups of vases and a number of pieces of jewellery; two vases from a L.H. III A tomb are shown in Fig. 3a. Beneath the north end of the Stoa terrace, in a room of an earlier building, was found a deposit of six dicastic ballots of the familiar wheel shape (Fig. 3b); two others had come to light in the area in previous seasons. This discovery may be taken to prove that the earlier building was a law court, perhaps the Parabyston, which is known to have stood by the Agora. The early structure, comprising a complex of rooms along the north side of an enclosed and gravelled courtyard, was in use from the late fifth into the latter part of the fourth century B.C., at which time it made way for the great square peristyle long known to underlie the north end of the Stoa of Attalos (Fig. 4). The square peristyle also may have been intended to accommodate a law court, but it was left unfinished.

The great stone drain that ran diagonally through the square from the SE to the NW corner has been reconditioned and restored to use. Work of conservation has been carried out on the Bouleuterion and Metooon. The east inner frieze of the Temple of Hephaistos (the so-called 'Theseum'), representing a battle between Greeks and barbarians in the presence of divinities, has been freed of the thick black deposit formed by water dripping down through a faulty ceiling. The cleaning has brought out the high technical quality of the carving and has also revealed a few surviving particles of colour: blue for the background, green for the boulders, and red on the garments.

Outstanding among the season's sculpture was a terracotta head of a bearded, helmeted warrior slightly over half life size, presumably from an akroterion (Fig. 5). It was found in a context of the second century B.C. immediately to the north of the 'Heliaia'. The date is somewhat before the middle of the fifth century B.C. Although badly broken, the head is an outstanding addition to the limited numbers of terracotta sculptures known from Athens. Among the inscriptions may be mentioned a distich on a statue base:

'Ἰδίας ἥ μεθ' Ὀμηρον ἐγώ καὶ πρόσθεν Ὀμηρόπουν
Πάροςτασις ἑρμαι τῶν με τεκόντω νεόνιον

It was found in the curbing of a Byzantine well some 45 m. NW of the Library of Pantainos. Between the well and the library, in the year 1869, the statues of the IIiad and the Odyssey were found by the Greek Archaeological Society; they are now in the National Museum (AM IV 160-169). The group undoubtedly adorned the Library of Pantainos, which dates from about A.D. 100.

A survey and a comprehensive plan for the landscaping of the Agora has been prepared by a landscape architect. The programme was initiated by King Paul and Queen Frederika, who on January 4, 1954, planted an oak-tree and a laurel respectively alongside the great altar to the east of the Metooon.

M. Mitsos has supervised the tidying of the archaeological area of the Amphitheatre and continued the study of the inscriptions. As well as those mentioning the sons of Kephisosodoros, another recording the name of his grandson (Kephisosodoros II), son of Meidas, is reported—a rich Athenian family of the fourth century whose dedications seem to have enjoyed a conspicuous place in the sanctuary. Other fragments of unpublished dedicatory inscriptions are referred to the period after the Battle of Chaeronea when Oropos belonged to Athens. At Regina D. Theokares continued excavation of the Early Helladic settlement and cleared a house set against the town wall. Its main room measured 4 × 3.50 m. and showed signs of two building periods and five floor levels, while traces of an earlier building also became apparent. Outside a narrow paved road 1-20 m. wide ran east. Other houses were also investigated. An oval cutting, the floor of a hut similar to that of the workshop found by the shore in the previous season, yielded numerous sherds, and to its west a small apsidal building was excavated. 30 m. of the fortification wall have been uncovered, as well as two deep pits full of ash and carbonised wood. The pottery from the season was mainly monochrome but also some partially glazed ware of the later Early Helladic period and plentiful Mycenaean sherds including two figurines. Some stone, metal and bone implements and bronze slag were found, and an Early Helladic conical stone seal bearing circles and dots. At Perati near Píote-Ráphi S. Iakovides further explored the extensive prehistoric cemetery in which Staia had cleared two graves in 1895. Five untouched graves and as many plundered were excavated, all save two belonging to a single complex. They are close-set small chamber tombs with dromoi, all of the L.H. III period and coming down to the end of it. Finds included about a hundred vases, little bronze, seals, and jewels in gold and semi-precious stones illustrating the lively trade enjoyed by the nearby Mycenaean settlement which has yet to be found. In one tomb two burials, clearly still Mycenaean in date, and one burial of an infant proved to be cremations: with the burnt bones of one were found gold and other ornaments recalling the finds from Tiryns (Karo, AM LV), a cylinder seal apparently from Asia Minor and a cartouche of Rameses II which provides an important chronological clue. In other tombs were Mycenaean clay figurines of an unusual type representing draped women with hands raised and clasped over their heads, as if mourners. In two tombs the displaced earlier burials were accompanied by food offerings.

In completing the excavation of the Early Christian basilica of Brauron E. Stikas has discovered a gold solidus of Justinian of A.D. 538, approximately the period of the building of the church. By the mediaeval tower of Vrána an obsidian workshop associated with the nearby Early Helladic
settlement has been disclosed in tests. I. Papademetriou and D. Theokhares report the excavation of two Mycenaean chamber tombs at Varkiza. In one which had been plundered a displaced burial in a recess yielded many vases, including a rhyton figuring naturalistically drawn fishes. Child burials were also cleared. At Alyki near Voûla three L.H. III chamber tombs were uncovered in the course of digging house foundations. Two are well preserved, and all have dromoi about 15 m. long with recesses in their sides. Each held five or six bodies, and the offerings include pottery, mostly L.H. IIIe, steatite spindle-whorls, and figurines. One vase bears the representation of a woman between two trees. Miscellaneous finds in Attica include Protogeometric and Geometric pottery from H. Ioánnis Rénti, a late sixth-century black figure lebes gamikos with marriage scenes from H. Andrées, fine marble funereal lekythoi from Voûla and Aigáleos, a fragment of a fifth-century relief from Heliópolis, and scattered unimportant tombs.

At Eleusis excavations under the direction of I. Travlos were conducted to determine the boundary of the Temenos to the north and west of the great Propylaia. The hieron was separated from the town by a secondary wall, but was itself also split into two parts, one comprising the Telesterion, the other a subsidiary quarter of priests' houses and offices. The boundary in this area was a wall, named the diateichisma in inscriptions, which was interrupted for an entrance at a point now covered by the Lesser Propylaia. While the extent of the hieron proper is clear from its peribolos, the limit of the subsidiary quarter particularly towards the town on the west had not hitherto been established. An inscription of 329/8 B.C. records the removal of the insecure parts of the towers and Pylon of the diateichisma and the stretch from by the House of the Heralds to the gate opposite the Íxos.
These Travlos identifies with the parts Α–Γ (the Pylon) on Fig. 6 and ΔΕΖ, the course of which he had determined by excavation. On the west of this wall and along its length ran a road from the gateway in the outer peribolos mentioned in the inscription. This road, which leads to the acropolis, seems to have been in use since Mycenaean times and affords a limit to the hieron. It also defines the edge of the House of the Heralds, while the identification of the gate can suggest the site of the δωλικός. The same inscription mentions houses of various temple officials and other buildings which further excavation may now be able to identify within the newly defined limits of the hieron. Valuable stratigraphical evidence illustrating the history of the site has been obtained from the excavation, as well as proof that the prehistoric city extended to this point on the north of the acropolis. By tests outside the Great Propylaia Travlos has established that the paved Roman
court was bordered on three sides by colonnades, not by a simple peribolos as has previously been assumed.

The excavation of the cemetery at Eleusis was continued by G. E. Mylonas under the auspices of the Archaeological Society and of Washington University. A total of fourteen burials of the classical period and twenty-three prehistoric graves were investigated, as well as an isolated Late Geometric burial, badly preserved, indicating that the area was still used occasionally in the closing years of the Geometric period. Apparently a large krater stood over the grave, while beside the body were placed two smaller vases. Only fragments of the krater were found standing over the grave, but they are sufficient to identify it as of the Dipylon class with funeral scenes on the main zone. Of the classical burials the most interesting proved to be a stone sarcophagus containing a well-preserved bronze urn with the ashes. Five lekythoi of mid-fifth century date and a piece of cloth, perhaps a shawl, almost two metres in length were found in the sarcophagus. A terracotta larne of a child contained the skeleton preserved in excellent condition, two small vases, a bronze strigil, and some twenty knuckle-bones. More knuckle-bones and eggshells were found on the cover. The larneax burial has been taken whole to the museum of Eleusis with the finds in situ. The prehistoric burials include cist graves of the late Middle Helladic period and Late Helladic shaft graves. Among the latter is a long and narrow built grave of L.H. II–III with a side approach and a well-constructed doorway. As usual it was a family grave, and yielded the remains of eleven skeletons, twenty-five vases, two clay figurines of the Φ type, and a mould for the casting of gold rings. On one of the faces of the mould are two engravings no doubt used for the decoration of bezels; on one is the representation of a mother bird and its young one in an animated pose, and on the other two Mycenaean women in rich costumes worshipping before a columnar shrine. Perhaps the most important find of the season is a group of eight graves found at the western end of the cemetery. They are separated from the rest of the area by well-built walls, and apparently form a historic landmark. No later burials were placed within the confines of this area. Six of these prehistoric graves were opened partially, examined, and then filled again in the middle of the fifth century, when the peribolos wall was also constructed. The other two, being deeper, escaped the attention of the classical excavators. Very few offerings were found in the graves, but what there are proved to be of the Middle Helladic and L.H. III periods. One of the graves of Middle Helladic date was enlarged and used again in the L.H. III period. The evidence obtained leads Mylonas to believe that the six graves, which were investigated in antiquity and whose area was set apart by walls, are the ones that were mentioned by Pausanias (I.39) as of the heroes who fought against Thebes, the graves which, according to Plutarch, were pointed out to visitors at Eleusis as those of the leaders of that expedition.

On the western acropolis (Alkathôe) at Megara part of a fine mosaic pavement was uncovered figuring dolphins and doves. A gold-leaf crown was the only find of importance from ancient cisterns in the town and Hellenistic tombs near the modern cemetery. Considerable work of restoration has been undertaken at the Temple of Aphaia on Aegina. The standing columns of the pteron with their capitals have been repaired with poros from the ancient quarry and the unsightly iron bands removed. In the NE corner a section of frieze and gablet has been replaced. In the cela three columns have been re-erected with the architrave and on them part of a column from the upper series. These restorations not only enhance the appearance of the monument but help to make the original internal arrangement clear to the visitor.

The Peloponnesse

At Corinth C. H. Morgan investigated a building which had been destroyed during the construction of the South Stoa in the fourth century B.C. A boulder wall, probably of Geometric date, and a second smaller wall, certainly of the eighth century, bound the area to the north; the latter was apparently the retaining wall for a cemetery to its south, as some simple shaft graves were found with plentiful Geometric fragments in their fill. The graves themselves had been plundered in antiquity. On the south side of these walls ran an open drain, in which a great covered drain of ashlars blocks had been built after the middle of the sixth century and covered with a cement pavement 0.25 m. thick in places. Traces of other building activity in this period are apparent, and two wells whose digging had been interrupted by the building operations were found. The fill of one contained sixth-century figurines and pottery, including a Corinthian kotyle bearing the incised injunction υπάρξει (ὑπάρξει). In the later sixth century this area appears to have comprised a large open precinct facing the new agora to the north. At some time in the fifth century a courtyard was laid with a pebble cement pavement. In it were offering tables or bases, and it was surrounded by small rooms incorporating a fountain or tank. Later in the fifth or early fourth centuries small cubicule rooms were constructed on the SW side of the courtyard; beneath the floor of one a deposit of figurines had been buried about the middle of the fourth century. By the end of the third quarter of the fourth century the building was abandoned and dismantled in the face of the construction of the South Stoa, its new threshold defaced by the wheels of haulage carts and the area eventually cobble-paved. Details of the building do not reflect contemporary house architecture or suggest a public
building. The number of drinking-cups found suggests rather a tavern, and the offering-table, tank, a niche for a statue, and the cache of figurines some ritual purpose. From the contents of the latter deposit and their character is inferred the presence of a cult of Aphrodite, and the building is thought to be a tavern dedicated to that goddess.

NW of Old Corinth D. Pallas excavated for the Archaeological Society a large Early Christian basilica dated by its carved stone members to the first quarter of the sixth century. In Sikyon Orlandos has cleared the court of the upper terrace of the Gymnasium of Kleinas and the great roofed hall of the Bouleuterion whose plans are now clear. The excavation of the former revealed in its north back wall a doorway leading through a narrow corridor to the adjacent shrine, no doubt of the Nymphs, as figurines and the niches cut in the rock suggest.

Restoration work at Mycenae includes the cleaning of the tholos tombs and reconstruction of the ring of the old Grave Circle. The bastion beside the Lion Gate is being repaired and previously excavated walls since covered by spoil have been cleaned. Wace's account of his excavations appears separately at the end of the present report.

The Archaeological Society's excavation at the new Grave Circle has been continued by Papademetriou in conjunction with Mylonas and Theokares. This is the circle that Papademetriou recognises as the burial place, according to the tradition known to Pausanias, of Aegisthus and Clytemnestra. Eight more tombs were excavated this year, and distinguished by the letters I-Π. The majority of them are rectangular shafts measuring 2.50 × 3.00 m. to 3.30 × 4.20 m. They were regularly roofed with wooden beams which rested on ledges cut in the rock or built of rough stonework on the long sides of the grave. Stone slabs were laid on top of the beams, and above this a layer of clay to keep out the damp. The majority of the tombs contained rich furnishings. In grave I eight clay vases of the M.H. III period were found, a bronze sword with an ivory pommel, a dagger with a rock crystal handle, two gold bracelets, a gold belt ornament, bronze tweezers, and a silver cup with grooved decoration and gilding on the rim. The position of grave N was marked by a piece of the grave stele with its socketed base. The excavation here has made it clear that the circle was not covered by a single mound, but that each individual grave had a small mound of its own revetted by stones round the edge. This grave contained two burials. In order to make room for the second, the first was moved to one side, together with its furnishings, and encased by a clay kerb. The later deposition was in the centre of the grave, the arms and legs outspread. The dead wore a gold throat band, and had at his right hand a bronze sword and dagger and a bronze vase; another bronze sword was found wrapped in cloth, with a bronze dagger and vase, alongside the displaced skeleton of the earlier burial. A gold cup containing gold ornaments and an alabaster vase was found near by. Four matt-painted vases with fine decoration were also found here, of which two are shown on Fig. 7. Here, as also in some of the other graves, bones from the funeral banquet were found over the roof of the tomb.

Four graves were uncovered on the south side of the circle. K contained four vases, one a fine
jug with polychrome band decoration. Grave M contained a single skeleton of a young maiden, on whose chest lay a necklace of semi-precious stones—one with a design of a flower pot and palm. Twenty-one vases of L.H. I date were found here. In *A* two skeletons were discovered, one of them again being displaced, and near the latter a bronze dagger and some gold bands. The skeleton in the centre lay extended without furnishings, the tomb having been robbed in antiquity; but the west part of the shaft, where no skeleton lay, yielded offerings which may belong to this deposition: a bronze sword whose leather sheath was adorned with horns and strips, a lance, a dagger, and twenty-eight obsidian and porphyry arrowheads. To the west of this a kiln and hearth of crude brick, dating to the earlier Middle Helladic period, and a small burial with two fine Middle Helladic vases have been uncovered.

Grave Ζ belonged to a young girl, and also contained a displaced burial. The body of the girl was adorned with gold diadems, necklaces of semi-precious stones and a faience amulet, a gold ring, ear-drops, and gold brooches. Grave O was the richest of all found this year; it can be called the Crystal Grave, because of the large number of objects of rock crystal found in it. Though traversed by the modern aqueduct it had fortunately remained undisturbed. One burial was found in the middle, and an earlier one had been moved to the west side; the displaced one had no furnishings. The later burial yielded two large gold diadems (Pl. IX.1), three dress pins with big crystal heads, a silver pin with a star-like head of long gold rays, and much other ornament of gold, amber, and semi-precious stones. A unique discovery here was a bowl, 0.15 m. long, of rock crystal in the form of a duck, whose head and neck formed the handle, and its tail the spout of the vase (Pl. IX.3). The grave also yielded many clay vases with fine decoration in matt-painting; the vases were found both on the floor of the shaft and on its roof; the most notable are a squat jug of L.H. I date and a tall amphora.

There still remain some graves to be explored inside the new Grave Circle. The chamber tomb discovered last year to the south of the circle has now been cleared. It had been looted, but many fragments of Geometric vases from later re-use were found, and also scraps of the rich gold ornaments from the original burial. Further to the south a classical cistern and a small grave of Protocorinetic date have come to light.

The French School continued excavations at Argos under G. Roux, P. Courbin, and R. Ginouves, with notable results. An ancient road to the west of the agora linked it with the Theatre and Odeon quarter. The houses of the classical period which flanked it were destroyed in Roman times by terrace works, but of the best-preserved one three of four orthostates of the north façade remain in situ to an original total length of 7.90 m. and height of 0.787 m. The level of the road eventually rose 0.50 m., covering a network of pipes carrying water from the Kephaliari spring. On the east the late stoa found by Vollgraff was investigated. It had two steps, the second its stylobate, and unfluted columns probably Corinthian; under it an exedra had later been converted into a tank. In the agora itself to the north of the Greek stoa the foundations of a marble tholos have been found within a rectangular platform with poros foundations and four white marble steps. The partly preserved frieze bore the dedication τῶν γυναικῶν καὶ τῶν νυμφῶν μετὰ τῶν ὁμοίων. Its marble roof tiles are in the shape of scales, and the roof was surmounted by an acanthus floral. The peristyle was paved with marble, and in the centre of the building are preserved the four lower steps of a spiral stair leading down to a cylindrical well. The date appears to be of the second century B.C.

The Roman Odeon, founded in 1928, has now been completely uncovered. The seats, coated with painted plaster, were partly cut from the rock at the centre of the cavea, which was divided by a central stair and two diazotoma with mosaics bearing leaf garland decoration. The wings of the cavea are supported by curved and radial walls. The orchestra with a diameter of 8 m. was bounded on the east by a brick prosenium with niches and stairways. The mosaic framed by polychrome peltae figured the head of a god in a wreath, offering tables bearing fruit and branches, a large vase, and finally a large kantharos in the prosenium niches; the centre piece is missing. Two steps lead down to the vaulted parodoi paved with mosaics of geometrical patterns. The building seems to have been roofed, and is dated in the third or fourth century A.D. Details of an earlier structure in this position suggest an imitation of the quadrangular Odeon at Athens.

Of the Mosaic Building north of the agora and partly dug by Vollgraff the dining-room has been cleared. The design of its mosaic floor reflects the arrangement of the furniture; in the centre fish appear against a circular blue ground. In the NE a large panel figured Dionysos leaning on a column surrounded by dancing bacchantes and satyrs; a leopard and a winged Eros flank the god. The great Roman Building, whose brick walls rise 10 m. above the ground level, extended at least 55 m., with a maximum width of 36 m.; its main entrance must be to the east. It comprises an apsidal hall in the west paved with marble and on two levels, the upper raised perhaps for a statue and below it a rectangular vaulted crypt containing three sarcophagi. Before it a long transverse hall had doors at each of its western corners and was paved with a geometrical mosaic. Beyond it to the west lay subsidiary rectangular and semi-circular rooms with wall niches for statues, and finally a large open rectangular court bordered by porticoes with Ionic fluted columns and by vaulted corridors partly underground. This type of building with apsidal crypt, transverse hall, and court recalls the familiar eastern pattern of such structures as the Heroon of Kalydon.
The extent of the ancient graveyard south of the town is indicated by the discovery of tombs by the modern cemetery, at the west of the agora, and in the intervening area of the Refuges' Quarter. Fifty-eight tombs were cleared from the Middle Helladic to Roman period, those of the Protogeometric and Geometric periods being particularly important. The finds were both varied and numerous, nearly 300 vases, most of them complete, being recorded. Of these Protogeometric tombs one was a cist burial of a child and yielded fine local pottery. A second tomb of an adult contained three vases, and was surmounted by a pyre which contained a burnt oinochoe and other finds. Early Geometric pottery from near an apsidal house includes a large black krater, a stand, a bowl with conical foot deriving from the Protogeometric type, and a very early Geometric skyphos: fragments of two large Middle Geometric kraters represent a period little known before in the Argolid, but the richest finds are again of the Late Geometric period. One burial comprises a great ovoid krater with loop feet standing 1.10 m. high and lidded by another krater: the quality of the painting is unusually fine, and as well as typical Argive decoration includes two pairs of wrestlers on a large scale under the handles. The decoration of the lid-krater includes dancing women, a horseman, and, unusually, kneeling goats. An uncommonly large cist grave 3.15 m. long contained a bronze helmet and breastplate in exceptionally fine condition (Pl. VIII. 5–6). The helmet is in three parts, crown, front without nasal flange, and back, all being riveted together; the cheek pieces are not hinged but fixed to the sides. On a high stem a crescent-shaped mounting decorated with conical rosettes is grooved to hold the plume, giving the whole helmet a height of nearly 0.50 m. The breastplate is in two parts, front and back. Hitherto they have been found only in two separated parts: the state of preservation of this example will enable their method of joining to be determined. There seem to have been neither hinges at the shoulder nor buckles at the side. The shoulder blades and breasts are summarily modelled, but the arch of the thorax is boldly marked. The belt is worked in repoussé technique, and of the three decorative bands at the base one bears a row of small dotted circles. With the armour were found two iron axe heads, twelve spits, three gold rings, and fragments of gold leaves, and the associated pottery gives a date at the end of the eighth century. A third burial of the same date contains a plain pithos and a fine krater notable for its technical innovations: on one side details on the figures are rendered in white paint, on the other the features are painted in outline (Pl. VIII. 3). From late eighth- and early seventh-century wells came a strainer-amphora with side orifice and a fine mid-seventh century sherd figuring a large head in an even finer style than that of the Polyphemos fragment found in the preceding year's excavation. A provisional exhibition of the finds has been prepared in the Argos Town Hall.

At Prêonía by Nauplion S. Kharitonides excavated for the Archaeological Society a number of close-set adult pithos burials dated by the accompanying pottery to the Kype Geometric period. The cemetery seems to have been in use on a limited scale in classical times. One great amphora on a tripod base has been restored 0.95 m. high. A poorly cut shaft grave in the previously excavated Mycenaean cemetery yielded a stone lamp with spiral decoration and a bronze mirror, but no bones.

American School excavations at Lerna have been continued under the direction of J. L. Caskey. Neolithic houses have not yet come to light, but a large number of sherds recovered from mixed fill on the south side of the mound provide clear evidence that the site was occupied at a very early date. Pottery includes fine examples of variegated or rainbow ware, red, black, and grey burnished wares, and pieces wholly coated with, or bearing, linear patterns in orange-brown glaze (Urfirnis). At least three levels of Early Helladic remains have been observed in several areas. The most considerable is a rectangular building of which the SW part was cleared in 1953. Its walls, 0.95 m. thick, are of crude brick resting on stone socles. Having been hardened by burning in a great fire, they stand about 0.80 m. above the level of the floors, and traces of their yellow clay stucco are preserved. Within, a long corridor, two large rooms, doorways, and four steps of a staircase that led to an upper storey have been exposed. The building was roofed with plain flat terracotta tiles and large slabs of bluish or greenish-grey schist. As little pottery was found in the rooms cleared this year, the domestic quarters may have been elsewhere. Several vessels, including a very fine askoid jar with patterns in dull red-brown paint on a light buff ground (Fig. 82a), were found in another burnt building nearby, presumably contemporary with the first. The level above was notable for a great number of bothroi containing ashes, carbonised matter, bones, and sherds. Over this was a third Early Helladic level, which in 1952 yielded a fragmentary jar of Trojan type with plastic decoration and free-standing wing-like attachments. Another object with foreign analogies (Troy, Sicily, Malta) is a flat strip of bone 0.106 m. long with seven hemispherical knobs on one side. This was found on a floor with grey Minyan ware immediately above the topmost Early Helladic deposits.

Four to five successive levels of Middle Helladic habitation were distinguished in the central, eastern, and south-eastern parts of the mound. A well-preserved apsidal house with three rooms, repeatedly rebuilt after fires, and a long building with four rooms flanking a gravel-paved street, are assignable to the later phases of the period. Grey Minyan, plain brown, and coarse wares occurred throughout. In some households black (Argive) Minyan ware appears to have been more popular than in others. Good examples of matt-painted ware appeared in the middle and late phases (Fig. 86). With them were sherds of a class bearing linear patterns in dark lustrous paint on a light
ground, and a few vessels with designs in dull white and red or purple on a dark ground, showing the influence of Middle Minoan styles. Cist graves and plain interments, of adults as well as children, were found among and below the Middle Helladic houses. The earliest Mycenaean periods were represented by a few sherds. Fairly extensive remains of houses and streets of L.H. III date came to light on the eastern side of the hill, where a Geometric pithos burial and pottery of the sixth, fifth, and fourth centuries were also found.

The joint Hellenic and American expedition continued its excavations at and near Pylos. Under the direction of C. W. Blegen the Megaron of the Palace, comprising Throne Room, Vestibule, Portico, and a narrow court, was re-exposed and fully cleared. The painted decoration of the hearth and floor of the Throne Room has been studied and recorded in water-colour drawings by Piet de Jong. All remains of frescoes, both those found still attached to the walls and those that had fallen to the floors, have been removed and conserved by Z. Kanakis. An extensive area to the SW of the Megaron was uncovered. Directly alongside the Throne Room seven small chambers were revealed. Four of them were obviously 'pantries' in which the ordinary household crockery of Pylos was stored. They yielded remains of nearly 6000 vases of many different shapes, among which kylikes, 'teacups' and saucers are predominant. Most of the pots were broken, but more than 100 were recovered intact. In these rooms innumerable fragments of fresco, in large part fallen from an upper storey, were salvaged. Beyond the pantries, to the SW, is a stucco-paved court about 7-35 m. wide.

![Fig. 8.—Lerna: (a) Early Helladic Askos Vessel; (b) Matt-painted Jug.](image)

The lowest course of an ashlar wall is preserved along the SW side; on the other side a similar wall has been removed, presumably by marauders in search of building material.

To the SW of the court are two rooms of state, each more than 7 m. wide and 10 m. long, with a good stucco floor. The first was entered from the SE through a distyle façade, and in the longitudinal axis stood a single interior column. The columns, which were no doubt made of wood, have perished, but their stone bases still lie in situ, and impressions in the stucco floor indicate that the shafts had forty-four shallow flutings. The walls of this room bore plaster painted with brightly coloured designs, and vast numbers of fallen fragments of frescoes lay heaped upon the floor. To the right of a doorway that opens into the second room of state, towards the SW, is a low stucco platform, either a place for a seat or a stand for a sentry or a servant. A doorway to the NW gave access to a passage from which a stairway ascended to an upper floor, while two further doors led to other apartments not yet excavated. Little is preserved of the similar large room at the extreme south-western edge of the hill, but it had a well-made floor, interior columns (one base still in situ), and fresco-decorated walls. A small excavation on the descending slope to the SE of the Megaron disclosed a maze of walls, badly damaged by the fire that destroyed the Palace. Here, too, there were evidently corridors and a stairway leading to the upper storey. Many fragments of frescoes were found in this area. More than a dozen soundings were made along the steep periphery of the site. House walls appear almost everywhere, but no evidence has yet come to light to indicate that the citadel was enclosed within a cyclopean fortification wall.

On a small hillock barely 80 m. to the NE of the Palace site remains of a great lintel block, observed long ago, betrayed the presence of a tholos tomb. The chamber proved to have a diameter
of about 0·30 m. Its wall, preserved to a height of 4·65 m., was carefully built of remarkably small unworked stones, laid in fairly regular courses. The doorway, constructed of much larger blocks of limestone, was 2·25 m. wide, about 4·50 m. deep from front to back, and 4·60 m. high. It was probably once covered by three lintel blocks, only the innermost of which, broken into four pieces, survived in situ. The dromos, about 4 m. wide and 10 m. long, had been cut in bedrock, and was not bordered by walls. The doorway was blocked by a massive well-built wall, about 2 m. thick, which was found still standing almost to its original height. The chamber was filled with hard-packed clayey earth. Much of it, evidently brought from an adjacent inhabited site, had probably formed part of a tumulus that was heaped up over the dome. Robbers had gained an entrance, presumably while the vault still stood intact, and the tomb had been thoroughly ransacked. Even a stone-lined cist at the right and a deep curving grave pit at the left had not been spared. No skeleton was found in position, but small bits and splinters of human bones, no doubt from several burials, lay scattered helter-skelter through the deposit. The disturbance were careless in their operations, and the numerous objects they overlooked give a tantalising idea of the wealth of funerary offerings that had been placed in the sepulchre. Apart from a vast quantity of gold leaf and scores of beads of amber, amethyst, faience, gold, paste, etc., and many fragments of ivory, the most notable items recovered are two amethyst sealstones (one of amygdaloid shape with an intaglio design of a man in combat with a lion); a gold signet ring bearing on its bezel a cult scene; four owls neatly delineated in repoussé technique in thin gold; a gold shield-shaped ornament in the form of a figure 8; and a large flattened cylindrical gold seal with a delicately worked representation of a crested griffin, a royal gem. In the region to the north, west, and south of Epáno Englianós, several previously uncharted Mycenaean sites were discovered. Trial trenches were also dug in the 'Cave of Nestor' on the precipitous northern slope of the ancient Koryphasion, and yielded pottery ranging from neolithic, through Early, Middle, and Late Helladic into historical times.

Sp. Marinatos conducted excavations at Pylos on behalf of the Archaeological Society, and uncovered two series of tombs, numbering nine in all. The first comprised three circular graves, in which the bodies were either laid on the floor or in pits, and the bones of earlier burials put in bothroi or niches opening in the walls of the chambers. There were few offerings recovered, as the tombs had been plundered. One tomb had a small subsidiary tomb in its dromos. Its chamber is described as a true Mycenaean 'columbarium' with fourteen niches at varying heights in the walls. One small niche held a craftsman's tools; of stone were hammers, a cubical grinder, a whetstone, a plaque, and his square, of bronze, choppers with bone handles, a one-edged knife, a chisel, and an awl. The second group was of six tombs, near which a Hellenistic or Roman potter's kiln was also excavated. The tombs are important for the light they throw on ancestor-worship in classical times; thus in one it appeared that cult was practised in Hellenistic times not only in the dromos but in the chamber. The northern half of the floor of the chamber was occupied by a pyre, in which was found the skeleton of a pig on its back, and in the southern were traces of another pyre, which contained fragments of one Mycenaean and one Hellenistic vase. In the upper fill were found Hellenistic sherds and an Argive and a Messenian coin. The tombs generally have short, sloping dromoi with vertical walls and circular chambers with walls rising to a dome. At their tops were cavities which had been considered mechanical expedients for the regular cutting of the tomb, but accurate measurements now prove that they do not lie in the dead centre. Small semicircular pits around the walls held the bones from earlier burials. Before the door of the sixth tomb was found a skeleton of a man without offerings. The upper fill of the tomb yielded Roman and other pottery and the remains of large wild animals. The Mycenaean fill below contained a fine clay deer's head from a Mycenaean rhyton decorated with heads of a deer and a bull, which lay on a heap of fifty Mycenaean vases, the offerings. On the floor the two bodies were accompanied by Mycenaean and Hellenistic offerings, showing that the tomb had been opened in later times. The animal bones suggest that the men who threw them into the tomb from above thought that it was the resting-place of hunting heroes. Generally the tombs yielded L.H. I pottery from the pits, L.H. III from the burials on the floors of the chambers, and before the doors broken libation kylikes. The lack of rich finds might be explained by the later intrusions: of the two sealstones found, one of sardonyx figures a ship's sails, and the other of jasper a lioness with a bird above and a boar below. The settlement accompanying the tombs is 500 m. away at Volimidia. Trial trenches brought to light traces of walls, and in one place L.H. III sherds and one metre lower L.H. I vases including cups of the Vaphio type and pithos fragments with rope decoration, but no walls; so this point was no doubt within a rubbish ground. On Rouéti ridge half an hour away tomb mounds were found to contain pithos and larnax burials, which Marinatos supposes to be of post-Mycenaean date.

In Olympia E. Kunze has completed the excavation of the south and west embankments of the Stadium and cleared the corner between the east wall of the Altis and the northerly extension of the House of Nero. The area has again yielded rich finds, which include a bronze youth over 0·37 m. high, once the support for the ring-handle of an immense tripod, a tripod leg 1·20 m. long with figure reliefs dating to the second quarter of the seventh century, two hammerdorn griffins protomes, a large 'Assurattasche' of oriental type, a small cast griffin protome, a sheet bronze casing of a lion's paw
terminal, greaves, and helmets, including one of Illyrian type and a top piece in the form of a bull’s horn cut together with the ear from a bronze sheet. The southern half of the Leonidaion has been cleared of the heavy overlying mediaeval levels, and the excavation extended east to the NW corner of the South Stoa. Further exploration of the area of the Roman building south of the Kladeos baths and west of the Byzantine church was made and its history from classical times made clear. The building itself, one of whose rooms later bore a mosaic floor, is of the second century A.D. Finds included much pottery, a life-size Herm head which seems a good copy in marble of a hitherto unknown Early Classical type, and fragments of a Hellenistic bronze statue of a woman. Fragments of the poros entablature of a Doric treasury have been recovered from a Roman wall, including a well-preserved corner geison with traces of paint, and from a late wall part of the dedication of Apollonia in Epeiros bearing the beginning of the epigram recorded by Pausanias (V 22, 3) and joining a piece of the same inscription found in 1941. The systematic cleaning of earlier excavated bronzes has brought some remarkable discoveries. A Corinthian helmet of early type is decorated at the edges with silver studs and with inlays of silver and ivory. A late archaic Corinthian helmet bears on one side the inscription ΜΙΛΤΙΑΔΩΝ ΔΩ [θ]ΈΚΕΥΝ ἘΙΔΙΣ ΔΙ. The shape of the helmet and the lettering leave no doubt that this is a dedication of the younger Miltiades, and the lack of the ethnic suggests that it dates to the period of his rule in the Chersonese, probably the decade before Marathon. Finally, the bronze plaque from the statue of Ergoteles, whose first Olympic victory was sung by Pindar (Ol. XII).

In Olympia museum more of the archaic terracottas and bronzes are exhibited in the newly opened gallery, which holds also the colossal head of Hera; another gallery is devoted to arms and armour, and the kouroi from Phigaleia, which has been mended, is on view with another recently found at Katákolon.

Apart from the Altis excavation, the NW Peloponnesse has been the source of rich and varied finds. N. Yalouris has excavated Geometric tombs behind the Olympia railway station on the right bank of the Kladeos. 4 km. SW of Olympia near Makryšia two Mycenaean chamber tombs with dromoi were cleared; they contained numerous burials, and yielded much pottery, both of local manufacture and imported Mycenaean vases. These include five large three-handled amphorae of fine local workmanship and two fragments figuring birds between spirals; with them were paste spacer beads with relief decoration of rosettes. Nearby two hills overlooking the Alpheus plain bear traces of Mycenaean settlement and give the first real evidence of Mycenaean habitation so close to the Alpheus. Between Olympia and Makryšia beyond the Alpheus at Kambouli a bothros was discovered, 9.50 m. square and 0.75 m. deep. It contained hundreds of miniature glazed vases of various shapes; among them are some with linear relief decoration of the type on vases from Elis. Their date is of the late fifth and fourth centuries. As well as these local products, Attic black and red figure vases were found, most of them lekythoi, also a great number of terracotta figurines and protomes of female type of the mid-sixth to the end of the fifth century. In the same bothros a late sixth-century clay relief plaque came to light figuring a man holding a phiale and reclining on a couch with a lyre in the background. Some bronze ornaments and a broken blue glass vase were also found. The commonest type of figurine is of a woman wearing a polos, which suggests a cult
of a goddess. The shrine whose deposit this is cannot be readily identified, although there are extensive traces of walls along the left bank of the Alpheus from Mouria to Ankóna opposite Mákrásia. Most of the tombs in the area have been plundered. On the heights called Bámbes opposite Olympia building traces include some certainly of shrines, and on Arnokatárakho one in the form of a small Doric treasury was excavated (8.40 m. x 4.55 m.) (Fig. 9). Finds include archaic pottery and fragments of an archaic silvered shield bearing spiral and cable decoration. A fragmentary inscription, ΤΟΣΟΣ, suggests that the shrine was dedicated to Zeus, and it is dated to the end of the sixth century. The length of occupation of this naturally strong site is shown by late neolithic fragments found near by: around the hill also are extensive traces of walls and architectural members, including two archaic Doric capitals. On H. Elías opposite Olympia the excavation of another temple has been begun. It is 20-05 m. long and has already yielded fragments of a painted terracotta sima. The richness and variety in date of the finds, which include Geometric bird and animal figurines, as well as Roman and Byzantine objects, suggest heavy occupation in this area over a long period.

Yalouris further reports walls of buildings, some circular, standing over 2 m. high south of Kréstaina and Brína. Tombs have come to light, one containing a late fifth-century decorated bronze hydria. Towards Samikón other cut tombs are noted, and on the lower slopes of Lapitha a strong ashlar wall 10 m. long and 1-60 m. high. Beyond Frankoklesía are walls and tombs, one of which contained a late sixth-century black figure lekythos figuring three maenads. Finds, including inscriptions and a late Daedalic clay statuette of a goddess, have been brought into Olympia from the vicinity. From Old Phigaleia dedicatory and funerary inscriptions have been recovered, as well as new fragments of the frieze of the temple of Apollo which have come to light at Bassae. Antiquities, including coins and inscriptions from H. Ioánis, ancient Heraia, in Arcadia, are being assembled in a collection in the school. From the Tranl Lákka gorge of Bertsi in Gortynia a headless statue of Asklepios more than life size has been taken to the Olympia museum, with another life-size torso of Roman date, and tombs have been noted in the neighbourhood. Near ancient Messene an inscribed relief, apparently of Athena, and a marble head, perhaps of Zeus, have come to light.

Pátras museum has received a funerary relief of about 420 B.C. figuring a standing woman holding a pyxis, from ancient Pleuras, and a Late Hellenistic copy of the Doedalas crouching Aphrodite, the head of which is very well preserved. L.H. III chamber tombs were excavated by Yalouris at Kangadí and Kalithéa on the way to Khalamdríssa; the latter contained a well-preserved bronze sword 0.81 m. long with its handle, a socketed spearhead, and a bronze greave. The grave is the first of this period to be excavated on the Greek mainland: wire and hooks held it in position, on the air sample the specimen from Enkomí in Cyprus, and its surface bears the low relief representation of a cross strap. Mycenaean tombs have been found at other points in Achaia. In Agios a Roman building incorporating material from a fifth-century Doric structure was investigated, as well as a nearby classical building. A Roman tomb with painted decoration was reported in the area. Inscriptions, including two fourth-century statue bases, were recovered from Kastrísi near Kaldáryta and a Geometric pithos burial at Kompegádi (Pátras) cleared.

CENTRAL AND NORTHERN GREECE

The Thebé Museum continues closed, but plans for a new building are being studied. Some poor tombs of Hellenistic times have been excavated east of the Amphitéon. On the west edge of the ancient site of Thespiai a Hermaic stele mutilated on the face and a fragment of a Hellenistic tombstone with relief rosettes have come to light. Kh. Krístou also reports that in clearing around the church of the Taxiarkhai near Koróneia he has rediscovered five large inscribed slabs (BCH 1920, 388) which he hopes to publish shortly. They are imperial rescripts; the most important one is Hadrianic and relates to drainage works in the Kopais and the regulation of the beds of the Kephisos and other rivers there. A Hellenistic proxeny decree has been found near Delion; and fourth-century black glaze vases by the ancient Larymna.

Geometric and classical cist graves with burials in a crouching position have been brought to light in the clearing of a sports-field at Amphiákleia (Dadi). E. Mastrokostas reports that one grave contained amongst other offerings a plastic kantharos of about 480 B.C. in the form of a head of a youth and a black figure lekythos depicting Achilles and Ajax playing at dice in the presence of Athena. Other classical tombs yielded a strainer with a handle terminating in the head of a waterbird, a Corinthian helmet, and various bronze vessels; the name of one of the dead, apparently Olympíchos, was given in incision on the feet of two late-fifth century cups—the earliest known examples of writing from Amphiákleia. Of special interest is the grave of a πολύχολος ἵμαρσος, who wore on her head a bronze covering and a bronze diadem with Geometric patterns in jewellery and wavy lines. Her neck was encircled by a double necklace over a metre long, composed of some 350 bronze pellets of triangular section and an amber bead with three pendant bronze water-birds, and by a chain of about the same length, from which were suspended two pairs of beaten bronze combs—perhaps the Homeric κέλαυσα; five four-spoke wheels with engraved Geometric ornament also seem to have hung from the chain. On her arms were a number of bracelets terminating in
snakes’ heads, and on her fingers spiral and semi-conical rings. About her person were three magnificent fibulæ of Boeotian type with designs of horses, birds, fishes, and a centaur, two iron fibulæ of the same type, and two large bronze figure-of-eight brooches. Other burials yielded fibulæ and vases, of which two bear Geometric decoration.

At Delphi Mastrokostas reports the discovery of a fragment of the epigram from the hetaira Rhodopis’ dedication of iron ox-spits as a tithe of her savings, which stood behind the Altar of the Chians. The script is archaic, and the arrangement of the surviving letters — ἀνθη[κ]ε ῾Ροδ[ότις] — suggests a metrical inscription (Fig. 10).

N. Verdeles has resumed his excavation for the Archaeological Society at Pteleos. A second Mycenaean tholos tomb has been brought to light close to that found in 1951. It is over 5 m. wide, but the dromos is very short and narrow. The tomb had collapsed and been filled in before Roman times, when a simple grave was cut across the collapsed dome. Some L.H. III vases were found in the tholos. On the north edge of the tholos were two shallow pits containing numerous bones, and on its south side, close under the floor, three grave-shafts (one with an intact skeleton in the usual crouching position); the latter seem to be associated with Mycenaean sherds found at the entrance of the tholos. Yet another similar tholos, unfortunately badly eroded, came to light only 30 m. to the east; it is also shown by vases to be of L.H. III date; a walled-off compartment on the east contained human bones, together with a horse’s jawbone and a dog’s skull, and Mycenaean sherds.

From this cluster of tombs Verdeles concludes that the Homeric city of Pteleos must have lain on the height of Gritsa to the east, where also stood the city of historical times. He has also tested the remains of a Hellenistic building complex, which had mud-brick walls on stone foundations, near the tholos tomb at H. Thódori; the outlines of two buildings have come out almost complete, together with fainter traces of two others. They seem to belong to a military establishment or agricultural colony.

At Pharsala Verdeles has continued investigations at the archaic tholos tomb previously cleared. On the edge of the mound a bronze hydria of the second half of the fourth century with a figure of Nike engaged under the handle has been discovered in a stone container, with Hellenistic graves alongside; Mycenaean sherds were also found here. Under the mound of the tholos a Mycenaean vaulted chamber tomb came to light; the dromos had a pavement which ran on into the chamber on the same width. The chamber contained an adult burial, and a large pile of bones mixed with Mycenaean sherds and jewellery. This tomb seems to have been looted at the time when the tholos was built. Verdeles considers that this additional evidence of a Mycenaean cemetery confirms his conclusion that Pteles’ Pthia lay here, and he believes that the city was on a nearby knoll above the sources of the Apidanos. Steps have been taken to preserve these tombs.

V. Milojčić has made a trial excavation for the German Institute at Odžak Magoula near Larissa as a preliminary to a fuller exploration of the prehistoric cultures of Thessaly and their relations to the North Balkans. The stratification here has thrown new light on the relative chronology of the pottery sequences of the region. A culture, older than the Seskoulo period and marked only by smoothed and finely polished pottery of A I type, is recognised in one deep stratum. The sounding could not be carried down to virgin soil. Among the finds from the upper levels are a
practically complete bowl like Wace-Thompson fig. 45, and a fragment of a female figure with a head and hair-style related to Tsountas pl. 32. 1.

Yalouri reports the discovery of late tombs at Kho uni in the interior of Attolia and at Amphiklokhia and the ancient Thyrhireon in Acharnêa; inscriptions and other finds have been brought in to the museums of Agrinión and Naupaktos. Continuing the excavations of the rectangular building at Kasse in the southern Epeiros S. Dakares has cleared the central court and the ranges surrounding it, with the twenty-six octagonal Doric columns and three further rooms. In a corner room the side of a stone staircase, which led to the upper storey, and the pavement of the original floor have been uncovered; all the other rooms have bases of tables in the centre. Water-pipes, various architectural members, and other finds have come to light. Dakares is satisfied that this building was not a pylon but a public xenon and that the occupation came to an end in the first century B.C. The upper courses are shown to have consisted of large baked bricks alternating with tile-faced timbers; the large stoai to the south of this building has also been tested, and seems to have been of similar construction. Accessions to the collection of antiquities at Nikopolis include an unfinished life-size male head in marble and four inscribed funerary stelai, of which one reads Μάξιος Μάρκου̣ | ἐνηρο-φύλαξ ἐτῶν ἐξ | χριίε̣. Dakares has discovered traces of prehistoric curved buildings and a perforated stone axe at Thestproikon.

D. Evangelides has continued the Archaeological Society's excavations at Dodona, completing the clearing of the square building and of the slope by the theatre. The former underwent many reconstructions. In its fourth-century form it had a peristyle, probably an internal court. After the destruction around the end of the third century it acquired a propylon on its south side. At a later date, after yet another destruction, a new oblong temple-like building was erected, and meantime other changes were made in the court. Evangelides is inclined to attribute the various destructions to the times of the Aetolian Dorimachos, Aemilius Paulus, and the Mithridatic wars. Within the NW corner of this building a prehistoric stratum has been uncovered with a hearth and numerous Early Helladic sherds. The finds from the excavations here include oracular lead plaques and an important inscription recording the admission to citizenship of two women in the reign of King Neoptolemos in the fourth century; this inscription gives us hitherto unknown names of peoples of the Epeiros. Of the rectangular building near the theatre the four outer walls are preserved with internal and external buttresses on some of the sides; the entrance is probably on the south. In its north part were two internal rows of three bases at regular intervals, the second one being at a lower level and having Ionic columns. The purpose of both these buildings still remains obscure. Other finds include more oracular plaques and various bronze objects. The most notable is a small bronze figure from the rim of a krater, in the form of a man reclining on his left elbow and holding a drinking-horn in his hand; it belongs to the beginning of the sixth century, and is probably of Lakonian workmanship like so many of the bronze figurines found at Dodona.

Evangelides has also made a small excavation at Glyký near Paramythia at the ruins of a basilica of the time of the Despots. Two Roman graves are reported by Dakares on the west edge of Ioannina, and four cinerary graves were discovered by soldiers 32 km. away by the Kalpáki road. The latter contained bronze weapons and ornament and rock crystal and amber beads; some sherds of the second prehistoric phase were found in the vicinity. Dakares considers these burials to be of Mycenaean date—a discovery of considerable interest for the archaeology of the Epeiros.

The excavation of the cemetery at Vergina in Western Macedonia has been continued by M. Andronikos, five more mounds being excavated and yielding pithos burials and many handmade vases, with bronze and iron objects similar to those discovered in the preceding year. It is thus confirmed that the entire cemetery is of the early Iron Age; the oldest mounds are in the north part. Protogeometric sherds have also been found. In two of the mounds intrusive Hellenistic burials were found, one consisting of a chamber 3 m. long with a low bench and a shallow painted frieze; it thus appears that the mounds were re-used in Hellenistic times. Among the most interesting finds is an amphora with dichrome decoration of bands and stylised branches, similar to one from Olynthos, and thus suggesting a date in the second half of the sixth century for the mound from which it came. Andronikos supposes that the position of the early settlement is that of the Hellenistic one north of the known palace of Palatia. Tombs of Macedonian type, some with Doric façades and painted decoration, have been disclosed in quarrying at Ano Kopaní on the oldest Kition. Ph. Petras reports that with the lowering of the water level in Lake Ostrava a grave circle of orthostates, with a diameter of 11.50 m., was revealed at Arniass; it includes some ten cinerary graves, while other graves can be distinguished outside the circle. These seem to belong to the prehistoric cemetery previously noted thereabouts.

At Salonica the museum in the Yeni Dzami was opened to visitors in April. The vestibule contains sculptures and architectural pieces, mainly of archaic and classical date. The main hall (Fig. 11) is occupied by copies of classical statues and Hellenistic and Roman works down to the time of Theodosius the Great, including the most notable new discoveries. A selection of vases and terracottas is displayed in two show-cases. Sarcophagi and other objects are exhibited in the yard. Work is continuing on the upper floor. Other acquisitions include the lower part of a fifth-century B.C. Ionic column found at the Syndravani Square, and gravestones of Roman date—among the
latter one of Philomousos and Thymele found near the Arch of Galerius, a grave relief of a woman named Hoplis with a frontal bust of the dead, and a marble altar of C. Furias Hermias with a relief of a young man in the guise of Hermes, equipped with sandals, caduceus, and club. Kh. Makaronas reports that the Arch of Galerius has been cleaned, repaired, and cleared of later accretions, and that the ‘Via Egnatia’, now lowered to the Roman level in this sector, has been diverted south of the Arch of Galerius. Walls of the time of the tetrarchy, attributable to the Palace of Galerius, have been revealed in the area SW of the arch, together with architectural remains in the vicinity of the octagon. Another late Roman vaulted tomb with four cists has come to light by the Leoforos Stratou; it had an enclosed vault area above, with a hole in the vault for the passage of libations. More Roman graves and a carved marble sarcophagus with an Eros and garlands have been discovered near the White Tower. From classical tombs at Nea Mekhanion on the south a bronze hydria and a black figure oenochoe with bulls have been recovered.

Petasas reports that at Tóumba in the nome of Kilkis a large vaulted tomb of Macedonian type has been discovered, with carved monolith jambs and a funerary couch; five undisturbed burials, dated by coins of Theodosius I and Honorius, seem to belong to a subsequent period of re-use. Two funerary reliefs with female busts and a gravestone of the early second century after Christ have been recovered at Pyrgadikia at the head of the Singitic Gulf; two further inscribed stele, one of A.D. 220

and the other of a citizen of Acanthus, have been recovered at Planà in the same neighbourhood. At Amphipolis D. Lazarides has excavated at various points in the ancient cemetery and uncovered twenty-five graves of different types, the majority being of the Roman period. The most interesting was a cist grave with paintings of birds and floral ornaments on the inside; it contained a gold wreath, iron weapons, and various offerings of terracotta, and probably belongs to the second or first century B.C. Among the other finds here are inscribed grave stele and statuettes, among which are no less than twenty-six of Aphrodite with a dolphin. Lazarides has also recovered from the vicinity of Amphipolis a gold diadem with two lyres in relief, a pair of gold medallions (one with a relief head in three-quarter view), some fourth-century red figure vases, and an early Hellenistic silver tet Arbor of Histiaea.

In the vicinity of Serres Lazarides reports chance discoveries, which include a tomb with a pedimental relief stela of a Thracian family bearing a date in the month Gorpios A.D. 132, and at Mesi Rodopis a fourth-century B.C. relief of a seated woman. At Stanopol in the region of Xanthi Makaronas has cleared the vaulted tomb discovered a couple of years ago; inside the chamber were found the two leaves of the marble door, similar to those of Langada, Vergina, and the Heroon of Kalydon. The chamber contained two handsome marble funerary couches with double pillows at either end; the feet of the couches were painted in encaustic like the throne in Rhomaios' tomb at Vergina. The chamber is over 3 m. square, and is peculiar in having a vaulted 'dromos' nearly 5 m. long. The whole construction is in local marbles; and the interior had no coat of plaster, the painting being done directly on the marble surface—a treatment hitherto unknown in Macedonian.
tombs. The tomb had been robbed, and only some fragmentary figurines were found; Makaronas
dates them to the first half of the second century B.C.

THE ISLANDS

In Thasos the French School has completed the excavation of the agora and rebuilt four of the
Doric stoas columns. Further excavation of the Demetriades property reveals occupation from
archaic to Byzantine times. Of the handsome archeaic polygonal walls in local marble, some stand-
ing 2.50 m. high, the oldest are dated by associated pottery to the early sixth century. Between
the ancient commercial harbour and the Dionysion a shop area in use from the sixth century B.C.
to Byzantine times was sounded. The triple arch of Caracalla has been restudied. Of local marble,
it stands on a socle 16.27 × 2.07 m. and four piers of different size and orientation. Details and
dimensions of its entablature were determined. On its east side the dedication on the architrave
naming Caracalla, Julia Domna, and Septimus Severus dates the arch between A.D. 213 and 217.
On the south the arch is met by a marble wall running from the direction of the temple of Herakles.
Excavation of the Hellenistic-Roman cemetery revealed an oblong funerary building, and at its
side fragments of relief sculpture and a female statue of the early Hellenistic period. Near by a
small vase was found to contain 134 silver and bronze coins of Thasos, Khalkedon, and Byzantium.

In Samothrace the excavations under the direction of K. Lehmann were concentrated on the area
adjacent to the east side of the New Temple, the early Hellenistic Doric marble building that domi-
mates the south part of the sanctuary. This now presents itself in its entirety so far as it is preserved.
The bedding of a road descending from the direction of the Ptolemaion to the south end of the
sanctuary along a polygonal terrace wall, which formed its boundary to the south and SE of the New
Temple, was uncovered. East of the north part of the cela of the New Temple, outside its founda-
tions and near to them, was found an unusual group of stones. In the centre there is a square lime-
stone block with a deep central hole made for the insertion of a tall vertical object, assumed to have
been a monumental torch. To the north and south this stone is flanked by other stones at a distance
of about half a metre. At the south a roughly cut marble block was found, with heavy traces of
wear on its surface, which is on a level considerably deeper than that of the Hellenistic temple;
and at the same level its northern counterpart is in situ beneath later coverings. Here the state of
preservation shows that the early marble blocks were covered by earth at a later period and that a
second stepping-stone, with a surface 0.14 m. above that of the earlier period but still 0.40 m. beneath
the upper edge of the foundation of the Hellenistic temple, was embedded in this earth. In a third
period this upper stone was in turn covered by a floor evidently intended to support a second suc-
cessor of the original stone and having a surface at the level of the building. At the same time both
stone settings were enclosed by frames made of large roof tiles stuck sideways into the ground. There
are then two sacred stepping-stones twice renewed on higher levels which flank a torceh and are
evidently of ritual significance. It is assumed that the three periods of these stones correspond to
the three major building periods of the temple, the first probably belonging to its original archaic
state. Analogous stones as stands for the accuser and accused in the Court of the Areiopagos and
the witness stones in other Attic courts, with the fact that votes of allegiance and pledges to secrecy
were common in mystery initiation, suggest that the stones in Samothrace were used for a kind of
sacred trial connected with initiation into the higher degree, the epopteia, which took place, as had
been concluded from evidence previously obtained, in this building.

To the east of the New Temple, in a fill of the Roman period near the SE corner of the building,
one large piece and numerous smaller fragments of the central floral akroterion of the rear façade
were found. The akroterion in Vienna found in this spot eighty years ago by the Austrian excavators
was a Roman substitute for this Hellenistic original. In the course of excavation in the north part
of the sanctuary in front of the archaic initiation hall (the Anaktoron) and to the NW of the rotunda
of Queen Arsinoe a massive archeaic terrace wall has been uncovered; it was a retaining wall
against the river in connection with the original building of the Anaktoron about 500 B.C., and runs
from SW to NE oblique to the orientation of the building and evidently following the original course
of the river. At the north it abuts on the façade foundation of the Anaktoron at a point just north
of the northeastermost of its three doors. Sporadic finds include terracottas and a gem with the
image of the Anatolian 'Kybebe' type. The goddess extends her arms, from which fillets hang
down or are fastened to the ground, and wears a patterned garment recalling the Ephesian Artemis;
she has parted hair and a thin high polos. Surface finds near the New Temple included a curious
group of flat omphalos-shaped marble objects of small size and possibly ritual purpose. A heavy
iron finger ring recalls Lucretius' allusion to Samothracian iron pieces which he saw used for expe-
riments with magnetic stone and of Pliny's reference to gilded Samothracian iron rings worn even
by slaves, presumably symbols of initiation which could be worn by free men and slaves alike.
A fourth-century B.C. honorary decree seems to be the earliest preserved Greek stone inscription
of certain Samothracian origin. It contains such forms as της Σωμοθράκων, and φωτεινῆς
πολιτείας, and is evidently in the Aeolic dialect. Lehmann suggests it may be evidence of an Aeolic
origin for the Samothracian Greek settlers, in contradiction to the stories of a Greek colony from Samos.
A fragment of a Thasian marble block from a large base or altar preserves part of a dedication to a
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king in monumental early Hellenistic letters, perhaps from the altar to King Lysimachus known from inscriptions. Other fragmentary Greek and Latin catalogues of mystae and epoptae are reported. Work of conservation includes the clearing of the eastern part of the temenos and the restoration of its missing contours by tracing the outline with reset ancient foundation blocks and the filling of the interior terrace to a regular level. The museum building has been extended by an added exhibition and storage wing. In Lemnos B. Brea has collected the material for the publication of the prehistoric settlement of Poliochini.

In Chios town by H. Anárgyroi N. Kondoleon has uncovered part of an Early Christian basilica. In its apse were found two tombs built of ancient blocks, one of which bore part of a late-third-century B.C. honorary decree for a man who was responsible for the dedication in the gymnasium of a history of the first beginnings of Rome, including μόνοι πρὸς δόξαν Ρώμης.

A. P. Stephanou reports a new inscription from Chios town preserving an epitome of part of

![Fig. 12.—Chios, Emporio: (a) Early Bronze Age Vase; (b) Black Figure Kantharos.](image)

the Homeric Catalogue of Ships (II. II 603–670). The first line is badly effaced, but in the following he confidently restores

\[
\text{Πολύμεινος 'Ηλείος} \\
\text{ναύς ἔξισκοτα} \\
\text{Μέγης Δωλιτέις} \\
\text{ναύς τεσσαράκοντα} \\
\text{ Categoria στὸκος ναύς δεκαδύα} \\
\text{Θόσα Αιττῶλος ναύς} \\
\text{τεσσαράκοντα} \\
\text{'Ιδομενεὺς Μηρίόνης Κρήτης} \\
\text{ναύς ἔνευκοτα} \\
\text{Τηπόλεμος Ῥόδιος} \\
\text{ναύς ἔνευκα.}
\]

Stephanou dates the inscription to the third century B.C., suggesting that it is part of a version for use in schools. Variations in details from the accepted text of the Catalogue and the place of origin make the stone particularly interesting and important. Building operations in the town south of Vounáki uncovered a votive deposit from a Demeter sanctuary. The dedications include miniature vases, figurines, a loom-weight inscribed with a dedication to Demeter, and Chian kouros dating from Hellenistic times and earlier. Archaic tombs containing vases and figurines are reported from Lithi and Phytá.

The excavations begun in 1952 by the British School on behalf of the Chios Society of Great Britain at Emporí in South Chios were continued during June and July of this year under the direction of M. S. F. Hood and with the assistance of J. Boardman. New trenches were opened in the Early Bronze Age settlement on the slopes below the acropolis which projects into the sea on the south side of the harbour. These have been placed down in places to a depth of 5 m. through successive levels of occupation without reaching the bottom. The houses have rectangular rooms with walls built of rough rubble, as at Thermi in Lesbos. A level of destruction by burning yielded many complete or nearly complete vases on or above floors of houses. Several of the vases have rich incised decoration, the incisions often being filled with white paste (one Fig. 12a). A section of
town wall 5 m. thick belonging to an early phase in the history of the settlement has been uncovered. At its widest extent the Early Bronze Age settlement occupied a large area, including the acropolis itself, as well as the slopes below and the south shore of the harbour. No undisturbed levels of the Middle or Late Bronze Age have been found, but sherds of matt-painted Middle Bronze Age and of 'Mycenaean' Late Bronze Age pottery (the first recorded from Chios) indicate continuity of occupation into those times.

Walls visible on the acropolis before excavation proved to belong to a late Roman fortress with a double line of ramparts on the landward side. The thin outer rampart was evidently in the nature of a terrace wall supporting a platform paved with large beach pebbles, above which rose the main wall 2 m. wide. From the main inner wall projected three rectangular towers of varying size; the two larger, at any rate, of these towers were hollow, with rooms inside them. The main gate of the fortress faced the harbour on the north, but a subsidiary gate gave access to the beach on the south side of the acropolis. An area inside the fortress was cleared and revealed a gravel-paved street running parallel to the main wall, with rooms or buildings on each side. From the evidence of coins found on the floors it appears that the fortress was abandoned during the third quarter of the seventh century, the period of the great Arab sea invasion culminating in the first siege of Constantinople (A.D. 664-8). The largest of the three towers of the fortress had been destroyed by fire, and from the room inside it were recovered a number of pithoi and amphorae. Some of these amphorae were cylindrical, others more or less globular with wavy combed decoration round the shoulder.

![Image](https://example.com/image.png)

**Fig. 13.—Chios, Emporió: Temple Area.**

These and other vases from the buildings inside the fortress provide interesting new evidence and dating for the pottery of the period.

A curved piece of walling in a field below the acropolis and just beyond the limits of the Early Bronze Age settlement proved to belong to a circular baptistery with a cruciform font sunk below the level of the floor. The font was lined with marble, and the walls of the baptistery had been decorated with painted plaster imitating variegated red-and-green marble slabs. The baptistery was attached to the SW corner of a large basilica church with apse and side aisles. Mosaic paving with simple geometric designs in five or six colours was identified in the narthex and north aisle. Baptistery and basilica were presumably destroyed together with the fortress during the seventh century. Fragments of life-sized marble statues from the area of the basilica suggest the presence of some large public building or villa here before the church was built. A very late inscription found built into the floor of the modern church describes the construction of a ναὸς doubtless referring to the early Christian basilica, 'on the ruins of the ancient city of Emporios'. If Emporios was already called by that name in antiquity it seems probable that it was the emporium or export centre for the mastic gum peculiar to this south part of Chios, where it is still largely grown. That mastic was already a staple product of the island by Roman times is clear from ancient writers, and Pliny speaking of mastic in general says: 'laudatissima autem Chia candida'.

Observation of terrace walling on the slopes of Mount Prophetae Elias above Emporios led to the discovery of a hitherto unknown ancient city. The main road of the city is clearly visible leading up to the Temple area in a conspicuous position on a saddle of the mountain (Fig. 13). The plan of the Temple with its altars was apparent on the surface before excavation. The history of the sanctuary goes back into the seventh century B.C. when there seems to have been nothing but a 'basis', probably a stand for offerings, in the open air. The Temple itself, a simple two-roomed
building, measuring about 10 x 6 m. outside with the entrance on the east, dates from the sixth century. It is built with large squared blocks of the white stone of the mountain, and the walls with their foundations are standing a full three courses to a height of nearly a metre above the floor. The inner room or cela enclosed the earlier 'basis' or stand for offerings, by the side of which was placed a low base evidently intended to support a cult statue. Outside the Temple a few metres to the north was a hollow 'bothros'-type altar, built of squared blocks and apparently contemporary with the Temple. A second altar was added in front of the entrance of the Temple on the east in or after the fourth century B.C. About this time alterations were also made within the Temple, and the original 'basis' was incorporated in a larger platform for offerings which filled the whole NW corner of the cela.

From the Temple were recovered a large number of votives, mostly vases and clay figurines. Nearly all the pottery found in the Temple is of Chian manufacture, and includes many shapes hitherto unknown. Of the few imported pieces most appear to be East Greek, and there is little recognisably from the mainland of Greece. The earliest pottery, dating from about 600 B.C., is of 'Naucratite' fabric, and the shapes include chalices—some fragments figuring sphinxes—and a votive plate showing part of a standing female figure armed with spear and shield and intended no doubt to represent the goddess Athena, to whom perhaps the Temple was dedicated. A late-sixth century kantharos, unique in shape and style of decoration, is painted in black figure with a cock (Fig. 12b). An interesting series of thymateria with pierced lids may date from the fifth century. The pottery from the last period of the Temple, after the construction of the second altar, consists mainly of simple goblets reminiscent of the archaic 'Naucratite' or Chian chalice. At all periods wine amphorae seem to have formed part of the dedications.

Fragments of two female statuettes, one of limestone the other of white island marble, belong to the sixth century. The latter in particular is of fine Ionian, probably Chian, workmanship. Other finds from the Temple include the upper part of a lyre player in faience, and a group of nine little lead griffin protomes, about 0.10 m. high, of fine workmanship and dating from the sixth century (Pl. IX. 2). The griffins have spike attachments, evidently for fastening them to a solid structure or mass. It has been suggested that they might have encircled the head of a wooden cult statue of the goddess which stood on the base in the cela.

Continued excavation at Emporion is planned this year, and it is hoped to undertake soundings at a site on the NE coast of the island identified from air photographs and confirmed by ground survey, probably that of Delphinion captured and fortified by the Athenians after the revolt of Chios during the Peloponnesian War.

At the Heraion on Samos E. Buschor resumed exploration of the temple and the area to the north. Scanty Late Neolithic pottery was recovered, but no building traces. NW of the temple the pre-historic course of the Imbranos was determined; it apparently ran SE under the temple. A gravel bed and embankment were found by the NW corner of the Rhoikos temple, near it a megaron in which three building periods were observed, a cistern, and an open place. Two phases of buildings and some child burials in the area all seem to be of the period of Troy IV and V, the early second millennium. About 40 m. to the SE under the prothesis of the great temple a building of the same date previously discovered has been further excavated. The massive walls with rectangular corners are interrupted by narrow slits through their thicknesses. Over the Bronze Age levels between the temple and the North Stoa isolated traces of the fill of the Rhoikos period yielded pottery and other finds of the seventh century.

On Delos cleaning below the floor of Sarapeion C yielded a group of amphora handles of a type hitherto unknown on the island; they are of the mid-second century B.C. and give a terminal date for the pavement. Final work on the Oikos of the Naxians with a view to publication brought to light new fragments of gorgoneion antefixes and Naxian marble tiles, one bearing as builders' placing mark the letter kappa. Cousteau's underwater survey of the coast revealed no ancient wrecks, but part of an anchor over 1 m. long was recovered. Miss V. Grace has completed the arrangement of the stamped amphora handles in Delos museum.

Kondoleon continued excavation for the Archaeological Society on Tenos by Xóbourgo. The building tentatively identified last year as a Thesmophorion has been cleared (Pl. VIII. 1). The identity seems now certain, although no inscriptions have come to light. In the western part of the sanctuary a Gallery of Pithoi was uncovered after last year's discovery of two pithoi in situ. One has been restored nearly complete; it figures in relief on the neck winged figures with another larger winged woman seated in the midst. Successive zones on the body figured horses, lions attacking horses and a hero fighting a lion, and a procession of chariots and hoplites (Pl. VIII. 2). In another part of the sanctuary a larger relief fragment was found depicting several zones of men and women dancing to the music of a double flute and on the neck a man facing, perhaps greeting, a woman. Fragments of another pithos preserve continuous meander bands. The sanctuary underwent various architectural changes in the fifth century. A strong wall visible above the sanctuary is confirmed as part of the city wall; behind it was found the lower part of a relief pithos with chariots in its lowest zone and hoplites and tripods preserved in fragments from the upper part. Other important pithos fragments figure a procession of women wearing poloi, winged horses, etc.
On Kimolos Kondoleon in a small private excavation investigated the known gravefield at Línmi (Hellenikà) on the west coast of the island (Fig. 14). The excavated tombs were of the Geometric period, and of the fifth century and later. The latter had for the most part been plundered in antiquity, but the Geometric tombs were untouched and rich in offerings. They were cut in the rock beside the sea, and each contained a number of cremation burials. From the twenty-two Geometric tombs were recovered over 200 vases, which make one of the richest collections of vases from tombs in the Cyclades. In a modern wall nearby was found a grave stele, the upper part of which bears in low relief the breasts and hands of a woman. The representation of the head is not clear, and the lower part was not decorated, though it may have been painted. It cannot be dated later than the seventh century B.C. In the wall of a private house in the Khóra of Kós has been recovered a fragment of a white marble relief frieze figuring a seated and helmeted Athena; Kondoleon dates it to the last quarter of the sixth century.

Kh. Khristou reports that various architectural pieces of Roman date, inscriptions, and vases found in the course of work on the new power station at Alivéri in Euboea have been transferred to a temporary collection in the gymnasium there.

In Kerkyra B. Kallipolites has prepared a wing of the Old Palace buildings as an archaeological museum, in one gallery of which architectural exhibits from the island and fictile revetments from the Artemis temple are on view. The Gorgon Pediment remains for the time in a storeroom, but other antiquities are accessible to students, and among objects newly mended for exhibition is a black glaze Lakonian krater of the early fifth century. A group of Hellenistic graves 4 km. from the town at Kánnia was excavated. Triple laurel leaves in gold foil were found by the heads of some bodies, and by another burial an inscribed stele was found in situ.

After the tragic succession of earthquakes in the Ionian Islands last summer Kallipolites rescued part of the antiquities in the ruined museum of Kephalinia and housed them in a hut. They include the vases of the Late Mycenaean collection and the small finds from Goekoop’s excavations, but other losses are heavy. Miss S. Benton proceeded to Ithaca at the earliest opportunity, and in conjunction with Kallipolites removed the surviving finds from the ruined Vathy museum to a building on the other side of the harbour: only one show-case was a total loss. The contents of the Stavrós museum, which has sustained no serious damage, have been transferred to the village library. M. Khatzidakis recovered about 150 icons from the destroyed museum in Zakynthos, but reports that fifty of the finest have perished. Of the numerous churches of the Venetian period three can be restored. Some hundreds of icons have been recovered from the churches; carved altar screens have been salvaged, and some forty square metres of late Byzantine frescoes—some not hitherto known.

On behalf of the Archaeological Society and the General Direction of the Dodecanese I. Kondes has brought to light part of the ancient fortification of the great harbour of Rhodes with a circular tower on the NE edge of the mediaeval city, and continued his excavation of the stoa on the north of the acropolis. Remains of Hellenistic houses have been investigated in the city. Near Malóna various finds and two inscriptions recording sacred laws suggest the proximity of a sanctuary of Dionysos. Near the shrine of Apollo Eréthimios has been found a mid-third century bronze statuette of Zeus. In the town of Kálymnos a tomb of the same date containing gold ornaments came to light. In the museum of Kós the collection of sculpture of the archaic to Roman periods is now exhibited. The museum in the mediaeval Kastro of the city is being prepared for the display of classical and Byzantine architectural finds, inscriptions, and the relics from the Hellenistic altar of Dionysos. Work of restoration of the Early Christian and mediaeval antiquities of Rhodes, Kós, and Astypalaia and other islands is also reported.
Crete

The year 1953 has been no less successful than the preceding one. In the Herakleion Museum, spacious underground magazines have been constructed, and the new wing with eight well-lit galleries is being completed. The museum will thus have twenty galleries, of which twelve will be used for public exhibition and eight for the collections for study; the new show-cases are now largely in use, and the old ones have been remodelled and are being used for the study collections. The Prinias sculptures have been reconstituted, and the Apollinaris mosaic has been brought in from Knossos and relaid. The Historical Museum, which contains the Byzantine and mediaeval collection of the Herakleion Museum as well as a first-class history and folklore exhibition, is completed and open to the public. Dr. N. Platon is to be heartily congratulated on the progress made in Herakleion, as also on widespread repairs and improvements in the smaller museums of Crete and on the archaeological sites; in the course of restorations at Tyliossos chronological points and the peculiar lavatory system have been elucidated and new plans made for the final publication. The Venetian harbour fort at Herakleion has been restored, and Platon has been indefatigable in his endeavours to save the later mediaeval monuments of the town from extinction.

St. Alexiou has continued the excavation begun in 1951 at Katamâ with funds from the Archaeological Society. In the Late Minoan cemetery on the west bank of the Kairatos four more rock-cut chamber tombs have been dug. The first, with a horseshoe-shaped chamber, had already been looted in antiquity; besides some cups it contained a piece of blue-painted wood, no doubt from a larnax, and a shark's tooth. The second tomb had a low bench in the interior, on which lay a skeleton; the chamber also contained a second skeleton and vases, which include a Palace Style amphora, and there were seats and a niche in the dromos. A third tomb had a square chamber, on either side of which was a bench with a skeleton oriented east; vases, including three Palace Style amphorae, and bronze implements were found in it; here also the dromoi had seats. The last tomb proved to be larger and more handsome, with a finely worked façade. It contained three dead in a contracted position inside wooden larnakes, one of which shows white colour. The potter includes an exceptionally fine group of Palace Style vases. In the SE corner of the chamber was a large three-handled amphora with unusual painted decoration consisting of bear's-tooth helmets with a crest and cheek-pieces. In the middle of the chamber was a marvellous jug decorated with birds and fishes, two burners, two unusually large alabastra, and a black tripod vase. At the back was a large jug with ivy and papyrus patterns and a three-handled Palace Style amphora with octopus decoration. The larnakes also contained some vases.

Alexiou has also discovered extensive traces of neolithic settlement on the height above, and excavated a house and a rock shelter with neolithic burials. The former is a large rectangular building with rough stone walls divided into a number of smaller rooms. Besides stone equipment and implements much handsome incised pottery came to light, together with some barbotine ware. At Vitsilâ a neolithic rock shelter has been discovered and is to be investigated.

At Knossos two more large rock-cut tombs were excavated by M. S. F. Hood in the Middle Minoan cemetery at Aiiâ on the slopes east of the Kairatos, close by the stairway and the large tomb cleared in 1951. The earlier of these tombs was circular, with a diameter of 6-7 m., closed by a massive stone wall on the west (entrance) side, with another wall dividing it into two compartments down the middle. It contained upwards of fifty burials in position, mostly inside pithoi (one shown Fig. 156). Seals and pottery place this tomb within the limits of M.M. II. The second tomb, with three compartments divided by stone walls, contained burials in larnakes (Fig. 156a). From it, and especially from the larnakes, came a large number of small finds and six sealstones, including a scarab in rock crystal, and a steatite cylinder with spiral decoration, which is the earliest cylinder seal of undoubtedly Minoan manufacture recorded from Crete. A lenticulal of pale chaledony has a fine engraved scene of a wounded bull with a spear sticking in its back. Other finds from this tomb were a silver pendant in the shape of a squatting man, a plain gold finger-ring, and a gold ring with a lily design on the bezel. There were also many bronze rings, ear-rings, pins and bracelets, and beads of amethyst, rock crystal, lapis lazuli, and cornelian. Objects and pottery date the tomb to M.M. III. A rock cutting in a field east of the Kairatos opposite the Temple Tomb was investigated; it may be a plundered Minoan shaft grave. A limestone 'Double Axe Stand' was found high in the fill.

On the Sanatorium site on the south side of Knossos a group of late Roman tombs was excavated by J. M. Cook in June, and in September Hood uncovered mosaics, which seem to indicate the presence of an Early Christian basilica in the same vicinity. Scattered antiquities and inscriptions have also been brought in from the Sanatorium area. A small cremation tomb of the Geometric period was brought to light in field works near the main road by the Sanatorium; about 20 vases from it have been reconstructed complete, and other finds include a gold pin and a bead of gold and amber. Several poor Roman graves have been exposed at the same point, together with blocks from a large Roman built tomb. A fragment of a Late Minoan bath or larnax found on the surface immediately west of Hogarth's houses has a thin straight column in low relief, with what appears
to be spiral fluting indicated in paint (Fig. 15c). A map of the Knossos area on a scale of 1: 2,500 has been completed by Mr. D. Smollett.

Road widening at H. Ioánnis between Knossos and Herakleion cut into a L.M. II 'Warrior's Grave', with traces of a blue-painted wooden coffin, and a large array of bronze weapons, including a cruciform-hilted sword with ivory pommel and a spearhead over half a metre long. The tomb was cleared by Hood. With the weapons were two fine sealstones, a lentoid of pale banded agate engraved with a lion devouring a bull, and an amygdaloid of black-speckled agate with a lion couchant. The only clay vase from the tomb was a lamp, but by the side of the warrior stood a gold cup, the first to be recorded from Crete (Pl. IX. 4). This is made from a single piece of gold, and has a rim diameter of 0-11 m. In shape it resembles the gold cup from the tholos tomb at Marathon, and bronze and silver cups from Knossos and Mycenae; but it is richly decorated in repoussé with running spirals set above arcades, exactly like the design on a silver jug from Shaft Grave V at Mycenae.

Fig. 15.—Knossos: (a), (b) Larnakes and Pithos from Middle Minoan Cemetery; (c) Larnax Fragment.

By the main road at H. Ioánnis J. Boardman cleared a small Protogeometric tomb and the side chamber to the dromos of another which had been dug away during the war. Finds included pottery, an iron dagger, and bronze fibulae. The graves form part of a Protogeometric cemetery which was investigated before the war.

Prof. Sp. Marinatos has extended his excavation in the vicinity of the L.M. I mansion at Válypetro, and located the potter's kiln. The complex, with a paved yard, measures 15 × 30 m. Many small fired parallel channels with a coating of mud plaster have been discovered, and also a broad wall believed to be that of the kiln itself. The French School has completed the exploration of the houses in Quarter E at Mália. On the south of House Zβ and under the house itself a wall of irregular masonry 1-60 m. thick has been cleared; it dates from the first period of the Palace, and probably continued on the other side of the east-west street in this sector. The street itself continued eastwards, flanked by pavement, for a hundred metres to a little hill where some walls and a threeroom house have been noted; the town thus stretched as far as the present chapel of H. Nikolaos. Another street with a pavement of sets or cobbles and a raised footway, flanked by walls a metre high, has been cleared on the east. On its south side was a house of the second period, which was
violently destroyed; it had a paved court with walls in fine masonry, which was entered over an ironstone threshold from the street, while a second threshold gave access to another room at the back. Farther east has been found a more modest house with a stuccoed room containing a column base and a block or altar—an arrangement found in other houses at Malia. A fragment of a vase decorated with nautilus, murex, and shell pattern in relief came to light in a deposit of M.M. IIIb, thus showing that the marine style so familiar at Phaistos occurs at Malia also.

At Kritsa on the edge of the Lasithi Platon has dug two vaulted Protogeometric tombs, apparently part of a larger cemetery, and discovered bronze ornaments, iron instruments, and vases; the dromos of one tomb contained a jug and numerous small cups for libations to the dead. An investigation by Platon and Dr. Levi of the site of the ancient city of Lyttos revealed the presence of important buildings and a Christian basilica. On the site of the ancient agora inscribed bases came to light in addition to those with hieroglyphic inscriptions to Roman emperors previously discovered by Levi; two funerary inscriptions have also been collected. A second-century B.C. grave at H. Nikolaos produced a series of interesting female figurines with fine drapery and hair styles, together with unguentaries and other vases.

Traces of Minoan buildings have come to light in Siteia; an intact Minoan Minoan figurine contemporary with those from Piskokefalo came to light here. A cave-like tomb of M.M. IIIa date and L.M. III graves have also been found. Platon has continued the excavation of the Minoan villa on the road to Piskokefalo, and uncovered the whole facade, which is built of courses of huge blocks to withstand the floods of the stream which flows past it. The long stairway at the north end leading up to the megaron is flanked by a room projects like a bastion from the facade. Beyond the magazine uncovered last year another large room has been discovered, thus bringing the total number of rooms on the lower floor up to five. A second long stairway of thirty steps, which apparently formed the southern limit of the villa, has been uncovered; it had two flights, of which the upper one is rock-cut, and like the staircase on the north side it seems to have led directly to the street. Exactly corresponding to the other stairway, it had a porter's box formed of two interconnecting rooms on different levels. Some apartments have also been excavated farther up the slope, including two semi-basement rooms connected by a low door whose lintel is still in position. The main rooms seem to have been on the upper floor and approached by a small narrow staircase.

The pottery is L.M. I. A second cave-like tomb has been found near Piskokefalo; it contained ten burials accompanied by vases, of which about eight hundred have been recovered intact; one of the door jambs was found to be a stone stool taken from a Minoan building. At Prastos two tombs have been excavated; though loot in antiquity, they produced much interesting pottery, including Orientalising, and iron spearheads. At Achromitai near Siteia various remains have been noted, including a cemetery with Protogeometric and Hellenic graves; and at Roumeli Digeni an ancient quarry has been discovered; it is apparently of archaic date, and contains huge unfluted column shafts, capitals, pillars, and other blocks.

The Italian School under Dr. D. Levi has continued work at Phaistos, gradually disengaging a new and imposing wing of the Palace on the SE of the Theatral Area, and bringing further light on the little known Middle Minoan or Kamares phases of the Palace. On the east of Room XLIX which was explored in past seasons, another room (L) has been disclosed; this room confirms previous observations of the successive building and destruction phases, as also the existence in these phases of a primitive Palace rather than isolated buildings. Here also beneath the buildings of the third and last stage—the only one hitherto known—of the primitive Palace an immense mass of stone-hard cement was encountered, impinging on a damaged floor level marked by a handsome pavement of alabaster gypsum; this pavement originally extended as far as a bench or platform with stuccoed sides and laid slabs on top, which was backed against the north wall. The north wall had a dado of fine alabaster slabs and blue painted stucco above. In the north part of this area, where the alabaster pavement had practically disappeared the floor rested on an earlier mass of fallen cement filling the long entrance corridor of the earliest phase of the Palace; this corridor has a beautiful pavement of white alabaster in perfect preservation. A small cupboard at this lowest level, found with its stucco complete, contained ten fine painted clay and stone vases. NW of Area L a sloping corridor has been uncovered, and another notable group of clay vases found.

An old sounding in Area XXVII has been enlarged, and it appears that in the second phase the later Areas XXVII and XXVIII formed a single room with a partition wall; among the finds here was an intact great pithos with lively polychrome decoration—perhaps the finest of this era yet discovered in Crete. The whole area was excavated down to the level of the first phase, and more than a hundred significant objects were found in situ on the floor. In the second level in Area LI a cupboard let into the wall and a stucco bench were uncovered, and more than a dozen magnificent large decorated vases were found intact here, together with capacious jars, a pedestal with polychrome and relief designs, a burner, an alabaster cup, and other objects; on the opposite side of the room was found a large cylindrical tankard containing dice or gaming pieces and a dozen little alabaster goblets. In the lowest level here a low stone bench or hearth was uncovered; on it were some vases containing ash or charcoal, including a boat-shaped grater; near the north wall were two stucco tables, whose original supports were of wood, standing about head high. More new pavement slabs
have been cut in the ancient gypsum quarries of H. Triáda for restorations in the Palace, and the floors of two rooms in the vicinity of the already restored lustral basin have been relaid; a cavity in the rock came to light under the pavement of Area LXXXIII, and was found to contain a ritual deposit of vases, including a fine glazed and decorated cup which offers a closer dating for the construction of this wing of the second Palace.

In Amári, in the vicinity of the ancient Sybrita, a series of poros slabs, with carved triglyphs above, has come to light in roadmaking; six of them bear proxeny decrees. In Khaniá a L.M. III chamber tomb has been opened; in the floor were three small pits containing the bones of eight or ten people; some interesting vases were also found there. A group of Protogeometric tombs, with a series of vases and iron weapons, instruments and ornament, has been excavated by Platon at Módi in the vicinity of Khaniá; the vases show a wide range of forms, and the tombs are of especial interest in view of the lack of Protogeometric in this region. Among other casual discoveries reported by Platon are a cache of bronze chisels and other implements, probably of L.M. I–II date, found at Varváro, a duck vase from Nírou Khání, and a deposit of stone vases by the Early Minoan tholos A at Plátnos in the Mesará.

J. M. COOK
JOHN BOARDMAN

The British School at Athens.
MYCENAE, 1953

The British excavations at Mycenae in 1953 had the following main objectives: the further exploration of the Prehistoric Cemetery outside the Cyclopean walls to the west of the Lion Gate, the area south of the Perseia Krone where a fine wall of ashlar poros was discovered in 1952, the houses to the north and south of the House of the Oil Merchant, and further investigation of the Cyclopean Terrace Building. At the same time work was begun on the excavation of the area within the Acropolis between the South House and Tsountas’ House. The excavations were supported by a research grant from the American Philosophical Society, with contributions from the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford, the British Academy, the Bollingen Foundation, and the British School at Athens, under whose aegis the work was conducted.

In the Prehistoric Cemetery several tombs of the Middle Helladic period were discovered. On the northern edge of the cemetery an interesting group of graves was found, one of the latest Mycenaean period, L.H. IIIIC, and two of the developed Geometric period. With the larger of the latter, a cist grave, nineteen vases were found which included undecorated vases of excellent fabric and a shallow bowl of ‘Pic Ware’ which demonstrate the contemporaneity of these styles. These vases, together with two others from a Proto-Geometric grave dug into the ruins of the House of Shields, form a series illustrating the gradual evolution of culture at Mycenae from the end of the Bronze Age into the Iron Age. They show that there was no sudden break in its development, but only a slow evolution as in Attica. The ‘Dorian Invasion’ was not a cultural revolution.

The ashlar wall of poros south of the Perseia Krone was found to be the supporting wall which held up the base of the mound of earth piled on the dome of the ‘Tomb of Clytemnestra’. The rock drops on this, the east, side and so a revetment wall was here necessary. On the west, where the rock rises, no such wall was needed. It was found that a mound had also been piled over the dome of the ‘Tomb of Aegisthus’, which had been covered with a thick layer of yellowish clay. These mounds have a radius of twenty to twenty-five metres, and this agrees with the results obtained in 1951 about the corresponding mound over the Treasury of Atreus, which was also supported by a wall at its base and had a radius of about twenty-five metres. Retaining walls of this type were noted by Stamatakis as having existed round the bases of the mounds which had originally covered the mausoleum and the tholos tomb at the Argive Heraeum. Gell, in his Itinerary summarising his researches between 1801 and 1806, in his plan of Mycenae places a tumulus on the site of the ‘Tomb of Clytemnestra’ and remarks that it was ‘either a tumulus or the covering of another chamber like the treasury’. At that date the ‘Tomb of Clytemnestra’ was not known. Neither Gell nor Leake saw it. According to Schliemann, the ‘Tomb of Clytemnestra’ was first excavated by Veli Pasha in 1820, but that is too late a date, because Veli Pasha was ruler of the Morea only from 1807 to 1812. His excavations at Mycenae must therefore have fallen between those dates. Schliemann quotes a Greek source giving the date as 1808, which may be correct. At all events, from 1802 onwards excavators like Lord Elgin’s agents, Veli Pasha, and Lord Sligo were active at Mycenae removing what they could find either in the Treasury of Atreus or elsewhere. So it seems reasonable to assume that between 1807 and 1812 Veli Pasha attacked the tumulus over the ‘Tomb of Clytemnestra’ in the hope of finding a tomb, and so destroyed its dome. Its dromos was then unexcavated and still covered by the ruins of the Hellenistic theatre. Pausanias does not mention a theatre at Mycenae, but he was shown a site called the ‘Tomb of Atreus’. It is probable that this was the mound over the ‘Tomb of Clytemnestra’. An open bee-hive tomb would have been a treasure to Pausanias like the Treasury of Atreus and the Treasury of Minyas. A mound with a wall at its foot would have been to him a tomb, for he describes (VIII. 16. 3) the ‘Tomb of Aegyptus’ in Arcadia, which Homer (Iliad II. 604) knew, as γῆς χόμα σου μέγα λίθον κρατησέν ι κύκλῳ περιερχόμενον, and he quite likely saw the poros wall at the eastern foot of the tumulus seen by Gell over the ‘Tomb of Clytemnestra’. The identity of Gell’s tumulus with the ‘Tomb of Clytemnestra’ seems certain, because the French Expédition de Merée in its plan of Mycenae, which much resembles Gell’s, places on the site of his tumulus the excavated tholos of a beehive tomb. If this suggestion can be accepted, then we shall be justified in identifying Gell’s tumulus as the mound covering the dome of the ‘Tomb of Clytemnestra’ and in believing this mound to have been pointed out to Pausanias as the ‘Tomb of Atreus’. Such a mound would have resembled Pausanias’ ‘Tomb of Aegyptus’, and if in his time it was called the ‘Tomb of Atreus’ this identification would place all the monuments recorded by Pausanias (except the subterranean treasuries) in the area close to the Lion Gate. Then we shall have identified all the monuments of Mycenae mentioned by the traveller.

In the house north of the Oil Merchant’s house a great number of carved ivories was found. Among these are several plaques with fine lions, including one showing a lion attacking a calf. These lion plaques may have decorated a small casket. There is the head of a Mycenaean warrior wearing a boar’s-tusk helmet like those previously known at Spata and Mycenae and some flat
plaqus with similar warriors’ heads. Among the small decorative ivory inlays probably intended for furniture there is almost every known Mycenaean decorative pattern, but most noticeable is the great number of model figure-of-eight shields in ivory of all sizes, from which it is proposed to call this house The House of Shields. With these ivories were five splendid stone vases, three unbroken (Pl. Xc), and two partially reconstituted. There are also fragments of at least five others. One fragment of white stone bears shallow drilled sinkings in its surface for the insertion of inlays. Several pieces of such inlay, both in crystal and in variegated stones, were found. There is also part of an Egyptian alabaster vase of 18th Dynasty date and some fragments of polychrome faience vases which are probably of Syrian or Phoenician origin.

In the house to the south of the Oil Merchant’s house, which was a basement house, there was in one room in the basement a store of vases. The kitchen ware and painted vases were against one wall, and the unpainted drinking-cups and bowls against another wall. In several rooms were many carved ivories. These, like those in the House of Shields, had probably once decorated furniture and wooden chests and caskets in the living and bedrooms on the upper story, which had collapsed and fallen into the basement when the house was destroyed by fire. The finest ivory is a plaque (Pl. Xa) with a pair of sphinxes in a heraldic attitude similar to that of the lions on the Lion Gate with their fore paws resting on the capital of a fluted column. There are three other plaques with sphinxes, and it is proposed therefore to call this house The House of Sphinxes. Other ivories include a plaque with argonaut friezes, and two with the spiral and lotus pattern so well known from the Orchomenos ceiling and Mycenaean frescoes. The decorative inlays include most of the well-known Mycenaean decorative patterns, but there is only one example of a figure-of-eight shield.

In both houses many ivory models, over sixty, of Mycenaean columns were found. Some were used for applying to a wooden background, but others are in the round and have removable capitals. The latter, with several rectangular blocks of ivory furnished with tenons and sockets, almost seem as if intended for constructing model buildings. There are columns of the Lion Gate type, fluted columns with 'Pergamene' capitals, spiral columns, and a column in wood with the pattern of the columns of the Treasury of Atreus.

The carved ivories from both houses form a most important mass of material, and certainly no comparable collection of ivories has been found for at least sixty years. There are far more carved ivories from these houses than are from Spata,11 Menidi,12 or the Mycenaean tombs excavated by Tsountas.13 These houses date, from the pottery found in the House of the Oil Merchant and in the House of Sphinxes, from the period known as L.H. IIIB, which is to be dated from about 1340 to 1210 B.C.14

This date is important, for it also dates the stone bowls, notably the fragment with inlaid ornament, the faience, and the ivories. Another consideration is the following. The size and richness of these three houses built in an undefended area well outside the protection of the Cyclopean walls indicates that at that time Mycenaean must have been not only wealthy with an active foreign trade but also a powerful state and enjoying profound peace. No one would have ventured to build houses like this in an open area had there been any risk of attack from land or sea, 'Peoples of the Sea,' or 'Dorians.' We must modify the theory, often advanced, which draws a distinction between the undefended Cretan palaces and the Cyclopean citadels of the Mainland and suggests that the first were safe from attack, guarded by strong fleets and the 'inviolate sea,' whereas the others were always liable to attack by marauding 'Dorians.' We now see that the houses of the citizens of Mycenaean were just as luxurious and undefended as the palace of Knossos.

In the House of Shields was found an inscribed clay tablet in the Linear B script similar to those found in the Oil Merchant’s house in 1952. In the House of Sphinxes in the doorway of the storeroom which contained vases were found seven seal impressions, all from the same signet (Pl. Xb). Perhaps they had been used to fasten the door of the room. On the back of each impression there is an inscription in the Linear B script. Thus in a row of three Mycenaean houses clear evidence of writing has been found in each house. This suggests that writing and reading were more widely practised in Mycenaean Greece than has hitherto been believed. This is an important fact for the whole question of early Greek literacy, but its implications cannot be discussed here.15

A. J. B. Wace

---

1 Wace, Mycenae, pl. 8, 9, p. 125.
4 Pl. 9.
5 Schliemann, Mycenae, p. 42.
6 Finlay, History of Greece, VI, p. 39.
7 Schliemann, op. cit., pp. 49 f. Lord Sligo and Veli Pasha are said to have excavated in the Treasury of Atreus in 1869 (B. M. Cat. Sculpture, p. 17).
8 II, pl. 69.
9 The 'Tomb of Alkmene' excavated by Agerilaus near Hallarius was probably, as suggested by Evans (Sphinxes Minos I, p. 107), also a mound with a wall at its foot.
12 Lellen in Das Köppelgrab bei Menidi, pls. VI-IX.
13 E.g. Agr. 1888, pp. 156 ff., pl. 8.
ARCHAEOLOGY IN CYPRUS, 1953 1

NEOLITHIC

There was no excavation in Neolithic or Chalcolithic sites, but a notable event was the publication of the report by P. Dikaios on his excavations in the mainly pre-pottery settlement at Khirokitia, in which he reviews the relationship and chronology of the cultures preceding the Early Cypriot. A new site of the Erini stage was located at Palaionylos near Ayios Thomas by surface finds, including a headless andesite idol of fiddle shape, now in the Limassol Museum.

BRONZE AGE

Further material from the Kafkala cemetery between Dhenia and Akaki reached the Cyprus Museum through confiscation of pottery looted in the southern area, where the tombs are relatively small and poorly furnished. It includes some good red-polished II and III and also black polished pottery. With the sponsorship of the Department of Antiquities and the assistance of Mr. G. R. H. Wright of the British Institute of Archaeology in Ankara, Mr. Justice Griffith-Williams undertook the excavation of two of the large looted tombs in the north part of the cemetery. These proved to be Middle Cypriot, and yielded large quantities of fragmentary but restorable white painted pottery. A small intact Early Cypriot II tomb group was excavated in the south area as part of the same operation. At Onisia near Dikomo a Middle Cypriot cemetery was brought to light by cultivation and one tomb with typical furniture, including some bronze weapons, was excavated by the Department.

At Enkomi both components of the joint expedition resumed their excavations. In the summer, Dikaios, for the Department of Antiquities, extended the area he previously excavated immediately within the northern sector of the town wall, which has now been traced by excavation for a length of 170 m. and is visible above ground level for a further 175 m. Here, to the east of the area previously excavated, was uncovered the earliest substantial building so far found on the site. It has massive walls of fortress character, the construction of which associated pottery dates to Late Cypriot I. A westward extension was added at an early stage of Late Cypriot II, but soon after, within the fourteenth century, the whole complex was destroyed in some catastrophe evidenced by a thick destruction layer. Rebuilding followed with modifications of plan and, after an interval, the town wall began to take shape along the periphery of the existing buildings. Later in the thirteenth century a further remodelling accompanied a strengthening of the wall at some points. After a second destruction in the closing years of the century, although the town wall was again strengthened at points considered weak, there was no more rebuilding inside it in this sector. From the Late Cypriot II levels and upwards, slags and other evidence of the copper industry were found. Among the finds were some cylinder seals and an ample harvest of pottery, albeit fragmentary, including specimens of the Tell-el-Ajjul bichrome ware and Mycenaean examples from IIIA onwards. But the outstanding find of the campaign was a fragmentary tablet of baked clay, which came to light during study of the sanctuary area previously excavated by Dikaios. Together with late thirteenth-century sherds, some of the Mycenaean IIIc style, it had been used to pave a hearth. Like the fragmentary tablet found by Dikaios in 1952, it is inscribed in the Cypro-Minoan script, and unlike the first tablet the surviving part of the text, possibly a poem, is perfectly preserved.

In an autumn campaign the French mission under Dr. C. F. A. Schaeffer laid bare large sections of the town wall on the west side, where alone its position had not previously been fixed with certainty. Within the walls the street layout was traced in trial trenches over a wide area. In the northern half it follows a regular grid pattern with seven 3-m. east-west streets at regular intervals of 32 m., crossed by a single north-south street. The latter has been traced from the north wall for a length of 200 m. to the centre of the site. The south part of the town, which has yet to be examined, does not seem to repeat the grid pattern; the latter Schaeffer assigns to a reconstruction of the north area following some disaster. A start was made with the linking up, by new excavations, of the areas already uncovered by the two excavators and their extension along the central north-south street. A building on this street, first built in the fourteenth century, and last re-constructed after a fire about 1200 B.C., produced some interesting bronzes, from the floor of one of the late rubble-built rooms. These included two votive ingots, each with a short Cypro-Minoan dedication, and a small figurine of a Syrian deity wearing the conical pshent. Dr. Schaeffer also found a fragmentary clay tablet (the third from Enkomi) inscribed with a long Cypro-Minoan text, but unfortunately much worn. It comes from the surface soil in the north-east area.

At Kakkia (Palaipaphos), the expedition led by T. B. Mitford and J. H. Iliffe searched unsuccessfully for further tombs in the Erevi cemetery which yielded valuable Late Cypriot III ivories and jewellery in 1952. However, one well in the area produced important ceramic evidence of the first phase of Mycenaean influence, and another with its wealth of ivory wasters proved the presence in Bronze Age Paphos of an ivory workshop with craftsmen of the first rank. Near by at Asproyi, and
likewise within the perimeter of the Bronze Age city, ten tombs were excavated in a cemetery which seems to have succeeded Evreti. All these tombs, which strictly speaking are graves following the traditional shape of rock-cut tombs, belong to the Late Cypriot III A and B periods. In a third cemetery at Kaminia, in the same neighbourhood, a complex of hasty burials of only slightly later date were excavated. The occupants, all young and mainly female, bear witness, Mitford suggests, to a pestilence or the privations of some long siege. A recess in the city side of the fosse beneath the siege-mound (see below) was found to have been used for some thirty burials in the thirteenth to twelfth centuries B.C. The associated pottery included a jug with strainer spout and a frieze of ‘Mycenaean’ bulls and ducks. Further examination of the sanctuary area excavated in 1888 revealed no undug strata in contact with the massive masonry walls, the early date of which it had been hoped to confirm; the first excavators had everywhere gone down to the rock. The expedition had previously been drawn blank as regards Bronze Age structures in an area to the west; an extension to the north has now been carried out by Mr. P. L. Shinnie. Here the removal of a late mosaic pavement brought to light an earlier Roman level but no earlier remains.

Further surface finds at the Kokkinokremmos settlement near Pyla included fragments, collected by H. W. Catling, of another large painted amphora, like that illustrated in JHS LXXIII, 134, fig. 2, but with stylised octopus ornament.

Early Iron Age to Archaic

Professor J. Béard, assisted by J. Deshayes, excavated a number of tombs in the Iskénder cemetery on the outskirts of Ktima, from which a good range of geometric pottery had been secured in the course of digging air-raid trenches during the war. The tombs, which range from the eleventh to the eighth centuries, are notable for their large stepped dromoi and disproportionately small chambers; one had lateral chambers opening off the dromos. One of the chambers was used for as many as eleven successive burials. The pottery and metal finds, which are the earliest known material from the region of Nea Paphos, provide useful documentation for a period which in this western part of the island is still little known.

Four intercommunicating chambers in the Turabi Tekke cemetery at Larnaca were cleared by the Department, following their discovery during cultivation. The earliest contained cremations in white painted II-III amphorae, and in another a sixth-century burial overlay the disturbed furniture of its first use in Cypro-geometric III, including a sword, knives, and a pair of gold leaf-shaped frontlets of thin sheet with pounced ornament of dotted lines. Some distance north-west of the Tekke the excavation of foundations for a new Turkish elementary school located no less than forty-one tightly-packed tombs. Ten were excavated, and some material was recovered from eight others. With one exception the excavated tombs range from the seventh to the fifth centuries, plain bottle-jugs and flat-necked jars of Syro-Palestinian form being their standard furniture. Some of the latter have painted bands, and one a small bichrome bird between the handles in addition to the bands. A fixed point in the sixth century is provided by a Fikelloura lekythos of a type grouped by R. W. Cook among the amphoriskoi, with meander on the neck, rosettes on the shoulder and, on the body, dot-reticulation with crosses above a band of crescents. The same tomb contained a plain pot with a short Phoenician inscription, and a black glaze Attic kylix. In the single earlier tomb two cremations akin to the earlier Turabi tombs had been followed by burials of the later period.

Excavation by the Department of Antiquities of tombs discovered in similar emergencies produced Iron Age material of varying quality from a variety of sites, some of them now recorded for the first time. The following are the most noteworthy: A large Cypro-geometric I-II tomb-group from the Vathykýkkas cemetery between Karavas and Lapithos joined others in the Cyprus Museum, secured when this cemetery was first located during road works in 1940. Following an outbreak of tomb-robbing at Aðras tou Vasilikou near Philia two small tombs with white painted II pottery were excavated. A nice group of Cypro-geometric II-III pottery was secured from an intact tomb discovered during quarrying at Álimas near Ephtakomi. In following up illicit excavations at Grotti near Peristerona (Mesaoaria), a bichrome IV amphora in perfect condition (Pl. XIe) was found in the dromos of a looted tomb. Possibly from the same cemetery is a model chariot with well-preserved painted decoration (bichrome IV), which the Cyprus Museum acquired by confiscation (Fig. 2). The contents of two tombs found during building works at the Dhekélia cantonment and secured for the Larnaca Museum include a free-field jug with an interesting subject in the bichrome IV style, unfortunately much defaced: a Bowman followed by a horse with a diminutive rider brandishing a whip. Building operations at Ayios Dhômétios near Nicosia produced two small archaic tomb-groups, including a handsome black-on-red amphora.

V. Karageorgis for the Department investigated the site at Pomés, from which in 1952 the Paphos Museum obtained a quantity of archaic and classical votive terracottas of all sizes. It proved not to be a sanctuary but a dump of surplus votives, more of which were found and placed in the Paphos Museum. Karageorgis also rounded off the excavation of the small sanctuary near Ménico possibly of Bál-hammán, which he started in 1952.

In Limassol a small group of votives, apparently in situ, was brought to light in the excavation
of foundation trenches for the new store of the Public Works Department, the first relic of the ancient Neapolis, apart from tombs, to come to light. Among terracottas was the lower part of a life-size limestone statue of good archaic style. Another group of terracottas acquired by the Cyprus Museum was traced to the site Zithkionas near Kalokhoria in the territory of Tamassus, where a dump of discarded votives had been dug into by villagers. An interesting item in this group, which is of seventh-sixth-century date, is a model ship with a cabin in the stern, a helmsman, and another member of the crew in what appears to be the crow's nest (Fig. 1).

Some stone heads of good quality and late archaic date were acquired for the Cyprus Museum from a find of broken statuary in cultivated land at Pérgamos. One of the heads (Pl. XIa) is a little over life-size, and there are reports that an even larger head was found and concealed. The sanctuary in which this sculpture was dedicated has not been located, but it would appear to have been of some importance.

**CLASSICAL TO GRAECO-ROMAN**

The Koukla expedition continued the investigation of the siege-mound raised by the Persians against the north sector of the city wall when they invested Paphos in 498 B.C. A third tunnel was found to have been cut by the defenders below the wall into the part of the fosse over which the mound was raised. Like the first tunnel examined, its function was evidently to occasion a sudden subsidence in the mound by firing the supporting timbers introduced during the digging of the sap;

![Fig. 1.—Kalokhoria. Votive Ship Model.](image1)

![Fig. 2.—Cyprus Museum. Model Chariot.](image2)

a third bronze cauldron used to convey inflammable material for this purpose was found. From the mound itself more archaic sculpture and syllabic inscriptions were recovered, and nearby, the second of a pair of towers flanking a gateway in the wall was located.

More was laid bare of the good ashlar building of the fifth century discovered in 1952, abutting the inner face of another section of the town wall. At one point an underlying structure of different orientation was found. How long after its abandonment in the fourth century the building continued to be plundered for stone was indicated by the discovery on the site of a lead plaque inscribed with a defixo in Greek of the fifth or sixth century A.D.

The archaeology of Cyprus suffered a grievous loss by the death, in a sailing accident in April, of G. H. McFadden, Assistant Field Director of the Curium expedition, to which he had devoted so much of his life and fortune. At the time of his death further excavation of the water distribution system by J. S. Last was in progress, but although new staff arrived in September to resume the investigation of Curium on behalf of the Pennsylvania University Museum, excavation was not resumed on a considerable scale. Miss D. H. Cox excavated in November on the acropolis a three-room metal-working establishment, possibly a mint, of the fifth century A.D.

Two of the tombs excavated by Béard in the Skénder cemetery at Ktima (see above) proved to be of fourth-century date. They yielded numerous plain wine-jars and a small quantity of jewellery.

Work in the Cyprus Museum on the fragmentary third-century pottery recovered in recent years from the Kafizin hill near Nicosia, and by T. B. Mitford on the syllabic and alphabetic dedications to its nameless oread, will be much facilitated by the publication of the material from this site which has been in Copenhagen since 1924. A hoard of 304 Cypriot city coins all of small silver denominations and ranging from the end of the fifth to the middle of the fourth centuries, was accidentally discovered during the construction of
irrigation works near Miniko and purchased from the finders for the Cyprus Museum. 353 of the coins are of the type of uncertain origin with the legend Ba-si A-ri, Herakles and lion and, on the reverse, Athena seated on the prow of a warship. V. Karageorghis, who is studying the hoard, has identified new varieties of this type but nothing as yet to make the attribution of these coins certain. The bulk of the remaining coins are of a type normally assigned to Euagoras of Salamin, but Lape-thus, Marium and Amathus are also represented by two coins each.

The suggestion that the original building on the site of the so-called marble forum at Salamin was the gymnasion of the classical city found some support in new finds made during further clearance and anastylosis by the Department of Antiquities, with A. I. Dikigoropoulos and V. Karageorghis in charge. A Ptolemaic statue-base re-used in the reconstruction of the wall of the east stoa is the third inscription found on this site naming a gymnasiarch. The first, found in 1890, honours a gymnasiarch Hylos of the time of Augustus. A ring-stone bearing his name and engraved with a lion, of which any Augustan gem-cutter might be proud (Pl. XIa), was found in the north stoa during the 1953 campaign. The earliest structure so far uncovered is the wall underlying that of the east stoa found in a trial pit dug in 1890 and now re-excavated. The first excavators recorded the opinion that it might be as old as the fourth century B.C. This opinion has not yet been verified, but the later history of the building has become clearer. The tall marble colonnade on the east, of good Corinthian style of the second century A.D., and the lower colonnades on the other sides, also of marble but formed of miscellaneous columns and capitals of later date (twenty-four have now been re-elected), now seem all to have been introduced in a late reconstruction, perhaps as late as the sixth century A.D. in the north stoa numerous vousoirs and one almost complete arch were found. These, if restored above the columns, which they fit, would provide an arcade corresponding in height to the east stoa, assuming that there architraves, not arches, were employed. In the late reconstruction the central part of the east wall was rebuilt and at least partially adorned with glass mosaics, but of the other three walls the lower courses were re-used. The condition of the latter suggest that at the time of the late reconstruction they had long remained derelict. Previously both the higher east colonnade and the others had predecessors of stone, but belonging to two district architectural schemes. The columns on the east were larger and plain, while those on the other sides did not connect with them and had stucco fluting. The latter are not necessarily earlier and certainly not as early as the fourth century B.C., as the first excavators suggested.

The east colonnade in its previous state extended across the north and south stoae to their back walls, where it was stopped by engaged half-columns at both ends, from which it was linked to the east wall by similar stone colonnades ending in similar half-columns. In the broad portico so formed, over 10 m. wide and 50 m. long, the original mosaic floor was replaced by a marble pavement on the introduction of the marble columns. The relationship between this portico and the rest of the peristyle in the period of the stone columns remains obscure, but it is hoped to clarify this in 1954, and to determine the various building dates. Further evidence was secured of the last modifications of the building, dated by coins to the reign of Heracles or later, and of the squatter structures which took shape within its walls after the decay of the city following the Arab raids of the seventh century, but before its final abandonment. Preliminary clearance was started in selected sections of the buildings surrounding the peristyle, in the course of which a limestone corinthian of fine archaic style was found, used as building material in a bench construction of late date.

Building operations in Limassol brought to light several tombs of the Roman period. Their contents, including in some cases lamps, coins, and inscribed epitaphs as well as pottery and glass, are now in the local museum. Another tomb-group with Roman glass, from the area of Sotira, was acquired for the Cyprus Museum. The museum also acquired by purchase a red ware barbotine jug of that stylish Augustan class of which there are good examples in Berlin and Baltimore, with three water-birds feeding from plants (Pl. XIb).

EARLY CHRISTIAN AND LATER

Excavation of the basilican churches at Cape Drepanum near Peyia was resumed by the Department (A. H. S. Megaw and A. I. Dikigoropoulos). A mosaic pavement in the atrium of the large Basilica I was uncovered, revealing four rather damaged animal panels: lion (Pl. XIc), bull, bear, and boar. South-west of the atrium a much smaller basilica (IA) annexed to the main building was located and partly excavated. It was noteworthy in being of the transept type despite its small size. Glass tesserae from the mosaics which adorned its three apses were found and also a quantity of small pieces of coloured marbles, which had evidently fallen from a panel of encrusted work in the north transept. Unlike the approximately contemporary examples of this work in Istanbul (St. Sophia), Ravenna, and Parenzo, which are geometric or floral, the Peyia panel included more than one figure. Basilica III proved to be of small size and simple plan, and to have capitals of the impost type, which came into vogue in the sixth century.

In the castle at Kyrenia investigation of the remains of the earliest of the three successive south walls revealed a tower of very elongated plan, with semicircular front, containing a cistern, and of better and evidently earlier construction than any of the Byzantine structures so far brought to light.
At Famagusta T. Mogabgab resumed, for the Department, the excavation of the Turkish fillings in the outworks of the Land Gate. The rock-cut ditch which formerly separated the gate from its ravelin was almost entirely cleared, throwing new light on the form of these defences at the time of the Turkish siege of 1571 and on the changes made thereafter.

The Cyprus Museum acquired a hoard of 3 gold and 1211 silver and bronze coins, mainly Venetian, found during building operations in Nicosia. The Venetian coins are exclusively of sixteenth-century Doges, and as none are later than 1570 the hoard may be regarded as a relic of the siege and capture of the city in that year.

The earthquake of 10th September caused serious but not irreparable damage to ancient monuments throughout the Paphos district. The rented premises of the Paphos Museum were declared unsafe and evacuated. Its contents have been stored pending provision of alternative accommodation.

Nicosia.

1 I am indebted to all those named in this report for kindly communicating information concerning their excavations and research.
3 *Antiquity* XXVII, 103 ff. and pl. IV.
4 *ILN*, 5th September, 1953, 342; *Antiquity* XXVII, 233 ff.
5 *ILN*, 2nd May 1953, 710 ff.
6 Cf. *JHS* XVII, 152 ff.
7 Cf. those in Myres' tomb 56, *ibid.* 158.
9 On the 1952 campaign see *ILN*, 18th April, 1953, 613 ff.
11 Discussed by Hill in *BMC*, Cyprus, xliii.
12 *JHS* XII, 196, No. 53.
Two Archaic Terracottas.

The British Museum recently bought by auction a number of terracottas in a lot together, of which two (1902, 4-10, 1 and 2) are of more than usual interest (Fig. 1). These are virtually identical and must have been made in the same mould. They are hollow, moulded front and back, and open underneath; there is no vent in the back. The modelling of the front is summary but careful: that of the back is sketchy in the extreme; this is due not to careless moulding, but to the cursory treatment of the back of the model from which the mould was made. The clay is rather coarse but homogeneous, pale orange in colour, and contains a fair amount of mica.

They represent a woman, archaic in style, who stands stiffly on a square base, the left leg slightly advanced, wearing a stephane, a chiton, and a himation draped diagonally over the right shoulder, with one end falling down the right side. Her left arm is by her side, the hand pulling to that side the central panel of the himation, in accordance with a common archaic custom; in her right hand she holds a fruit to her body. Her lank hair is parted centrally and falls in a mass down her back, and she has a long face, with protruding eyes and a slight smile.

When were these pieces made? The treatment of the himation, in particular the absence of folds where it crosses the stomach, is characteristic of East Greek sculptures of c. 570 B.C., and of Rhodian terracottas of c. 540 B.C. But the style of the head and the treatment of the hair bring the dating right down to the very end of the Archaic period, to c. 490-470 B.C. This discrepancy between the style of the head and that of the body is not uncommon in the popular art of the coroplast.

The question where they were made is less easily answered. That one of them was found at Benghazii (the ancient Euesperides) can be regarded as certain from the presence on it of a label on which was written, in faded ink: "I. B. Benghazii, 1803." Nor can there be any reasonable doubt that two pieces so similar and so associated were found together. We have no evidence that they were excavated in Benghazii by "I. B."

Now any terracotta is more likely than not to have been made somewhere near where it is found, for most communities appear to have possessed a factory to satisfy local needs. And when two identical pieces of a type otherwise unknown (as these apparently are) are found together, that probability is considerably increased. Yet there are certain grave objections to regarding them as of Cyrenaic manufacture. In the first place, the available evidence suggests that terracottas were not made in Cyrenaica until c. 460 B.C., for no pieces in Cyrenaic clay have been found there earlier in style than the Early Classical period. In the second place, the workmanship is far too skilled for pieces of that fabric belonging to the fifth century. And in the third place the clay of which these are made differs markedly from that of Cyrenaic terracottas.

Where, then, were they made? There are, unfortunately, to my knowledge no similar pieces whose provenience might be a guide. But there is one locality which is eminently satisfactory on grounds both of fabric and of style; that is Sicily. The treatment of the face is similar to that found on a number of Sicilian types, and the continued use of this early form of drapery into and beyond the period of these pieces is well attested there. The clay could well be Sicilian, and the summary but careful workmanship is eminently suitable. Nor need this evidence of contact between Sicily and Cyrenaica about 480 B.C. cause surprise. For later on in the fifth century, from about 430 B.C. onwards, there is evidence of the closest possible association between the two communities in the fact that many terracottas of a marked Sicilian character were then being reproduced by Cyrenaic factories. Perhaps this contact started with the presence of Sicilians in the heterogeneous colonists of immigrants collected by Arcesilaus IV when he refounded Euesperides in 482 B.C. Possibly, indeed, we have here the personal possession of some such immigrant, brought with him from his native land.

R. A. HIGGINS.

British Museum.

1 E.g. the 'Hera of Cheramy' in the Louvre and the pieces associated with it, especially Payne and Young, Archaiic Marble Sculpture, pl. 26.
2 E.g. BMC terracottas (1903) no 207 = Winter, Die Typen der figürlichen Terrakotten III, Pt. I, 4. 4.
3 E.g. Winter, op. cit. 114 and 125.
4 E.g. MA XXXII, pl. XXXVIII. 9 (about 500 B.C.); Winter, op. cit. 114, 1 (about 470 B.C.).
5 See BMC Coins, Cyrenaica, clxxvii.
A Greek Vase from the Thames.

The Attic red-figure kylix (Figs. 1-2) which is the subject of this note was acquired by the Reading Museum prior to 1896. It is mentioned in Stevens, Descriptive Catalogue of Reading Museum, 1896, p. 41, as having been dredged from the Thames.

Typical of kylikes with decoration of this type is the large drinking-horn splashed across the lower part of the figure. Close parallels to the painting occurred at Al Mina (Beazley, *JHS* LIX, 1939, pp. 2-3, nos. 6-14) and are ascribed to the late sixth century B.C.

It is not impossible that the vase arrived in the Thames during prehistoric or even in Roman times, but naturally all find of this nature cannot well be distinguished from a discarded relic of the grand tour or from a collection.

I should like to record my thanks to Mrs. A. D. Ure for help in preparing this note, and to Sir John Beazley for helpful criticism.

George C. Boon.

Archaeological Assistant, Reading Museum.
A Lakonian Krater at Corfu (Fig. 1).

This has been put together recently from many fragments in the Corfu Museum (Inv. no. 235, found before 1914 in Corfu itself). It is of Chalcidian shape, very near to that of the example in the Villa Giulia (Mingazzini, I vasi Castellani, no. 428, pl. 43, 5), but with the upper handle more arched and a light moulding under the foot. Height 313 mm., diameter of lip 303 mm., brownish-red clay, paint of poor quality, surface damaged. Several fragments of body are missing. For the type cf. Lane, BSA XXXIV (1933-4), 149.

It is interesting to record this find made on the route of exports towards Sicily, Calabria, Campania, and Southern Etruria.

D. CALLIPOLITIS.

The Museum, Corfu.

L. 1. Professor Louis Robert, who saw a copy of the inscription at Ankara, suggested the restoration of the first word as Ναυμάκης, as a short oblique stroke before the o may well have belonged to an angular 9, the form found elsewhere in the inscription. Otherwise, Ναυμάκης might equally well have been read. The Χάρμη, attendants of Aphrodite, to whom they give a bath in Od., VIII, 364, are particularly suitable patrons.

L. 2. Whether by διαφόροπος the goddess of Mirth or the simple, abstract noun intended is not clear. After the bath's active, autobiographical address and διαφόροπος in line 2 I should prefer to give μακλημένος its rarer, active sense, and translate the phrase [stv] διαφόροπος μακλημένος as 'always concerned for me'.

L. 4. Παθέα, the daughter of Asklepios, would naturally find a home in a health-giving bath.

A Bath Inscription from Osroene.

In May and June 1932, as a member of the Anglo-Turkish expedition working at Sultantepe, between Harran and Urfa, I excavated a bath building in the Roman settlement at the foot of the mound. The main hall of the bath was paved with a fine mosaic, decorated with geometric patterns, some of which had affinities with motifs current at Antioch on the Orontes during the first half of the fifth century A.D. At the northern end of the pavement, incorporated in the mosaic, was a five-line hexameter inscription in a tabula amata (Fig. 1). The inscription was almost undamaged, except for a diagonal break at the left-hand end (which resulted in the loss of about four letters in ll. 1/2, and of about three or two in ll. 3/5), and a small hole which obliterated three letters not far from the beginning of l. 1.

L. 5. The meaning of this line can only be that the bath was restored by the good offices of one Isaios. During the excavations, the wall of a room on the west side of the main hall was found to run at an angle to the main axis of the building. This room may well have belonged to an earlier version of the bath.

The lettering of this inscription would perhaps, by itself, point to a fourth-century date. It certainly appears earlier than an example (also in mosaic) at Pisidian Antioch which is dated, with a margin of ten years either way, to A.D. 374. (See D. M. Robinson, 'Greek and Latin Inscriptions from Asia Minor', TAPhA LVII, 1926, p. 234, fig. 68.) The abbreviation sign ις is by no means unknown in the fourth century, though it is, indeed, most commonly found in the fifth and sixth centuries. (See Avi-Yonah, 'Abbreviations in Greek Inscriptions', Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine, Supplement to Vol. IV, 1940, p. 37.) There appear to be no dated examples of the use of as an abbreviation of 8, as found twice in this inscription.

As has already been remarked, some patterns used in the mosaic (notably that of an outline diamond with a central four-petalled rosette and a single petal at each angle) have parallels at Antioch which are dated to the first half of the fifth century.
NOTES

century. (See Doro Levi, Antioch Mosaic Pavements, Princeton, 1947, Ph. LXXI b, LXXI b, LXXIII.)

The tone of the dedication is uncompromisingly pagan, and perhaps suggests (taken with the evidence of the lettering) an earlier rather than a later date for the bath; the fourth rather than the fifth century. Julian the Apostate was very active near Harran in A.D. 363, and it is tempting to link this inscription with the period of his reign (361–363).

The dimensions of the inscription are as follows: Height of tabula ansata: 0.68 m.; width (by computation): 3.40 m.;
average height of letters: 0.075 m.

Note.—My thanks are due to Professor W. M. Calder to whom I am indebted for many helpful suggestions, and to Mr. Seton Lloyd, for permitting me to publish his photographs of the inscription.

Michael R. E. Gough.

University of Edinburgh.
J. L. MYRES

SIR JOHN LINTON MYRES, President of the Hellenic Society 1935-38, died on 6 March 1954, in his eighty-fifth year.

A Scholar of Winchester and New College, he contributed articles on local antiquities and studied geology to occupy his spare time while obtaining first classes in Honour Moderations and Greats, and in 1892 he was elected both Craven Travelling Fellow and Burdett-Coutts Geology Scholar. Throughout his life he regarded science and arts as complementary studies; a review written after his retirement ends with the words: 'The chemical formulae in the Appendix need a clear head.' His research took him to the eastern Mediterranean, to Crete, where he shared the first excitement of Sir Arthur Evans's discoveries and the recognition of Minoan writing, to Anatolia, and to Cyprus, which became his particular sphere, though never to the exclusion of other interests. In 1894 he carried out excavations there and reorganised the Museum at Nicosia, and in 1899 he collaborated with Ohnefalsch-Richter to provide the Museum with a Catalogue. He was Fellow of Magdalen 1892-95, winning the Arnold Essay Prize in 1899, Student of Christ Church 1905-7, founder of Man and its first editor 1901-3, Lecturer in Classical Archaeology at Oxford 1903-7, and Gladstone Professor of Greek and Lecturer in Ancient Geography at Liverpool University 1907-10. He then returned to Oxford as first Wykeham Professor of Ancient History. By 1915 he had published A History of Rome (1902), The Dawn of History (1911; it went into its 12th edition in 1946 and was translated into Spanish in 1959), and A Handbook of the Cesnola Collection of Antiquities from Cyprus in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, N.Y. (1914), in addition to more than a hundred articles which not only added to knowledge but also in many instances introduced new methods. They are listed in his Geographical History in Greek Lands (1953), but a few examples will show the range: Gothic foliage carvings (The Builders' Journ. 4, 1896); The origin and purpose of the megalithic structures of Tripoli and Barbary (Proc. Soc. Ant., Ser. II, 17, 1899); On the plan of the Homeric house (JHS XX, 1900); The early pot-fabrics of Asia Minor (Journ. of R. Anthr. Inst. 33, 1903); The Alpine races in Europe (Geogr. Journ. 28, 1906); The Sigynnae of Herodotus (Anthr. Essays Presented to E. B. Tylor, 1907); The geographical study of Greek and Roman culture (Scottish Geogr. Mag. 1910); Sarcophagi from Cyprus (Antike Denkmaler 3, 1912); Herodotus the Tragedian (Miscellany Presented to J. M. Mackay, 1914).

From 1916 to 1919 he was Lieut.-Commander (Acting Commander) R.N.V.R., first in the Naval Intelligence Dept. and later in the Military Control Office, Athens. He was mentioned in despatches, and was made Commander of the Royal Order of George I of Greece in 1918 and O.B.E. in 1919. His intimate knowledge of the coast of Asia Minor, non hos quae situm munus in unus
(the Turkish authorities had not welcomed curious travellers, and he had trained himself to map country with the minimum of equipment), sent him out on foraging raids to bring in news and cattle for the Navy, much as patriotic Ionians must have harried the Persian coast. Oxford after the war was full of stories of ‘Black-beard Myres’ and his adventures with spies and Higher Authority; they were probably less incredible than the truth, and certainly in 1939 he described nostalgically how to run a boat into harbour under the enemy’s guns. It is difficult to realise that in 1919 he was already fifty years old.

The next twenty years were full of activities. He was General Secretary of the British Association 1919–32, President of the Royal Anthropological Society 1928–31, of the Folk-Lore Society 1924–26, of the Hellenic Society 1935–38, and of the British School at Athens 1934–47. The last responsibility continued after his retirement in 1939, during the difficult years of the war, and was combined with a still more ticklish job, the General Secretariaship of the International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, in which his puissance in the interests of international goodwill was a chief cause of sanity in the years of post-war hysteria. His help and advice were freely given, to New College and especially to its Library, and, as the writer remembers with special gratitude, to St. Hugh’s College, to the Honour School of Geography, of which he was pater et rerum inventor, to the Archaeological Survey of South Africa, and to individuals whatever their academic status, provided that they shared his enthusiasm for finding things out. The steady flow of articles and reviews continued; his interest in the concrete was undiminished (*The Structure and Origin of the Minoan Body-shield* in *Man*, 1939, is a good example), but he was increasingly led to explore the influences which determined artistic form and the relation between poetry and art. *The Political Ideas of the Greeks* was published in 1927, and in 1930 he gathered together in the 600 packed pages of *Who Were the Greeks?* (Sather Lectures, 1927) the results of forty years of study and creative thinking about the countless influences which produced the unique phenomenon of Hellenism. They are very like his lectures, at once a Grand National and a labyrinth, from which the ant stored up illegible fodder for future sustentation and the grasshopper drew pure enjoyment—to regret thirty years later the evanescent vividness of those striking details about Vampires. Of the two categories of good lecturers, those who knew a lot and enjoyed their omniscience and those who knew a lot and enjoyed what they knew, the Wykeham Professor was facile princeps of the second group.

He became Sather Professor of the University of California in 1927, Hon. D.Litt. Witwatersrand in 1929, Officer of the Order of St. Sava in 1930, Hon. D.Sc. Wales and Huxley Memorial Medallist in 1933 (*The Cretan Labyrinth, Journ. of the R. Antir. Inst. 63*), and Hon. Ph.D. Athens in 1937, and he received the Order of Dannebrog in 1939 and the Gold Medal of the Society of Antiquaries in 1942. His Knighthood was conferred on him in 1943. In the same year he gave the Frazer Lectures at Cambridge (Mediterranean Culture, 1944), and in 1951 he received the Victoria Medal of the Royal Geographical Society. BSA 37 was presented to him to mark his seventieth, and in July 1949 there was a Special Issue of *Man* in honour of his eightieth birthday. Since then his publications have included: 1950: *Dryos Caphalae* (CR 64); *Minoan dress* (Man 50); *Homeric art* (BSA 45); *The film in the service of art criticism* (Eidos 1); Easter in a Greek village (Folklore 61); 1951: *The structure of stichomythia in Attic tragedy* (Proc. Brit. Acad. 34); *The tomb of Porsena at Clusium* (BSA 49); *The Man and his past* (Essays presented to O. G. S. Crawford); 1952: *Scripta Minoiti II*, in which Sir Arthur Evans’s material on Linear B script is published, itself a gigantic work; *The pattern of the Odyssey* (JHS I.XXI); 1953: *Geographical history in Greek lands*; Herodotus, the father of history; Ancient Groceries (Greece and Rome 22).

The last title is a fitting reminder of his richest gift. He was both φιλοσοφός and φιλόλογος. No detail was too technical, remote, or trivial to excite his interest, and all were made to contribute to a sum of wisdom which included experience of the present as well as knowledge of the past. His vast learning was the reverse of encyclopaedic; when he set out to write a Catalogue of Cypriote antiquities, it became a survey of Cypriote civilisation. The power to see small things as parts of a large design and amorphous masses as orderly stages in a development, to illuminate the unknown by a happy analogy with the familiar, and to bring together things which had never been thought of simultaneously, gives his books their peculiar quality. The interpretation is so creative that it perpetually approaches the sphere of imagination, and sometimes crosses into it, but if a conclusion was challenged, he would immediately produce fifty precise pieces of evidence in its support. The result is that his books are at least as fruitful for the sceptical as for the credulous reader, and most profitable of all for the reader who is prepared to set off in pursuit of the game which he has put up. Even in the last year of his life, he refused to write his reminiscences because there were so many more interesting subjects. No one who has heard him talk would find this easy to believe; the stories, rich in themselves, were made irresistible by the wit and drama of the telling, and on one legendary occasion he ended, ‘Yes, yes; like Odysseus, I have seen much and remembered more.’ But it is certain that there would always have been new ideas to express, for he resembled Odysseus also in his inexhaustible resourcefulness. οὐδ’ σατι ἄλλοι ἐννοοῦσι...
JOHN PENOYRE

When John Penoyre retired after thirty-four years' service as Secretary and Librarian of our Society, the following appreciation of his services appeared in the Annual Report for the Session 1935–36:

"To Mr. Penoyre's loyal devotion to its interests, and his indefatigable energy and enthusiasm, the Society has been mainly indebted for its expansion during these years, for its present efficiency, after a period of unavoidable anxiety, and for the variety of its services both to members and to Hellenic Studies generally. His re-organisation of the library, his development of the photographic collections, and the transfer of these first to Bloomsbury Square and later to the present headquarters in Bedford Square very greatly increased the facilities offered both to students and to teachers; and his concurrent administration of the two Schools of Archaeology assured intimate and efficient co-operation between these institutions and the Hellenic Society.

"By the development of the new status of Student-Associates, the younger generation of scholars has been brought into earlier enjoyment of many of the privileges of membership, and has benefited by the keen personal interest and intimate knowledge which Mr. Penoyre has always delighted to place at the disposal of those who work in the library or draw on the Society's collection of photographs and lantern slides. With characteristic foresight and energy, Mr. Penoyre announced his impending retirement a full year in advance, to minimise dislocation of routine, and to enable him to devote the current session to the revision and completion of those departments of the Society's library which owe most to his personal interest and special knowledge.

"The Council takes this opportunity to record the gratitude of the Society to Mr. Penoyre for his long and invaluable services and to wish him health and long enjoyment of the leisure to which he now looks forward."

This tribute, alike in its content and its wording, so admirably summarises John Penoyre's services to the Hellenic Society and to its library that any addition to it can be justified only by striking a more personal note. If we try to recall an impression of him in action, it is unquestionably his energy and enthusiasm that we first remember. The energy was never obtruded: he always seemed busy doing something to improve the library, or the photographs or the slide-collections, and for many years he spent much of his week-end leisure in this task. It was then that he could be free from the interruptions of readers and visitors, to whom in working hours he always seemed to find time to offer help or a patient ear. It was a controlled and methodical energy, based on most careful planning, the fruits of which, in addition to the organisation of the two moves of the library mentioned above, are to be seen and appreciated in his Subject Index and in the systematic expansion of the Author Catalogue.

His enthusiasm was by no means limited to the administration and improvement of the library,
for in the field of Greek art he had a wide knowledge and genuine aesthetic appreciation. The same enthusiasm found wider outlets when he travelled in Greek lands, first as a student of the British School in 1900–1 and again in 1907 when he spent a long summer alone in Thasos, undertaking a topographical survey of the island and making valuable discoveries of architectural remains, sculpture and inscriptions, all described, with his own plans, drawings, and photographs, in JHS XXVIII (1908). Staying at the School at Athens before and after this journey he was able to keep in close touch with its activities and to see something of the excavations at Sparta in which he always took the keenest interest. Being also Secretary of the School at the time this was a valuable addition to his experience and to his many qualifications for this post. Having these responsibilities towards two committees, he had no difficulty in showing that he was equally at home in librarianship and in committee-work, although the necessary gifts for these activities do not always coincide. But he seemed to have them in full, and his genial and conciliatory manner was not a screen for weakness or indecision. He made up his mind clearly when faced with, or consulted on, problems concerning the Society or the British School, and his judgement was seldom at fault. Sometimes, one felt, he took these matters almost too much to heart, and this sensitive conscientiousness contributed without doubt to the serious breakdown in health that followed on his exertions in carrying through the move to Bloomsbury Square in 1909–10. His idea of a rest-cure, which dismayed his friends at the time, was to cross the Andes and make his way down the Amazon, with native guides only; but in the result he came back cured and eager to resume his duties, though he seldom chose to speak of his experiences.

It would be a great mistake to infer from this adventure that he liked solitude, for he was fond of company and good talk, and always interested in the young; to his encouragement of Student Associates reference has been made above. He was a lover of the countryside and of music; and that he parted with his pianola (never to be replaced) when he turned his rooms in the Temple into a depot for the collection and despatch of sweaters for the troops in the First World War is typical of his devotion to the task in hand. Many will recall the wit and persuasiveness of his letters to The Times in this connexion, and those who knew him recognised them as typical of the man. They revealed that blend of personal modesty and pride in doing his job efficiently which characterised all his work. It was only natural that the respect so inspired should develop into friendship, though this was not offered cheaply, and he was deeply pained by any lack of considerateness, whether in the library or elsewhere.

In conclusion, a reminiscence which his friends will appreciate. In the General Strike of 1926 he applied, characteristically, for some task in the emergency. Queuing with many younger applicants (for he had already passed his fifty-fifth birthday), he was asked by the interviewing official whether he could drive a car; on replying that he could not, he was asked brusquely, 'Well, what can you do?' and the reply came promptly, 'I can sweep out a railway-carriage or run a Government Office.' Neither offer was accepted, but he would certainly have lived up to his promise, for his creed was that any task, large or small, is worth doing with all one's powers. And it was his steady adherence to this creed that made Penoyre render such memorable services to the Hellenic Society, which now laments his passing.

A. M. W.
NOTICES OF BOOKS


The latest volume of the Realencyclopaedie goes down to Pontane (an epithet of Cybele). Since the zweite Reihe began at R, this great enterprise, which has now been in progress for exactly sixty years, is plodding on to within sight of 1,000 volumes. Until very recently, in fact, the last Halbband appeared after a long delay, and the rewriting of the early volumes will be long overdue. Among the larger articles dealing with Greek matters in the present volume are those on Polemon, the archon Polykatos (a succinct account by G. Klaissen, much of the earlier stages of the work done to narrow down its date), Polykrateis of Samos, Polyeuktos, Polykarpos, Polyberchon, Pompa (almost a monograph, cols. 1789-1953), and Polystratus. There are some striking omissions, for instance Palis in the broad sense; and many articles are already out of date: Polithyshephon should have mentioned the material from Thebes and Achaea, as well as Thessaly, discussed by the late M. Feyel, Polybe et l'histoire de Bistis, Paris, 1942. But the difficulties in assembling and publishing material in the conditions of recent years must have been formidable, and the editor is to be congratulated on his successful continuation of this work, of which he can now fairly say "pas magna fui."

In fact, Ziegler has himself written the article which is the main concern of the present book, on De Poli. Its 159 columns make it by far the largest in the volume (indeed, it might advantageously have been shorter). It follows the traditional pattern of an RE article, factual and sectional; and a list of contents enables the reader to find his way easily to the discussion of whatever point interests him. An encyclopaedia article is by definition something rather different from a separate study. Ziegler knows his genre, and criticisms will therefore be mainly on points of detail.

It contains, in fact, bibliography, Niece's article on the chronology of the Gallic Wars (Hermes, 1878), is quoted, but not Mommsen's reply in the same volume (reprinted in Römische Forschungen, II, 297); Holleaux gets less than his dessert weight only two articles (which should now in any case be quoted from the more convenient Études d'épigraphie, Vol. I); Ed. Meyer's study of the Second Punic War is most conveniently found in Kleine Schriften, II; Birkenmaier has important notes on Polybe in REG, 1943, as well as 1937; an article by Knoblauch in Klio, 1932, is twice quoted as by Kurfiss; and Strachan-Davidson's Selections from Polybius (Oxford, 1888) are quoted with the data. However, no two men would agree on the contents of a table of references. The bibliography, and Ziegler has provided an extremely comprehensive and serviceable list. Incidentally he has considered work as recent as that of Mioni (Polybius, Padua, 1940), Erske (Rheina. Mus., 1951), and Pedech (REG, 1951), but Buon's monograph on Fabius (in the Römische Forschungen) on Polybius and Philinins (REA, 1952), were too late for inclusion.

In his discussion of Polybius' life and journeys, Ziegler might possibly have paid more attention to De Sanctis, who argues convincingly (against Cuntz) that Polybius was allowed to leave Italy before 150. Polybius' explorations in the Atlantic (Pliny, Nat. Hist. V. 9) Ziegler dates to 147; but Cuntz' argument against his leaving Carthage during the siege is cogent, and there is in fact no reason why the voyage should not have taken place in 147 after the fall of the city. Ziegler suggests that there is no time for this, since Polybius hastened at once to the Achaean theatre of war. This is, however, a deduction from the fact that Polybius was at Corinth shortly after its destruction (XXXIX. 2); but this event cannot be closely dated, and provides no evidence that Polybius was in haste to get back to Greece. His presence before the final catastrophe in Achaia might have seriously embarrassed him. The Achaean leaders were men for whom he had no sympathy (see XXXV. 15); and it cannot have escaped the notice of a Roman general acting against the Achaean Confederation. His personal feelings at this time are necessarily conjectural; but a voyage of discovery in the Atlantic may have offered him a not wholly unwelcome distraction from the Achaean war. The date of De Poli is for his own convenience; and De Sanctis is also to be followed in the theory that Polybius visited Spain with Scipio Aemilianus in 151. Although Ziegler's considered view would put this visit in 153, when, he thinks, Polybius accompanied Aemilianus to the Numantine War, he twice (col. 1490, n. 1, col. 1485) seems half-way towards his conclusion. In fact, Polybius' case for the use of De Poli's account has been conclusively exploded by the evidence of the later war. If Polybius were at Numantia it has yet to be proved. Ziegler argues (col. 1474) that to have written a monograph on the basis of information sent by Scipio and his staff would have been "irreconcilable with Polybius' frequent caution and prudence." But Polybius nowhere lays down the absurd principle that a historian may only write monographs about what he has himself witnessed; and to argue that an old man of seventy was debarred from writing the history of a war at which he had not been is not to except at the cost of becoming a "stylist and mere translator," seems to do an injustice to the historian's craft. It must still be regarded as an open question whether Polybius was present at Numantia. On the other hand, if De Sanctis' version is accepted before and Polybius' journey to Spain dated to 151, this hardly affords support to the theory favoured by Ziegler (and originally Schulten's), that Book XXXIV holds its present place in the Historiae because it serves as an introduction to the Celibiterian War. As Ziegler concludes (col. 1484), the war had begun in 153 (and the Lusitanian War the year before), and for all his attachment to Aemilianus, Polybius can scarcely have made his command in the war the feature on which to hang an uncertain history. A clue to the position of Book XXXIV is perhaps to be found in III. 4. 12 (cf. Lorenz, Unterrichtungen zum Geschichtsschrift der Polybius, Stuttgart, 1931, 68): the continuation of the Historiae after 168 was designed to fill the gap between the wars of the various peoples after they had come under Roman dominion up to the period of ταραχή κα ταρνησίδος which ensued" (the phrase means "the disturbed and troubled time" with the implication of convulsive military movements; Hannibals translation (political) confusion and revolutionary movements (CQ 1945, 139) neglects Polybius' normal usage). Ch. 5 suggests some ambiguity about the date at which this later period began, though Polybius proposes to write on it δεξάμενον πολλοκαὶ δὲ δοκὴν, so that the book may have been more or less over (as perhaps in Spain and at Corinth), δὲ δὲ μεσαὶνας (as at Carthage), δὲ οὔ και χειροτος (as in the organization of Achaea). It is difficult to resist the view that the Book XXXIV was to be the dividing line before and after the Celibiterian War. As Ziegler concludes, on the other hand, the account came appropriately before the final Achaean outbreak, and the wars in Macedonia and Africa, leaving exactly five books of narrative history, which was, at the outmost, preceded the account of the Roman constitution in Book VI.

Ziegler's discussion of Polybius' studies adds little to Von Scala, but avoids his occasional excesses of ingenuity and lack of balance. Here perhaps more could have been done. The literary background of the Hellenistic school of tragic history should have been sketched rather more fully along the lines suggested in B. L. Ullman's article in TAPA 1942 (not mentioned by Ziegler), with some discussion of Polybius' conceptions to the theory as well as his criticisms of it. Had Ziegler gone into this more thoroughly, he would hardly have reached the conclusion that ἦν τωκ τού συγγραφέους, who reported marvels with a view to inspiring piety among ordinary men (XVI. 12. 9), were theatrical writers, Polybius' military survey inside a union with Curtius (e.g. II. 58. 12, cf. 56. 10, 59. 3, III. 38. 9, X. 34. 1, etc.) show clearly that the reference is to 'tragic historians.'

On the composition of the Historiae too Ziegler's account is open to criticism. He rightly rejects Erse's recent case for dating their composition in a single bloc towards the end of Polybius' life (though he omits to note the two passages which are decisive against this view, viz. III. 4. 1 and IX. 9. 5). But he quotes no evidence in support of the view that Polybius had carried the composition of his Historiae down to the battle of Pydna. Nothing is to be gained in this difficult matter by outpacing the evidence; and it remains true that there is no passage later than Book XV which compels or even prompts us to suppose that it was composed before 150. Book VI presents
a special problem, on which little need be said here, since it will be discussed by C. O. Brink and the present reviewer in a forthcoming number of CQ. Ziegler's version of the separatist view assumes two layers, one written before 160, the other before 133 B.C. In his testimony that of Kornemann (Phil. 1931); it represents a retreat from the full separatist view of two editions, the second reflecting a failure of confidence in the stability of Rome, as revealed by political events in the second half of the century. Moreover, as has generally been admitted, it is logical to admit that Book VI is a single whole, if a rather muddled one. The supposed contradictions in fact vanish when considered in their proper context. The automatic acceptance of the constitution in redaction is rendering any excess, as described in 18.6-8, is new and by Ziegler; it is possible that Polyb. who sees the single law as intact, without in any way guaranteeing its permanence (cf. CQ 1943, 75); like all other constitutions, the user will decor in its turn verde. On the other hand, there is a strong element in ch. 4, supported in Wirkun (Springer, 1943) and still in the hand of the Senate (51.6), and the account of the future decay of the Roman constitution in 57.5, both in fact refer to the mixed constitution, and not, as Ziegler believes (col. 149.5), to ch. 21 of the same. Thus Ziegler is right in his mixed constitution that deliberation is in the hands of the Senate (19.2.3), and hence a sign of its decay when deliberation passes into the control of the commons. Once these main stumbling blocks are gone, the remaining discrepancies in Book VI are no more than can reasonably be attributed to a certain muddle-headedness on the author's part; and the way is clear to a better understanding of what Polybius was trying to say in this essay on political science.

Unfortunately Ziegler has nothing to contribute to this matter; and some of his incidental suggestions at this point seem not very happy. It is a long-standing difficulty that the passage cannot be found in which Xenophon identified the Spartan and Athenian constitutions (V.45). In my view, and I hold that the passage stresses the originality of Spartan institutions; nevertheless, it seems hardly likely that the Xenophon who Polybius mentions along with Plato, Ephorus, and Callisthenes is a corruption of Xenophon, an obscure writer on Cretan affairs (col. 1944, n. 2). The more plausible candidate is that Polybius was concerned essentially with Ephorus, and merely quoted the rest loosely and even inaccurately.

Ziegler has made a valuable collection of Polybian views on history (cols. 1900 ff.). But in one important field he does his author serious injustice. It is well known that Polybius distinguishes between αὐτοδίκη, πράσευμα, and άφεσις, and that his usage of one of them. Thus the αὐτοδίκη of the war of Macedon against Persia are: (a) Αρηνορίων's retreat; (b) the crossing of Agesilaus to Asia. It was the consideration of these incidents that led Philip to his decision, according to Polybius, not on the basis of a πράσευμα, but on the basis of a άφεσις. Likewise a constitution is one of the greatest αὐτοδίκη leading to political action (VI.2.9); for it is especially because of a state of facts that its rulers regard it as a βασις τῶν ἐρωτών (VI.2.10). Ziegler misunderstands all this when he asserts (col. 1519) that Polybius 'die αὐτοδίκη duchaus ins geistige, in das δικαιοσύνη, ροή, πράσευμα der handelnden verleugnt.' (col. 1512). There is nothing, then, about the retreat of the Ten Thousand. To Polybius an αὐτοδίκη is an event (or fact), which leads some person or persons to take a decision; but it is, in itself, neither the decision nor the consideration which led to it. That Polybius sees in wars and other complicated public events, and he forecasts that the events will be laid in the basis of a πράσευμα, from the excess of his matter of fact, and for an explanation of the idea of a decision, and not only in the last. Ziegler introduces a confusion into his definitions, and Ziegler introduces a confusion into them when he describes the aims of leading individuals and communities in (col. 1510) 'die eigentlichen αὐτοδίκη die eigentlichen πράσευμα die eigentlichen άφεσις zu trennen, and does not point out that Polybius does not and owns, it is impossible of his definitions.

Ziegler's discussion of Τύχη in Polybius seems to be generally just, but perhaps attaches too much importance to the qualifications of the term 'fortune', as is not strange in a passage which refers to Polybius merely talking in metaphors, and does not really believe in Τύχη. Who today can say with confidence what 'belief' meant for Polybius? Nevertheless, I should find it strange if he did not write at least one of those three years which consolidated Roman power throughout the

1 It is to this passage that Polybius refers back in XXII.18.7-8, not to some lost passage (Ziegler, col. 1512).

occumene as due to some objectively existing power; see, for example, I. 4. 4-5 (where incidentally Ziegler makes two false translations at τραγάνησας τοῦ κοίμησαι: "ein solches Wunderwerk zustande gebracht" (col. 1515); "ein solchen Kampf auszufechten" (col. 1516); it means "put into action, bring before τύχη being regarded as a play-producer (cf. CQ 1945, n. 1).

In conclusion, two further points, one slight, the other fundamental. Who lent whom books? asks Ziegler in connexion with the statement that Polybius and Aemilianus (XXVI, 23.4), and bases his answer on the fact that at that date Roman houses scarcely possessed libraries of any note. He has overlooked that Aemilius Paullus, as the owner of Perseus' library (Plut. Ann. Paul. 28.8) was a noteworthy exception to this. According to Scribonius the borrower (cf. Von Scala, Studien des Polybios I, 76). Polybius' influence on Vico, Machiavelli and subsequent historians is generally noted; but it is true, the foreign to Italy, as it has never entered into it more deeply than the "influence" for, as Delatte has demonstrated (La constitution des États-unis et des Pythagoriciens, Paris, 1948), Book VI of Polybius must take responsibility as one of the αὐτοδίκη of the tripartite, mixed constitution which plays so significant a role in the United States (and the world at large) today.

My copy of RE XXI.2 duplicates cols. 2435-6, and omits cols. 2433-4; and I have met the same kind of irritating fault in post-war copies of RE. It is perhaps unreasonnable to criticise the publishers of a work which, despite a subscription from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, costs the British purchaser £4.11s.6d per half-volume.

F. W. WARBANK.


It is a pleasure to greet this volume of studies dedicated to a great scholar on the occasion of his seventieth birthday. The work of Professor Gilbert Northover in the field of classical scholarship, and in wider fields, is well known everywhere, and this handsomely produced and printed collection of essays is a worthy outcome to the tribute field of studies started both through his teaching and his writings, has been profound. The bibliography with which the volume begins will be of great interest not only to the student of Pindar or the Greek dramatists, Terence or Virgil, but also to those who will welcome the opportunity of joining Northover on all sorts of excursions in the world of ideas.

The width of Northover's interests is indicated by the diversity of the essays in this volume. We begin with Homer, pass through his school and across the world to Pindar and Plutarch, and finally conclude with Goethe and Milton. The content of the book is so considerable that it is impossible to attempt any discussion of individual contributions; I can do no more than give a mere list of authors and subjects: G. M. A. Grube with the poems of Homer; Leonard Woodbury on the 'seal' of Thoeghis (19-26); W. B. Stanford on μάνατος φρονία in Pindar, Phil. 4. 109; S. M. Adams on the three-movement form of the Persae; L. J. D. Richardson on the inner conflict (the clash between the Athenian poet and his Persian characters) in the Persae: Ivan M. Linforth on Soph., OC 129 2, 1211 f., 1757 f.; R. A. Browne on two points of dramatic technique in Euripides' Medea; W. P. Wallace on the Spartan invasion of Attica in Thuc. 4. 116 f. This decision is presented by Antiphon's Cherotics: E. A. Havelock on the reasons for the trial of Socrates; M. D. C. Tait on the method of hypothesis in the Phaedo: Norman W. Dewitt on Epicurus and Meno: G. R. G. Melville on the Latin text of M. A. Graeber with the text of Homer by infra-red; E. R. Dodds on a hydriam fragment (P. Mich. Inv. No. 5) of a Greek novel; J. T. Tuckle on the evidence of Alexander's attitude towards Greek philosophy; Lily Ross Taylor on Lucretia imagery from the theatre; J. O. Todd on the chronology of the Iliad; M. F. A. Tattersall on the false restoration of Virgil's farm: Robert J. Getty on Utebala in Verg., Gen. 1. 7; E. T. Salmon on Horace's ninth satire: W. Leonard Grant on elegiac themes in Horace's Odes; Henry George Shirreff on the use of and context of ideas of the Alexanders: W. H. Alexander on Sen., Ep. Mor. 46. 1; Gilbert Bagnani on the wealth of Trimalchio: L. A. Mackay on Tac., Agric. 36. 5; T. E. Robinson on the prophet in Israel and in Egypt: J. J. Rose on the use of modern and modern; Joseph Whatmough on an under-estimated figure in Homer: Barker Fairley on Helena in Goethe's Faust; A. S. P. Woodhouse on Milton's pastoral monodyes.

R. D. WILLIAMS.

The mammoth book has its drawbacks: it is too heavy to hold, or to carry about, and too much too expensive to buy; moreover, this is only the smaller half. A mere list of authors and titles would make this review too long, so it will have to be selective. A large number of the articles will be remembered. The volume contains essays addressed to David M. Robinson, without having it printed on every page; the name of the various authors would have been more useful to him. Some of the photographs are good, others not so good, and most of them have been assembled without any regard for the size of the plate. Why is the lovely mirror handle on pl. 51 so small, an invisible object in a waste of expensive, paper? Must the superb athlete on pl. 59 be coupled with that revolting (pl. 58)? While we know that let us be grateful to him for the many, beautiful things he has collected for us. It is an important book and contains much good matter.

Professor Childre plays first with The Significance of the Sling for Greek Prehistory. He makes Greek Prehistory seem simple. Isn’t it, you think. Middle East, slings, light pottery versus Egypt, arrows, dark pottery. Greece clearly started with light pottery, and Professor Childre says slings came there before arrows. There were quite a lot of arrows at Neolithic Dini. The arrow was a short bow, rather than a bow-shot from the fortresses wall. It must be connected with Melos, the source of the Obsidian, whose first inhabitants probably used metal, and the early connections of bronze are with Egypt. Middle East, with Egypt. The arrow is a little troubled about sling-stones; as Professor Childre says, they may so easily be something else.

Selman publishes a new bull’s head rhyton (p. 6, pl. 2). How he got it from a city site of Minyan style from first-hand evidence of originals with good pedigrees. Restorations are spread far and wide, so are drawings, but good, detailed photographs of originals found in scientific excavations hardly exist. Selman’s illustrations of the bull’s head from Corinth, where the treatment of the hair seems to be impressionistic and there is little modelling. The style of the Knowns bull agrees with Karo’s photos of the silver bull’s head found in the Shaft Graves, but is less like Stefen’s bull that in the head, with its stylization and advanced modelling, is later than the Knowns head, perhaps much later. This reviewer was left dizzy and breathless after thirty pages on the Minoan Creations by Lilian Lawler (p. 23). Strabo and Athenaeus are favourite authorities and, apparently, as important as Homer and Evans. Post-Minoan monuments are unquoted, but in Minoan times the dance is everywhere, even on the Hagia Triada sarcophagi, where one interprets events as good, as a bull on his shoulder, not a cuddly calf, mark you! but a stiff, awkward bull, trying to bring off a flying gallop.

Miss Hansen gives an interesting account of Prehistoric Sardinia (p. 54). The devoted editor, G. E. Mylonas, has crowned his already stupendous labours by a personal tribute of forty pages (p. 64), to show that there was no cult of the dead in Bronze Age Greece. The alleged Grave Circle at Mycenae has no similarity due to Minoan graves, or G. Thomson. Mylonas might have stressed the difficulty of distinguishing between being buried and decay. It is probably the best explanation of the ‘toasted’ corpses at Lucus.

D. Levi (p. 108, pls. 4, 5) publishes a peculiar tomb group from Charaviti in Attica, a common scientific excavation with a Mycenaean context. The type of vessel, of course, lasted on: there is a Geometric example in Ithaca (B34 XII1, pl. 21). The lady on Acrocorinth is unique in its being a woman’s field, but she may be genuine and of the period. If her style passes, that of the male rider will not go with it. The contours of his horse are abrupt, and geometric-looking, and so are his features. I know no other rider formed by a horse by the ear. Boys don’t present it, and horses just will not have it. Grab your horse by the mane if you like, clasp him round the neck if you must, but leave his ears alone, if you want to stay with him.

Still, the references of S. N. Marinatos, Dr. Thucydides (126), as translated by Mr. Yavis, run easily, but their exact meaning is elusive. Some of the ideas, dimmly discernible, are attractive. Eneiores—nine-year’s cycle, must be right as an adjective both for Acacus the Rain God and for fat beasts. Gold of Mycenae, won by mercenary service in Egypt: who then worked it? M. must tell us, and in Greek.

Jean Bérard (135) tells in twenty pages that he wishes to publish the Dorian invasion up to 1100 B.C. He quotes many texts and examines much archaeological material, but surely he misreads the relevant evidence, Stubbs’s article on the Mycenaean pottery of Attica and the Koroni Acropolis. Fortunately it is clear that Early Attic Geometric pottery is an indigenous growth, showing no trace of foreign influence. The Athenians invented a story to account for the Pelasgian Teichos, an uncouth wall, which they uncovered on the Acropolis, but who could we believe—Athens or Thessalia? It should be called the Kestrels’ Wall; kestrels live in it.

It is a pleasure to read the vigorous, picturesque style of J. D. S. Pendlebury’s posthumous article ‘Egypt and the Aegean’ (165). It seems to the writer that Early Attic Geometric pottery is an indigenous growth, showing no trace of foreign influence. The Athenians invented a story to account for the Pelasgian Teichos, an uncouth wall, which they uncovered on the Acropolis, but who could we believe—Athens or Thessalia? It should be called the Kestrels’ Wall; kestrels live in it.

It is a pleasure to read the vigorous, picturesque style of J. D. S. Pendlebury’s posthumous article ‘Egypt and the Aegean’ (165). It seems to the writer that Early Attic Geometric pottery is an indigenous growth, showing no trace of foreign influence. The Athenians invented a story to account for the Pelasgian Teichos, an uncouth wall, which they uncovered on the Acropolis, but who could we believe—Athens or Thessalia? It should be called the Kestrels’ Wall; kestrels live in it.

Henry Field gives a sketch on Ancient Man in South-western Asia (2). He quotes the excavations on the barreness of physical and archaeological Iran. This statement must now be revised after Brown’s discoveries in Azerbaijan.

Sydney Markman (p. 11, 12; 19) on temple models, should have quoted the model at Ilidza (Robertson, BSA XIII1, pl. 45), which is Geometric in style, and certainly is painted to represent tiles.

Mr. G. P. Stevens (331, pl. 12) is, of course, right in comparing the shape of bronze pithoi (Olympia IV, pl. XXXVIII), to his reconstruction of tripods on poros blocks on the Acropolis at Athens, but he should go farther. Bronze legs on a stucco-covered support are not going to look well, especially with tabs of bronze nailed to the stucco. The shape of the right shape, actually found on the Acropolis, would look much better and be firmer. Legs, plating, and blocks should be brought together, and very likely, many if not all tripods with legs made of plated metal should be reconstructed on solid foundations, Mr. Stevens’s way.

Having dailed too long already the sculpture section must be treated shortly. Mme Kanouzou has given us a good view of lovely material, generally well displayed in good photographs and drawings (565), but as a rule, only the stucco casts are actually published on the restoration of the mirror on pl. 51.

It is splendid that the Vatican has recovered his legs, pl. 59.

E. Langlois has a well-illustrated article on an Artenian head (639, pls. 63-6). We are glad to hear from C. Picard that it is Apollo, not Athena, on the Axos mitra (653). We never doubted it.

Miss Giela Richter has a message to us about gems of Aspasios (730, pl. 85, 86), and so has E. Kunze (736, pl. 88-90), when his sharp eyes detect Etruscan bronzes in Greece. We see George Chase’s apes (724, pl. 87), and commend to the attention of L. Dv.

The reviewer cannot accept JHS to permit her to write a book on this Festschrift, but she hopes that she has said enough to show that it is a serious contribution to learning.

SYLVIA BENTON.
NOTICES OF BOOKS

practice. The double content of long-past and contemporary matter in Greek epic has puzzled all Homeric scholars, but F. shows how it is still an important part of the art of Homeric hexameter to include ancient and often purely religious material in new lays. F.'s analysis of the Greek hexameter by no means prejudiced its popularity with scholars and "Nichtphilologen" alike. F. has been led therefore that a translator may be found so that in due course the Homeric and the simultaneous views will become available to the English reading public everywhere.

The volume is provided with full indices, and is beautifully and accurately printed. Missprints were noted on pp. 199, 263 only, while an acute accent sometimes accompanies the various cases of "eiai".

J. R. T. POLLARD.


C. M. Bowra has a happy way of making a complicated subject attractive to the reader. In Heroic Poetry he moves lightly from Hammurabi to Leónidas to Japan, pouring from Amtalhes's hom horn passages 1 and sumptuous poems of the period from the old and familiar to the new, with acute and sensitive comments on their resemblances and differences. The "mass of material" which deprecates is an attraction rather than a discouragement, even if the reader may sometimes doubt if this Aare is Akkadian or a Soviet synonym for a machine gun. After a first chapter which limits the subject to a close definition of the anthropocentric interest essential to heroic poetry and excludes India, Africa, and Ireland, we have three chapters on content: the equation, the hero, and the world in which he acts. The next five chapters deal with the technical side of things, the laws of similes, of verbal change, of habit, of the burden of the poem, and of the poet's view of the world. In the last chapter go the poems in history by discussions of the dates when heroic poems were written, and the reader is informed to the image of his being led across the thin ice over the deep waters of controversy. Sometimes the danger is revealed by a "but" or by another that, for instance, the Jute question is left to the reader. He never, however, has any doubts whether the heroine of the Odyssey is an epic or not. What matters is that when discussion is confined to the surviving poetry, and not to the poem as such, the matter of authenticity is involved, the doubt underlying almost all the evidence, small and great, cannot but cast doubt on the conclusions reached.

In this Journal Homer deserves priority. Pre-Homeric poetry may have been shamanistic (p. 19). This came as a shock, since though epic language might have this origin, it seems impossible that the stories to have been preserved by it. However, the evidence that shamanistic poetry in general precedes heroic is admirably slight; the special information attributed to

---

1 It is inherent in the scope of the book that knowledge of no language can be assumed in all respects. The author has chosen the hard way of giving English verse translations in a generally reproduce the form of the original so far as our accent allows. The text is bound at times to blur the sense. Alliteration is particularly reminiscent of the original, and his apologies for the obscurity of A.S. mannerisms is expressed by the renderings than by the poet. "Mer-sheets" or "a boat under berries"; the "boys all ready Stepped on the stem" are more alien than "a sea-drawn, a sail" or the "boat was under the cliffs; the warriors promptly embarked." The poet did know and love ships, nie opposites Ulpiex Beuvisum seren.

2 Examples of very trivial points are: p. 36. Iamb. tetrarn.

3 Anacreon, Aesop, Aeschylus, etc.; but who would not prefer Philip's? P. 46. Cil. says the poems are "embellished," and not attests their falsification of history. Brut. 16. 62. P. 479. These similes are quite exceptional; similes of one line or more than a total number of lines in Iliad, and I have noted only nine other lines repeated. P. 48. The use of a pair of ears in war is supported only by one broken reference (I. 1927, 250) there are other post-Myc., features which might have been mentioned.
Orpheus, Musaeus, and Boyan hardly proves that their heroes were magicians, and on p. 377 shamanism is relegated to Meillet's pre-Greek hexameters. Homer is without argument the author of \textit{Iliad} and \textit{Odyssey} pretty well as they appear in our manuscripts. In discussing a visual impression in the \textit{Odyssey} he suggests that he may have gone blind late in life (p. 421), and the bard of the \textit{Hymn to Apollo} may somehow identify himself with him; it is hard to see what else a Greek audience would find therein. Finally, he observes that his \textit{Iliad} is longer by broken interludes than the \textit{Iliad}, and it is tempting to think that Homer, who knew the art of the short lay, used it to some degree in the \textit{Iliad} but passed largely beyond it in the \textit{Odyssey} (p. 307). The famous contradictions, such as the premature parting of Hector and Andromache and the ignoring of the Embassy, come from a supreme artistic sense of the dramatic requirements of the situation, made possible by the peculiar conditions of recitation (pp. 311 ff.). But the possibility of an illiterate Homer is put higher on pp. 357 ff., where after discussing the indubitably oral epics of this century, Osman \textit{Delibogović} and \textit{Manas}, he passes to the \textit{Iliad} and \textit{Odyssey}: "As we have seen, their very extensive use of "epizeugia" in the \textit{Iliad} is in the tradition of improvisation and their many devices of narrative belong to an oral art. If we cannot deny that they are oral poems, we can surely admit that they reached their present form through some such process as may be observed among the Kara-Kirghis and there is evidence that the \textit{Iliad} and \textit{Odyssey} are to be well and nobly shaped and that it is not only literate poets who know how to compose on a large scale." A German critic might detect an Ur-\textit{Boorua} or suggest that Homer held high objects in the \textit{Iliad} and \textit{Odyssey} which his long similes show an advanced art. He is unique in his use of a story within a story. The tremendous force of Achilles is compared with the 'modest, untutored effect' in a Russian boy's story (p. 318). Homer makes skillful use of similes, but the contrast of their easier, more noble lives, dignify and complete the heroic character. Only the death of Sigurth in the \textit{Elder Edda} can at all compare with the \textit{Iliad} in 'authentic tragedy'. In general, Homer the artist shines like a moon among stars. His material background chiefly reflects the thirteenth and twelfth centuries, with some older elements and a little contemporary adaptation (p. 394), and the whole living world which in its ease and humanity is equally different from the Hittites, the Scythians, and the Soloi. We are therefore presumably the world of Agamemnon not of the poet. In Chios the Sons of Homer, known to Findar and Plato, 'both recited the Homeric poems and composed poems of their own' (p. 300). Homer was here inspired to imitate, producing, however, not true heroic poetry but narrative poems (p. 555). If this primrose path may be dangerous for the unwary, it offers much to interest and enlarge the student of Homer. It is the great merit of asking more questions than it answers.

The first and last chapters show how difficult the mere definition of heroic poetry is. There are no objective criteria; a poem may treat, with fair accuracy or extreme freedom, stories of the present or the distant past, of private quarrals or national causes; there is no measure for the amount of comedy, romance, or magic which it can contain without losing its character; it is usually but not invariably in metrically uniform lines; the poet may or may not be heroic and the whole point of the poem is to take the poems commonly considered heroic and see how many of the characteristics commonly considered heroic each shows. The competition between Seth and Horus (Pritcha) in \textit{KoeПер} is the most pre-Homeric \textit{Iliad} and \textit{Odyssey}. The poet, who has affinities with the catching of the otter in \textit{Kutme Strika}, and Spanish ballads or the later oral poetry of the Uzbek (pp. 546, 551), even though touched by romance, might be thought to have as good a claim as such a lyric piece as the language has for a pre-Homeric \textit{Iliad} or \textit{Odyssey} with its mythological and ecclesiastical flavour. The division of heroic poetry in Chapter XIII into primitive, proletarian, and aristocratic suggests that types so widely different in their setting might more fruitfully be taken as another form of the same thing, even prose, to which each is akin. Anglo-Saxon religious poetry was, of course, much more akin than \textit{KoeПер} to \textit{Iliad} and \textit{Odyssey}. But \textit{Iliad} and \textit{Odyssey} remain a problem; were they intended for princely or popular audiences?

At the end the reader will ask how far the author has succeeded in his avowed aim of continuing the subject where the Chadwicks stopped. He has brought in new material and discussed new subjects. Particularly relevant to Homer are his account of bardic families in Russia and well-authenticated long oral epics, which I am wholly incompetent to discuss, his reconsideration in the light of this new material of the effect of literary on oral tradition, and his emphasis on details of special interest, such as the influence of \textit{Iliad} and \textit{Odyssey} from which the peoples had migrated. It is more doubtful whether a closer synthesis is yet possible. The more recent material, especially some of the proletarian poetry, increases the difficulties, rightly or wrongly, but does not seem to show more clearly the difficulty of a synthesis and the danger, in \textit{Protean} an art, of arguing from what did happen in one country to what may have happened in another.

DOROTHEA GRAF.
NOTICES OF BOOKS

1. It is agreed that there were no corsets in the Shaft Graves. Saglio and Nilsson saw breastplates on the Warrior Vase, but Nilsson says that γυάδι belong to the Ionian equipment. Wiesner says the garments on the Vase are of leather. Kourouli霞e breastplates were the Cloth Shields. Niederer and Lorimer make representations of bronze corsets begin in seventh century. (The apparent disagreement is largely verbal.)

2. The iliad describes ein glänzende Metallpanzer.

3. χιλιος is Semitic: Nilsson says that there was no Phoenician influence on Greece before twelfth and little before tenth century, χαλκογινα was a military derivation from the civilian χιλιος. (This should date χαλκογινα to late eighth century, a claim often made.) ἄραστρα is thought by Walde-Pokorny and Boasco to be I.E.: Chantraine, Nehring, Schrader, Kretschmer, and Ernst-Meillet say it is not. On semantic parallels T. prefers to use Indo-European *σαμαριος, *σιραμιος, *σαμαρος, *σιραμος.

It seems that the evidence is convincing to make ἀραστρα late, but:

4. ἀραστρα, ἄραστρα are derived from ἄραστρα, have been in the vocabulary long enough to establish themselves and change their meaning, and do not outline epic. Therefore they, and a form like ἀραστρα, are Old; therefore there were no corsets in the Shaft Graves, they are Archaic. Consequently (a) ἄραστρα is dismissed as an hyperbolism introduced by the Alexandrian editor and 'nothing prevents us' from making the words Archaic, which were Myc., II. bronze corsets have never been found, not thought to be no bronze helmets until one was found at Dendra. (Why quote the evidence, if it is to be disregarded?)

5. There are unknown or uncancelled fragments from Milman Parry, but Parry is mentioned only in note 355 to p. 135 to be triumphantly confirmed: κωδονά is used of μύχο seven times out of eight in speeches; the poet or non-combatants use ὑποπολεύειν, etc., but fighters do not abuse battle. This is misleadings, words like σπιρέω, used by Sarpedon, and Meriones, not very cheerfully, and by Hermes disguised as a Myrmidon; also by Agamemnon dissuading Menelaus from fighting, by Zeus rebuking the goddesses for the encouragement of the Greek; and other similar creative. Elsewhere one praises fighting of any kind, but if κωδονά had been used when Achilles sadly watches the others fight (Π. 601; cf. Π. 298) or Zeus debates whether to let his son die with honour (Π. 439), how pathetically appropriate it would have been thought.

Strong disapproval of Parry's possible overstatements makes T. (against his principles) look for subtle differences of meaning ad locum between similar words, ignoring such obvious identifications as τοὔμων διάλεγεσθαι — μύχον, διάλεγεσθαι. I looked up the forms (only) actually used in the Iliad, and found 19 nouns for fighting given on p. 171. The result is: Nom. 12 forms metrically different + 1 equivalent, μύχον-ανάσιον; Acc. 14 different forms + μύχον-ανάσιον-δημιου + πόλιον-ανάσιον; Gen. 8 different forms + πόλιον-ανάσιον; Dat. 13 different forms + μύχον-ανάσιον. It is clear that the weight of evidence points to the recurrence of words in the same positions, although in fact words like κωδονά, which cannot be very old, have their preferences, but he does not mention metrical convenience as an explanation of the synonyms κωδονά-ανάσιον. Yet metrical behaviour and the quality of words and phrases generally give evidence of date; χαλκογινα has glossaesthesia Character which γυάδι has not, and is not likely to be younger; *σαμαριος is typical, and they should be causally equated; the phrase which survives is χαλκογινα, not to be explained away as a transfer from a non-existent *σαμαριος. This criticism, however, may arise from personal prejudice.

The other theses are in need of defense is it worth while discussing his methods of proof in some detail because his conclusions are so attractive. Out of 104 words, 14 are found to be Mycenaean, 15 Mycenaean-Aciclo, 25 Aciclo, 25 Aciclo-Ionic, 9 Mycenaean-Aciclo-Ionic, and 16 Ionian. He foresees that this will be quoted as authoritative for the next century.

It is useful to have the ancient and modern lexicographical material and a summary of later uses collected for each word.

DOROTHEA GRAY.


The manuscripts of Homer show a curious unreinvention in the use of η before another vowel. Thus θάλασσαι regularly appears instead of the expected *πάλασσαι, while in the aorist subjective στήρι meaning with contrast with ρώσια. On the other hand, both ἱππαλία and ἱππαλια are surprising developments of *ἵππαλεία. The author shows that no one should and rejecting previous attempts at an explanation, proceeds to a detailed examination of the evidence. He concludes that the confusion is pre-Alexandrian; η is attributed to analogical spread (Ἡπαλία after Ἰππαλία) and to the assimilation of ρώσια into ερώσια. The meeting of sound changes in the metathesis took place with subsequent metrical regularisation (τοῦ εἰς τοῦ) or where η was contracted (κάκος κακός).

It is substituted for η before a vowel, which forms would have survived otherwise. Now ησις and ησις are precisely the same, whereas words and forms confined to the epic-retained η.

The dissertation shows the careful scholarship we should expect from a pupil of Prof. Leumann, but for all his ingenuity Dr. Werner, like his predecessors, is constantly being reviewed by *σιος and *σιος, which may serve to epitomise the problem. In the first place these forms never occur before a vowel, which suggests that the last vowel is short (-ος) and everywhere σιος would be expected for it. Now *σιος and *σιος are precisely the forms we should expect. Let us assume that they stood originally in the epic. The subsequent development may be phonetic or merely orthographical. It is possible that in the course of time nasophasies the two σιον together, and in due course this contracted vowel was represented as η. Or, according to Meillet's theory (adopted by Chantraine and Schwizer), when two similar vowels occurred adjacent only one was written — *ηςις. In the period of μεναιάριστος the letter became long, and the genitive singular needed to be clearly distinguished from the nominative; so recourse was had to the specifically *ηςις. There remains the problem of the accusative ηςις (134), where we have to be sure of the linguistic evidence. As for the analogical influence of *σιος which would then be confirmed for the poet of the Οδύσσεια (so Debrunner). There is no end of hypotheses, but the solution offered by Meillet—Chantraine—Schwizer appears nearer to me. It is indeed difficult to understand why the author should set his face so firmly against orthographic considerations in dealing with a problem of manuscript spelling.

L. R. PALMER.


Professor Wade-Gery's J. H. Grey lectures, delivered in Cambridge in 1949, are printed here together with detailed notes and bibliography, (on the Catalogue and on some pedagogic points. It is now possible, thank to the author, to assess the strength of the evidence for the beliefs, suspicions, intuitions, suggestions, and conclusions which necessarily formed the basis of the lectures. To the end the reader must refer constantly to the notes at the end of the book, and it should be clearly pointed out that the (lectures is of only minor significance. It would be interesting, indeed, to know why Wade-Gery decided to give his lectures on the Iliad a purely dogmatic or interpretative form; or whether, if he thought the premises upon which they are based (pronunciation) to decide to lecture on the Iliad and in particular on the composite problem of authorship and composition. Homer's scholarship has surely reached a stage at which new syntheses are worth propounding only if supported by full
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documentation, or at least by some documentation: not the least interesting thing about Wade-Gery's lectures was the feeling they sometimes gave one of being wafted back to the time of Samuel Butler or even of Thomas Blackwood, when the best of both worlds was composed in the eighteenth century and recited at the Panionia at Mykale. That this festival then he accepted mainly on the basis of II, 20, 409 ff., the simile of the bull sacrificed to the Helikonian king. It is an interesting fact that Poseidon Hekaton, whose worship was widespread outside Asia Minor in the eighth century: Helikonian Orchestos itself and its precinct of Poseidon are mentioned in the Catalogue, as Wade-Gery points out. For the existence as early as the end of the last century to the Panionia. This is important for that what the Kastros meadows, is held to show that the Ephesia festival, too, existed in the eighth century. Are we to suppose that the only reason why people sailed down the Asia Minor coast was to attend festivals? Even if the simile implies autopsy by the poet himself (and this is by no means certain) a ship may simply have stayed for the night by the mouth of the Kastros, as it brought him back home from

—Ithaka perhaps not; certainly not, Wade-Gery would say: perhaps it was merely sheltering from that storm in the Icarian sea which has recently impressed the modern, realistic estimate of three generations to a century gave Homer a plausible date in the eighth century. This very attractive idea is followed by one less convincing, based on Pliourach Vit. Perikol. 13, the Panathenaia, and Perikles in the preceding century. This does not accord with the fourth-century testimonia; the possible absence to date of sixth-century representations of epic recitals (not necessarily contests) at the Panathenaia is one to be of limited significance for this question. The last lecture on, 'The Creative Poet,' is even more discursive than the first: much of the Iliad was fictitious, and its historical elements were derived from Homer partly from traditional verse, perhaps, from the eighth-century Greek-speaking Trojans with long memories. The only unusual suggestion here is the last one, which seems to fall short of total plausibility. Some will prefer to believe that the composer of the monumental poem worked up his material in his own poetic style, and that the Hektor (well reproduced as fig. 3). In general, this book is weakest where it aims to be most original; even what is commonly accepted, for example that much of the Iliad is fiction, is propounded in an odd way, in equally irrelevant and unconnected, it is not a question of significance. Specialists will find that the notes and appendixes contain useful material; the more general reader, as always, will gain greater profit by widening his knowledge of the Iliad itself.

G. S. KIRK


It soon becomes clear in reading this study that it presents the arguments of an advocate rather than the verdict of a judge. The author's aim is to demonstrate the artistic incompetence of the Odyssey in its present state and thereby to prove its multiplicity of sources, and would like to get rid of most of the allegiances of inexperience made by earlier Separatists and has added some of his own. Exploring these with minute care, he arrives at conclusions which differ considerably from those of his predecessors. In his opinion the Odyssey in its present state is a synthesis of two large-scale poems and four shorter works,
of art from Homer's *Odyssey* to Joyce's *Ulysses* is exempt from these?

Yet, no matter how much one may disagree with the arguments and deductions in this book, one must readily acknowledge its value as a constructive survey of the chief critical currents in the study of the *Odyssey*. One recognizes throughout, even in the severest denunciations of *B*, that, in the author's own words, "ex ist. . . . nicht etwa barbarische Zerstörungsfreude, die uns verschiedene Hände unterscheiden lässt, sondern im Gegenteil das bittere Bewusstsein, dass die Götter unserm 'Phrangoschen Poesie' . . . Perhaps in time Dr. Merkelbach will publish a more judicious revision, in which the genuine perplexities are not crowded out by *ungarn* *sphragis*.

W. B. STANFORD

---

**NOTICES OF BOOKS**


The pleasing traditional format of the Clasiques Hachette, so closely similar in this edition and in Pierron's edition of 1917 (but the Greek type has been much improved), prompts a comparison between Pierron's methods and those of the present editors. By way of introduction Pierron contented himself with a five-page analysis of the contents of the *Odyssey* (extracted verbis from his *Histoire de la litterature grecque* together with brief summaries at the beginning of each book. On the other hand, he generally gave a little more than half the page to his notes on the text (which is printed above the commentary in these editions). The present editors have reduced their notes to the essential minimum. But their introduction, comprising discourses of the Heroic Age, the Homeric poems, the *Odyssey* itself, the voyages of the *Odysseus*, the later tradition, and the language of Homer, amounts to 75 pp. Besides each book has its own introductory note and apparatus, and the book is rounded off with a grammatical appendix (43 pp.) and an explanatory index to geographical and historical terms (97 pp.). The whole is a veritable compendium of information on Homeric problems. The carefully chosen illustrations deserve a special word of praise.

Teachers and students will find this an invaluable survey. More advanced scholars will do well to consider many of the remarks on Homer's style and material. Apart from his work on *Vergil*, Merkelbach's systematic and encouraging reports to the geographical problems are very fully considered, Ithaca being identified with Thiaiki. On the question of authorship the editors deny that 'Homer' could have composed both the *Iliai* and the *Odyssey* exactly as they are now; but they are hesitatingly inclined to admit that, in view of the differences one can see in the earlier and later works of writers like Victor Hugo and Corneille, a single author may have composed the bulk of both poems. In most of the greater scenes, in particular the conversation of *Odysseus* by *Polyphemus* averages over 3000 words, the editors think 'une qualité de génie et de sensibilité . . . si personne que jamais elle ne peut être attentive ni même approchée dans la suite des siècles; même naturel, même sobriété, même sens profond de l'humour', etc.

The notes are brief. For the most part they cover only technical problems of text and exposition, and authorities are not cited. The philological and grammatical comments are such as one would expect from scholars advised by Mazoz and Chantraine. A few misprints (on pp. 46 and in the n. on 9, 450; and in the text of 5, 321; 9, 219, 290) need correction, and the printer has let the type slip rather often.

The editors are to be congratulated on an edition both elegant and accurate, both comprehensive and economical: and it is manifestly (as they hoped) 'au courant des derniers progrès de la philologie, de l'archéologie et de l'histoire'.

W. B. STANFORD

---


Since the third edition of Rzaczk's *Hesiód* (Teubner) appeared in 1913, our knowledge of the lost *Catalogue of the Women* has been advanced by the discovery of more than twenty papyrus preserving substantial fragments of the text. A new edition, therefore, is necessary, if only to make the new material more readily accessible to students of Hesiód. Traversa, however, has not been content with making a mere compilation, but has undertaken to publish the fragments within the five books, arguing on affinity of mythological content where precise testimony is lacking. By applying this method and relegating most of the testimonia to the end of the
text, he presents us with the skeleton outline of the first four books, the fifth being represented by a single line. Dabious fragments are still, of course, numerous.

The existence of the fifth book, questioned by Rzach despite the testimony of Cyprian in his letter to Genres (Ep. 54, 10, 1), is now generally accepted. Cyprian (Ep. 54, 10, 1) and Tertullian (Conf. 44, 6747), Pap. Mai. Bod. 10560, known to Rzach, gives the transition from I to II, and Pap. Vind. 13 the virtual end of III and beginning of IV. In both cases the division is dictated by extraneous considerations and disregards the continuity of the argument.

In attempting restorations of the papyrus texts Transversa has gone cautiously, making about twenty suggestions and admitting only six or seven into his text. Some of them, however, are not too happy. His conjecture Ἡ ἤρθη ἐκ τὴς ἀγκαλίας in the app. crit. of fr. Bg 11, 5 is sublimely indifferent to the metre (I cannot see how to put the blame on the printer), and ηοῇροῦ in fr. 14, 1 was virtually anticipated by Evelyn-White's ἥρθη ἐκ τῆς ἀγκαλίας. His conjecture ηοῇροῦι in [fr. 12], ηοῇροῦι ἀπὸ τῆς ἀκήρεος θαλάσσα, is certainly wrong for three good reasons: (1) Hunt (and Transversa) gives space for approximately five letters between θαλάσσα and ηοῇροῦ; (2) instead of ηοῇροῦ we need θαλάσσα or its equivalent, since the two parts of the Minotaur are in antithesis; and (3) ἀπὸ is the opposite of the sense required (cf. ἀπὸ τῆς ἀκήρεος). I suggest ἀπὸ τῆς ἀκήρεος ἀπὸ τῆς θαλάσσα, the rest of the line, I think, alludes rather to the bull half, e.g. ηοῇροῦι ἀπὸ τῆς θαλάσσα ἀπὸ τῆς θαλάσσα. A comparison of Transversa's text here with that of Bg 11, 5, ηοῇροῦι ἀπὸ τῆς ἀκήρεος, as the marking of doubtful letters Transversa is quite unreliable.

The treatment of the older material is at times too hasty and unctitical. Fr. 56, ηοῇροῦι ἀπὸ τῆς ἀκήρεος θαλάσσα, ἦν ἰδίος διάλογος, is not considered as necessarily referable to a quotation of θαλάσσα of schol. Laur. Ap. Rhod., gives bad sense, and since Ap. Dsc. ends the quotation at θαλάσσα, we should perhaps follow suit, ἦν ἰδίος διάλογος looks like the scholar's gloss. Again, Transversa's comment quoted from Bg 1, 5, is not the comment of neither Transversa nor any other editor, as far as I know, has seen anything wrong. The Catalogue attributes only to Helen and Menelaus (cf. schol. Laur. Soph. El. cited by T.), and so we cannot mark a lacuna between the two lines, but must regard Ap. Dsc. as an interpolation. The proposal on p. 34 to delete fr. 53, 1 and insert 33, 3 after 53, 1 does not alter the difficulty.

In other respects, too, this edition shows signs of haste. Missprints are frequent (Transversa's advance apology for them will not, of course, blind one to them). The text of fr. 53, 2 ff seems to be a conflation of two different restorations by Evelyn-White, and to have lost the main verb in the process. On p. 115 Vergil is misquoted, and some of Transversa's, e.g. σαρώνεσθαι, on p. 63 and agnoscetro on p. 98, will raise the purists' eyebrows.

In short, while this edition has made some contribution to the study of the Catalogue, particularly in the arrangement of the fragments, the prevalent carelessness seriously reduces its value.

J. H. Quinney.


The first two fascicles of the 'new Deihl' were noticed in this journal two years ago (LXII, 1952, 125-6), and the general remarks there made hold good in most cases for this third fascicle also. Like its predecessors, it has been seen through the press by R. Beutler of Munich, who must be responsible for many of the new additions, although I have found only one note (on Hipp. 1, to be referred to again below) to which he has added the symbol "(B)."

The covered is the same as that of the third fascicle of the second edition (1956—referred to as "D")—: A. Iambi rei, with Archilochus and Alcaeus; B. Iambi rei, with Archilochus and Alcaeus; C. Iambi rei, with Archilochus and Alcaeus; D. Iambi rei, with Archilochus and Alcaeus; E. Iambi rei, with Archilochus and Alcaeus; F. Iambi rei, with Archilochus and Alcaeus; G. Iambi rei, with Archilochus and Alcaeus; H. Iambi rei, with Archilochus and Alcaeus; I. Iambi rei, with Archilochus and Alcaeus; J. Iambi rei, with Archilochus and Alcaeus; K. Iambi rei, with Archilochus and Alcaeus; L. Iambi rei, with Archilochus and Alcaenus; M. Iambi rei, with Archilochus and Alcaenus; N. Iambi rei, with Archilochus and Alcaenus; O. Iambi rei, with Archilochus and Alcaenus; P. Iambi rei, with Archilochus and Alcaenus; Q. Iambi rei, with Archilochus and Alcaenus; R. Iambi rei, with Archilochus and Alcaenus; S. Iambi rei, with Archilochus and Alcaenus; T. Iambi rei, with Archilochus and Alcaenus; U. Iambi rei, with Archilochus and Alcaenus; V. Iambi rei, with Archilochus and Alcaenus; W. Iambi rei, with Archilochus and Alcaenus; X. Iambi rei, with Archilochus and Alcaenus; Y. Iambi rei, with Archilochus and Alcaenus; Z. Iambi rei, with Archilochus and Alcaenus.

The principal additions to the text are the anonymous imbeci of P. Lyc. 168 Ca and 487 (pp. 68-72) and the new fragments of Hilpox and her scholia from P. Oxy. XVIII 2174-6 (numbered 1-3, cf. J. ][174, 13) —: minor additions are the promotion of Archil. fr. 126 Bergk from the commentary to the text as fr. 944, six new iambic amblespota (g a b, b c; 35 a; 29 g a, b—all untranslatable), two new hexameter lines (Nos. 543 and 544, all found by O. Masson in a MS. of Tzetzes at Trinity, Cambridge), the promotion of the text to Hermes fr. 2 of a line from Hesych. (τοῦ Ἀθηναίων 5.65—cf. Bergk, PLG iii. 639), and a new choliambic adseptoton (6—unimportant). The Strasbourg
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I found this book with due moderation about this enthralling book. Dr. Irigoin tells us that he set out to study the language of choral lyric from Alcman to Pindar, that he was led through that to study the history of Pindar’s text that this investigation is the only work given to him by Professors Dain and Chantaine. In it he seeks to apply to the history of Pindar’s text the principles which Dain had already employed in his Histoire du texte d’Enée le tuctique (Paris 1946). He has also written a detailed study of the metrical scholia, to which he refers in his bibliography as ‘paralitique’—one can only hope that we shall not have to wait long for it, since it is obviously a work of the first importance for metrists and, indeed, for the history of an obscure or completely unknown author. After a well-considered bibliography (pp. ix-x), a list of sigla and other abbreviations (xix-xxvii), and a brief introduction (1-2), in which the services of Drachmann, Abel, and Turyn are acknowledged, the book is divided into three parts of unequal length and value (the fifth and fourth centuries—3-28; the Alexandrian period—29-90; the edition of the Epiphanics-91-286). A short summary by way of conclusion (297-300) is followed by a list of Pindar MSS. (301-2) and a comparison of two and existing MSS, most of which Irigoin has himself examined (Schroeder, it should be noted, listed one hundred and eighty-five). Finally, there is a very full and helpful index (443-62).

The book directs the reader back to Pindar’s own MS, which Irigoin believes, on the rather dubious evidence of the Timotheus papyrus, ‘était écrit comme de la prose’, and works down from there to the pre-Alexandrine editions, in which he has also himself examined, the first only of the epigrams but also of some degree of unintentional ‘ionisation’. Since he attempts to study the pre-Alexandrine transmission of Pindar in almost complete abstraction, the inadequacy of the evidence is more to the disadvantage of the book; but even within the limitations of his evidence he has not considered the possibility that Pindar’s MSS may have been preserved along with his house.

The second part begins with Zenodota (the words are not in Ol. 5 inscr. are a little confused, as if someone thought ‘letraire’, or not to be ascribed as referring to ‘letraire’). In Ol. 5, where the word is written by an Aristophanes of Byzantium (who is credited not only with the establishment of the text but also the division into books and the invention of the colometry; on this last point, see Irigoin’s Recherches sur les mètres et la lyrique chorale grecque: la structure des vers (Paris 1953)), Aristarchus and his successors and opponents, and Didymus (a study of whose methods reveals for the first time the real strength of Irigoin’s scholarship, and enables several now anonymous school-books to be assigned from his commentary), to the editors of Turyn and of the early papyri (down to the second century A.D.) in this, the section on the Panae is especially to be noted: Irigoin shows that the most probable order is IX, X (or X, IX, VIII, VII, I, II, VII, XII, XIII (which perhaps belongs to 334)).

The third part contains the real meat of the book, the detailed study of the transmission of the text from the Epiphanics from the second century A.D. to the earliest printed editions. Though needing the closest attention if one is to follow it, it has been written against the grain so to speak (Irigoin worked backwards from the known MSS, but writes forward), this is a really brilliant piece of scholarly detective work, which challenges comparison with such classics of the art as Carter and Pollard’s Enquiry, and which by a careful use of all possible lines of enquiry—palaeographical, codicological (to adopt Dain’s ugly but useful word), philological, historical—puts the history of Pindar’s text into a quite different shape (how modern is the idea of examining Irigoin’s plate with the lemmata colicium in Turyn’s edition, p. vi). To summarise too briefly, I hope not too unequally, Irigoin’s complex and careful arguments: the Epiphanics were chosen to represent Pindar in the school curriculum, and a new edition of them, probably in codex form, with a commentary drawn from the works of earlier editors, was made; in the latter part of the second century A.D.; from it descended three printings of the Ambrosian and Vatican recensions. Of the Ambrosian archetype we know only what can be learned from the MS, A, copied (perhaps directly) from a very battered MS aulicus. About 1280 (Turyn demonstrates that Turyn’s late dating of this MS is wrong)

A point of detail: in this chapter (33) and the next (44), Irigoin treats the second Pythian as incontestably meant for victory in some local games; he has evidently missed Bowra’s article in NC 45, 1937-1, 1-28 (now Problems in Greek Poetry, 1935, 66-92)

and completed from a MS, of class 3 (see below); there are good reasons to think that Plutarch knew A, and I should be inclined to hazard the suggestion that A may even be in Plutarch’s handwriting. About the sixteenth century the Vatican recension divided into two parts, and the second part of this division is as nos. 383-2 D, i.e. the four books of the Epiphanics with the first lines of lsth. 9 and an abridged text (Olympians and Pythians only), both texts with full scholia. These were still uncials, and they were transliterational sessions, into minuscule about 1000; the oldest printed text is of about this date. The NCA of the complete text is later (1050-1100, at which date its scholia were abridged), and approximately contemporary with the earliest discoverable prototype of the MS, prepared by an unknown scholar, most probably in Thessaloniki, by the critical methods which passed for scholarship at that date and place (Irigoin calls this MS, which can be reconstructed down to its price m page, Thessalonician politian); the other prototype of the abridged text (b) is slightly later (about 1100) and almost certainly Constantinopolitan; the earlier prototype of the full text (b—1075-1159) may be rather earlier than that. The full text (2—not the same as Turyn’s 3, on which see below) is probably of the twelfth century, but is only known from two MSS, of class 3, the non-Ambrosian part of A, and Turyn’s (or ‘recensio Parisiensia’), which Irigoin shows to be in fact the edition of Maximus Planudes. The latter was descended from Planudes’ edition, V in particular is shown to have connections with Thessalonien (through the edition of Germanos (1275), of which it is in part a recension), Irigoin shows (against Turyn) that Planudes’ V is not the same as the Moschopoulous own edition contained only the Olympians, and was completed from other sources by an unknown scholar about 1450. Further, it is shown that Triclinius made two editions of Thessalonien (one by the MS, a, the later by a group of MSS, of which b is perhaps the best; as befitted a Thessalonian, Triclinius used a descendant of Thessalonien, as a scholarly edition reconstructed from P and Q), but he did not make his researches to any single period, and his claim to be regarded as the first modern textual critic, first put forward by Wollmowitz and supported by Aubreton (Démétrius Triclinius et les recensions médievales de Sophaclé (Paris 1949)) is shown to be amply justified. Space forbids the full analysis of the papyri and the other verbal and textual evidence (such as the date of the last MSS, and early printed editions, especially his solution for the problems presented, by Calligeros, Roman edition of 1515 (Chap. vi, especially pp. 496-20).

The best course for a reader wishing to obtain a quick view of what Irigoin has done for the history of Pindar’s text would be to look up the references to Turyn’s report; and then see that some parts of Turyn’s most suspect opinions (e.g. the relationship of his 3 or recensio Parsina to the reconstructed MS, β (139 n. 2), or his view that K is a copy of F (314, cf. 318—9) are defended, but that in most cases Irigoin refers to Turyn’s report, and can claim to be regarded as a reading particular attention should be drawn to Irigoin’s use of watermarks for dating (e.g. in the cases of I, C, and K). A correction which may be of particular interest to students of inscription relates to Turyn’s report that Κ 14.18 reads multiplex, Irigoin comments (269 n. 1) au f. 71’ un trou, qui a fait disparaitre les lettres -e-O, l’aise aparcier le milieu du mot ονάξβενον du f. 72* (O VI sch. met., ep. 1 [Dr. I, p. 153, 9]).

Irigoin’s study is not only the history of Pindar’s text which is illustrated by Irigoin’s history of Byzantine scholarship acquires new detail and increased reality from his beautiful full colour engravings, and he even allows himself for a few gleaning moments to add a few words about his classroom and the great teachers of that age are expounding Pindar. On every count we owe a great debt of gratitude to Irigoin; and any future edition of Pindar on the history of Classical scholarship in the Middle Ages which claims to take this book into very careful account will stand self-condemned.

J. A. DAVISON.


If we select at random any one type of dactylic hexameter and consider carefully how it is used by Pindar, we are likely to find that it shows a strong tendency to exhibit a ‘bridge’ at a given point throughout certain poems and at a different point throughout other poems. Thus the verse ε-ε-t tends to assume
The form ε-Δ-ε- in P. 3 str. 5, N. 11 str. 1, etc., but ε-Δ-ε- in P. 3 ep. 3, N. 10 str. 4, etc. Some types, on the other hand, tend to exhibit the same bridge without significant variation between one poem and another; thus ε-Δ- nearly always occurs in association with the dactylo-trochaic dipody, feminine hemistiches, and cretice, in P. 3 str. 5, but as cretic, prosodiac, and iambic dipody in P. 3 ep. 3. His argument rests on a considerable body of statistics, in which details of the position of bridges in several types of dactylo-epitrepi verses are presented, but he does not distinguish the position that dactylo-epitrepi verses were conceived by the Greek poets, and should therefore be analysed by us, as combinations of units familiar in other types of verse. When he says of ε-Δ-ε- 'à première vue on l'analyserait ainsi: dactyle-trochée, répétition du dactyle, et versification de crétié,' we may reasonably ask 'who is 'on'?' This assumption inevitably gives his main argument the appearance of circularity, an appearance reinforced by his consistent use of the term 'synaphe' where 'bridge' would beg the question less. Support for this kind of analysis of dactylo-epitrepi verses may perhaps be sought in two quarters:

(i) In some verses of unambiguous analysis the components seem commonly to be linked by bridges, e.g. macr-τ-ε-τ-, ουτ-τ-δ-, gl-βοδινος; this structural principle, observable not only in Pindar and Bacchylides but also in e.g. S. Aj. 565-645, may usefully be invoked for the solution of analytic puzzles such as P. 8 str. 5 (pp. 72-3, 84-5). M. Irigoin, however, relegates verses of this kind to a minor role in his argument (pp. 64-81). They would have made a better starting-point than ε-Δ-ε- and Δ-ε-Δ-, though their value is only suggestive, and limited; the number of really unambiguous analyses is, however, not large (e.g. P. 27 ε-Δ-ε-, ε-Δ-ε-), and of those which are certainly unambiguous some of the components do not exhibit the bridge between the components, e.g. gl-βοδινος, gl-τειτο. (pp. 67-8).

(ii) Irigoin classifies dactylo-epitrepi verses as 'ascending', 'descending', and 'reversing' (e.g. Δ-ε-ε-). To which of these classes a given verse is assigned by him depends on most analyses of his own interpretation. He promises us, however (p. 45), a further study of the part played by the a-chorion oratorio in his later verse, if it should appear, for reasons independent of his analysis of dactylo-epitrepi verses, that certain strophes exhibit a pattern of 'ascent', 'descent', and 'reversal', and his analysis alone meets these requirements, the assumption he has made about the structure of dactylo-epitrepi verses would deserve very serious consideration.

Meanwhile, the book must be judged as a presentation of data, as nothing new is added. It appears in Philologus 61, pp. 268-305 (cf. Snell's Bacchylides, p. 24 *), in the structure of dactylo-epitrepi verses, namely:

(a) Bacchylides consistently observes the bridges (ε-Δ-ε-, ουτ-τ-δ-, ε-Δ-ε-), except in poem 1 and occasionally elsewhere in Pindar. Other poets

(b) Bacchylides shows a consistent preference for the diacrases (Δ-ε-ε-), ε-Δ-ε-, ε-Δ-ε-, ε-Δ-Δ-, etc.

(c) Both Pindar and Bacchylides show a certain tendency to treat diacrases of type (B) as a matter of response.

M. Irigoin attempts to replace these limited and casual generalisations with others of much wider application, accepting ε-Δ-ε- for both Pindar and Bacchylides and substituting ουτ-τ-δ- for Pindar only.

M. Irigoin separates the bridges, in which he includes Δ-ε-, from 'dactylo-trochaic series', and formulates his rules on the strength of the latter alone; an unjustified proceeding, since ουτ-τ-δ- normally occurs in wholly dactylo-epitrepi contexts. For Maas's str. 5 (p. 104) states the rule: 'In his dactylo-trochaic rime he makes no reference to the stronger element, analagous than ε-Δ-ε- to ουτ-τ-δ- as a statement of the structure of N. 10 ep. 2. His data illuminate the practice of Pindar and Bacchylides on many points of detail, but the validity of his generalisations is slightly less than may appear on first sight; he treats an elision as constituting a bridge—whereas the phenomena of the iambic trimeter suggest that it would be wiser to make a special category of elision—and he sometimes dismisses exceptions by casting doubt on the text even where the textual problem is merely a typographical error. But this he does not affect the metrical point at issue (e.g. B. 13.91, 15.9).

K. J. DOVER.


This book has no claim on the attention of specialists in the subject. It offers simply summaries and discussions of the seven complete plays and even to the general literary location of these it has little new to contribute. Its author has the merit of warning his reader against the danger of judging Aeschylus by modern standards of the dramatic, a warning from which the writer, at least on one or two crucial points, might have got much profit. But this is counterweighted by the usual reluctance to admit that anything in Aeschylus is crude or primitive. The Suppliaces, for example, contains 'no embryo art'; 'this is no pioneer art, ... but a master craftsman, handling with magnificent assurance a discipline already elaborated, full-blown art' (p. 10). O. finds the main interest of the plays in the general pattern running through them, or, in his favourite phrase, their 'harmony.' This view should at least have the advantage of warning its holders against the sin of 'character-study' or 'psychological subtlety' in the characters; though O. himself is not always free from this tendency (see, for example, pp. 30, 63, 92, 102-3). But it has the unfortunate effect of leading him to castigate attention on what could be Aeschylus's development of certain theological doctrines. True, he once warns us that the Oresteia is 'not primarily a document of religious doctrine, but a play, a work of art' (p. 113); but on the whole he ignores the implications of this remark. At the root of his attitude lies the usual habit of vaguely assuming that tragedy was felt to be in some sense a religious ritual, without raising the awkward questions of what sense it was religious. O. nowhere remarks that the origin of that is now a case understandable and controversial. He seems to assume that because tragedy was part of a festival of Dionysus, a tragedy by Aeschylus was a religious performance in the same sense as a modern oratorio and is therefore unfavourable of his. And in spite of having written two books on Homer, O. makes no attempt to set Aeschylus against the general background of Greek literature. The very existence of epic poetry is scarcely mentioned. Aeschylus's own valuable hint about his writings (Athenaeus VIII 347 E) is not quoted, any more than it is usually in popular books about him; and Wilamowitz's vitally important definition of Attic tragedy (Euripide, 1889, p. 192) is not quoted at all. His interpretations, totally ignored. It naturally follows that O. accepts without questioning the generally received view of Aeschylus as an original thinker, working out in his dramas a theological system which exalted Zeus to a Jehovah-like domination of the universe. The purpose of these two books seems to be to distil the essence of Zeus (p. 61): 'the essential drama is 'the poet's own reconstruction of Zeus.' In the Agamemnon, we are told yet once again, 'Aeschylus seeks to justify the ways of God to man  ...' (p. 129). Just as O. never for a moment contemplates the possibility that the main subject of the Prometheus may have been the fortunes of Zeus and Prometheus, so he protests indignantly against the notion that the main subject of the Oresteia may be the fortunes of the house of Atreus. The style is clear and straightforward, and there seem to be comparatively few mistakes of fact. But the author's irritating habit of making points which he might well have made directly by quoting English, or occasionally French, authors, does not make good his several attempts at apparent indifference to the great body of evidence which is available on this subject. He once refers to Wilamowitz's introduction to his translation of the Oresteia; but this is the only mention of anything in German, and the text itself shows no sign of the author's assimilation of anything from his translator's tragedy or his Aischylus: Interpretation. Even in a popular work of this kind, such indifference to scholarship has unfortunate results. O. quotes Aeschylus in a whole variety of translations, mostly in verse and mostly more or less free or imprecise:
not do his own prose renderings, when he uses them, suggest that he possessed the technical competence which a writer even of a popular audience must possess; so difficult an author should possess. O’s preoccupation with the complete plays to the exclusion of the fragments not only inhibits him from giving his reader as much as a hint that Aeschylus wrote other plays besides those we have and those which made up the trilogy to which they belonged, but also makes him unwilling to do more than glance at the difficult and, to the serious reader, inescapable problems that are raised by the Danaid and Theban trilogy and, above all, the Prometheus.

One cannot doubt that, had the author lived to carry out a final revision of this book, it would have been much improved; indeed, the editor in his preface suggests that O. might have published no more than a fuller, better, and more satisfactory chapter on the Pro- metheia than would have no doubt been expanded, or never published. But on the evidence of the printed volume it is permissible to doubt whether the writer possessed the scholarly and independent judgment that would be needed to produce a popular account of Aeschylus in any way comparable to, say, the late H. Weir Smyth’s Aeschylean Tragedy.

HUGH LLOYD-JONES.


These four volumes of translations, all of them worthy of study by the expert as well as by the general reader, show an interesting diversity of style and of approach to the problem of rendering the words and spirit of Greek tragedy in English. Sir John Sheppard’s translation of the Agamemnon, already established in part, is based mainly on Headlam’s text. It is interesting therefore to compare it with Headlam’s translation and to mark its greater clarity and vigour, while it loses nothing in point of accuracy. Both in lyrics and in the blank verse used for the iambic portions, Sir John contrives to combine an easy and contemporary, yet poetical, vocabulary into periods which reflect the dramatic values of the Greek and convey not only the details of Aeschylus’ imagery but also the intricately developing action, thought, and passion. So true a rendering that it is not only a part upon the translator’s life-long acquaintance with the works of Aeschylus, and also on his ability to distil his experience in both blank and lyrical verse which seems neither stilted nor archaically remote to the contemporary ear. This line or that may be most to the taste of one or other versions; and there are no doubt many to whom Mr. Macneice’s free verse may seem better suited to present Aeschylus in modern dress; but no lover of the Agamemnon will read this version without pleasure and profit. A very short and almost trivial Illustration must suffice to show its quality—TV, 563-6, χιλιανά 6 δέ λόγοι στίς οὐκομετοιχόντων διδόν παρ’ άφωνον 6πειρόμενον 6σπείρων τινών κτήριαν εν στουήνοις κτώσις στουήνοις εν μεταφρασίαν κτώσις στουήνοις εν μεταφρασίαν κτώσις στουήνοις.

—freezing cold,
When Idas was all snow—it killed the birds.
Or sweltering heat at noon, when not a breath
Of wind stirs not, the mountain, the sea.
Sank in his bed and slept.

As in his earlier volume in the Penguin Classics, which contains the Theban Plays, Mr. Watling employs a modern idiom and style in which he is well at home. His versions have directness and vigour which will not estrange the ear of the reader of modern poetic drama, while the turns to the plays which have involved so many of his favourite authors. Mr. Watling’s feeling for poetry and for the language of Sophocles’ work is sure; and the leading threads which bind together episode and stasimon and their contrasting but clearly comprehensible for the Greeks reader. The very directness of his approach tends to inconsistencies: in the iambic portions verse alternates with a rapid free-stressed verse which does not submit kindly to analysis; and a poetic idiom is interlarded with an undiscriminatingly common in daily speech, with an effect very different from the breath-taking perfection of Sophocles himself: For example, it seems out of key to translate Aj. 542 (φοβος προεσταλθη) αυτον δαπα χρυσον ευθς καταρσις) by the "One of you bring him here, whichever of you is looking after him"; but at the great moments Mr. Watling does much better than this. In the lyrics there is little beyond the use of words to represent the repetitive balance of strophe and antistrophe which the reader cannot fail to understand. Sophocles’ intention in the translated version, even if its impact is reduced. The images are mainly rendered with accuracy and force—e.g. Aj. 477-8(‘Who’d be that man? To huddle over the coals of flickering hope. Not I’). Mr. Morison’s version is at once more complete, consistent, and ‘poetical’ than Mr. Watling’s and less dramatically effective. He would take an honourable place amongst nineteenth-century translators for his careful vocabulary, and unsatisfactory chapter on the Prometheus; but no doubt the play would be more obscure than evocative, more often grand, elevated, and remote. So Mr. Morison has spaced the Poet’s speeches in his modern humour. He is at his best in the lyrics, where his sense of poetry and use of rhyme and metre give poise and balance to the ode, and at his worst in stichomythia. Their versions of Aj. 595 (O shew 2 ιθαρχις) will serve to illustrate the weaknesses and strengths of both translators, though Mr. Watling, in his attractive stanza, is perhaps more than usually laconic.

Watling:

O glorious Salamis, beauty of the world
Set fast for ever in the waving waves,
Pity us here,
Stretched on our grassy beds. How long?
Months without number,
Year after weary year,
Waiting for nothing but our cold
Dark everlasting graves.

Morison:

O glorious Salamis, enthroned on high
Amid the waves that lash thy shore,
Conspicuous to every voyager
Thou hast the happy seat:
I all sore of heart
Long while through these uncounted months
Have tarried, by time’s weary course
Depressed and in the camp have lain
Here in the pastures of Idas’ plain
And have no hope left but to reach anon
Hades’ din realm abhorred.

Both books provide brief stage directions and introductory notes. It is a pity, though no doubt a matter of policy, that in both Mr. Watling’s book and Mr. Vellacott’s in the Penguin Classics the lines are not numbered.

Mr. Watling’s translated Alcestis, Hippolytus, and I. T. Like Mr. Watling, he uses a contemporary style to lessen the strangeness of Greek drama to the reader, but in Iambics he mostly abandons even blank verse for plain but often effective prose. The result is a restrained, faithful rendering of the Greek sentiment. This is more often than not well phrased for acting on the stage. Strophe and antistrope are distinguished in the choruses, though there is little metrical correspondence and in some places—Hipp. 1102 ff. for example—expansion of one element makes it quite disproportionately long. In contrast with Mr. Watling, Mr. Vellacott’s tendency is to over-elaboration and especially to the insertion of adjectives not found in the Greek text, to underline his meaning; but despite these qualifications, the reader cannot fail to mark those qualities which distinguish Euripides’ work from that of the other tragedians. Whether or no this style of translation will continue to satisfy is not certain; but the Penguin Classics deserves the greatest praise for the care with which they publish what they achieve. Amongst other benefits not the least is perhaps the renewed interest with which they set the student of Greek literature to reconsider his favourite translations of an earlier age.

P. G. MASON.


Mr. Goheen finds in his study of the language of Antigoné six dominant image-groups, which serve to arouse and establish connections of thought, emotion and judgment from part to part of the plays, and sustain the play as a whole; however, have a double value: they have the "denotative value of their particular use, in a limited context", and they serve to characterise the points of view of different characters in the play and set them in sharp
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opposition on fundamental matters'. They also help us to understand the basic issues or facts of human experience which the poet regards as relevant to his theme.

The author considers first what he calls the 'money scene'—struggling with which Creon's words such as μονή and μονής. This is especially apparent in the scene with Teiresias, in which Creon is quick to allocate bribes to those who oppose him, but has been foreshadowed already in the prologue, when the head of the sphinx is seen on hearing that his edict has been broken. Next is the 'military sequence', another favourite image of Creon, revealing that his view of government is that of a military dictator, who demands unquestioning obedience from his subjects. This is a literal meaning in vision, and expression, admiring the orderly, impatient of what cannot be brought under an elementary, direct kind of order. Imagery drawn from animals and the taming of animals is used frequently and splendidly, and the view that as men are to be brutes so are the gods to men. Creon again makes much use of this, and it throws light upon his attitude to the relations between governor and governed. The same imagery appears also in the Parodos (conflict of eagle and snake, chariotrearing and the race-course), the first Stasimon (man taming wild animals to his yoke), the third Stasimon (παραβάτας is taken as a metaphor from the driving of horses), and the fourth Stasimon, which contains images derived from the yoking of animals. Perhaps Mr. Gough is over-subtle in seeing what he calls a sub-conscious 'Freudian slip' in the choice of the word σέληνει (literally of a dog fawning) in Creon's line 1244 μοισίς μ' αἰδώς φαβέκιον, but it shows that he is wide awake to the overtones of language. The last two sequences in which he finds are the marriage motif and the tropes from disease and its cure. The treatment of the first of these is interesting, especially in the way in which it is shown how Antigone is face to face between the ideas of love and death. There is also a discussion of the theme of state metaphor, which gives coherence to Creon's opening statement of policy, and recurs from time to time throughout the play.

In two concluding chapters, the author carefully analyses the language of Creon's speech of Stasima I, II, and IV, and deals with some of the problems raised by the play. He finds in Antigone's language a direct emotional and extra-rational mode of expression, and considers that she has immediate impact, emotional, rational, verbal, but intellectually limited. The play is seen in its simplest terms as a 'conflict of two persons in respect to a burial', and this conflict is made over the deeper issues of ethics, politics, religion, and philosophy, in particular a probing into the celebrated παραβάτας controversy. A postscript suggests ways of enquiring into some of the secrets of Sophocles' style, rightly rejecting both the method of cataloguing individual words and the literal meaning of each figurative expression and relating it to its context and to similar expressions throughout the play. It is not, however, an easy book to read. It abounds in such phrases as 'evaluative response' and 'multivalent awareness'; and the argument would have gained a hundredfold in clarity if it had been presented in terse, concrete, and more precise English. There is an exhaustive bibliography comprising some 150 books and articles and a good Index locorum. The notes deal with detailed points of interpretation, and Antigone's speech as wholly genuine, and keeps κόσμος at 692, but he labours in vain to defend παραβάτας at 968 and παραβάτας (reading παραβάτας and deleting the stop before it) at 914.

R. W. B. BURTON.


Lesky takes as his starting-point the thesis developed by Schadewaldt in his paper Sophokles und das Leid (1944) that man reaches his fulfillment in suffering. While rightly emphasizing the isolation of the Sophoclean tragic hero, he sees a further primary function of suffering in striving to overcome isolation and seek after fellowship with each other in love and understanding. This theme is illustrated first by an analysis of the prologue of Ajax: the stricken hero is revealed en tabule, alone amid the carnage, displayed by a mocking Athena to Odysseus, who draws from the scene a lesson that is fundamental to our understanding of Sophoclean tragedy—

οὐκ ἔχει ταῖς ὁμόλογοις ἀλλὰ ἀληθῆ ἢ ἐπιστάσεις ἢ δύναμις ἢ ἀπόκρυφος σκῶν.

This realisation of the nothingness of man forms a bond uniting the figures of tragedy, and the humanity of Odysseus is further revealed at the end of the play when he realises that there must be a limit to hatred of a fallen foe, that after all it is not κόσμον to continue it, and that it must give way to its opposite.

He follows some editorial and textual notes, and narratives of little general interest. There is an interesting discussion of the famous line οὔτε συπαθήσεως οὔτε συμπάθειαν ήν, in which Lesky gives due attention to the word ἰάμων, indicating that συμπάθεια is something deeply ingrained in Antigone's nature, and not mere woe. There is a debate point against Creon; and he finds in this line the kernel of the clash between the two, the irreconcilable conflict between the nature that loves and the nature that hates.

Trachiniae contains a similar portrait of an isolated soul striving for union with a loved one, Deinaria's sympathetic nature being revealed as much in her attitude to the captives as in her love for Heracles; and in Elettra Lesky sees in her mature form both the opposite and the loneliness to fellowship with her loved brother, a fellowship with the living, not, as in Antigone, with the dead. Oedipus too, in the midst of his shrinking from human contact, nevertheless sticks out his hand to help a landless stranger, a man whose self-will finds its fulfilment in old age within the grove at Colonus. It is in the character of Theseus in Oedipus at Colonus that Lesky finds Sophocles' most complete portrait of the humane personality, in thinking of whom we may recall the familiar words of Terence.

In addition to developing his main thesis, the author does well to point out that in the plays of Sophocles the gods appear on the whole to be indifferent to the questions of mankind, an attitude which distinguishes him sharply from both Aeschylus and Euripides. This paper is a good example of recent trends in Sophoclean studies which seek to show that the poet is most likely to yield up a tithe of his secret to those who in reading his plays language upon the relationships between man and nature.

R. W. B. BURTON.


All who enjoyed the lectures of the Wykeham Professor of Ancient History in the 1920s, on 'Greece and Persia' and kindred subjects, will be glad that Sir John Myres has published this book, to supplement or replace the valuable notes he has carried on with undergraduate and postgraduate students. And for those more numerous readers of H. who, for whatever reason, did not hear the lectures, there is even more cause for gratitude. Parts of this book almost reproduce the lectures, as at least one earlier reviewer guessed for the first time. But then Myres is too well trained to fail in the final good turn, and if there be any criticism of this book it is not in the technical detail, but in the somewhat large extent (560 pages) of the bibliography, which has been arranged (like other people) by an unexpected discovery, is harder to believe. Moreover, human affairs often have their own 'pedimental structure', which will out, even in the most artless narrative; e.g., home—abroad—home, or childhood—school—career—old age; and the treatment of the history of an aggressor is not least. Nothing would be easier than to trace pedimental structure in an official narrative of the 'Benham Stakes' of 1940—42, or of the campaigns in which Fins, Mints and Drunks received their standing in the communiques, in which they had vanished three years earlier. Readers must make up their own minds whether it is due to conscious planning that the story of Aristagoras at Sparta is 'enframed between his arrival and his departure' (p. 175); and on H. VII. 20-136, Sir John concedes that 'the latter half' of a
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pedimental structure 'is (as so often) less formally presented than the earlier'.

There are a few verbal slips. Pausanias I. 32-3 is wrongly cited for the Athenian tribal order (p. 210); Dicaearchia (p. 13) is misspelt, but interestingly, from Eusebius; Hecataeus, in V. 36, deprecates immorality, not 'evacuation' (p. 197); and the 'left and 'right' of an order of battle are more than once those of one looking at the map, and not of the combatants Greeks at Lade, p. 197; Persians at Plataea, p. 93. There are also a considerable number of misprints, chiefly in proper names and in references; small matters, but not what one expects of the Clarendon Press.

The illustrations are attractive, and not least p. 67, where we have, reprinted in permanent form at last, the first sentence of Herodotus' work, 'dressed in the manner of an eighteenth-century gentleman'.

But the great thing is that Myres' notes on Herodotus are published, including his observations on H's geography and on 'The Man: his Life and Travels'. Over thirty years ago, Alan Blakeway was telling a Freshman about a paper read by the Professor to the Geographical Society, 'The Capture of a British Ark or Bull to the British Navy. It is a pity that his alone fell too early to take him to Greece in the Thermopylian days of 1940; even though all the tragedy and stasis known to Thucydides were to follow thereafter.

A. R. BURN.


Professor Blacklock starts perhaps a trifle arrogantly, with 'an advantage in that characterisation in Euripides is a well-worn topic and a stand-by for generations of examiners. Yet his book is nothing but an attempt at his writing, even though a good deal of its space is to be given to stating the views of others. A full treatment of his work was why for an examination para passus of Euripidean women; these in fact came in for attention in so far as Jason cannot be treated apart from Medea or Orestes from Electra, while the classic case of Iphigenia's change of character at Aulis gets incidental mention on pp. 93 f.; 120 f. The contention of the work is that, with the exception of the I.T., Euripidean's main interest was in character and not in plot. One might perhaps regard a man of remarkable talent as a manifestation of reaction to prevailing views, for, stated absolutely, the character is not constant, but varies from play to play, as indeed of the I.T. indicates. Thus the more elastic views on this side of Euripides (see, e.g. Dionysus, Kitha or against Dionysus, Artemis, or other relevant Olympians; such gods are beyond predication of good or evil and reconciliation of their conduct with human standards need not arise. The god is, as Teiresias says in the Bacchae (314-16) 'what we make of him' (cf. Dodds, Bacchae, Introd. p. xiii) and so παρελθελων του καθουμενου. Thus I am hard put to it to find a point of contact with Mr. Greenwood's problem, and must excuse myself on pronouncing this 'fantasy theory' and the praiseworthy criticisms of the 'rationalist' and 'symbolist' approaches which form his first three chapters.

His fourth chapter is taken up with a treatment of the Suppliant Women and the proceed of the presuppositions of the earlier part entirely. I am, like him, puzzled by his claim that Phe- fessor Kittle, in his book on Greek Tragedy, though not 'going so far', supports much of the author's contentions on this play. K. V. Greenwood p. 93 n., -is to be added to those who regard this as one of the Euripidean 'true values'. Now Kittle (op. cit., pp. 921 and elsewhere) makes it quite straightforward pacifist study on the theme, if one may so put it, 'quiescent delirant reigned, plectturum Avichi', with no hint of anything essentially different. Professor Greenwood, however, tells us 'ostensibly E is supporting the alliance with Argo in 342 B.C., but is in fact attacking it (p. 107). To argue his point Mr. Greenwood has to make much of the political allusions in the play, so far as 'the city' is a poetic term (p. 228). Consistency with the second of Mr. Greenwood's initial propositions (see above), apart, do others find it hard to discover the Highest Common Factor of these two views?
In his last chapter (‘Realism and Greek Tragedy’) Mr. Greenwood has observed what he takes to be a convention whereby (p. 132) in several plays a lyrical section is followed by an iambic passage during which the action is not advanced at all; the speaker merely elaborating, in a lower emotional tone, the connotation of the foregoing simple εἰς, the lyric ofSkhp., O.T. 1297–1358 are followed by the iambics of 1359–1415. In such a function the iambics never apparently precede the lyric. Mr. Greenwood does not elaborate on the significance which may underlie this, for he uses it only to illustrate a technical point, but the iambics have certain ‘conversational’ qualities, and are on the whole more ‘conversational’ and less formally structured. This is a character of Greek Tragedy which he is discussing. If explanation is needed, may it not perhaps be an unconscious memory of the evolution of tragic form: the original lyric dialogue having been expanded, the tragedy trochaic and then iambic, so that the lyric–iambic sequence in static situations reflects the development? Or, if the music had predominated at the expense of the words in the lyric, the iambic ‘explanation’ may have taken the form in which it exists without giving an answer to the question of necessity (iambic–lyric). Much labour has evidently gone into this book, which is modestly and pleasantly written. The thought, however, rather passes the present reviewer by, so that after considerable rereading he finds himself staying with the smelling-fuddled Frenchman at the Bridge-table: ‘Mes enfants, je nage’. 

John G. Griffith.


This short book contains two separate studies. The first is an examination of Heraclitus fr. 12, which appears in Diels as οὐκ οἰκεῖ ναὶ δίδυμοι, and in the Voce edition of 1950 as οὐκ οἰκεῖ ναὶ δίδυμοι, etc. It is seen that Zeno agreed with Heraclitus in calling the soul an exhalation (the two statements as a consecutive and, presumably, coherent quotation. Any effort to show that there is, after all, a reasonable connexion in sense between the two statements, as some have attempted to suggest, is impossible. The fragment to show that Zeno agreed with Heraclitus in calling the soul an exhalation) took the two statements as a consecutive and, presumably, coherent quotation. Any effort to show that there is, after all, a reasonable connexion in sense between the two statements, as some have attempted to suggest, is impossible.

Meanwhile the sceptical will note that the first clause, the river-statement, is original in appearance and contains, for example, long dactylics and an archaic repetition in tōν γραφήν, which is itself anomalous (cf. fr. 15 where the dactyls are preserved in the fragment of the Heraclitean handbook because of the superfluous link οὐκοι τῶν οὐρανῶν). Further, since οὐκ οἰκεῖ ναὶ δίδυμοι would in itself easily illustrate Canehei’s point, were it original, it is not easy to see why the river-statement, which has no detectable connexion with souls and certainly adds nothing to the plain assertion which follows it, was ever quoted. It is conceivable that Heraclitus saw in an original quotation which really proved his point, produced fr. 12 because it at least contained οὐκοι (with which the process of exhalation is connected), and then attached a paraphrase of part of fr. 36 (οὐκ οἰκεῖ ναὶ δίδυμοι), which at any rate appeared to be relevantly paraphrased into the river-statement in Heraclitean handbook because of the superfluous link οὐκοι τῶν οὐρανῶν.

If we assume any linguistic difficulties in the second clause, but immediately fasten upon οὐκ οἰκεῖ ναὶ δίδυμοι, in the first. This word is foreign to the original saying, he maintains, for the following reasons: (a) It is equivocal (i.e. τοῖς οὐναριοῖς could be taken either with it or with ψυχήν), and Heraclitus was only equivocal, the dative being preserved and the genitive by the dative; cf. fr. 5. (b) The juxtaposition of the four dactyls was only natural if they formed a single grammatical unit. (c) The saying is intended to emphasize the opposition. The same dactyl chain, and the same opposition, occurs in Protagoras. In fact, the oppositions in Heraclitus are normally of general application, but οὐκ οἰκεῖ ναὶ δίδυμοι restricts the opposition in question to a particular application. It will be seen at once that these objections to οὐκ οἰκεῖ ναὶ δίδυμοι are non-essential and are fully preserved in the Heraclitean tradition. This fact, in any case, public dispute, sometimes based upon a radical misunderstanding of Heraclitus: for example, it is apparent from the extract of fragments that Heraclitus was not opposed to specific and concrete facts, but were at pains to express the general and the exact, and his spirit was particularly addicted to such examples. Rivier makes the most extraordinary use of Snell’s contention that the Heraclitean ‘opposites’ were essentially connected with and derived from human experience. This thesis is made to fit a mention of a human standard, οὐκ οἰκεῖ ναὶ δίδυμοι, in fr. 12; ‘Or la démarche d’Héraclite se fonde sur une expérience vécue où se consomme l’union de la pensée et du monde’. This experience n’eut jamais nommée parce qu’elle n’intervient pas à titre propre’ (p. 10)—and so on.

A complicated examination of the possible transmission of the fragment reaches the conclusion that the second clause belongs to the original quotation; but the only legitimate conclusion is that the two statements show a connexion necessarily from the same source. By the removal of οὐκ οἰκεῖ ναὶ δίδυμοι and the equation of οὐκοι τῶν οὐρανῶν, Rivier eventually finds himself left with an original pronouncement containing only three elements and a propositional unit. The analysis of the fragment in relation to its context that a plausible estimate of Heraclitus can eventually be formed. Only, the reader of Rivier’s book must beware of being carried along too far by an air of sweet reasonableness; when he stops to examine his own criticism, he may be faced by the bitter reality of philological discussions that like on pp. 36 f., where Rivier maintains at some length, that if οὐκ οἰκεῖ ναὶ δίδυμοι were excluded, then ψυχή would directly govern the case (pp. 3 and 754). The river itself, he thinks, is conceived by Heraclitus as bathing in ever new waters.

The second study in the book is called ‘Ἀρτεμίδος ἔκλειψις, with reference to the description of the chemist’s experiment in Πράγματα τῶν γυμνώτητων ἔτος ἔκλειψις Αρτεμίδος’ Rivier argues convincingly that it is wrong to translate ἔκλειψις here as ‘conjecturer’, but that ψυχή (which undeniably develops, towards the end of the 5th century BC, into a description of gymnastics) was probably an earlier specific meaning, namely to estimate the nature of a partly unknown complex by comparing its known elements with similar known elements in a fully apprehended complex, and inferring a relation to other elements in the two complexes. It is maintained that this was a common Greek figure of thought (which differs from a universal type of inference, I would add, only by being more explicit), and that it is first seen in Greek literature in Homer. The argument and everything the book is concerned with (e.g. the evidence of Aristotle) is explored in detail.

Euripus says to Odysseus: οὐ γαρ σ’ οὐδείς, ξένοις, δοκίμων φερον (οὐδόκοι), he means that he has found no likeness between his partial knowledge of Odysseus, derived from a limited experience of him (e.g. of age, stature etc.), and his estimate of corresponding characteristics of a complex type already familiar to him, i.e. ‘good athlete’. Rivier pursues his idea somewhat selectively through the Homeric similes and other early Greek poetry; many of his conclusions at this point are sheer conjecture, and more thorough documentation will be needed if we are to be satisfied that, for example, the δῶ δω likely depends directly upon this particular habit of assessment by explicit comparison. The author regards his study as preliminary, and promises a more detailed examination of the subject.

G. S. Kirk.


Mostly in aim and compass, this book outlines in five short chapters the views of the early sophists on political theory. Notes and bibliography are copious, but contain too many notes and too little space to serve their avowed purpose of furnishing a guide to the student. The sophists collectively (‘rhetères philosophiques’) are described as adherents of the ‘subjectivist principle’ of Protagoras, which led them to discard belief in objective values and principles of natural justice, and to acknowledge that reason is the stronger. Protagoras’ own more moderate social philosophy is reconstructed along now familiar lines from the Platonic myth. Chapter IV, correcting the preceding generalities, traces the divergent developments and the nature of natural equality by Hippas, Antiphon, and Alcidamas; Phales also finds a place here. A brief concluding chapter points out logical weaknesses in the sophistic position.

Sources are briskly dealt with. The concordant testimony of authorities so exact, morally and intellectually, as Plato and Aristotle (and, it would seem, Xenophon), sufficiently guarantees their historical accuracy, and allows us to accept without further question the views reported in the Protagoras, Xanthippe, Gorgias, and the Protagoras debate. The question at issue is the speakers’ sincerity. This quality is rarely to be found in them (p. 6); but Protagoras was sincere in formulating his ‘Homo mensura’ (‘the fruit of long meditation’), and the
actions of many sophists (unspecified) confirm its authenticity. Hippias' sincerity is assured by his plain speaking (in both Plato and Xenophon). These criteria will not find universal acceptance.

The scope of the subject is rather strictly limited. There is little reference to Thucydides or Eurypides, none to the Antiplonic tetraboles; but Critias, Meno, and Callidices are cited as typical sophists. The Anonymus Iamblichus is by-passed with a neat petitio principii (n. 40: 'Ce penseur philosophique, qui ne peut, par le courant sophistique: il examine les choses judicieusement'). The Social Contract is relegated to a note. Aniliphion appears briefly as a liberal cosmopolitan in company with Acharnians, whose interesting observation of freedom and Masenius (hardly avoidable, one might think, in the context) is elevated to the dignity of a theory 'in agreement with his philosophic principles' (n. 79b). The references here appear: (I) le Crousseau (506a 1 f, b 11 f), do not reveal much in the way of philosophy.

The attempt to characterize sophistic thought by a collective psychology and even common doctrine (though this is disclaimed and denied) not only leads to arbitrary inclusions and exclusions, but inevitably breaks down; and the failure to distinguish systematic theory from rhetorical commonplace makes it easy to attribute to these professors greater originality than they probably possessed. The evidence being what it is, the distinction is not easily drawn: the more need for caution. 

Extracting standards should not, perhaps, be applied to a book which makes no claim to original scholarship, and avoids the excesses of some recent works which do. The views here expressed are formed by tradition and the ascent of eminent historians; but the manner in which this is done is often dogmatic, even for a short work, at once unnecessarily sketchy and misleadingly

R. MATTHEWSON.


The lauboured catalogue of virtues that survives of Gorgias' Euthyphro is here examined in a discursive commentary in order to throw light on the author's views on morals and the Sophists' idealists. Vollgraff concentrates his attention on vocabulary, deliberately eschewing questions of style as secondary to his purpose. He makes no attempt at comparison with other examples of the genre. (An alternative consideration of form cannot here fail to affect conclusions about meaning.) In the attempt to determine the precise meaning of the terms employed he assembles much lexicographical material from varied and sometimes remote sources. He finds in passing that this 'discours d'apparat' was published at Athens between 427 and 423, the latter limit being fixed (in conclusively) by references in Aristophanes' Clouds. In contrast to this, the term is found to be that of the graduate of Gorgias' school rather than that of the citizen-soldier; and, properly understood, it confirms Plato's account of the fundamental doctrines of the sophists. Further Vollgraff argues that Gorgias formulated the educational theory commonly adopted by the later rhetorical, and opposed by the philosophical, schools of Greece and Rome, which is thus expressed by Quintilian: 'Interim et sublimitate heroi carminis animus adsurgat et ex magnitudine rerum spiritum ducat et optimis inquirat.'

It is not so much these conclusions in themselves as the discovery of support for them in the fragment that taxes the author's ingenuity and the reader's credulity. The latter conclusion emerges in the second half of the book, whereupon the resources of later Greek and Latin literature are brought to explain the significance of the word πόσες, and proceeds to an account of various views of the lover of glory in the Greeko-Roman world down to the fourth century a.d. There are here many sound and interesting speculations, e.g., An. xi. 162, Aristotle's theory of tragic catharsis.

The interpretation of πόσες in E.N. i.; but the connexion with the Epitaphius is tenuous. That the text most deserving of a full commentary are those in an essay, the word has been weighed enough: but in what scales did Gorgias weigh his words? "insonans atque olim ostendit o πόσες ου συμβαθεῖν." Vollgraff here observes, correctly, that mourning for the dead seldom lasts for more than a generation, and commences only on their decease; but is this really enough, is it not properly to elicit the spirit of the jingle, to justify discarding the generally accepted meaning here, however amply other meanings of πόσες may be adduced?

The transpositions suggested in the text of Diels-Kranz, of ἀνθεύλετα (antithèse fausse, indigne d'un écrivain de talent) and of ἀρεταὶ; πόσες show an equal excess of rationalist zeal; similarly, the parenthesis introduced from μορφώσεως to ἀνθεύλετα achieves a slight improvement of logic at the cost of greater verbal clumsiness. The conjecture γνώμην (cont. δέους) is endorsed at its first occurrence (DK ii. 396, 3); the same antithesis is rejected as repetitive four lines later. One would have supposed that the two stood or fell together. Among other divergences from the usual interpretation are these: νομίσμα ερήμων; 'legitimate aspirations'; reasonably; ὦρτισι εἰς τοὺς ὦρτισις, κοιμίσι εἰς τοὺς κοιμίσις; 'Conservers avec les conservateurs, révolutionnaires avec les révolutionnaires'; 'in pursuit of their own advantage' (not 'of the common good'); c'est ce qui ressort de toute sa manière de pensée; τῇ βίντε οὖ τῷ βίντε κάθε is called a moral application of the doctrine of the κεφαλή, indicative of opportunism and moral relativism. This line of thought is hinted at.

Begged questions abound. ἀνάφερεν is discarded on the ground that the imputation of militarism would have offended popular sentiment, pacific at the time; at the same time the appellative ἱπποκράτειος, with the aorist active of 'sacriligious, in fifth-century Athens if not elsewhere. We are told that ἰπποκράτειος however that τῆς ἰπποκράτειος cannot imply egalitarian sentiments because the teacher of Callidices and friend of the Thebans cannot have approved of democracy; τὸ δέ θεός therefore means here 'disinterestedness' or 'consistency.' At the same time Vollgraff suggests that τιβινίς Latinino modo that it was, after all, intended to be understood by the general public as meaning attachment to the principle of equality; deliberate ambiguity conceals the 'sceptical relativism' of its more openly expressed, would have endangered its champion at Athens. Can we really have it both ways? And are we to suppose that an Athenian audience was expected simultaneously to swallow the black and white? They are presented as though to make amends? Similar deliberate ambiguities discovered elsewhere appear not only pointless, but supported by an appeal to those views of Gorgias that the commentary seeks ostensibly to determine.

It is an appeal to the standard arguments of no one recommended by others before Aristotle, and disliked by the traditional. That proves nothing here; the abuse of an argument presupposes its validity; and if Sophocles 683 castigates the immorality of rhetors, O.C. 1127 (where τὴ �eventName is ascribed to a special Attic virtue implies neither). What then? The function of the rhetorical speech? The book of its deontology which the sophists of the fifth century; nor are these attributes theirs in the dialogues in which they appear. Do to disclaim ethical motives in education Plato themselves - indeed, not to charge them with deliberately undermining the moral code. And it might be salutary, where the concept of 'sophistic' is all, putting a question, to discard the generic term and stick to proper names.

It is not always easy to be sure what Vollgraff's conclusions are; a translation to accompany his text of the fragment would reduce the chances of misunderstanding, and perhaps the importance of inconsistencies. The conclusions of this essay, a fragment of illustration are often illuminating and his comments on them valuable: the book will recommend itself more by these than by the cogency of its main argument. There is a fair number of unimportant missprints, mostly in the footnotes.

R. MATTHEWSON.


Close and often subtle analysis of crucial passages is here combined with an attitude of critical detachment and an awareness of the relevance of contemporary political issues. On the main theme, that justice is intrinsically advantageous, Mr. Murphy pronounces in favour of Plato against the 'social view,' holding that there cannot be duties which have no relation to the good of the agent. But since Plato refuses to expound his doctrine of the good, the argument of the Republic is 'never fully stated,' and the fundamental question of ethics, 'what makes an act right?' is, not directly considered there. In noticing the survival of the former as a 'law of necessity, which must include Aristotle's ρήματα; the power of the legislative power, the right of choice.' Both the reflective and the unreceptive man are said to apply their convictions to questions of action, but in the same way: the desires of both are transformed by, and apparently unified with, the same ends, and so are not merely of its instruments or its slaves. On this view the difference between the man who knows, and the man who accepts 'true opinions' from others, is only a matter of degree;
the gulf between 565a and ἰμαήρην tends to disappear, though it is acknowledged that those who are deficient in the latter state of mind can never be fully virtuous. Mr. Murphy argues that, in spite of 476a, 565a can even apprehend the forms, at least if the gulf be closed.

It is the obligation of each citizen to look to his ὠνομασία, his total well-being. Mr. Murphy rightly rejects the view that Plato intended the individual to possess only the virtue of his class, the philosopher to be a cobbler, for example, who does a "devoid of wisdom" carpentry. He contends that the individual is never treated by Plato as a de-personalised functionary but always as a human being, and never compelled to follow a mode of life which is not justified in terms of personal good. Plato is not consistent, however, in the passage (476b 500) which stands, for Hegel and Rousseau. The important thing for him, however, is not that his citizens should feel free but that they should act rightly, and achieve in their lives the maximum of personal happiness they can form themselves (whether this is for all that government by the competent is the better thing in his own personal interest. On this question of individual freedom more might perhaps have been made of the autonomy which reason confers on "virtue".

In the course of the argument some of the recognised commonplaces of Platonicism receive blows which are shrewd rather than damaging. It is contended, for example, that reminiscence has nothing to do with the problem of the common change, the doctrine of the theory of forms. Plato rejected the Socratic paradox that "no one ever willingly he states that Leontias in 435b is represented as a deliberate away-deer"—but this is highly controversial. (The paradox survives in a form which Plato knew, that every soul pursues the good, has to be understood of "what seems to it good" or perhaps (elsewhere) as referring to "everyone in his saner moments", it seems to me that great confusion has resulted from this.

Murphy finds that the "degrees of reality" is absent from the Republic; unreal reality (or imperfect reality) is said to imply false thoughts, not unreal (or partially real) things. The "imperfectly real" body is taken to mean not complete images (476, 510) which stand in the way of this interpretation are treated with great ingenuity: for example, the ἀναμνήσεις, which is lacking in the "creatures round about us", etc. (in the Line), is interpreted not as "reality but as the imperfect concept of what it is, the "true" names like the "true" names for Plato, physical things possess independent reality, though he seems later prepared to admit that some degree of unreality is implied by continuous change or becoming. He thinks it Platonic dogma (and not just a methodological assumption) that there is an idea everywhere there is a common name, though he has some hesitations regarding negative forms; but individuals (men, hair, mud, and the rest) do not, in his view, owe their existence to their forms, nor do the forms derive their reality from the individuals. The doctrine of the forms is thus not a principle of explanation or coherence. The ordinary view of the Form of Good as transcending and knowledge is dismissed as mistaken Neoplatonism. Consequently the metaphysics of Plato on pp. 249-252 stand abandoned as an insoluble problem; and it is suggested that Plato himself gave up the doctrine for the same reason.

The distinction between the πρῶτος κόσμος and the ὁμοίωμα; in Phaedo seems to me to be the distinction between external finality (teology) and internal finality (that of the final cause); Socrates" is willing to assert the latter but does not feel able to substantiate the former. Mr. Murphy's theory that the πρῶτος κόσμος would contain an explanation of efficient causality (as well as the phenomena of growth) seems obscure in itself and unrelated to the text. On the other hand, there are many excellent pieces of exposition. The account of dialectic is illuminating. The function of dialectic is clarified by the distinction between "inference" and "explanations"; the former is inductive; the latter is not inductive in its ascent nor deductive in its descent. Thus the requirement of Burnet, Taylor, and Cornford that dialectic should demonstrate the axioms of mathematics, etc., from the principles of godlessness is neither possible nor the method of his discourse and difficulties in Plato's doctrine of pleasure. The final chapter on Art—in spite of its merits seems to me spoiled by inaccuracies (e.g. that Books II and III reject only the imitation of base characters); Professor Burnet's statement, however, that Mr. Murphy's obiter dicta on the Poetics (one of which draws the impossible deduction that for Aristotle art had value only as a pleasant conveyance of sound doctrine) also suggest that this theory was not received from Mr. Murphy the attention it deserves.

The book ought to be used as a valuable stimulant by all students of the Republic. Among the principles of interpretation which it lays down, there is one which too few commentators on this and other dialogues have recognised: that it is dangerous to draw conclusions from any of the earlier forms of statements since they are liable to revision as the argument deepens. J. Tate.


It was in 1968 that Sir David Ross's version of the Meta physics inaugurated the Oxford translation of Aristotle, and it is only fitting that his hand should give the finishing touch to a work on which he has throughout bestowed a care generally unobtrusive but ever present. It is fitting, too, that this final volume should illustrate the new light that has been thrown on Aristotle, and the new picture of his genius in the formidable body of material which was formed itself (what is for all that government by the competent is the better thing in his own personal interest. On this question of individual freedom more might perhaps have been made of the autonomy which reason confers on "virtue".

In the course of the argument some of the recognised commonplaces of Platonicism receive blows which are shrewd rather than damaging. It is contended, for example, that reminiscence has nothing to do with the problem of the common change, the doctrine of the theory of forms. Plato rejected the Socratic paradox that "no one ever willingly he states that Leontias in 435b is represented as a deliberate away-deer"—but this is highly controversial. (The paradox survives in a form which Plato knew, that every soul pursues the good, has to be understood of "what seems to it good" or perhaps (elsewhere) as referring to "everyone in his saner moments", it seems to me that great confusion has resulted from this.

Murphy finds that the "degrees of reality" is absent from the Republic; unreal reality (or imperfect reality) is said to imply false thoughts, not unreal (or partially real) things. The "imperfectly real" body is taken to mean not complete images (476, 510) which stand in the way of this interpretation are treated with great ingenuity: for example, the ἀναμνήσεις, which is lacking in the "creatures round about us", etc. (in the Line), is interpreted not as "reality but as the imperfect concept of what it is, the "true" names like the "true" names for Plato, physical things possess independent reality, though he seems later prepared to admit that some degree of unreality is implied by continuous change or becoming. He thinks it Platonic dogma (and not just a methodological assumption) that there is an idea everywhere there is a common name, though he has some hesitations regarding negative forms; but individuals (men, hair, mud, and the rest) do not, in his view, owe their existence to their forms, nor do the forms derive their reality from the individuals. The doctrine of the forms is thus not a principle of explanation or coherence. The ordinary view of the Form of Good as transcending and knowledge is dismissed as mistaken Neoplatonism. Consequently the metaphysics of Plato on pp. 249-252 stand abandoned as an insoluble problem; and it is suggested that Plato himself gave up the doctrine for the same reason.

The distinction between the πρῶτος κόσμος and the ὁμοίωμα; in Phaedo seems to me to be the distinction between external finality (teology) and internal finality (that of the final cause); Socrates" is willing to assert the latter but does not feel able to substantiate the former. Mr. Murphy's theory that the πρῶτος κόσμος would contain an explanation of efficient causality (as well as the phenomena of growth) seems obscure in itself and unrelated to the text. On the other hand, there are many excellent pieces of exposition. The account of dialectic is illuminating. The function of dialectic is clarified by the distinction between "inference" and "explanations"; the former is inductive; the latter is not inductive in its ascent nor deductive in its descent. Thus the requirement of Burnet, Taylor, and Cornford that dialectic should demonstrate the axioms of mathematics, etc., from the principles of godlessness is neither possible nor the method of his discourse and difficulties in Plato's doctrine of pleasure. The final chapter on Art—in spite of its merits seems to me spoiled by inaccuracies (e.g. that Books II and III reject only the imitation of base characters); Professor Burnet's statement, however, that Mr. Murphy's obiter dicta on the Poetics (one of which draws the impossible deduction that for Aristotle art had value only as a pleasant conveyance of sound doctrine) also suggest that this theory was not received from Mr. Murphy the attention it deserves.

The book ought to be used as a valuable stimulant by all students of the Republic. Among the principles of interpretation which it lays down, there is one which too few commentators
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astérisches Frühschriften über die Ideenlehre (1949), embodying conclusions supplementary to articles published in Hermes in 1940 and 1941.

In his Introduction Ross maintains the old view, rejected by Jaeger, that the Protopitcios was a dialogue, as was Cicero's Hortensius, known to be derived from it. It is interesting to find that he holds this position, though he does not discuss it in detail, as does the same question in The Philosophy of Aristotle (1952), is now inclined to return to the traditional view (Phil. Quart., 3 (1953), pp. 249-50). At all events, the question is still an open one. Ross, unlike Walser, does not apportion the attribution of the three Books among the three Books, though the order in which he arranges them is roughly the same as the three Books. A brief but interesting attempt to assign fragments to individual speakers is made by Allan in The Philosophy of Aristotle.

One may be confident that this work will remain standard for a long time. Its usefulness is increased by the bibliography and full indexes.

D. A. REES.


This book is a real achievement in scholarship; with its companion volume, Studies in Menander, we have the first large-scale attempt to give a complete and coherent account of Greek comedy from the beginning of the fourth to the mid-third century. Chapter I, "Forebodings on Later Greek Comedy" is reprinted in an amended form from the Bulletin of the John Rylands Library. Chapters II and IV are as it and IV, a nonsensically with comedy and its poets from 400 to 370 B.C., from 370 to 321 B.C., and with New Comedy. Three subsequent chapters give most valuable accounts of Philemon, Diphilos, and Philocles, and two others place Menander and Aristophanes in an appendix.

Webster bases his work on the very large number of Greek fragments; he makes use of all the evidence, both literary and archaeological, known to the reviewer, and also of all the most recent publications. Space compels him to confine the book therefore is not easy reading, with its mass of references (some 1600 in the Index Locrorum), and its footnotes (possibly 3000). The nature of the fragmentary sources, the task of writing a history of the comedy of this period is beset with difficulties, depending as it does on tentative arguments and on the reconstruction and dating of lost or fragmentary originals. Of this, Webster is well aware; he writes (p. 114). To judge the fragments is of course unsafe, as the Menander fragments show; if the Bacchides had not been preserved, who would have guessed that "whom the gods love they destroy" was a slave's jest;? and (p. 145) seen though the glass of adaptation Menander's Greek and Philion's Greek is apt to look alike. When the reconstruction depends on Roman adaptations, evidence exists if one assumes that the Roman scholars had in front of them both Latin and Greek texts when they reported alterations made by Roman poets. But if we were not told that alteration had been made, any inference that there would be impossible to detect, especially if Beare's interpretation of "contest" is accepted. Where studies claim to see a development in the style and dramaturgy of Terence, could they equally do so if the pieces were preserved?

Webster's arguments are brilliant. He concludes that the original of the Amphitryon was written soon after 331 B.C., possibly by Diphilos (p. 96). Earlier scholars had connected the cavalry charge (Amph. 243 f.) with the tactics of the Diadochi and considered he who follows Jaeger; others point out Roman elements in the scene, and it is possible that the description is a Plautine invention. Webster, however, refers us (p. 91) to Euphronios's picture of the battle of Mantinea and says that the only surviving fragment of the comedy occurs when a cavalry charge decided the issue between figures of hero, scale was the encounter of Alexander and the Great King as depicted in the Alexander mosaic, . . . In default of other evidence this dates the original of the Amphitryon soon after 331 B.C.

But this is tentative, given the fragments. But we read (p. 95) of the "allusion to Alexander in the battle rear." It also assigns to the original of the Menandri an earlier date than previous scholars. He quickly disposes of the argument based on Athenaeus (xiv, 658) that the Honoyoi of Poseidippus was the original, and he follows Fränkel in believing that the list of Sicilian kings (Men. 409 f.) is Plautine and therefore says for the coming year. His argument, however, is tenuous; the joke at 563-4 is Roman; the introduction of the joke breaks the sense, as Leo, who brackets 565-6, had seen. Webster suggests that the original which has fallen out from these lines is similar to the one fragment of the Adelphi of Alexis. Then, after noting parallels with other fragments of Alexis, he concludes (p. 74) it seems therefore justifiable to regard the Menachmi as deriving from a comedy written about 340, perhaps Alexis' Adelphi.

When his attention to the fragments turned, he was introduced in Studies in Menander. Plays cannot be isolated in one category, and one play may include several themes, each concerned with a different category. But Webster occasionally falls into avoidable inconsistencies; Penia (p. 10) in the Plautus classed as a Mythological play in The Philosophy of Aristotle, was a Fury from tragedy and a landlady (cf. p. 140), while in a discussion of philosophy in comedy (pp. 33, 35) Penia (Frugality?) is a mean between Wealth and Beggary.

There are occasional attempts to overstate his case; for instance, the story of Phoan (p. 18) was popular in the fourth century fourth as shown by its occurrence on two vase. Only two vases (and those of the late fifth century) do not appeal to popular. Sometimes lack of space compels him to be dogmatic on controversial points. In (1953), the author of Sokrates, produced his Oidipodou. Sometimes in his desire to extract every possible hint from the fragments, he does not take account of the accident of preservation and the absence of context evidence.

These remarks must not be taken to imply that there is more to criticise than to praise; that is not the case. Individuals will disagree with many of Webster's arguments, but will find difficulty in providing evidence to contradict him. His widespread knowledge of all the sources, together with his insight and sensitivity to style, makes his book indispensable for all students of Greek and Roman comedy. With its full index and index of names, it stands as a reference book, though for this, fuller synopses of chapters in the table of contents could have been helpful, and a less frequent use of "op. cit." would have made reference quicker. The references had been carefully checked, and there are very few misprints (one, p. 125 n. 1; another, p. 226). Unfortunately the remarks of the Menander scholar, praises to rationalisation. The plates are excellent, but the book deserves a better presentation than that given to it by the Manchester University Press; it is a major work of scholarship and will remain for long the standard work.

J. M. T. CHARLTON.


The text of Theocritus in Gow's O.C.T. and the translation of it in The Greek Bucolic Poets differ only in minute detail from those in his major work reviewed by Trypanos, JHS LXII (1952), 135 f. The introduction and apparatus criticus of the Bucolicci Graeci, taking account of the papyrus finds and of the critical discussions, are fuller than those of Wilamowitz's edition, though naturally one would compare the translation. The text of Wilamowitz's edition, Gow adds (p. xii) are "for the English reader" of which besides literary and of Theocritus. The Fraggs. 1 and 2, insignificant verbal citations from Eustathius and the Etymologicum Magnum. The poems of Bion are printed in the order of Stobaeus, but as authorities frequently refer to Wilamowitz and other numbering, a table of references is given. Gow also adds a transcription of the Papyrus Vindobonensis Rainer 29801.

In The Greek Bucolic Poets there appears a prose translation of all but the Technology and the most corrupt of the poems in Gow's O.C.T. The introduction and account of Greek Bucolica poetry, and of the history of Theocritus, Moschus, and Bion; a critical estimate of their work would have been an added attraction. The poems have short exegesis, and introductions and footnotes; difficulty left unresolved in the text are pointed out. In the Preface, Gow explains that his aim is both to give an accurate translation for students reading his text and also to produce a version which would appeal to the Greek-less reader. The text is as cross he is incompatibility; the first, of course, is successful; happily the second. Gow is deeply indebted for turn of phrase and expression to previous translators, as, for instance, a comparison (p. 67 f., with those of Calverley and Trevellian will show. Yet the Greekless reader will find entire the simplicity and soft loveliness of the original. Gow's version lacks poetic quality and also the strongly categorical words with modern prose demands. The Greekless will be advised to read other translations.

Both volumes were in the press before the appearance of Trypanos' review. Some of his criticisms are met: e.g. Edmonds' emendation in Id. 27, 75, is discarded. But valid: in Id. 15, 127 (false ref. by Trypanos) Gow's
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emendation, necessitating Rossbach's in the following line, is
understanding. If the MSS. adda something 'another' (for this
year's festival) 'is to be rejected, Ahrens' 42' is the better
reading. In Id. 18, 20 Trypanen censures Gow for not accepting
Eichstätt's emendation with its possible support from Vergil, Edn.
169. Now it seems a fragmentary sentence (as Ad
papyrus (Theoretur I, 257). The emendation improves style
and sense; it is the only one to justify an alteration of the
verse. Gow retains the MSS. reading, but with no authority, to
improve the balance of the sentence, he prints sei (1, 6)
where 14 lies in the text. In The Greek Didactic Poets the slip in translation at Id. 18, 30 has been corrected, but
the misunderstanding in Id. 22 remains.

Some three-quarters of the content of these volumes had already
appeared in Gow's Theocr. and Callimachs' in the edition
revised there are no new papyri, and Gow has the advantage of Gallavotti's
work and his edition of 1945. To this, he has to add. His
text differs from Wilamowitz' O.C.T. largely in mere alterations of
punctuation and spelling. Sometimes conservative, he returns to MSS. readings in place of
Wilamowitz' conjectures (e.g. (Bion) 1, 94), even when this
involves leaving a passage corrupt (e.g. Mosch. 3, 16; 3, 112)
sometimes he needlessly accepts emendation when Wilamo-
owitz printed the MSS. reading (e.g. Mosch. 3, 118; (Bion)
1, 18; 1, 88). His other emendations are few, and generally
important—for instance, τ for σ (Mosch. 2, 51; 4, 18;
4, 64; cf. Bion Frug. 11; B), etc. Of his others, συγγραμμα
Mosch. 3, 112; Bion 1, 88; (cf. Bion Frug. 11; B), etc. Of his others, συγγραμμα
Mosch. 3, 112; Bion 1, 88; (cf. Bion Frug. 11; B), etc.

One may question the policy of the Syndics and Delegates of
the Presses. With such a wealth of translations for the
general reader and a sufficiency of editions for the student, with
Gow's Theoretur and Gallavotti's Didactic Poets available for the
scholar, with such obvious gaps in the O.C.T. series and the
pressing need for other new editions, the publication of these
two volumes could have been deferred to happier times.

J. M. T. CARLTON.

Callimachus. Ed. R. PEIFER. Vol. II. Hymni et Epi-
+ 208. 42s.

Pfeiffer completes in the second volume his edition of the
works of Callimachus. The two volumes together (on the first
see Smiley, JHS LXX (1950), 195), are without question the
most important publication in the field of Hellenistic literature
since Wilamowitz' edition first appeared in 1879-80. The
second volume now published includes the text of the hymns
and epigrams; the didascalia and scholia to the hymns;
prologomena to the fragments, hymns and epigrams (pp. ix-
xxvii); the testimonia to the posthumous corpus, Schol.
data et corrigenda (pp. 241-291), and indices and vocabularium.
Both the author and the Claren-
don Press are to be congratulated upon the completion of this
splendid edition of one of the most refined Greek poets.

Many problems connected with the life and works of Calli-
machus are still unfortunately beyond solution with the limited
material at our disposal to-day. Even such elementary things
as a reasonably accurate knowledge of the dates of the poet's
literary creations and the outline chronology and genre of the
works are as yet denied us. Pfeiffer, in his prologomena to the
fragments, examines a number of important items which emerge
from the study of the available material, which is indeed much
richer than what it was at the time when Schol.
views on many a question he has already stated in his notes in
Vol. I (e.g. that Apollonius does not belong to
the Hecale, but also on the Acta—and this has bearing on the
relative dates of Theocritus, Callimachus, and Apollonius
66). We have, since the last two volumes of the
Acta the 'actia' were independent, not connected either
due to a dialogue with the Muses or otherwise, etc.). But he also
introduces a few new arguments, the most important of which are
his inferences on the 'Acta' and the final conclusion
of the poet himself of his complete works. For indeed the absence
in Pap. Oxy. 2256 of Cola 78-88, which include the nuptial rite,
and the appearance in its place of a different epilogue, a couple
in which the Cola seems to address Arsinoe (fr. 61, 11) in the
Addenda Vol. II, seem to indicate that lines 78-88 were added
later, when the Cola was included in the Acta; and this
probably took place when a final edition of that poem was prepared
for inclusion in the complete works of Callimachus, which the
poet himself prepared at an advanced age (cf. fr. 1, 33 f.
and fr. 112, 9). It is interesting to see that Pfeiffer has at
last come round to the view (cf. p. xxvii) that the (Milan)
Diegesis are little more than a summary of an older longer
piece (cf. Pfeiffer on the fragments the only point I would like to raise are that, whereas the popularity
and influence of Callimachus in the Hellenistic and medieval Greek
world are so carefully outlined, no word is said about his
influence upon the Romans, in the work by A. W. Spataro (of
course, admirably traced), and that we find nowhere in this edition a concise and concentrated treatment of the metres
of Callimachus (which are again excellently treated in individual
notes, and marked in the index rerum notabilium under Mantel and Prosodia
and Prosodia

The examination of the papyri and manuscripts on which
the text is based is detailed, and the stemma codicum of the
hymns (with the 'significant errors' always indicated) admir-
ably constructed. The reviewer is not altogether happy about
the transcriptions of the hymns derive from a lost archetype (ϕ)
of the twelfth-thirteenth centuries, brought to the West, possibly
by Ioannes Aurip/a (p. lxxii). The number and order of the
hymns seems always to have been the same. But it remains
strange that no trace of Hymn V, the only hymn by Cal-
imachus in elegiac couplets, has ever been found on a papyrus.
With regard to the epigrams it is interesting to see that Pfeiffer
fully understands the variety lections of the Plauadre as mere thirteenth-
century conjectures (e.g. οὐκ ἐστιν χάριν... (Bion)
hymn to Edmonds' accepted by Gow. Criticisms, however,
are carping; the text as a whole is established by a judicious
selection from the work of previous editors, and presents the
result of recent scholarship.

The text of the hymns and epigrams is carefully established
and must be considered a definite improvement on the fourth
edition of Wilamowitz. And this is not only due to the
friendliness of his readings at the Press, but also to his fine feeling
of the Callimachian style; a number of new cruces have
been introduced into the text as well as some excellent conjectures
by the editor and other scholars of recent date (e.g. IV, 49
σωσίαν Πελεφύδην Pfeiffer in the Smiley edition),

..ἔσφησεν Ὀμήρου Maas-Groenert). As opposed to Vol. I, no
ecclesiastical apparatus accompanies the texts of Vol. II.

There are, however, a few points where the text looks highly
suspicious and where more work has been done by the annotator
than by the editor. The most striking instance is VI, 92-94.
The whole passage from I, 91 if. is suspect, as I, 91 already shows, where
no second caesura follows the strong caesura; but ϑέου σαντίων,
μετ' ἐνοημένον (cf. 57, 31) is perhaps preferable. The
viewers (ὡροῖς) is a variant Lobel proposed for the μνήμ." of Papp.
2226, on which cling the bones on the one side
and the skin on the other, can hardly have been taken as
the starting point of the description. Moreover, V, 41 Κριτοῦ δοροῦ;
or II, 108 διὰ τὸν ἱερὸν, where I should like to suggest

... ἔσφησεν Πελεφύδην (cf. p. 18, 2) or, III, 18 ἡμέραν equals look equally
suspect. The apparatus is concise and neat. It may be
perhaps regarded a little too austere where emendations and
suggestions by scholars are concerned. In fact, a few un-
convincing ones are omitted, like IV, 14 τοῦρδη suggested by
Ruhken (παλλινή of the text is intolerable after the τοῦρδη
κόκκων of the previous line or IV, 41 δικτύον Ἀθηνάς suggested by Schneider. That Schneider is right can be seen from
Col. 293 and 294 (cf. Hes. I, 456). The text is correct, not
τοῦρδη, but Πελεφύδην (cf. Hes. I, 455). This incidentally points to the fact that Calli-
machus must have known the version of the Homeric hymn to
Apollo which has in line 110 ὁμοῦ. This for matter we will still
have to consult Schneider.

The detailed edition of the Diegeses to Hymn I-II and the scholia
ψ to the hymns, which follow on the text, is excellent and
fully in the tradition of Drachmann and Wendel. The
Addenda suggest Corrigenda also contain much important material.
The most striking is the first line and the diegesis of a new
action on the Artemis of Leucae. But the new material on the
(Cana) (fr. 110), the text of Pap. Mich. inv. 4947 of fr. 202, as
well as many of the important suggestions and corrections by
Vetsera, Smidt, and Bremmer. The extensive number of
fragments of Vol. I (many of which have been accepted by
the author), are not less significant.

Lastly I should like to commend the Index Verborum, a for-
testable task in a text so very fragmentary. The difficulty of
from papyri, is full of problems; the extant editions are there-
fore overburdened with supplements and emendations. Pec-
ciouni sets out, as he expressly tells us, to give a text of Herodas

C. A. TRYPANIS.
free from a number of 'arbitrary conjectures', which he re-
legates to the apparatus. A brief introduction, a number of notes and
a list of the διακ μαγείων and rare terms and con-
structions, and (b) of the metrical peculiarities of the poet) com-
pany the text.
On the whole the book contains a lot of useful material
contributed by previous editors and other distinguished scholars.
But it does not puzzle so much that is original to the study of the
author, and the advanced student of Alexander the Great need not
hope to use it with profit, for it bears the marks of a hasty
production and displays a lack of accuracy in detail which is
often shocking. It fails to indicate the extent of the striking feature in this
respect is the inaccurate manner in which the readings of the papyri
are so frequently reported (cf. e.g. 1. 10 Σιλάνιας, as supplied by
Kenyon, instead of Σιλίανιας in the papyrus; VII. 139 Κων
des by Blass, instead of Κωνινος in the papyrus; VII. 102 ὄσω
dην by Blass, instead of οὐσίαν in the papyrus; VI. 298 ὄσω
dην by Blass, instead of ὄσων in the papyrus, etc.). Moreover
in the apparatus readings, supplements and conjectures are often
not attributed to the right scholar (e.g. IV. 47 λέη read by
Palmer is a careless mistake of Nisimowitch; 36 οὐδὲν supplied by
Blass is attributed to Rutherford, etc.), and some not
mentioned at all (e.g. IV. 37 διὰ μή [τι] οὐδὲν is given in the
text, without mention of Hicks, the author of the supplement, etc.).

The text, even if we disregard the inaccurate manner in which
the readings of the papyri are reported, is not what one would
have hoped for. Blistant mistakes have been introduced there,
like Μάλικα Κώνινος (V. 4), which gives a broken anapaest
impossible in Herodas (407 μάλις of the correcor is obviously
sound), excellent emendations and supplements and even
outlook, like the θαλάπης in I. 67 (suggested by P. Maas,
388 Θάλαπης, p. 386), which does away with the initial
choriambus, or Homer's θαλάπης never in I. 64, and obviously
inferior ones have been accepted like θαλάπης of Blass in
VI. 66, etc.

The apparatus is not complete and often misleading (e.g.
I. 4 where you can hardly gather that the change of speaker
does not occur in the papyrus but is a conjecture by Hackett, etc.),
and the notes, though giving much of importance, also include
great deal of elementary linguistic material, and are in many
instances not the work of the editors. Who, for example, will believe that
in I. 18 θαλάπης is not used in an anapestic context (cf. Anacreont,
57, Hesych. v. θαλάπης, and Lianan, Epist. 428)? In fact, further
of Gyflis ('Make fun of me: these things are for you the younger
women') clearly points to the use of the word in that sense.

C. A. TRYPANIS.

Nicander. The poems and poetic fragments.
Edited with a translation and notes by A. S. F. Gow and
A. F. Schofield. Pp. xii + 247. Cambridge: Uni-
versity Press, 1953. 30s.

Nicander is certainly not an attractive poet. An author, as
it seems, of the middle of the second century B.C., he endeavoured
to give the science of poetry with concisely but comprehensively
failed to achieve either a comprehensive view of the place of
the various creatures, their bites and how to cure them, and substances deadly to man or poisonous in a
fanciful language and style, cannot stimulate the reader
of poetry. Nor is his approach to science of much interest
to the modern scientist: for Nicander was not even an original
researcher in the field of zoology and botany. As O. Schneider
has shown (Nicandra, pp. 181 ff.), when composing his
he mainly drew on works of one Apollodoros, who wrote on
venomous creatures at the beginning of the third century B.C.,
and the Alexipharmaca. He is well informed from a second source
by the same author. But a new and up-to-date edition
cut of a text of this nature, is always welcome, and in the case of
Nicander even more so, because the other only useful edition
cut by O. Schofield, published in 1865, is both out of date and
hard to get.

Gow and Schofield have made a laudable effort. As they
tell us in their preface 'the book makes no pretence to be a
distinctive treatise, but its conclusions stem from the
writers of the poems'. There is no doubt that they have
succeeded admirably, as in keeping their object. They have produced a
which is on the whole reliable, even though it is readable,
though many passages of its are, as the authors themselves
say, only tentative, and a number of notes, which, though un-
fortunately not constituting a continuous commentary, are
of great assistance to the reader. Moreover, an important index
and the flora, etc., which, in their notes, are not to be
found at the end of the book and an appendix (II) on weights
and measures. The significance of this publication is that it is
the first serious endeavour to identify the half-real and half-
natural world of animals and plants of Nicander. Recourse
has been naturally made to earlier works in which this has been
treated (J. G. Schneider's commentary, M. Bering's writings in
the Allgemeine Medicinische Central- Zeitung 1904, etc.), but the information given here is much fuller and much more up to date.

This book is of course not intended for students in Nicander
is a more precise and careful in his methods. His compilers
ours follow the example of Callimachus with a few diver-
incarnations, on which see Kroll, RE XVII, 261.

And so we must conclude that Nicander always
observe the bridge of Hildberg (a word never ending in a glottal
second biceps (thesis) cf. Th. 97, 618, 890, Al.
909, 905; secondly, that in one instance he does not over
the bridge of Naeke (i.e. a word never ending in a monosyl-
labric fourth biceps (thesis) Th. 457 and thirdly, that in
instance again the epithemeral is the only caesura in the
line, Th. 894.

But in order to achieve this comparative metrical precision
Nicander either pads his lines with meaningless words like δί
πλες, δίκας (Th. I, 25, 483, etc.), or plays havoc with the
language, unscrupulously producing words and forms to
an unknown source (cf. e.g. Th. 125 δίμυλος; 206 ἐποτάν 
54 φλαστόῦ; 58 χριστοῦ; 115 ἐποτάν, 115 χριστοῦ; etc.); even
a consonant can be arbitrarily added to an ending to avoid
shortening in hiatus; Th. 166 ἐποτάν! On Nicander's use of a
additive with a feminine noun for metrical reasons see H. Kloek.
De dactyloiterie in N. questions selectae, Diss. phal.
Vindob. 6 (1868), I, 90.

But the metre is not the only reason why Nicander mishandles
the language. He frequently distorts it simply to facilitate his
operations of sheer ignorance. His innovations and distortions constitute no contribution to Greek
verse: they do not even mean what the stem or the endings connote,
and most of them never recur in Greek literature. Clearly no
one pass this book feeling happy dealing with a poet like this, and likewise
no reviewer.

But even in a poet as complicated and unique as Nicander
a few slips and omissions which appear in the text could have
been avoided. Perhaps the most striking is Th. 52, where the
verb φωνηῖται, scolding the i of φωνή to 39. This is, of course, impossibly;
the voice of a human being must have been, or must conceal, what the poet wrote.

Zωομάχοι is probably a gloss, later incorporated in the text.
That these lines metrically imperfect like Th. 79 or 597
where no second caesura or where foliages follow 39
caesura could have been edited metrically perfectly (write in
Th. 79 ἅλια ἑκάτων ἑκάτων ἐν ἑκάτων ἑκάτων ἑκάτων ἑκάτων
writing of the ὄροις; and in 597 ὄροις ὄροις ὄροις ὄροις ὄροις
never used by Nicander to denote the place of descent, which
reads ὄροις quite distinctly. It should then be the black
and not the white hell (Eukippos). At this point I should like to
add one more reclamation against the editions reported by O. Schneider or Gow-Schofield.
I came across it (together with a large number of those reported) copied by
a scribe, in an edition of Nicander by Gouronc (Paris, 1557), now in the library of Trinity College, Oxford.
It is on Al. 283, where Bentheim emends the λεγόμενος of all the manuscripts into λεγόμενος, deletes the stop at the end of
and places it after λεγόμενος. That he is right can be seen
from the place of Al. 292. In No. 248 &c never be in the third
place, unless preceded by a main verb, and the noun, and this is the case there (cf. Th. 245, 397, 394-471,
Al. 572, 506 and Eukippos, loc. cit., 23, n. 2). But these are concerned with minor points when one
considers the nature of the text and the type of editors had in
mind. One thing, however, which is unfortunately missing,
would have been most desirable, and would have made
the book much easier to use for an index verbum. For this
we shall still have to consult O. Schneider. Unfortunately the
words and forms peculiar to Nicander are not distinguished from
the common Greek vocabulary the poet uses.

C. A. TRYPANIS.

The Tradition of the Minor Greek Geographers.
By AUBREY DILLER. Pp. 200, 3 pl. London: The
Archaeological Institute (agent for Britain: B. H. Black-
well, Oxford). 1953. 28s.

At first sight the preparation of a corpus of the lesser Greek
geographers might appear a simple task. Two overlapping
collections were made in Byzantine times, one probably dating
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back to Justian, and the other not later than the ninth cen-
tury, and all the others at the latest of the twelfth.

Though these codices suffered severely in the under-
ground transit from Constantinople to the West, and entire
quires are now missing from them. Some hundred years ago,
it is true, several pieces of an early medieval text of this type
(now at the monastery of Vatopedi on Mt. Athos) were
abstracted by black-market dealers and found their way to the
Bibliothèque Nationale and the British Museum. But by then
C. Diller had completed his work on the Manuscripta Graeca
Minores, and he was only able to make hasty use of them in
Vol. V of his Fragmenta Historiorum Graecorum. At some points,
therefore, his editions have remained seriously incomplete.

Diller worked on the archetypal MS and most of their copies (including the next most important MS,
Cambridge), but has inspected the text at Vatopedi and has
surveyed the entire modern literature on the subject, now
published in the fruits of his long research in a brief but close-
packed volume.

In Ch. 1 Diller sums up the whole MS tradition and describes
the principal codices in detail. In Ch. 2 he provides a bibliogra-
phy of 450 numbers, including reviews and obiter
dicta. There follow three chapters in which improved and
enlarged texts are established of three treatises on the Black Sea,
(1) ps.-Arrian, (2) and (3) the Euxine portions of the Meditter-
anean περίγραφων of Menippus of Pergamum (partly recon-
tected in Arrian’s account of the River in RE), and of
Scymnus. The text of ps.-Arrian is completed by insertion of
the middle portion from the London fragment of the Vatopedi
MS, and the author’s numerous borrowings from the genuine
Arrian. In the case of ps.-Menippus and ps.-Scymnus are sedulously
collected. Parts of Menippus and Dial-Herakleitos are recon-
structed from the incomplete Paris archetype and from many
recognisable extracts in ps.-Arrian. As Menippus probably
died in Egypt Augustus and may have been anterior to Strabo,
the establishment of his text is particularly to be welcomed.
Diller has laid solid foundations for an up-to-date corpus of the
Geographi Minores. We may hope that he will proceed to this
work.

A remarkable feature of the bibliography is the comparative
neglect of the Peripluvs Maris Erythrai (by far the most valuable
of surviving περίγραφων), and the abundance of writings on ps.
Scylax and on the περίγραφων of Hanno, whose θεατηρία is
evidently attractive game for modern academic sportmen.

M. CARY.

Catalogus codicum astrologorum Graecorum. Tomi
IX Pars I: codices Britannicos descriptiv STEPHANUS WEIN-
stock; pan prior, codices Othonenses. Po. vii + 212.

This admirable volume brings near to completion the great
undertaking which we owe to Gumont’s vision, energy, and
genius. From the beginning it has given much more than
its title suggests: not only the codices, but when they appear complete or in copious excerpts, with notes and
indexes. This was the only practical way of handling so large
a mass of buried literature; no words of praise are adequate for such an effort. We cannot but thank the editor with his uncanny ability ‘to hold a great number of different
matters in the mind together for long periods’ (to use a phrase of
Isaac Newton as quoted by D. M. S. Watson, Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc. XVII, 1953, 171). I need hardly say that Cata-
logus is of the greatest importance not only to historians of
science but also to all who are concerned with social and
religious conditions and with the development of the Greek
language from the Hellenistic age till well into Byzantine times.

In this volume we are especially indebted to the editor for the
work and care which he has maintained the high level of the work as a whole. After describing the thirty-six Oxford manuscripts (which include a large one that belonged to Oliver Comwell) he prints various astro-
logical texts, a calendar (published by him earlier in 78S
XXXVIII, 1948, 37 ff.), and some important non-astrological excerpts from Psellus. These last (on which Weinstock and E. R. Dodds have made admirable emendations) cover a wide range of subjects, including the Chaldaic Oracles, which still need a full edition, and such fragments as the Bouleuterion, which: like the excerpts published by Bidez in Cat. man.
arch. gr. VI, they preserve otherwise lost fragments of Proclus.

In one of his De omnimaria doctrina present a curious problem.
On p. 123, 5 ff. there are two brief sentences from §§ 48–9

1 On pp. 112.12–131.4 Weinstock is right in bracketing καὶ ἑξήκοντα τόσον καὶ ἑξήκοντα καὶ τὸ ἑξήκοντα: should we not also change ὡς into ὡς ὡς? If a scribe had read it

2 Published since these lines went to press.
attested by the incidence of the surviving fragments. Too much emphasis must clearly not be laid on statistics here, especially with the literary canon so long established by Alexandria, but it is nevertheless significant that, as against thirty fragments of Titus, only one each can be ascribed with any certainty to Polibius and Pultarch! Of the classical authors Homer, it goes without saying, emerges facile princeps with about five hundred fragments—Apollonius Rhodius has to be content with four. Aeneas leads the field among Greek poets, 1 but it is remarkable that none other than the two latter and with each other are Aristophanes and Menander; Plato has at least six times as many fragments—but the poet ‘above five or so include the 'AbTh. II.; Demosthenes boasts twice as many as Iocrate, with the other orators nowhere in the race.

Unreliability would rob an inventory of this kind of much of its value. So far, however, as your reviewer has been able to judge from a cursory survey, Mr. Pack has maintained the highest standards of accuracy, bestowing on a project bravely conceived the competent execution which it merited.

B. R. REES.


1. In the preface to this volume Mr. Roberts explains that it precedes Part XX before of a benefaction from UNESCO, which it was decided to use in the production, for the first time since Part XV, of a volume devoted wholly to new literary texts; it was a condition of the UNESCO grant that the volume should be put to an end before the end of 1952 and the production of Part XX was therefore postponed. This volume contains all the unpublished fragments of Alcaeus and Sappho, and of commentaries on their works, which Mr. Lobel has identified in the Oxyrhynchus collection, and Mr. Roberts adds the excavation news that a complete edition of the remaining fragments of Alcaeus and Sappho is in active preparation; he explains that this is why the volume does not contain the customary index verbalum.

The volume (pp. 1-121) is devoted to twenty-one new texts (2828-308), of which three (2828-90) are certainly, and one (2921) probably, Sappho, two (2922-3) are from commentaries on Sappho (2923 probably on Book IV); 2924 contains bibliographical details about a book of Sappho (probably Book VIII), four (2925-8) are certainly Alcaeus, 2929 is 'Sappho or Alcaeus', 2930-5 are more probably Alcaeus than Sappho, 2936-7 are from commentaries on Alcaeus, and 2938 is 'Alcaic verses?...'. Included here for the sake of the reader's ease of reference is a list of other Sapphics and Alcaics (pp. 122-47) contain additions to known papyri of Sappho, Book I—1231, 2081(e), 2166(a); 1787—and of Alcaeus—1233, 2081(d), 2166(b); 1234 and 1360, 2166(c); 1788; 1789. Inaddition the fragments and illustrations are the tragically unintelligible débris of unidentifiable Alcaic or Sapphic verses; but there are some of more than papyrological interest, 2288 contains the first twenty-one lines of Sappho's prayer to Aphrodite (8:1 App. = 1), in which we find (i) a stop after ἱεράμονον ιός (v. 8), suggesting that the adjective is to be constructed with ἱερόν only (Vogliano, Il nuovo Ateo, 1952, p. 5), (ii) support for F.'s spelling ἱεραμόνον (v. 14), and (iii) a strong hint that v. 19 began δέντος φονεύον, in which case πούς (v. 18) is already prefixed, deliberative substantive, and the probability that Edmonds' τόδε (for δόδε) is right is greatly increased. 2928 fr. 2, 4 seems to contain the rare word δισφέρα (LSJ's first item from Polysyllabic, but the adjective is more probably ηλικιακός (sex not certain); cf. Inscript. Lib. 46 (150), and col. i may contain parts of two poems (I cannot make 4 correspond metrically with 22-4). 2929 names two more of Sappho's friends (Archeas and Pleistodis), making it least certain that the Dea of 23 (b) is the same god as that of 21 (b), but it is a deliberative substantive, 2924 seems to contain a list of first lines, with the title Ἐπίθελασια and a puzzling stichometrical note which Lobel reads στροφῆς ὁλοθρίῳ, i.e. between 130 and 140 lines. If so, there would be an element in the usual collection (for example, Sappho Book I) with the alphabetical notation, and that we should read στροφῆς ὁλοθρίῳ, i.e. 11301+ (2925 fr. 1 con-
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This collection was acquired in 1930 by the University of Bologna, and a preliminary inventory, together with a provisional reading of the texts, was published by Moaverozcani and G. B. Pighi in Augustus 27 (1947). In all, thirteen texts of exceptional interest have already been published in journals either by the present editor or other papyrologists; the thirty-seven remaining texts all documents are here presented along with the texts already published, which have been revised in accordance with suggestions made privately or in periodicals by scholars who have studied them.

The literary texts range from Homer's Iliad to Origen's Homiletes, including, inter alia, fragments of a Homeric panegyric, of a kerygesia in hexameters, of a scholastic manual containing a summary of the Iliad, and of a Christian amulet. The last-named fragment, whose date is now amended to the fourth or fifth century, was published by the late Professor of the patristic and Patristic period, greatly venerated in the Coptic Church as in Eastern Christianity generally, but not hitherto mentioned in papyri, so far as is known. Perhaps the most interesting, however, are the three fair-sized, continuous fragments, originally forming part of a roll and dated in the third or fourth century, which illustrate a genre already known to us from the two works, Tómos ἐπιστολος and ἔπιστολος χαρίσματος, attributed respectively to Demetrius and to Libanius or his school. The epistolary categories defined in these works are in the present text further subdivided, and the fact that the text is bilingual in Greek and Latin—though it has not yet proved possible to determine which is the original tongue—provides another hint of the importance of the papyri. The fragmentary character of the latest Epistola found support amongst the better educated and more prosperous circles of Egypt's population.

The Ptolemaic documents (10–14) are among the worst preserved in the whole collection, and their mutilated state greatly reduces their potential value. From 11 (r), however, if the suggested dating (on p. 36) be correct, it may be possible to establish a much earlier date (721 B.C.) for the Ptolemaic first appearance in Egypt than has hitherto been accepted. The Kerygesia in hexameters, on the other hand, is more fragmentary and difficult but again so fragmentary that the editor has been hard put to it in many cases even to classify their contents. A valuable document is 24, a copy of a contract of sale from Tebynnis acquirer, who does not appear in our list of clients, and which has been replaced by a useful introduction on the bibliothèque by E. Kyrinou, though reference might well have been made to the extensive literature on the subject already in existence (see CAH X, 927 f.) and con-

in the Archivio storico fiorentino is 442/3 (see my note in CR n.s. III, 1933, 144).

In any case we have a most remarkable confirmation of the view, held long ago by Boeckh and K. O. Müller and revived by W. J. Stobbe in pregnant, and commented on, by S. Severyns. Similarly, 25, a δαίμων of A.D. 193 would have benefited by a reference to the introduction to Philet. 1, 6, with its full bibliography of recent discussions on this type of document.

The general impression given by this volume, then, is of a difficult, but of no little interest, and commented on, by S. Severyns. Similarly, 25, a δαίμων of A.D. 193 would have benefited by a reference to the introduction to Philet. 1, 6, with its full bibliography of recent discussions on this type of document.

The general impression given by this volume, then, is of a difficult, but of no little interest, and commented on, by S. Severyns. Similarly, 25, a δαίμων of A.D. 193 would have benefited by a reference to the introduction to Philet. 1, 6, with its full bibliography of recent discussions on this type of document.

The general impression given by this volume, then, is of a difficult, but of no little interest, and commented on, by S. Severyns. Similarly, 25, a δαίμων of A.D. 193 would have benefited by a reference to the introduction to Philet. 1, 6, with its full bibliography of recent discussions on this type of document.

The general impression given by this volume, then, is of a difficult, but of no little interest, and commented on, by S. Severyns. Similarly, 25, a δαίμων of A.D. 193 would have benefited by a reference to the introduction to Philet. 1, 6, with its full bibliography of recent discussions on this type of document.

The general impression given by this volume, then, is of a difficult, but of no little interest, and commented on, by S. Severyns. Similarly, 25, a δαίμων of A.D. 193 would have benefited by a reference to the introduction to Philet. 1, 6, with its full bibliography of recent discussions on this type of document.

The general impression given by this volume, then, is of a difficult, but of no little interest, and commented on, by S. Severyns. Similarly, 25, a δαίμων of A.D. 193 would have benefited by a reference to the introduction to Philet. 1, 6, with its full bibliography of recent discussions on this type of document.

The general impression given by this volume, then, is of a difficult, but of no little interest, and commented on, by S. Severyns. Similarly, 25, a δαίμων of A.D. 193 would have benefited by a reference to the introduction to Philet. 1, 6, with its full bibliography of recent discussions on this type of document.
of sound values, the data which an objective analysis reveals both in Linear B and in Greek are useful, and the experiment is an interesting example of a necessary method. Its negative results may well be due, as she herself admits, to uncertainties and to errors of judgment in selecting and preparing the texts to be subjected to analysis, in manipulating the figures which result, and in assessing whether the things which are being compared are in fact comparable.

In the Linear B material, for instance, a number of four-sign men's names are determined by compounded elements of two equal halves, and a frequency count will reveal that certain syllables have preferences or aversions to one or other of the four positions; but to design a method of analysis to extract these preferences through that of different elements in the material. In Cretan to modern Greek, when applied to words which probably do not have this compound structure, and to embarrasement in manipulating three- and five-sign words.

There is ample evidence, in the Index, of words which clearly have place names: But shall we assume, for the purposes of a statistical count, that these are formative elements: creating distinct words (adjectives, diminutives, etc.)? Or different case-endings of the same word? Or added exclamatives which are not really part of the word at all? There is an evident danger in attempting a mechanical analysis of differing forms without understanding the syntax of the contexts in which they occur.

The question arises as to what are the rules we are to assume for the Mycenaean spelling of Greek words? Did the scribes, as in the Cypriot syllabary, have to show the entire consonant outline with open syllables, so that κόρη 'boy' would reappear as ko-ro-ω-ω-ω? Or did they (as Mss Heale somewhere unconvincingly argues) admit open syllables? 'Broken' vowels to the pattern, shortening the spelling to ko-ω-ω-ω? Or were they, as the reviewer has suggested, restricted to the Brutlly 'isosyllabic' κα-σσ-σσ?

If Linear B really contains Greek, at what stage of development did it arise? And if we confine ourselves to lists of men's names, must these all be in the nominative? These are problems which must continually face all those who are attempting a similar attack on the script.

Michael Ventris

---

**NOTICES OF BOOKS**

Acology and prehistory (unlike Kretschmer, who sees this as a vital need).

Van Windecken's hypothesis and its working-out are interesting and ingenious, but few may feel inclined to accept it so long as the evidence supporting the argument falls on the collection of proposed etymologies and they could not be regarded as secure enough for the purpose.

Special interest attaches to the suffix -ας in common names and place names (-ας in Asia Minor). Van Windecken explains this (as he also does with -ος, -της) as (Pelasgian), and argues that the association of -ας and -της is secondary: -ας (IE *yat) is an enlargement of a nasal stem (pp. 43 ff.). This is an attractive theory of the dialectal variation in Pelasgian, but in other cases it would descend from IE -άς. It is indeed possible to point to rare cases in IE -άς added to a nasal stem. But it is surely significant that -ας and -της are found almost exclusively in two types of clue, place names and names of deities (amongst the latter a southern type). The possibilities are that invading IE-speakers, prehellenic or Hellenic, either (1) borrowed the words from earlier Aegean peoples, not speaking IE, or (2) coined them on arrival in the area. Van Windecken, and I judge Kretschmer, choose alternative (2); but it is hard to see why the newly-coined suffix should have been used just for nouns of the type mentioned, both calculated to suggest foreign loan words, and not generally.

(Διαφάνεια) is analysed (pp. 3, 32, 42) as *α-κορμεν-τη (all but ak is suffixal?): Skl. agmen, 'stone', Gk. σκυλος, 'anvil'. The connexion of meaning 'bath' is not readily apparent. Still less clear is the phonetic relation with αδνυς. Another example of IE -ας,听众, is ‘Athena, where -ας is treated as an enlargement of *αθήνα, 'mother'. But again the evidence of place names (cf. Мардон) seems our safest guide, and to point to non-IE origin.

In contrast, the etymology, however, appears prima facie well founded.

So ροδος, connected with OHG, brst 'board'; or ροδος with IE *σκος, 'cut'—if this was acceptable, then ροδος could have the same source as κορμος, on the semantic of which see also Palmer, Trans. Phil. Soc., 1950, p. 156 n. 2. Then but we might ask, Why two related words, in 'time'?

A. C. MOOHRHOUSE.


Eduard Schwyzer accepted the task of rewriting the Greek Grammar for Müller's Handbuch in 1921. The first part appeared in 1934, and the first volume was completed in 1959. At the time of his death in 1943 the volume on syntax had reached the fourth stage of publication. After his death it was continued by the late Professor Albert Debrunner, who completed the text and saw the present volume through the press.

The purpose of this work is to provide a comprehensive, encyclopaedic, and authoritative summary of the syntactical doctrines which have emerged from the labours of scholars. While it is possible to point to minutiae which the author has overlooked or ignored, it is said that the completion of Schwyzer's great work is a landmark in the history of classical philology. From it future research will take its start.

It is in the third requirement we make of such a work—the indication of the unexplored territories and the planning of future exploration—that the book suffers the defects of its virtues. Yet much remains to be done. For instance, the doctrine of the verbal aspects contains much that is puzzling. Of the 'infective', Schwyzer's treatment, which is notably concise, contains no indication that it is a type of verbal but is also a state (Zustand), to which and with which it is closely connected. In his discussion of the 'infective', the author's treatment is misleading. He speaks of the 'infective' as 'impersonal' (pp. 561, 562), and says that the infective (as a state) is nothing more than the act of being infected (pp. 562, 563). This is clearly not the case, for the infective is a state and not an action. Schwyzer's account of the infective is inadequate and incomplete. The infective is a state and not an action. Schwyzer's account of the infective is inadequate and incomplete.

A concrete example may serve to test the adequacy of pre-
can be said in its favour. The plan is straightforward, the proportions just, the style brief, clear, and businesslike, and the book in general pleasing to read. Though scholarly controversies do not obtrude themselves (there are practically no footnotes), Robinson has always shown a remarkable insight and if his judgments have an appearance of dogmatism (a feature of the Hellenic History criticised by Ehrenberg in JHS LIX, 296 f.), he reasonably claims in his preface a right to discuss his material with respect unimpressed by probability. The photographs are excellent (not so the maps, except the borrowed from CAH).

Although, however, this is an attractive book and will undoubtedly be useful for its own sake as a contribution to the subject, it does lie open to serious criticism. R. does not give us an impression of having worked closely enough with the evidence and with modern works on the evidence. It would not be realistic, if it ever was, to demand that the writer of a general history should be an authority in the period and aspect of his subject; but he should surely be familiar with the controversies behind the views he adopts, and should restate these views in his own language, so that what he offers is an original work, stamped everywhere with the impress of a single mind. In R., on the contrary, one seems to be reading the opinions of a series of experts. This impression is not without concrete support.

R. acknowledges in his preface the permission of A. H. M. Jones to draw upon his remarks on the economic background of the Roman Empire in Journal of Roman Studies, xxi, 221-30. These remarks appear, in fact, in a review (pp. 149 f. of that issue) of Walbank's Decline of the Roman Empire in the West, in which Jones alternately presents Walbank's arguments and comments on them. In the actual words of Jones' five paragraphs appear without quotation marks, and with very slight alteration, on pp. 609 f. of R.—whose contribution is limited to tidy-up expressions ('But this and that must not be pressed too far'; 'One can... to exaggerate') transforming the exegesis-comment pattern of the review into the semblance of an argument developed by a single mind. Whatever we may say of a convention allowing the verbal quotation of long passages without more acknowledgment than this, surely a historian should present his conclusions in his own words rather than in those of others, however felicitous—particularly when the controversy is immensely complex. R. takes the matter further (pp. 610-12) makes little difference, for here he seems to be largely based on Walbank himself.

R. makes other acknowledgments in his preface which the reviewer has not followed up. He has, however, detected some minor instances of verbal dependence: e.g., on pp. 41, 100 f., 103, 349 (cf. CAH I, 443, III 59, 61, 44, VI 436). The following is a selection of errors of fact: Chios was part of Aelia (p. 134); Argolis is the name of a State (154); monasticism was a new form of ascetic life (p. 230). Salamis (not Salamis) is applied to Pericles, is equivalent to 'epitome autokrator' (199) and means 'general with absolute power' (243); Munychia comprises the whole promontory of Piraeus (214); Pericles' voyage to Rome (360) and his almost continuous trips to 429 (only twice before, so far as we know) (293); Athenian expeditionary forces consisted essentially of the nineteen- and twenty-year-olds (266); the 13,000 Athenian hoplites in 431 included those on garrison duty (237); the Roman kings were elected from a royal family (449): a tribunus plebis could veto the veto of his colleague (494); there were only first consul of their family between 200 and 146 (so, to be sure, Frank in CAH VIII 365; in fact, however, ignoring branches of gens) (495); the SC ultimum dates from the Second Punic War (597); Caesar was tribune and censor (530); it was a novelty of the Julian year that it began on 1 January (531). A number of mistakes in a general history are inevitable and do not render it useless, especially when writers, like here with the evidence of verbal dependence on other writers to give an impression of superficiality. A disappointing feature of the book—turn to less central criticisms—is the failure to mention ancient literary contexts in coin inscriptions.
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complain that it makes no mention of Athenian Tribute Lists, Atthis, Busolt's Greek History (though Beloch's is included), Jones and Ehrenberg's Documents, or ILS. As a guide to further study it will undoubtedly be useful to the type of reader for whom it is written. The reviewer is sorry not to know more about The Helminth History of Greece, Warde Fowler's City State, Grote's Plato, Headlam's Election by Lot, Greenidge's Roman Public Life, or Momigliano's (Claudius). There are few misprints—though a particularly unfortunate one occurs on p. 221.

T. J. Cadoux.


There are collected here, as a tribute to Sir John's eighty-second birthday, a dozen papers written by him for various occasions, of which the most important is the Oxford inaugural lecture on Greek Lands and the Greek People and others on The Value of Ancient History and The Geographical Study of Greek and Roman Culture. All are reprinted 'with very few changes, but with added (though not gratuitous) remarks, of affinities to more cursory and curtailing of repeated topics'. The title of the book is explained as follows: 'The phrase "Historical Geography" has been familiar, since the work of E. A. Freeman and H. B. George, both to historians and to geographers. But the phrase is often used in a way which might better be described as "Geographical History"; for sometimes it is the geographical features which invite historical commentary, rather than the historical events which invite geographical treatment. This book is novel, and it is not seen: examination in this (or any) sense, but we know the kind of history, intemately blended with geography, that is meant. In all historical problems both elements are there—the human decision and the physical situation. And it is now generally acknowledged that the history of a region, the history of a town, is inseparable from the geographical conditions of its site. In recent papers (Ancient Geography in Modern Education) that this kind of correlation between historical and geographical studies is more widely valued and practiced than formerly, and in a note of 1951 that much has been done since 1928, though 'ground-nuts, a geographical crime, have just cost Great Britain thirty million pounds'.

Natural enough is said on the Mediterranean climate and vegetation. The land is often thin-soiled scrub-land or moor, extending upwards from the coast along the edge of the continental land-mass as far as the borders of the Black Sea. In 1915, "'Philosophers wanted to replace quantity by quality, and recommended eugenics tempered with ismarchand; while politicians preached a national crusade to exploit the Persian Empire; Alexander's conquests were thus realized much more than that of the previously most expensive

brandy.' The solid gains (of the Crusades) were Famagusta and Rhodes . . . the great failures were not Acre or Jerusalem, but Antioch and Alexandria retained in alien hands, as Alexandria and the Siphon never had been. In the struggle for good luck from 'Axine'—even if 'Axine' was suggested by some native name sounding like it. The theory of important clima
tic changes in historical times needs re-examination; is it so
certain that 'a general hardening of the physical conditions' 
governs the extent of the行銷? If three are other ways the process was

The book ends with a bibliography of thirty pages, beginning as far back as 1921.

J. O. Thomson.


The University of Birmingham Historical Journal needs no commendation. The present review will deal exclusively with Mr. R. F. Willetts' article on the 'Historical Importance of the Gortyn Laws'.

The author begins with a brief archaeological introduction, followed by a summary of the main provisions of the code: in the previous note on p. 105 it was not seen: the reader that are (readly, 'Language and Style') we are given a brief description of private law in general, and an account of the judicial procedure described and implied in the Code. The remainder of the article is devoted to a comparison of the Gortyn Laws and the Laws of Hecataeus. Although most of the sources are literary, and the Code is mentioned only in connection with the laws of adoption and inheritance, and the sliding scale of fines for offences against the person.

The article is pleasantly written and produced, though one paragraph (p. 110) misplaced comma in line 10 of p. 108 makes the sentence ungrammatical and the sense difficult to understand. Greek words occurring in the text are transliterated in the footnotes where some lengthy quotations are given, they are left in Greek in these cases.

Unfortunately it is not made quite clear how the early, middle, and late codes mentioned on p. 105 fit into the framework of primitive law. The author seems to be implying that the Gortyn Code, like the Code of Hammurabi, is purely laic. The author does not mention the curious interjection 'Tho!' at the beginning of the code: it would be interesting to know how much, or how little, religious influence it included.

In the description of court procedure, Headlam's views ('JHS XIII, 'The Procedure of the Gortyn Inscription') are accepted in toto. Mr. Willetts does not mention the peculiarity of the language for comparative purposes. He is correct to accept Headlam's rejection of Darsee-Haussoulle-Reinach's apparently reasonable suggestion that the word implies that the Hörkos of the person described as Horkitéros will be given greater weight; Kohler and Zeising do not mention it in the admittedly brief bibliography, render the word as 'näher zum Eid'. A more important omission deals with debt-slavery: the word 'nêmaménon' is rendered 'damned for debt', and there is no mention of the possibility that it may have been 'damned for liberty'. It is true that the leading English authority renders the word as 'a debtor judged by the Court to be insolvent', but that is not the only possible interpretation, and hardly deserves to be called 'important textual evidence' for Cretan debt-slavery.

Of the testamentary clauses (most of which seem enlightened and humane) the most remarkable, perhaps, is the clause which makes the testator's executors 'are, so long as they become extinct, to

serfs automatically become free—though they are not sold. When they become apêtairoi (a word which Mr. Willetts wisely refrains to discuss) rather than citizens proper: neolamodia, perhaps, or hypomeiones, though such a catastrophe could never have
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occurred in Sparta. The author seems to agree with Seeborn, that serifion was a result of foreign conquest. This view was, of course, official in Sparta (and similar views were held, both by the ancient and the modern) in seventeenth-century (England); but it was not universally held in antiquity, and has been hotly contested today. The Turkish-Cretan parallel quoted in note 109 is significantly inelegant; the liberated serifons must have been treated, not as from enslaved natives, but from immigrant protégés of the local dervishes—clearly apetairoporos rather than Fokkens.

With the sliding scale of penalties we are in a far harder position. The crete we use, like the Anglo-Saxon system with its varying wergilds, is open to the same sort of abuse. Serfs, whose existence in other respects seems tolerable, and certainly compared well with that of the helot (though Aristotle attributes their passivity to the solidarity of their masters rather than to their own contentment) have only been freed by 1823. It may be, therefore, that the offences against their own order they pay double the fine that free men pay. Even the Apetairos has four times the value of the serif. Mr. Willetts might, perhaps, have explained the relation of the stater to the drachma: it is not entirely self-evident. But his descriptions of the class system are valid; the connexion of tribe with class is rather less clearly established. On p. 110, it is hinted that Xenophon's use of the word Sykkosion for a Spartan subject is a survival of a nomadic period when Spartans had, presumably, once lived in tents together, though it is doubtful whether Skene really means Tent, and in any case it is immediately made clear, on the evidence of Aristotle, that the word Sykkosion is neither ancient nor characteristic.

The article concludes: 'We can therefore understand why Cretan institutions continued to be highly regarded by the supporters of aristocracy.' Since we have long known, from the Ionian revolutionaries, that democracy is a natural aristocratic, that feat of understanding is fairly simple; yet, apart from the scale of punishments, the Gortyn Code has not really helped us very much in this matter. Where it has helped us is, the side, that Crete, unlike Sparta, was not a mere anti-kingdom but the involved semi-feudal state of the old Frankish state of France. It is also interesting to note that, unlike Cretan states seem to have been engaged in almost continuous wars, Sparta, with its far more military structure, did actually, Epps and Cavaignac have shown, manage to avoid them.

Some of the author's apparent oversights and omissions are clearly due to the inevitable conciseness of the article, and will be more fully dealt with when the author brings out a completed study of the Code. This may be eagerly awaited; studies of the Code, in English, are not easily available to the average reader, and Mr. Willetts' viewpoint, while it may not be universally accepted, is one which may help to shed light on some still unsolved problems.

H. W. STUBBS.


Both these books have a wider interest and importance as contributions to the study of Athenian society than one might consider, indicating the nature of the material to the interpretation of which they are devoted—a class of inscriptions mainly ill cut and difficult to read and unenlightening in themselves (though of course the remains of all but twenty or so from Attica, the remainder from Aegean islands under Athenian control (Leonnos, Skryos) or Athenian influence (Naxos, Amorgos)—are sometimes, as here, called horoi or horoi-inscriptions; their function, however, was not, or not merely, that of recording of Athenian society than of one or other of which nearly all the horoi-inscriptions refer: χρεος, for the leasing of an ornamental estate when the guardian prefers not to administer it himself; ἀθικός χρεος, for the remission of a debt by a bonâ fide owner of the land which he held in another's use; and, commonest of all, προμαχή ὑπό λόγον, usually rendered as "sale with the option of redemption" (though Finley (p. 35) insists that it represents no more than the giving of "security in the form of conditional sale") with or without the condition again, in referring theories advanced by Paoli on χρεος and on ἀθικός χρεος and of Meletopoulos and of Meletopoulos (in Poimene IV, 1949) on προμαχή ὑπό λόγον, Fine defends and develops, convincing it seems to me, that the Athenian-land contracts, Meletopoulos' article was not available to Finley who analyzes these contracts in Chapters III-IV, and he takes much less pains to refute Paoli's theories indeed, his note on pp. 241-2 suggests that he has misunderstood P's view of ἀθικός χρεος.
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In Chapter VIII, by far the most speculative and controversial in his book, Fine deals with the problem that is raised by the lack of evidence for the use of horoi between Solon’s time and the fourth century, a problem with which Finley does not concern himself, and puts forward the explanation that land did not become alienable in Attica until the time of what seems to be the earliest literary reference to its use as security—in a comedy by Aristophanes, probably produced between approximately 425 and 410 B.C. or a reference to the pledging of a house has been seen in a probably somewhat later fragment of Pherekrates. There are no other references earlier than the last decade of the fifth century. It is Fine’s contention that only the experiences of the Peloponnesian War broke the taboo on the alienation of land.

Fine’s detailed argument deserves careful consideration. There are, however, several weaknesses in it. To begin with, the alienation of the fifth century is much less significant than some of Fine’s later critics try to make it appear. Comedy and law-court oratory are the only forms of fifth century literature in which we could expect any reference to the pledging of land. The earliest sure reference to the pledging of land is from the middle of the fifth century, and Fine shows that they do contain one or two references, while Kratinos is the earliest writer of comedy of whose work any considerable fragments survive. Again, although Fine (p. 202) believes (perhaps mistakenly) that loans secured by movables—beverages—were probably common by the time of the Peloponnesian War, the only references to this practice that he can discover in comedy are in Hermippos (fr. 29) and in the Ekklesiazousai and the Plousios. The only other fifth century writer to mention it is Herodotus (3.196), describing an Egyptian custom. Thus even if there is no literary evidence, except perhaps in Pitarchus, for the alienation of Attic land in the fifth century before the Peloponnesian War, that is no proof that it was inalienable, for what evidence should there be that it existed on the island quite unknown to the fact that land was alienable in the late fifth century; if it had not long been so, the ‘Draconian’ constitution would have been too transparently fraudulent; and even the phrase attributed to the Draconid hymnides (41.272) is no evidence against the Fine’s comment (p. 193, n. 87). As for the epigraphic evidence, it is so significant that most of the surviving horoi cannot be older than the fourth century and that not a single one need be older than the late fifth. What other inscriptions relating to private transactions survive from fifth century Athens?

IG I the only private texts are dedications, epitaphs, a few erotic messages, and five boundary markers (three of tombs)—those horoi which were so extensively used in the fifth century. It is also to be noted that the inscriptions are not uniformly concerned with public or private transactions, but are, in fact, becoming more concerned with publicity and documentation.

Fine is no doubt right in arguing that land became alienable by a gradual process, and it is not inconceivable that among the more conservative of the countryfolk a great deal of the alienation took place even until the Peloponnesian War, but it seems to me that the process must have begun much earlier than Fine will allow. Granted that it is better not to draw any inference from Hesiod’s Boea and that in Solon’s time probably most Athenian landowners still regarded their land as inalienable; yet even earlier some land that can hardly have been waste must seemingly have been alienated, for how else could the Attic nobles have acquired their estates? The practice was certainly common enough in Sicily and Southern Italy; in fact, Finley’s remarks on the law that Solon’s testamentary work had no effect on this development.

On the question of the Solonian horoi (which F. admits may have been of wood) he accepts Woodhouse’s view, as modified by Lewis—and thereby, I think, he weakens his own case. However, I cannot help feeling that those whom Finley, who felt it to be wrong to alienate land could have devised or participated in a transaction somewhat similar to the psephos en nomo . . . as a legal fiction to circumvent the inalienability of land, had they so desired. Whether they could have done so, however, may seem impossible; but if they did feel able to do this, it becomes inexplicable that this sort of contract should have passed out of use for 160 years and that land should have retained a status of strict inalienability for the whole of that time. Moreover, in the events preceding the sale, it is hard to see how Solon’s seastachthos could have involved an uprooting of the horoi and a freeing of the land, as he claimed. The explanation that F. adopts is in fact too ingenious to be credible but not quite ingenious enough to be adequate. It is easy to suppose that the horoi which Solon removed served merely as reminders of the fact that the head of the family owning the land on which the horos was fixed could not sell the land. So one can probably suppose that the designation of a certain landholding as a 450th of the whole (even six-fifths) of the produce of the land so long as he remained in debt; thus he was tied to the land. He may originally have pledged his own person as security, being unwilling or unable to pledge his land, but when he could not repay what he had borrowed instead of giving it back to his creditor he handed it to him and to his creditor that he should become virtually a servile, by accepting this obligation, rather than a slave; hence, however, his constant fear of enslavement. Whether hekatomoros or ekatomoros may be more correct is a question which I feel before the, estates of large landowners, as Aristotle says, and if we take both categories together there is ground for his assertion that ‘all land was under the control of a few’, but that is another

question. Although if we do not accept Fine’s explanation of the Solonian horoi, there is too little evidence to prove that the psephos en nomo is a considerably earlier way of using land as security than the horoi, as he maintains in Ch. IV, for references to it on the horoi and in literature are much earlier, they are, however, far more frequent, and Finley (p. 35) agrees with Fine that the psephos en nomo was the characteristic form of Athenian security.

But it probably did evolve first, for, as Fine says, the form of contract which gives greater security to the creditor is normally the older (though this argument carries little weight in the context of his theory that land was not used at all as security until a time when loans on the security of movables were probably common), and Finley adds that it is the sort of security that those who were not tenants or borrowed money when there was still strong feeling against the alienation of land.

In Chapters V-VIII Finley tries to determine what kinds of real property were given in security, in what circumstances such transactions occurred, and what perhaps, in his explanation of the creditors and debtors were. It is in this direction that his special interests take him further than Fine. From such scanty and patchy evidence as we have, no firm conclusions can be drawn concerning Athenian practice in the sphere of real estate, but I think that F. does succeed in showing that there is some reason to believe that those who borrowed or lent money on the security of landed property were mostly well-to-do (and of course almost all citizens), that those who lent were not professional creditors, but that those who borrowed or lent money did not borrow for any productive purpose. In other words, transactions in which real estate served as security lay outside the mainstream of Athenian business life—a conclusion which would support Fine’s contention that in the countryside surrounding a city and a port that played so large a part in the commercial progress an old-fashioned attitude to landed property long survived. It is another sign of Athenian conservatism in the sphere of real estate: the mere fact that land was alienable content until the third century with such an unsatisfactory form of publicity as the horoi, I have no space to mention other valuable points made by Finley in these chapters. Among the most useful: on p. 76 Finley seems to confuse proreumenes and prozones and to stress the importance of land devoted to one purpose (in the same foot); I do not understand his remark (p. 97) that gene ‘could be created only by action of the state’; on p. 95 Fine skill for Skillous. Both books are excellently produced of the very few misprints it is worth mentioning only that on p. 38 in Fine antikratos is misleadingly placed as a
heading. Each has an index of texts discussed, both epi-
graphical and literary; Fine has no other index; Fin-
ley has a full general index as well as an index of Greek
words.

C. RODWEALD.

Egemonia Boeotica et potenza marittima nella politica
de Epaminondas (Università di Torino, serie nu-
colazioni della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia, IV, 4).
By F. CARRATA THOMAS. Turin: University, 1952.

In this scholarly and impressively documented essay, Carrata
Thomes traces the story of Epaminondas' attempt to develop
Boeotian sea-power, as a means to his end of 'transferring
the Propylaia to Thebes'. A preliminary section traces the his-
tory of the Boeotian navy down to 366, including its creditable
record in the Decelian War.

As usually in ancient history, the writer's first object is to
make scanty evidence go as far as possible. Thus much is neces-
sary. 'D's supposed presence at Thebes of a Carthaginian
naval mission under one Hannibal, the subject of the grant of
prophecy, IG VII. 2407 = Syll. 179 (cf. Glotz, 'Un Carthaginois
à Thèbes en 365', in Milanges N. Jorga). In the name of cau-
tion, it is as well to remember that the date is uncertain, the
mission is not mentioned, and the Carthaginian's name is an
emendation to the text (a paper transcript of a lost in-
scription). The ground for dating the inscription to the
mid-fourth century is secure; Hippas and Daitonia, named in
a proposed cruise in the Aegean, Athens and Sparta would
treble Pelopidas in 363. But for dating it precisely, the only
grounds are that it belongs to a year when neither Epaminondas
nor Pelopidas was Boeotarch, and that it fits well in the time of the
naval building programme. It certainly does that, especially in the
light of the friendship of Dionysius of Syracuse for Athens and
Sparta; but there is no proof that it does not belong to the decade after
366.

Minor details are usually accurate; but Xenophon (Hell.
V, 4, 16; VI, 4, 26) certainly does not make the Spartans, in
378 and after Leuktra, withdraw 'from Kreusis and Aigos-
thena' by sea (pp. 21, 22 and nn.). On the contrary he is at
pains to deprecate their use of the laborious and unattractive
path up and down the Euboean spurs of Kitharon; and if CT
had followed in their steps he would probably not have included
Aigosthenes among available Boeotian ports in Map 1.

A point in Diodorus' excessively brief summary of Epami-
ondas' speech (Diod. XV, 38), which puzzles Sigma, Carrata,
is perhaps susceptible of elucidation. E. urges the Boeotians
to hope for success in their enterprise, διότι τοὺς πολλοὺς
μάχας θαυμάσῃ ὑποστήριξεν τὴν τῆς δαίμονος ἀριστο-
κρατίαν καὶ ἀνάφερεν τοῦ Σέρικου πολλοὺς δυνάμεις
καὶ τὴν πλησίον τῶν Καλλιθεομένων τάξιν. This is cer-
tainly a strange argument with which to support a 'big
navy' programme. Is not the point, however, that since power on
the sea gives its possessor a great initial advantage, the Boeotians
need not have been afraid of the Athenian experience? They must
διασωπήσει τὴν δαίμοναν, like the Athenians under Themistocles,
and then their power on land, plus a moderate naval effort, will
suffice to consolidate their homeland. D.'s source (Ephorus?) probably made the
argument more explicit.

The episode is of great interest as shedding light on the scope
of Epaminondas' thought. How far did it extend to a just appreciation
of Boeotia's economic potential? And could something really have been made of her position as a
sea power, as emphasised in a well-known fragment of Ephorus?
These questions, opened up by Carrata Thomas' stimulating
essay, remain unanswered by history. To the Boeotians' unpre-
paredness and inexperience of 378 is added the Boeotian army to
Arcadia (Thucydides would have enjoyed the πολέμου;)
and with the death of Epaminondas, his achieve-
ment was revealed as limited, like that of so many other
failed protagonists to the temporary illusion of his people's military
power.

A. R. BURN.

Timoleon and his Relations with Tyrants. By H. D.
WESTLAKE. Pp. ix + 61. Manchester: University Press,
1952. 7s. 6d.

In this study Professor Westlake gives reasons for believing
our authorities to be biased in Timoleon's favour. The bias has led
him to misrepresent facts. Hence he proposes a number of restora-

The loss of contemporary records has made us dependent on
three writers who lived centuries after Timoleon.

The other, Diodorus Siculus and Cornelius Nepos, were
contemporaries of Cicero. It is generally agreed that the his-
torian Timaeus (336-260 B.C.) was the source from which Plu-
tarch and Nepos took their material. The chapters in Dio-
dorus which refer to the history of Syracuse are largely based on Theopompos (Hammond CQ XXXII, 1938), but the
rest of his account of Timoleon is taken from Timaeus. If the
legend of Timoleon is tainted with bias, Timaeus is the person
probably to be responsible.

Timaeus appears to have venerated Timoleon as Trenyno
venerated General Gordon, 'Warrior of God, Man's friend
and Tyrants' foe'.

This is not surprising. Timoleon had been throughout the
friend of Timaeus' father, Andromachus. But if he shared the
antipathy to tyrants dated from his boyhood it certainly was not
lessered when Agathocles, who had seized power at Syracuse
in 317 B.C., expelled him from Sicily.

We may have also to take Timaeus' religious beliefs.
He held that (as Bury phrases it) 'to every sinner punishment
unmistakable as such, is meted out in this life'; he was ' ever
on the watch for mysterious or daemonic influences on human
affairs', and was thus predisposed to admit the claim publicly
made by Timoleon that the deliverance of Sicily was accom-
plished under supernatural guidance. In a study of history
such a point of view would not conduct to accurate investiga-
tion of facts.

Professor Westlake's most striking 'reconstruction' is con-
cerned with Timoleon's liberation of Syracuse.

In 345 B.C. Syracuse was subject to the tyrant Dionysius.
At Leonitini, Hicetas, a former friend of Dion, held power, but
now he was plotting to make himself tyrant. With the help of
aristocrats who had taken refuge. From them an appeal was sent
to Corinth for help in their struggle with Tyrannus. Hicetas
supported the application, but evidently 'with his tongue in
his cheek', for a letter written by the Corinthians not to send a force to
Syracuse. By this time he had come to an understanding
with the Carthaginians.

The Corinthians, ignoring Hicetas, despatched a small force
under Timoleon (344 B.C.). Before it left Corinth Hicetas had
written to Dionysius all about it except Ortygia.

Recognising that the presence of the Corinthians would
prove an embarrassment, he planned with Carthaginian help to
prevent them from landing in Sicily. But Timoleon was too
clever to fall into this trap, and thereupon sailed for Taormiumen,
there where he was welcomed by Andromachus.

He did not take long to make his presence felt. The oppor-
tunity came when disorder broke out at Aetranum; one faction
appealed to Hicetas, who marched thither with 5000 men; the
other to Timoleon, who brought with him 1200. Timoleon
caught Hicetas' men off their guard, attacked them, and de-
teared them. Professor Westlake is certainly right in his sug-
gestion that Hicetas, regarding Timoleon as a rival but not as
an enemy, had no intention of fighting, and was under the expectation
of being attacked. 'Timoleon gained the victory because he
had attacked without a declaration of war. He could claim that
the duplicity of Hicetas was sufficient provocation.' For reasons
of safety Hicetas did not cross with his force.

Timoleon was now joined by the tyrant of Catana, Mamercus,
and next we hear of a Corinthian contingent operating at
Syracuse. As to details Diodorus and Plutarch are in disagree-
ment. Diodorus represents the Corinthians after the battle of
Aetranum as hurrying immediately to Syracuse, where they
defeat Hicetas. He goes on to picture a situation, evidently
lasting some months, with Ortygia held by Dionysius, Achr-
adina and Neapolis by Hicetas, while the Carthaginians lay
outside the walls. It was only in the following year (i.e. the
archonship of Pyhrdotus—345/4 B.C.) that Dionysius abandoned
Ortygia.

Professor Westlake accepts Diodorus' chronology (for which
there is independent evidence), but argues that his narrative is
all that is incredible.

Plutarch states that immediately after the Aetranum battle
and within fifty days of Timoleon's arrival in Sicily, Dionysius
surrendered Ortygia, and was sent away to Greece.

According to Professor Westlake, what occurred was this: D.
did not make overtures to Catana, but after Timoleon had
offered to abdicate, but proposed to admit the Corinthians to
Ortygia; he himself would retire to Catana, to remain there
under Timoleon's protection; 'if Ortygia held, he might hope
for aid from Syracuse; if it was taken, he might be able
to help him in his fortures'. But Syracuse was taken sooner than he expected. The failure of the expedition con-
duced by Hicetas and the Carthaginians against Catana led to
the losing Achradina and the Carthaginians, despairing of
success, left Syracuse. Hicetas also withdrew, entering into
agreement with Timoleon that he should be allowed to retreat
to Leontini after a mere show of resistance'. (This recon-
struction is based on Plutarch's statement that Hicetas left
Syracuse after a battle 'in which not a single soldier of Timoleon
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was either killed or wounded.

Timoleon now invited the
Syracuse to dismantle the fortress on Ortygia; whereupon
Democritus, having nothing more to hope for, abdicated and
was conveyed to Peloponnesus.

In later chapters Professor Westlake studies Timoleon's
further dealings with Hecatas and his relations with other
Scyrian tyrants. He adds an appendix on 'Timoleon and
Timoleon's Flattery.'

This short study merits the serious consideration of scholars;
to ordinary students it may be warmly recommended for use as
a Companion to Plutarch's Timoleon. It will deepen their interest
and widen their outlook.

W. H. PORTER.

The History of Alexander the Great (Brown University
I: Part II, Art. II. Providence, 1933. 2 vols. $7

In this new book Professor Robinson fulfills a promise made in
his earlier work 'The Epoch of Alexander's Exploitation
(Brown Unic. Studien I, Providence, 1934), to supply an 'Alexander-
aryument.' Although he now discards this vague description of
what he intended, it will nonetheless serve to summarise fairly
well what he has produced.

The object of the book, in the author's own words, is to 'present
all the ancient accounts of Alexander in such a way that
they can be readily handled by others, and to add some comments
of my own.' The commentary is reserved for a second
volume, to be published in parts; the present volume consists
of a brief preface and introduction, is divided into two parts.

The first, an arrangement and indexing of every reference to
Alexander's expedition in the five 'extant' authors, Arrian, Dio-
decius of Prusa, Curtius, and Plutarch, occupies only eighteen
and a half pages; yet it constitutes by far the most important
section of the whole work.

This concise index is twofold in method and purpose. A
dictionary of Alexander's events, used throughout the entries and categories. The entries are the place names and the categories in which the authors who belong to the particular locality. The framework is provided by the itinerary of Alexander from Ilion to Babylon
given by Arrian, with which the itineraries of the other four
historians largely agree. This itinerary differs only slightly
from the true itinerary reconstructed by R., in his earlier book,
which can now be used for checking. In this way all references
in the five authors are grouped around the chief events of the
expedition in a chronological table of those events. Where
more than one account exists, the reader can at once compare
the historians' treatment of the same incident.

The second form of indexing is that by 'categories.' This
is done by analysing the entries and assigning them to one or
other fifty categoriesembraced in twelve general groups of
branches of subject-matter found in the five authors, and are
therefore of a very general character. The following selection
will indicate their range: XXVIII. Alexander's character;
the man himself; story of his character. XXVIII. Alexander's outstanding activities; acts of b.XIX. Alexander's far-reaching plans; exploration. XXXI. Alexander's selection, or matters touching on his divine nature. XXXII. Alexander's defeated enemies; categories are XCVII-XLX; sources named by the
extant historians (the precise source being indicated in
parentheses); unnamed sources (the common m.tan., om., etc.);
Gibbon mentioned as sources by the historians.

The categories are attached to each group of entries, an
arrangement that enables the reader to follow quickly the
nature of what is being reported and also to pick out digressions
or errors in the accounts of different authors. There is no separate
index for the categories, as both of the groups and the
subject can easily compile his own list from the references here,
and all students of the period now possess a perfect instrument
of control in the use of modern works, in particular the first
part of Berve's Alexander, which is constructed about a very
similar selection of categories of subject-matter.

Of the second and longer part of this volume little need be
said. It consists of an English translation of all the passages in
Jacoby's collection of fragments from No. 117 (The Royal
Ephemerides) to No. 153 (general references to the History of
Alexander). Although not perhaps strictly necessary, this
forms a logical complement to the index of the extant authors,
and with the translation of the text as much as to English
students the rich material contained in Jacoby. The trans-
lations are drawn from the Loeb collection and elsewhere;
occasionally they are R.'s own.

In this work, R. has carried out his plan simply and effec-
tively, but a final judgment of his work must await publication
of the commentary. The considerable similarity in form and
content between the five extant authors has facilitated his
arrangement of the index, and even the choice of categories, in-
evitably, to a subjective prejudice; but, as I hope to show in
my review of R.'s work in the journal of the Classical
Society, the transmission of the text departs from a very
careful acceptance of the text as much as to modern students.

The Royal Journal of Alexander through the compilation above
the passage is so closely dependent upon the
R. States, and the fact that the book is called
the transmission of the book depends upon his acceptance
of the expression of the story contained in Plut. Eum. 2 of the destruction
Eumenes' papers by fire in late 326, one of the many im-
probable inferences of Plutarch's style contained in Plutarch's Lives
of Eumenes and Demetrius.

In any case, R.'s thesis, already expounded in his earlier book, does not affect
the value of the present volume; readers can form their own
conclusions from a study of the index.

Stumbling will be easier in the promised commentary;
the first volume provides them with a most helpful
and accurate guide to the study of the Alexander-historians.

R. H. SIMPSON.

The Discovery of the Mind. By Bruno Snell. Oxford:

The subtitle explains that the subject of these essays, for
the argument is not continuous, is 'the Greek origins of European
thought,' and a note by the publisher indicates that the book is
called "Die Entdeckung des Geistes, with the addition of the present seventh chapter, Human Knowledge and Divine Knowledge, which was in MS. The translation is by V. K. Term."

The discovery of human knowledge is a subject of great
interest in Snell's handling of the Greek gods, he can understand
Aristophanes' jokes at them. On p. 83 the Archimedes
of Pindar's (elaboration of parts rather than unified
construction of the whole) is the only thing that is placed
with certain features of archaic Greek art. Pp. 92 f. incidentally
realise the human drama, especially tragedy, may have
devolved from ritual. Pp. 115 f. say in little space a good deal
that we cannot hope to have understood the poet, at least in the earlier writings.
The section on the development from mysticism to logos
(181-266) deals largely with the passing from simple to analogy, and
all that implies. That on The Origin of Scientific Thought
(227-245) contains some curious and interesting observations
arising from the fundamental opposition of Greek is the only
language in which we can observe the formation of a technical
scientific vocabulary using native material only. An
important point is that raised on p. 236, that quantitative observation
seems to begin with Democritus, at least in the earlier writings.
(p. 243) 'The view that humanism, ends with a plea for a little courtesy in a bit of tolerance,
and, a socrates Eunice, just a dash of your irony.' Pp. 266;
Art and Play in Callimachus, oversteps, I think, the humorous element in it.

Overall, the book is interesting when it compares
with the Age of the Arkadia, especially in Vergil; the statement on p. 281, that Ec. x, 32 and the general
idea of Arkadia as a land of song come from Polybios, iv, 20, 4
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This book, which has taken a long time to reach a reviewer, is needlessly bulky by reason of digressions irrelevant to the main theme. The author has correctly observed that, since man has been trying to shape his opinions, his opinions are recorded, and quite possibly before that, there have been two main views concerning time. One is cyclic, a belief in a constantly recurrent process, leading to no definite end. The other might be called teleological, which holds that events reach up to some ultimate goal. The former finds expression for instance in the Stoic doctrine of the world, the latter in such Christian philosophies of history as St. Augustine's. This, with proper illustrations, leading peoples of history, might well have formed the subject of an interesting essay; but it is hard to see what purpose is served by such things as a review (most of Chapter IV) of the results of documentary criticism of the Old Testament, the earlier enquiry (pp. 49 ff.) as to whether Gilgamesh and Job are connected (pp. 194-8). The author generously dedicates the book, save for a full index of the technical terms having to do with purification and so forth.

In the whole of the first division of his work, the author has quite needlessly handled his subject. He appeared to think that the Greek version of comparative material is available to anyone studying purity, pollution, and purification among the Greeks or elsewhere. For instance, on p. 115 he has occasion to mention Stoeis and Euripides, and it is necessary to note that this is simply the Greek version of a legend found over a great part of the world (Japan furnishes a very notable form of it) concerning the man who tried to get his wife back from the land of the dead and failed because he broke some taboo. On p. 184-5, he is surprised that "au cinquième siècle la souillure du meurtier semble s’arrêter à la frontière de son pays". A very modest amount of anthropological knowledge would tell him that so old a notion as that of the pollution of the blood belonging to a time when the man was the sacred animal for all practical purposes, the whole world, and it therefore mattered little whether a polluted and polluting sayer was put to death or banished; the world was rid of him either way. On p. 277 he adds, once in a while, a tabula, but only to show that he has no clear idea what it means.

His knowledge, moreover, of the religion of classical Greece has serious limitations, although he has consulted some good works, as those of Farnell and Nilsson. For instance, what he says on p. 126 concerning the pigs offered by initiates at Eleusis shows a lack of clear conception of Greek ritual. On p. 243 he seems to define Ἐορδής as 'un acte matériel qui s’attache à un acte religieux'; it is nothing definitive and cannot be affected by it. On p. 308 he has something to say of Zeus Melichios, but seems never to realise that that deity cannot originally have been Zeus at all. On p. 348 (end) and elsewhere, he speaks as if he supposed that the Mysteries involved some kind of positive teaching. Here and there defects of taste and scholarship are to be found. How he can imagine (p. 320) that Euripides in the I.T., 1159 f., is burlesquing a purificatory ritual passes my comprehension. On p. 395 neither he nor his translator (op. Stoh., flor. 74, 3) nor the use he makes of one from Aeschylus (Supp. 363-4) indicates that he realises that neither will scan.

It is a relief to pass to his exposition of Plato, an author in whose work one is much more at home. He illustrates his extracts, sometimes unnecessarily long, from several of the principal dialogues the use made by the philosopher of those conceptions of purity and impurity which he had deduced from the vocabulary of the ritual and the ceremonial. We are, in fact, one of the earlier part of the book that M. is much too inclined to look for definite ideas, reducible to logical statements, in a field where vague feeling plays a very important part. All that he says here is worth careful consideration, but there are more extravagant than I in Platonism thought to determine the soundness of the conclusions arrived at.

The printing of the book is none too accurate. Some misprints are corrected in a list of errata on pp. 3-4, but many remain. Slips of the author which passed unnoticed during proof-correction are, e.g., on p. 256, line 6, where for Héraclès read Apollon, and on p. 330, note 2, where Grenouilles should be Nuits.
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The book is divided into two sections, of which the first, *Empiricism versus Inspiration*, contrasts the attitude of the founders of physics and their successors with that of the medical writers. The former seem to have made no use of experiment whatever, the alleged examples of experiment proving on inspection to be mere tricks of the trade. The latter, it is argued, were the first to develop the theory of the universe, not from the study of the stars, but from the relation between man and his environment. The development of this view is well illustrated in the book, and the author's arguments are soundly based.

H. J. Rose


This is a posthumous work of its lamented author, prepared for the press and given a brief summary at the end by Mr. W. M. R. Copperthwaite. It is a comprehensive survey of the main developments in Greek thought from the beginning to the middle of the 5th century B.C. The author, an outstanding philosopher and scholar, has made a valuable contribution to our understanding of the origins of Greek philosophy. His treatment of the subject is clear and concise, and his analysis of the main figures and schools of thought is thorough and balanced.

H. J. Rose


This work consists of four essays, originally lectures intended for the 100th anniversary of the death of the great German poet. The last part of the book gives the collection its title; all deal with aspects of the thought and literature of Greece. The first is entitled "Das griechische Geschichtsbild in seiner Entwicklung zur wissenschaftlichen Historiographie" and deals with Homer down to Polybius. D. points out that the epic poet, to judge by what he himself tells us of the lays of his bard, was not, at least in intention, a mere teller of pleasing tales without foundation in fact. In fact, he adds, Homer, who wasorious, zörgernd, zuletzt aber sicher mit einem Ja antworten lassen (p. 12). He had in him therefore the kernel of the latter historical principles (p. 16). Herodotus is next considered, and he is shown to be a close observer of the human character, but for his realism, his interest in factual detail. The last part of the book is devoted to the relation of the literary to the poet, and to the influence of poetry on the development of modern thought and literature.

H. J. Rose

D. assumes that the deceiver of Penheus in the *Bacchae* is Dionysos himself; I do not.
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Homer at least supplied some political history and terminology to later political thinkers. But the didactic tradition, notably Salom, the ideals of Euronia, Euksomnia, and Dike are emphasised with increasing clarity amid social changes and political discourses. The slightly more precise term, isonomy, becomes a catchword now of oligarchy, and the question to be long and frequently discussed was "what is the best form of constitution?" New freedoms had created a demand for political education, and there were those who undertook to teach men how to govern. This collection of "nouns" as a tyrant; the old view that it was based on unwritten laws which may be revealed by gods or discovered, but not created, by men—this is as Heraclitus it put—it-nurtured by the divine law is in his time a damascened "law" or "law from above," a nature, tradition, and by explaining (Sinclair does not seem to mention this point) that law is the arrangement of reason. Meanwhile the question: what is man? had become important for political thinkers other than sages or philosophers: Thucydides had his views on human nature, and records the theory of immortality in the field of relations between states. But he used his political science in order to write history and not the other way round.

At the dawn of the fourth century, Isocrates was the founder of the school of Hellenic writings; by way of the Stoic cosmological, Polybius' theory of cyclic developments, Aetica's humanisation of the monarchic ideal, and Philo's eclecticism, and so to the merging of Greek theories into the context of the Roman principate.

Sinclair has produced an admirable, well and clearly written. It is an immense convenience to have in one volume these succinct and thoughtful accounts not only of the giants, Plato and Aristotle, who must dominate the scene, but of the political ideas of other thinkers—chiefly those from Protagoras and Antiphon to Dicaearchus and Euphranor. Sinclair writes for those who are willing to consult the sources, but his book should also be most useful to Greekless readers—perhaps, however, it would have been more attractive to them if he had translated as well as translated (in a useful index) the Greek words in his text. One might criticise small points here and there. There is a note on p. 76 which implies that the office of strategos became equal to the archon and that the much vaunted Gorgias' visit to Athens in 427 B.C. and its importance for rhetoric. The account of Cicero's arguments about Leos in Thuc. III would be clearer if it were first explained that only a pamphlet had been challenged and the inanitiability of Cicero is perhaps in point. Cicero here provides a good example of the neglect of attic eloquence. But the only possible source of serious disagreement lies in Sinclair's treatment of Plato, with whom he is clearly out of sympathy. One might criticise his interpretation of various passages; but the main complaint must be that the fundamental problem does not clearly emerge: how can there be organised social life without authority? Plato found that authority belongs to reason, both individual and social, reason is the god and the self-guaranteed. This is surely to his credit, and may be pleaded in mitigation of those features of his theories which might otherwise seem to him with totalitarianism of the irrational variety.

J. Tate


The 'first edition' of the present work consists of a single essay entitled Pythagoras and Orpheus which appeared in 1939. The new edition brings out the essential nature of these figures by stating their differences and similarities. The most striking contrast was the thesis that Pythagoras' theory of the transmigration of the soul was aristocratic and concerned only with the souls of human beings, whereas his theory of souls was a democratic theory of souls all enjoying immortality in equal degree. Guthrie, in Common 15 (1939), 280, rejected this distinction as un-Greek, and argued that to the Greeks psyche was always material and was divine in so far as it shared a cosmological view of nature which led to the belief that the individual psyche was God and that the individual psyche was God and that the individual psyche was God and that the individual psyche was God. He admitted that the Homeric soul, though material, lacked this cosmic affinity, being 'the idea of a short-lived society of warrior kings to whom the body was all that made life worth giving'. Nettle, again, in REL IV (1941), 242, pointed out that a theory of transmigration presupposes belief in a non-material transmigrating element. Reaching the conclusion that Pythagoras regarded the soul as the material principle of life, he inferred that "it is only a theory of transmigration which is indefensible" and that class of men who had a divine non-material soul, unlike everyone else. But the inference is undoubtedly wrong.

Kerényi returned to the charge in 1949 with a second edition of the essay (Abbae Vigilis II, Amsterdam), to which he now attached an appendix on Ennius' theory of the transmigration of the soul. This appendix was in fact an extensive answer to Guthrie's criticisms. The first section is devoted to an attempt to demonstrate the possibility of an aristocratic theory of soul, contrary to certain leading fourth century Greek theories. The Chinese analogy is interesting but proves nothing; and the exposition of Ennius remains, as his French reviewer observed (Bayet, REL 1940, 243), 'remarkable'; but has not real bearing on Pythagoras. The all-important link is the observation that Rudiae, Ennius' birthplace, is near the Pythagorean city of Tarentum. More than this is required to persuade us that Ennius' conception of the moon as the dwelling-place of divine souls is good Pythagorean doctrine.

In the third edition, published ten years later, Kerényi presents three studies, of which the first is the original essay, the second is new, and the third is the appendix of the second edition. The new study speaks away most of the positions of the earlier work, and is an important attempt to define the essence and origins of Orphism. At the outset Kerényi seizes upon the literary character of Orphism as its most salient ascept. As he observes, means Orphic books; and German in speaking of Orphik has an advantage in precision over other European languages which speak of Orphism, Orphismus, Orphino. He attributes to the transformation of Greek civilisation in the seventh and sixth centuries B.C. the importance of his religious phenomena, which are in this period connected with Orphism, such as initiations, abstention from eating of flesh, concern with ceremonial purity, etc.; and he emphasises that the true nature of Orphism will be restored only when we can recognise it for what it is, the strange association of such phenomena with the reading of books. Kerényi draws attention to the incongruity with which Theseus, in Euripides, attributes Hippolytus' exaggerated regard for purity and the outdoor life, not to youthful extravagance or a passion for hunting, but to discipleship of an Orpheus manifested through a mass of books'. His explanation of the incongruity is plausible. He suggests that Euripides' mention of books is an anachronism. Contemporary forms of initiation involved the study of Orphic books, but the later characteristics of Euripides' Hippolytus, purity and the outdoor life, belong to the primitive initiatory practices from which the later, written, Orphic teletr evives. He notes how, in general, Orphism as a mythical teacher stands against a background of wild nature.

Following a somewhat tenuous thread of argument Kerényi proceeds from a possible derivation of the name Orpheus from ὁ ὀρφής to the occurrence of the name Kelinoi, which points certainly that has meaning, in connexion with two cults of an initiatory character, one at Phyla in Attica, the other at Andania in Messenia. The eponymous Phylus is father of Kelinoi, whose son, Kaukon, founded the rites at Andania. Since the place of initiation is both the site of the temporary character (πριβετός προφήτης ως Θυλος, Πρυτανεύς) at Andania, Kerényi regards them as more primitive than Elatus with its stone hall, and therefore as likely to illustrate the literate stage of Orphism. He suggests that the earliest initiation ceremonies in Africa and elsewhere will recognise the temporary bath house in which the initiants stay during their period of trial, instruction, and seclusion. From the name of the priest at Andania, Lykos, Kerényi infers that the young
candidates lived there as wolf-men, Orpheus, the dark, like Kelainos, is the name for the initiator who instructs the boys, and leads them in the ceremonies which take place in the wild at night. Thus Hippolytus, who, in his ritual purity and life in the wilderness, you might (for him) be called the follower of Orpheus in his primitive form. Incongruity only creeps in when, as in Euripides’ day, Olympian means ‘a mass of books’. The subjects dealt with in the writing are likely to reflect the topics of the oral instruction, and Orpheus as a literary figure still personifies the idea of the civilisation and education of man, not as at Eleusis through the revelation of an agricultural myth, nor, as in the Prometheus, through the use of fire or handcraft, but through a sort of temptation in the wilderness, a life of abstention and instruction in the desert places.

It will be obvious that seekers of cast-iron facts about antiquity will find nothing to interest them in Kerényi’s study. But though he is likely to find enthusiasm in an author which consorts well with the earliest evidence about Orpheus will set value on a hypothesis which makes many of the rougher places smooth. The new essay which the author presents in this third edition certainly merits the attention of scholars.

J. S. MORRISON.


This is an interesting little book, clear, scholarly, and concise. It is true that M. Séchan says little that is new, and his conclusions are not always open to suspicion; yet he is stimulating even when he is wrong, and his views are often persuasively argued.

The work is divided into five chapters, of which the first is concerned with the part played by fire in Greek religion. Torch-races were familiar events in Greece at all periods, and the theme of Prométhée is naturally at the heart of the Promethean myth. Birds, too, were associated in folk lore with fire myths. But Reinaud’s attempt to identify the eagle—‘a préfiguration animale’—with Prométhée failed to explain how it came to appear in the legend as his herald in chief. Whatever the original meaning of ‘Prométhée’—and Séchan has little time for fanciful philological speculations—the Titan had, by the fifth century, and largely through Aeschylus’ ennobling influence, assumed the tragic and symbolic role which was destined to captivate the imaginations of Christians and poets alike.

The second chapter discusses the Homeric myth, and shows how Aeschylus modified it radically by substituting an era of human degradation and misery for the traditional Golden Age.

The third chapter is concerned with the ‘éléments constitutifs de la Prométhée’. Séchan analyses the significance of the double traditions of eternal punishment and release in Hesiod, and agrees with Wilamowitz that the former was the older. This, however, he says is impossible in Tarentum, for the thorny problem of the διακεκρατος των των πασαν, which merits more consideration than Séchan is able to devote to it. But where such is uncertain, it is perhaps unfair to expect the answer to a book to deal with all the difficulties involved.

Schmid’s belief in the promethean miracle of Zeus’ gift to man is firmly rejected, and the sophist neatly of the Aeschylean Prometheus is firmly dealt with in the fourth chapter. This and the final chapter contain the author’s highly controversial views of the function and place of the Prométhée in the trilogy.

Séchan’s theory that the reconciliation of Zeus with the Titan was cemented in the final play of the trilogy by the institution of the Attic Prométhée is supported by the introduction of the Attic Prometheus, by Sichard. Where Séchan goes astray is in his insistence that the play in question must have been the ποιήματι not the Λυκείωμα as has been generally supposed. His argument that the epithet ποιήμα ‘ne puis pas un acte passager, mais une fonction stable’, ‘vité, portée-feu’, is seriously weakened by its hostility (on the titres of the other play) of the Hébépolis.

The book deals at length with the notion of the thymaticus that will be the first to be adopted. It is not disconcerting to find that the history has a clear and distinct history. Meanwhile the book is full of new, clear, and important material, and is an admirable book on the entire thought of an age, which so often results in distortion or false profusion.

The rest of this note is best devoted to a few points which have interested this reviewer, and will illustrate the quality of the whole. In the chapter on Ionian science, though much is made of the religious and mythopoetic background, the distinction between the nature-philosopher and an observational scientist is not drawn so clearly as it might have been after the work of Cornford and Jaeger on the vision in the Library and the theological origins of Ionian speculation itself. Of Socrates, whom Bertrand Russell could consign to a scientific purgatory before admitting him to heaven, Sarton says, ‘Greek science was not disview, for he called a necessary halt to uncontrolled specula-


This is a difficult book to treat adequately in a short notice, particularly for a reviewer who is not a mathematician. Another difficulty, for anyone reviewing this book, is that in the author’s words ‘it is not written for classical philologists, but rather for students of science, whose knowledge of antiquity is rudimentary, and who have never had adequate knowledge was too shallow to endure’. Professor Sarton adds that his interest in language is probably more genuine than that of most philologists in science, and regrets that very few of his hearers have had any previous acquaintance with classical literature.

The print and get-up of the volume is very French.

J. R. T. POLLARD.
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more fashionable distortions of Marxism or pragmatism, and has a genuine understanding of 'epoiesis in ancient and modern alike.'

E. D. PHILLIPS.


The history of ancient science needs perpetual rewriting in the light of fresh developments of modern science. Intensive modern work in genetics has made it desirable to know not simply what the Greeks had achieved in the sphere of biology, but how their opinions were on propagation and heredity. Undertaking to meet this growing need, Dr. Lesky has carried through a thorough and painstaking enquiry which will remain as a landmark in its own field of study.

The main topic in English that bears directly on the subject of Dr. Lesky's research. What comes nearest to it is Joseph Needham's admirable History of Embryology. But embryology is not the same thing as genetics; and thus comes about that, among the fifty and more authors included in Dr. Lesky's select bibliography only two names of writers in English appear, to wit Burnet and Heidelberg, and they get in only on account of their general works. All the rest are Germans, except for Laignel and Lavastine, authors of a text in the field of medicine. Their work and finally Aronstein's German scholarship not only in the sense that it is the first complete exposition of its theme but also because it rests almost entirely on German work of the last thirty or forty years. The writer of this notice is not a biologist, a fact familiar with more than a small portion of the specialist literature concerned. He must therefore confine himself to a summary of the contents of the book and a layman's estimate of its merits.

It is an open question undertaken from the point of view of the history of medicine, a wise decision which lends it direction and gives it a setting in a wider context. Dr. Lesky is to be congratulated on handling her special subject as not to leave out of sight his bearing on the general culture of science. She clearly worked through through all the available material, and this claim the long table of Behandelte Stellen substantiates. The starting-point of the enquiry is Magna Graecia at the turn from the sixth to the fifth century B.C., because it was then that Alcmaeon cut sufficiently free from Homomogygogon. The other biological question, whence comes the seed in man. After Alcmaeon and the Pythagoreans, the Hippocratic writers supply the next great source. Then it is the turn of Aristotle, the greatest figure in the whole history of biology, whose influence dominated later antiquity and the Middle Ages. Finally, Galen and the Arabs come up for discussion. Like other historians of science (as distinct from philosophy) Dr. Lesky cannot fit Plato into her picture. Her judgment on this debatable, as I shall say, subject is based on the broad and comprehensive consideration, or on the biological question, whence comes the seed in man. After Alcmaeon and the Pythagoreans, the Hippocratic writers supply the next great source. Then it is the turn of Aristotle, the greatest figure in the whole history of biology, whose influence dominated later antiquity and the Middle Ages. Finally, Galen and the Arabs come up for discussion. Like other historians of science (as distinct from philosophy) Dr. Lesky cannot fit Plato into her picture. Her judgment on this debatable, as I shall say, subject is based on the broad and comprehensive consideration.


Mr. Murray, who forty years ago published his History of Chess, has now written what is essentially a similar monograph to other board-games, full of the latest knowledge and more up-to-date than the old standard works of Thomas Hyde (De ludis Orientalibus, 1694) and Stewart Gulin (Chess and Playing Cards, 1898). The board-games of the world are classified under the five main headings of games of alienism, war, race, hunt, and magic, and for each variety details are given of its rules, nomenclature, and geographical distribution. In his first chapter, the author discusses the board-games of the ancient and classical world, while a final chapter is devoted to the general topic of the origins and distribution of board-games.

In his reconstruction of the board-games of classical times, Mr. Murray owes much to Professor R. G. Austin's scholarly article in Antiquity (1940), but is able to throw further light on some problems from his wide knowledge of present-day games. Thus Polybius' difficult commentary on Sophocles' mention of the 'five-lined board' is clarified by what we know of games played on pentagons in Crete, India, and the New World; and the mystery of the 'sacred line' remaining in the name of board-games, we have no evidence from the classical world of any of the hunt or mancala (pebble-and-hole) type. Games of alienism are inferred from surviving boards and from a mention in Ovid. For the rest, patale, poale, and Ipanale belong to the class (admitting only the possiblite drac) while kubia, kubina, and duodunect si are of the race-game variety (like backgammon). So much the author deduces from scattered literary references and the rather confusing commentaries of later antiquaries. The rather confusing commentaries of later antiquaries and the rather confusing commentaries of later antiquaries. The rather confusing commentaries of later antiquaries and the rather confusing commentaries of later antiquaries.

It seems, indeed, that in many parts of the world some board-games are really quite serious undertakings, concerned with soothing, amusing of spirits, or curing the sick. This is one of the many lines of speculation in support of Plato's contention that life is both thorough and careful work, which will from now on be the standard book of consultation for its subject. The reference to Marin's article on page 234 and in the bibliography should read <Mar XLI (1942), 64.>

W. C. BRICE.


Eight years ago, in the Preface to his Théâtre de Dionysus, the late Sir Arthur Pickard-Cambridge looked forward to a com-

The Director of the Warburg Institute is well qualified to write on the early Mesopotamian and Egyptian civilisations, and in his book, the first of a forthcoming four-volume survey, he shows that in 1948-9 he develops themes first presented in his King and the Gods (1948) and Before Philosophy (1949). His aim, as clearly stated in the preface, is to concentrate on the social and political innovations which mark the appearance of the first civilised societies. "Civilisation" is to be understood in the narrow sense of homo politicus, and Frankfort rightly confines himself to Egypt and Sumer ("Mesopotamia") as the cultural centres of the ancient Near East, for the later development of civilisation in the peripheral areas is not his concern.

The opening chapter is a criticism of the historical philosophies of Spengler and Toynbee, whose views on civilisations and their development he cannot accept, since they betray the weakness of an analysis in which the referent is not known, and the evidence is, not surprisingly, more selective, but it has been possible to include over 300 photographs, a valuable supplement to the text and a very great convenience. All this makes a stern course for the non-specialist; those who stay the course have an opportunity to measure evidence against hypothesis in the light of a critical judgement whose general soundness and accuracy it would be impertinent for the reviewer to praise.

The Anheista is included among the festivals, partly for the sake of the connections which are made between some of its elements and the dramatic festivals (these, it is shown, of marginal importance for drama), partly to place the dramatic festivals in the general setting of the worship of Dionysus at Athens. The place and elsewhere the emphasis is rather on what happened than on what is said, and the references to the references to the authorities, Hoorn, Choes and Anthestheria (1951), with its catalogue of choes and selection of plates. The section on Rural Dionysia is useful, within its length, for dramatic performances outside Athens and the country towns of the City Dionysia print, almost complete, of the dramatic inscriptions relating to that festival and to the Lenaia, with brief introductions and notes. Chronological evidence from other sources is given only incidentally, and the important new didascalia-fragment from a text of Aeschylus (P. Oxy. 2256) has appeared too late to be mentioned.

On costumes and masks a good deal has been said in recent years, and new material continues to be published (e.g. terra-cottas at Corinthus). Professor K. von Gerkan has discussed some of the evidence for comedy further in his Studies in Later Greek Comedy. Here, without decrying what has been achieved already, we may perhaps hope that fuller collection and study will help to remove or define the doubts which the present work has expressed.

In general, the author warns us against argument from artistic representation to real life, from fourth- to fifth-century practice, and from South Italy to Athens. For comedy the evidence of the so-called phylake-"vases" is especially valuable. Costumes and the display of masks are regarded as independent derivatives of early Dorian farce, and therefore not to be compared directly with those of Attic comedy; the performances correspond perhaps to Attic mime, of which some substance has yet to be mentioned. This hypothesis needs more development. Nor have the author helped the development of the costumes (often, it must be admitted, empirical) of the possible use of the known marks in the known plays, with their additional results for identification and chronology. What emerges is a good, coherent, and part-provisional picture: we need more research.

The chapters on actors and chorus survey the main questions and the materials for discussion without attempting to enter into detailed controversy, though footnotes indicate some of the places where fullest discussions may be found. Thus the section on 'Number of actors and chorus' is a short analysis of the plays as a basis for the conclusion that three actors, given some quick changes of mask, could have performed the tragedies without help from anyone who could reasonably be called an actor. The Old Comedians in "pass" is a view which is seen as a possible factor in the unimportance of the actor in the Old Comedy]]. For New Comedy no fixed custom is inferred owing to the uncertainties of Greek fragments and Latin adaptations. On this and other passages throughout the book the brief discussion from first principles has still a useful service to perform.

In a work which lacks the author's final revision, some caution is occasionally necessary over details. Some minor incompletenesses remain at his own wish; where there are slips of pen or notation, they are usually corrected on sight, or easily checked. Perhaps it is desirable to mention some. R. 23. Clem., Alex., Protrept. i, 2, add, after 'παρέχε', the words 'εάντι ανετοῦ καὶ διέσεως μενδόλ'; the school, should have a full stop after "εμποροῦ". R. 27, l. 5 from the foot, for 'καλές' read 'cakes'. R. 39 n. 2, for '394' read '953' (cf. passage 28, p. 26). R. 42 n. 3, read "IG II 3103" and 'four names follow'. R. 96. Plutarch, Eunom., 8, read 'τινῶν τῶν παραλλαγοῦσα τῆς' (cf. 956 ff. (dramatic inscriptions)—a few restorations appear to be wrongly marked; the date applied to Ameipsias (p. 114) can be corrected from p. 110. R. 145, l. 6, for 'κοθήνης' read 'τηρίνους τούκους ποιείς', as on p. 255. Text and plates have been well produced, and those concerned deserve our gratitude for what must have been an exacting task on a useful and important book.

E. W. HANDLEY.
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developed to meet the administrative needs of a quickly emerging system of political control. Frankfort draws freely on his experience as the excavator of Tell Asmar and Khafajah in the Diyala region to present the best general account of the life and culture of Mesopotamia. He carries the picture up to the reign of Sargon of Agade, who began to break down the central powers of the temple over the land.

In marked contrast to Mesopotamia the development of civilisation in Egypt proceeded along other lines, despite the influences of Mesopotamia on the country between the end of the Gerzean period and the beginning of the First Dynasty, for which the evidence is collected in a valuable Appendix. The discussions in Chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8, now almost a chapter devoted to the city which was for long ever changing, for this played an insignificant role. The characteristic of Egyptian civilisation was the institution of divine kingship and the rise of a monarchial society during the second two thousand years with little change. This, according to Frankfort, gave Egyptians a unifying sense of security which their Asiatic contemporaries lacked. History shows that this notion, if dominant, was more crippeling to individual initiative than the insecure pattern of Mesopotamian political life.

It is not possible to read this book without much profit and stimulation of thought on fundamental historical questions concerning the divergence of forms of civilisation.

D. J. Wieeman


This work represents a large and well-filled cabinet containing more than three hundred numbered cards, each about 74 in., by 44 in., on which are reproduced by a collotype process outline sketches, mostly in pencil, of selected Egyptian statues from various periods stretching from the earliest to the latest. The card is the best form of the work to be issued, and is concerned with statues of males only. It is broadly divided into two categories—statues with feet placed together and those with the left foot advanced. Both groups are arranged alphabetically, and there are notes on the position of the hands. Inscriptions are summarily sketched merely to indicate their location on the statue. Little detail is in fact intended; most faces, for instance, are rendered as featureless masks. Each card gives at least two aspects of a particular piece, and some have several views and two or three three-cross-sections. A brief index lists the various groups according to their poses.

The term ‘statuary’ has been broadly interpreted to include specimens which are not normally regarded as the work of the sculptor. There are, for instance, some seventy-five cards concerned with the mass-produced votive bronzes of the Late Period; some twenty others deal with shawabti figures in various materials; six are of pottery figures, mostly of dynastic date; and two are religious statues dedicated to flowers and plants. Even with this moderation it may perhaps be felt that a number of cards should be devoted to objects such as glazed amuletic figures of deities and the crude little waxesimaged of the Four Sons of Horus which protected the wrapped viscera in later dynastic burials. The number of statuary-type objects may have dictated the omission of some notable examples such as the standing statues of Senusret I from Karnak, the earliest complete royal statues of this type, the unusual standing statue of Senenmut at Chicago, the Amarna king at Brooklyn with his unique standing pose, the Anen of Turin, the gold Amun at New York, the Tuthmosis III from Medamud, to name a few at random the list could be greatly expanded.

Within the limits set by Schafer’s original scheme for a typological study of Egyptian statuary, Miss Hornemann appears to have carried out her task with diligence, but the reviewer of this work must constantly ask himself whether such industry has been well spent. Miss Hornemann’s outline drawings, competent as they may be, cannot convey the beauty of the original and the precision of detail. If collotype was to be used as a means of reproduction, one asks whether photographs, supplemented with line drawings where necessary, would not have served the purpose better. The chief criticism of this work, however, must be that it has remained quite static. The general public fluttering of the cards will seek in vain for any appreciation of the true character of Egyptian statuary; to the philologists, by now the greater proportion of professional Egyptologists, the book may be an invaluable source of reference, and depends upon data other than poses for the dating and identification of statues; and the few serious students of Egyptian art-history will still have to fall back upon their own records, corroborations, and evaluations of Egyptian art found elsewhere.

Miss Hornemann’s summary drawings cannot assist any stylistic analyses.

Cyril Aldred


This account of German archaeological investigations in Crete during the earlier part of their occupation of that island is edited by Professor Matz. His foreword cautions that the plans how the set-up and some of the plans were destroyed by bombing. The authors deserve praise not only for an excellent publication but also for their restraint in refraining from attacking sites excavated by other nationalities. This restraint has been rewarded by results of exceptional interest. Spectacular ones would have been from famous sites, because these researches open new ground and illustrate how deeply the Minoan civilisation had permeated the west end of the island.

The picturesque burial site on the Akrotiri peninsula only a quarter of an hour’s walk from the monastery of Gouverneto (already noted by Marinatos as a Mycenaean site), the extreme richness of the Knossos material, as is well known, have excited interest. Even from illustrating much of the plain neolithic, and his publication is altogether, quite innocently, given the impression that the decorated sherds were more numerous. This account not only corrects this impression but also adds to our list of neolithic shapes the bowls with inverted rims and those with undulating rims (well known in the neolithic pottery of Central and Northern Greece).

It is still open to question whether the differences between Kamares and Knossos neolithic are due to regional or chronological distribution. Pit-hobs, rims with parallel horizontal line of string holes below the rim have parallels in Macedonia. A stone axe and two obsidian blades were found. No burial was found in situ, but some human bones belonged chiefly apparently to the neolithic period were found washed out of their original positions by rain. The absence of human remains suggests that the cave was used only for burials in the neolithic period, though it may have been occupied by shepherds in L.M. III times.

August Schögerdendorfer describes a tholos tomb and a settlement at Apesokari (a name which the local inhabitants luridly derive from ‘the heads that fell there’ when it was a Turkish place of execution). The site commands a narrow valley leading from the sea to the fertile plain of the Isthmus of Elbena. The Minoa cemetery had been heavily looted by the peasants, so that Schögerdendorfer was lucky to discover a small unrobbed tholos tomb of M.M. I date, the earliest certain example of a Cretan tholos except the very primitive one excavated by Marinatos at Krasi. The pottery, typical but not exciting, the fine collection of birds’ nest stone bowls (mostly statite or breccia) all date from the M.M. I and M.M. II periods. The entrance complex of rooms is interesting because it was used purely for ritual purposes. There is no sign, as in some of Xanthioudides’ tombs, that the rooms were used either for primary burial or as ossuaries. The Germans also tested the settlement, excavating two rooms of the M.M. I–II period. It was a small desultory enterprise; the attempt to rebuild them, but the attempt was abandoned so soon that it is suggested the workmen may have been removed to work on the new palace.

The next two chapters by E. Kirchen and K. Grundmann describe the trial excavations on the important Minoan city at the Asosomatos valley, a district rather neglected by recent investigators despite the gold rings from Vistagi now in the Rethymno Museum (Pendlebury’s ‘Pistagi’; I have also heard Bistai, all perhaps from an original ‘Emvreyi’).

The excavated parts look poor and provincial beside the great palaces of Central Crete, but a comparison is obviously unfair, since the Monastiraki rooms belong to the domestic quarter, not the state apartments. The considerable area, however, occupied by the building, having justified the application ‘palace’ and the importance of the site from administrative and commercial points may be seen from Dunbabin’s map in his account of the antiquities of Amari (BSH XXII). The site is inaccessible, though to Cretans excels the beautiful views of Cretan are more than adequate compensation.

The materials from the Late Minoan cemetery of Khania are described by Janzien, who arranged them in the Mosque by the harbour what was rescued from the old use in 1934. The vases illustrate the first half of the L.M. III period, not very adequately illustrated in earlier publications, and the shapes provide some interesting variants on familiar types, especially of the strait-mouthed jug. I know not why, as a ‘water-jar’. He also lists the M.M. I vases found by Theophanides.

Drepper describes some vases from a L.M. III grave at Suda, the bucket and a fine imported Levanto-Helladic crater with chariot and warriors frieze.

The same writer describes briefly the site of Aptara occupied from Pregeometric up to Venetian times. The most interest-
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ing remains are the city walls, the cisterns, and a twin sanctuary (to unknown deities) probably erected about 400 B.C. The wide circuit of the walls (3-8-3-9 km.) makes it certain that they were used as a city of refuge by the surrounding villages. The walls are said to be all part of one system, despite the assertions, in technique of various sections.

Gabriel Welter and Jantzen give an account of their researches on the site of the Dictyнакеum and the astonishing Roman 'autobahn' leading up to it. Considering the pitiful condition to which this was reduced by the local population in 1791, the Greeks have done well in reconstructing its history. Geometric sherds indicate the existence of a shrine in the ninth century B.C. By the end of the seventh century there seems to have been a prostyle temple of which traces were found. The temple was restored by the Samians after their occupation of Khania in 520 B.C. seems never to have been completed, but some blocks and a large Doric capital built into the Roman foundations presumably belonged to the temple. This is referred to by Pausanias, and is the temple of the Hellenistic temple visited by Apollonius of Tyana. More remains of the temple build by Hadrian in A.D. 123, showing that it had an Ionic porch in white marble on the east side and a Corinthian porch in white marble on the west. The relief with legs of a Pan described by Porceke proved to be a sculptured base for one of the Ionic columns in the Ephesian manner.

The final chapter consists of a survey of sites in Western Crete by E. Kirsten, who includes in it a number of places that I have visited. In particular, the central Cretan sites the survey is good and well documented. He makes useful suggestions on the sites of Psychion, Phoinix, and Arados. After the general survey he discusses in detail some trial excavations carried out in the Syndra district of western Crete, and these excavations are described in the final chapter of Marinos ap Aphotolou, a site that obviously merits further investigation. Other tests on the site of Syndra itself showed evidence of occupation from the Late Minoan III period up to modern times. I am disappointed, however, to note that Kirsten associates the name with Sybaris and the Achaeans colonisation of Crete. Personally I have always associated Sybaris with Sphoinx and Brithomartis, and thought that it was one of the few names which were almost certainly Mycenaean.

The book is beautifully printed and illustrated, and Messrs. de Gruyter deserve great credit for their share of the work.

R. W. HUTCHINSON.


This publication of the second volume recording the Italian excavations at Phaistos has been delayed by two events, first, by the death in 1937 of that fine scholar and most charming man the late Luigi Pernier; second, by the outbreak of the Second World War. Some of the material was described by Pernier as early as 1907 and written up to date in 1929, but the difficult task of bringing the whole work up to date to 1950 has been admirably discharged by Professor Luisa Banti, who has tried, as she states in her preface, to preserve as much of Pernier's work as Dunbabin did of Payne's in the Perachora publication.

After a brief preface there is an introduction summarising what we know of the destruction of the first palace, survivals of parts of it in the period of the second palace, the construction and destruction of the second palace, and some remarks on stratigraphic tests carried out in 1956 East of the Central Court.

Part 5 (Parts 1-4 have been published already in Vol. I) is devoted to a general description of the ground floor of the second palace, followed by shorter descriptions of the elevated area of the palace in the North-west and the evidences for a second story there, and by descriptions of various stray finds of interest. The first five chapters of Part 6 consist mainly of a detailed account of the architecture of the second palace, the materials, and the art, with emphasis on the differences between the art of Phaistos and that of Knossos.

The next six chapters, one for each of the rooms, give a detailed account of each of these, some very interesting and stimulating remarks on the local varieties of pottery at Phaistos in particular, in the Mezara generally, and in Eastern Crete (a speculative but plausible survey). A very short chapter gives the question of the destruction of the second palaces merely whets the appetite for more, but I think we can appreciate the reason. The Phaistos book is a vírēo παξίν which will not go out of date entirely, and Professor Banti probably wishes to exclude from it anything that might appear to be still απόκεντρων. She has already expressed the views she formed after her excavations in 1939 in the volume of Annuario della Scuola Archeologica di Atene for 1942, and here confines herself to replying to some criticisms of her dating made by Schachermeyer in Rito 1945 and by Platon in Κράτος. No doubt further questioning of the stratification of Room 27 of the first palace and the impossibility of its remaining in use as a cellar to a later period as suggested by Platon. Pendlebury defended, I think successfully, Evans' stratification against Abegg's attempt to do the same thing for Phaistos so far as the first palace is concerned, but does look as if M.M. Ib and M.M. IIa were palatial fabrics, and as if the poorer people in many parts of Crete, perhaps even at Knosos in the poorer quarters, continued to use pottery of M.M. Ia types into the M.M. II period. This is undoubtedly true, but, since it not only affects the validity of Evans' ceramic dating for Crete as a whole but also the date of the construction and destruction of the earlier palaces at Phaistos and at Mallia. I hope Professor Banti will attempt to do this controversial work.

In the final chapter of the volume the authors discuss the shrines of the palace, and display a healthy scepticism, strongly refusing to regard everything as sacred, as may be seen by some of their sub-headings such as 'the supposed altar of the same-structure corner of the Central Court' and 'the baths or lustral basins'. The so-called 'lustral areas' have never been satisfactorily explained. If they served a religious purpose, one would have expected to find one represented on one of the numerous seal impressions illustrating religious scenes. If they were baths, why did the Minoans, who were otherwise so fond of drains, not furnish them with an outlet for the water? One of these lustral areas, at least, the one opening out of the throne room of Minos, must have served a ceremonial purpose, thought it was indeed a bath, but if instead of baths, may I suggest the possibility that they were Turkish baths, since the moisture provided by the body of the bather does not require a drain to carry it away? the heat, of course, would have been provided by the normal portable Turkish bath.

It is curious that Phaistos, which provided one of the best instances of the survival of the Minoan Velchaos, has no continuity in its palace shrines, not even from the first palace to the second palace.

On the whole the volume is splendidly produced and a worthy crown to the long labours of Pernier in Crete. On some of the photographs the shadows are rather dark (e.g. fig. 96 and fig. 163), but this is largely caused by the interference of the light of the Central Court in Crete, the middle of the picture being too white, of course, to photograph in the morning or evening, but then the shadows, though less dense, are longer.

Signor Stefani's plans, when they occur, are, as always, beautifully drawn. It does not matter very much in what order the chapters are read, but a specialist can browse for hours on this volume and find interesting material everywhere. Compare, for example, the classification of the masonry into three types: (a) isodomic ashlar masonry reserved for external walls, facing columns, light walls, and rarely in doors as in the sky; (b) walls with two ashlar facings and rubble filling, a rare form of construction, at present known only in the walls North and West of Court 49; (c) walls built with irregular stones, but these differ in the two great groups, the walls round of the rectangular stones 0.80-1. m. high and above small stones cut in parallelepiped fashion with plenty of clay mortar, held together by an external coat of stucco, whereas the walls of the second palace had to go from top to bottom, usually large irregularly parallelepiped stones. Wooden beams no longer occur in the fabric of the walls, but are liberally employed for doorways and antae. Stucco is employed in the usual Minoan manner and we find the same two varieties, one a coarsely burnished variety of 14 cm. thick covering all walls and a fine coat, only 5 mm. thick at most, laid over this as a ground for painted decoration.

Individual points of interest are the bronze socket of the door post between Vani 25 and 40 (p. 71), a fragment of pithos from Magazine 27 with an inscription in Linear Script A incised on it (p. 87), an interesting statinct lamp (p. 109 and figs. 57, 59), a slim amphora with vase-stand incorporated in the base, dated M.M. IIa by Evans, the painted decoration of the Palace of the Phaistos and Hagia Triada (p. 112); cf. also from the Katambas with a cartouche of Thothmes III recently excavated by S. Alexiou, a cubicle opening off Room 63 determined by the discovery of Room 4 at Hagia Triada and the Room of the Pater Couch at Knosos (p. 169), and some faience plaques with scale and shell patterns perhaps attached to wooden caskets, not to a wall as first suggested (p. 342).

The authors refrain from reconstructing, in Evans' manner, an elaborate palazzo nobil and content themselves with giving distinguishing between the 'piano unico', 'piano primo', and 'primo piano sopraelevato', leaving not disproved but un-
proven the question whether there was a full second floor in the ordinary sense of that term.

Two small examples of genuine arches were found in internal walls, but one of these might belong to a Hellenistic repair, and there is no reason to think that the west return of the north block of M.M. III B is of a rather primitive type (pp. 447–9 and Figs. 278, 279).

The volume is a necessity for all libraries and a desirable luxury for all individuals who can afford it.

R. W. HUTCHINSON.


Price not given.

This is a brilliant book. The foundations of the treasury stand nowhere even to toichobate level, and the scattered blocks are neither numerous nor well preserved. Yet M.M. Bousquet's analysis of the problem is very plausible in its main lines, and have shown it to be as interesting, though by no means so beautiful, as the acknowledged masterpieces of its age, the fourth century B.C.

Nor can the student of Greek architecture afford to ignore Bousquet's conclusions on the mathematics of its design, which seem, after a perusal of Chapter VI, surprisingly well established.

South of the east wall of the sanctuary, the foundation (XIII on the general plan of Delphi) was uncovered in 1895. It clearly indicates a treasury some 64 by 9 metres, facing south. In BCH 1912 Dimnoros assigned all the marble fragments in its neighbourhood, though correctly perceiving their fourth-century character, to the layer of the cross-fagade to the west; a confirmation of the report of the ancient writer on the surface of the terrace above. Pontom in 1924 returned them to XIII, but gave this to the Acantians and, misled by the unique anteae with their engaged columns, restored it as a temple with an eponymous hero, a project which we should probably have confirmed Dimnoros's date by a study of the mouldings, and in 1937 the torrent of Rhodinia uncovered the new fragments which, with others found among the Roman shops below, have made the present study possible.

Boussquet gives the treasury to a small gate (B) in the east wall of the sanctuary, whose threshold he discovered in 1948. South of Gate B the wall is polygonal of the sixth century, north of it square or trapezoidal and probably of 293, 501, and of the east, the supposed reconstruction of the Prytanæum according to the inscription FD III, 5, 62. Now north of our treasury is a short retaining wall evidently designed in close conjunction with it and therefore, though polygonal, of the fourth century. The new sanctuary wall truncates it on the east, and so proves that our platform, at least, had been laid out before 334.

All courses up to the toichobate of the treasury are of the grey S. Elias limestone, used on the fourth-century temple of Marathon, and also found in the acropolis. The clamps are H-shaped, the toichobate itself was of S. Elias stone, but not so well finished, and contained blocks of irregular length. A more regular toichobate, for which the surface of the course below had been carefully prepared, was also existing on the existing toichobate to fl-clamps, whose two prongs run vertically downwards. These are used on the rest of the building. There was apparently an interval, associated by B. with the Third Sacred War; and when work was resumed, the walls were made slightly thicker. Hesitancy appears in the toichobate blocks and the orthostates, both of varying height, but dressed to give the orthostates everywhere an apparent height of 85 cm., the toichobate 29. Reference to chapter X X X I I will make clear. A ragged boundary results on the reconstruction between the limestone toichobate and marble orthostates. The building, indeed, was unfortunate in its stone. It was half of Parian, half of Pentelic marble. The Parian for some reason ran out, and the inferior Pentelikon, too, were there, but existing on the upper two courses, such as the frieze and cornice, normally coloured on Doric buildings. The orthostates, the lowest marble course, were set back some 10 cm. from the front of the toichobate, giving the treasury a width of 42,000. It is a varied expression of a way of building, 0.297 metres high, exactly one-twentieth of this amount. B. reasonably infers a foot of 0.297 metres, wall-courses each a foot high and a width, at orthostate level, of 20 feet. The eventual lengths were 28 feet. Above the orthostates came the special course of the fl-clamped course, the dactyl course for this architect as important as the foot.

As on the Pinakotheke at Athens, the rear corners had false anteae, somewhat longer on the long sides. The two anteae of the dactyl façade are formally unprecedented. Their outer sides are nearly twice as wide as their fronts, but the half columns attached to their inner faces make their capitals after all nearly square on plan—biscetted though they are on front elevation. A deep chamfer half separates each engaged shaft from the wall behind. The construction, however, of alternate the north and south plans of the east antae, and B. has recovered the first five courses of the east antae, numbered upwards A to E, immediately above the orthostate. He has also the block from immediately below the capital. He rightly concludes, from the diminution of the engaged column and other evidences, that the original height of the orthostates and the architrave sofite, and with the orthostates totalled exactly 13 feet in height.

The architrave calls for no comment structurally, but the matter of the frieze was various. The north side had the north side had the east the wester sides were (36 to 4 to 483 cm., and the mixture of the two sides of 48 cm., one at the centre of 483, and four of others of 46 for each. There were therefore three between the two central columns, and this façade resembled a propylon. The angle of the pediment was 14°, or 1 in 4, and the architrave sofite came exactly 7 feet below the apex of the raking sima, giving the front a height of exactly 20 feet, equal to its width at orthostate level.

So far all seems reasonably certain. B's cross-wall and door wall ramps around it were more controversy. No foundations of a cross-wall would seem from Plate III to remain. I cannot see that the block Plate XIII, 5, from the 'chiselled course', even granted that it comes from the west wall and has the marks of clap makes on its inner face, is certainly placed itself or can establish the position of the cross-fagade to the east, to a toichobate, orthostate-course, and 'chiselled course' of quite irregular stones; and the inscription on Plate XIII, 5 appears nowhere to run over on to neighbouring blocks. Perhaps, however, we should see a disappointment of the architrave, with no loftier than 17 feet, on the analogy of the Siphneus Treasury. He gives its door a lintel unprecedented in Doric, five courses below the architrave. But again he pleads the influence of the Ionic tendencies.

Indeed, other unusual features seem to derive from Ionia. The column-shafts, for instance, have an apophyge, unique in Doric, below the echinus; and the heun-bed has an elaborate Ionic moulding, an ovolo above a cyma reversa. Others are at least eclectically, in other words, the anta-capitals and the cyma reversa crowning the abacus of the column-capitals. The taenia of both architrave and frieze slope outwards in a way almost unprecedented. Most remarkably of all, a small caviato with painted leaf decoration separates each metope from the taenia of the frieze. The door, as restored, is given an eclectic cornice of ovolo, Lesbian Leaf, guilloche, cavetto, and astragal, specially designed, thinks B., as 'an attention to it as appropriate to the mathematician's mathematics; and, in a similar spirit, the very visible cavetto when added to the perfectly square metope, makes an important mathematical irrational. After a short argument that the building is Cyrenese—from the names of prooxeni engaged in general building—is a doubtful point, B. moves on to its architectural mathematics.

The designer was closely influenced by the geometer Theodorus of Cyrene (for whom see Thucydides 147 D) and by Plato, and much concerned with the architectural expression of irrational roots. Where he could achieve no direct relation (as he often could) of lines, areas, and volumes, he showed from some dimensions that at least he knew the numbers crucial to the mathematicians of his age.

The lower diameter of the column is 90, its height 206 dactyli, respectively ten times the square root and one hundred times the cube root of 9 (the two lowest square numbers, 4 and 9, and the two smallest square roots, 2 and 3, were both playing a great role). Further, the lower to the upper diameter was as 3 to 2; so that the architect who had obtained and, living after Hippocrates, had consciously obtained an area at the top of the shaft two-thirds that at the bottom. He showed, in fact, that he knew the areas between the squares and the rectangles of their diameters. Again, the heights of architrave and frieze are related as 3 to 8, the ratio between the diagonals of a square and of its cube. Without the prominent moulded taeniae their respective heights would have amounted merely to 3: 21: 26.

Turning to the three notorious problems of the fourth century, we have the architect knowing the value of π, for he made the height of the column-capital 11 dactyli. 208 divided by 11 gives 10 × π ÷ (1,772). The height of the frieze, too, is 17,772. ÷ appears so often, because it is the side of a square equal in area to a circle of radius 1.

The theatre at Corinth, which lies about 200 miles northeast of the Temple of Apollo, was first discovered in 1696, and trial trenches were dug in it between that date and 1904. The task of excavation, however, was not completed until 1911, when the Hellenic Institute, which was engaged in the work, involved the removal of enormous quantities of earth, was carried out by the late Dr. T. L. Shear between 1925 and 1929. The excavation accounts were published by him in AJA XXII, 1919, and XXX, 1928-29, and by R. Stillwell, who assisted him as architect, in AJA XXXXXXI, 1941, and XXXXXXII, 1943.

The latter has now published, in the series on the Corinth excavations, a handsome and detailed volume on the theatre, with many drawings of the architectural fragments, and 103 text-figures consisting of photographs and sketches. The eight chapters are headed: I. History of the Excavation; II. Location and General Description; III. Detailed Description; IV. The Greek Period; V. The Thraexa as an Arena; VI. Restorations and restoration plans; VII. Restoration of scena ex orna; VIII. Inventory of Architectural Fragments (a painstaking catalogue); VIII. Summary and Chronology.

Plates I-VIII at the end give plans and sections of the theatre and its surrounding area after construction. It would have been helpful if the names of parts of the theatre had been added to Plates III and VII. There is no index.

It is unfortunate that the Corinth theatre is not better preserved, but war and the excavators who have taken their toll. Fairly substantial remains of the Roman period are certainly visible, though most of the cavea seating has disappeared; but the remains of the Greek theatre, apart from the Hellenistic orchestra grotto, are scanty. In the broad outline of the arrangement, however, the modern theatre (V.3.1, V.5.8) refers particularly in connexion with Corinth (they were taken to Rome after the sack of the city), has left no trace of where they once stood. Perhaps the most striking feature of the paintings surrounding the arena was the fact that ten rows of seats were removed, and the arena wall was decorated with hunting scenes, the lower half of which was quite well preserved at the time of the excavation. Eight photographs of them (figs. 76-93) are given. It is curious that no reference is made to E. Gappo Jr., Observations on the Painted Veneto of the Theatre at Corinth and on the arrangements of the Arena,' Hesperia Suppl. VIII, 64-70, pl. 8-9.

Stillwell dates the earliest theatre to about 415 B.C. From 400 B.C. the cavea seems to have been still being worked on, and the decoration of the cavea continued to be used, possibly with a temporary stage of the phylakes type. At the end of Augustus' principate and the beginning of Tiberius' reign (41-54 C.E.), a new cavea (the seating having been preserved) and a scena ex orna from the straight Asiatic-Hellenistic type were built. About A.D. 77 the theatre was damaged by an earthquake. A comic is inscribed Traiani avo germancio et coloniae ludi Iulii (Lucius Iulius Corinthiensis was the name of the Roman colony; cf. O. Broere in Hesperia X, 1930), but the general rebuilding seems Hadrianic, a date which would not suit the Scopa ChoralStripe. A rough date is given above, which are being published separately, evidently come from the Scena ex orna. The conversion of the orchestra into an arena, as mentioned above, is attributed to A.D. 211-17. The orchestra was partly covered by a very large water-tank.

How many cunei were there in the Roman cavea? This volume is oddly inconsistent on the point. The Greek cavea had fourteen kerkerides; and on p. 46 we are told: 'The lines of the seats in the cavea were established by the later Greek, save that below the lowest two levels the number was certainly diminished by half. Not enough has been cleared above the diazoma to be certain, but the number was probably doubled. It was almost certainly so in the upper mezzanine (sic); and in n. 13 below, on diminished by half', the thead and aedices: This gives the normal Vitruvian arrangement of seven cunei. We can presumably take this last number as definitive;
NOTICES OF BOOKS

but in Pl. I, drawn by J. Travlos (cf. Stillwell in AJA XXXIII, 96) the Roman theatre is shown as having eight cunei from top to bottom. True, this is only a topographical plan; but in Pl. VIII and b, specially drawn to show plans of the second century A.D., the cunei are used and their use is useful. On a (cf. p. 12) where it is reasonably argued that two sets of stairs connecting stage-buildings and orchestra are Κρανώνια κύλημα, mention could have been made of Eretria, where a single set of such stairs has been discovered, because a rather similar case is given to Fiechter, Baugeschichtliche Entwicklung des antiken Theaters, fig. 119 (Masson's theory of the working of the aulaeon); cf. W. Beare, The Roman Stage, Appendix E (= Hermathena LVII, 194-15). On p. 96, where the author connects the conversion of the orchestra into an arena with Caracalla's campaign of A.D. 214, and compares the theatres of Curium in Cyprus and of Philippi, a comparison could have been made with the methods adopted at the theatre of Dionysus in Athens (Plutarch, Periplus, 316 E).

But the author is correct in comparing at many points the theatre of Sicyon. He mentions the two blocks let into the Hellenistic orchestra gutter (p. 20, n. 5), the deepness of this gutter as the 'fountain' (p. 33, n. 20), and the fact that the entire area of the hypokaustos (p. 132).

This last is surely due, as at Sicyon, to the presence of rock immediately under the stage-buildings. We can think of the ramps which led up to the Hellenistic stage, and which can be roughly paralleled by Epidauros, Oropus, and Sicyon (cf. Pickard-Cambridge, op. cit. 264).

The text is defaced with such words as adilus for the plural of aldes (table of contents and pp. 10, 44, 58, 77 n. 39, 68), hydriaca (p. 123), and ophalos (p. 59, 68 and fig. 61, 69), Oxeatos as a transliteration of οξεάτης (p. 41, n. 1), χοτύκτως, χειρὶς as for κοῦρ (pp. 84, 96; correctly in the footnote to the latter, which, however, contains other misspellings). It is possible that there is a doubt a misprint (pp. 35, 94), since the correct form appears on pp. 41-3.

Versura is a substantive, which on p. 58 and elsewhere denotes side-walls flanking the stage (cf. Vitr. V. 6.8; such terms need definition), so that one cannot speak of a porta versura (p. 13).

Stillwell, with others, understands the word as denoting revolving doors; although it means 'snail' and hence 'spiral', we do not know exactly what sort of opening it signified in the theatre, since Varr. R. R. III, 5.3 says only ophalos pro pedunculis, petissimum eius generis quod coelum appellant, ut solet esse in caevo in qua tauri fugaverant solent. Kontomonomial (p. 87, and the same in Greek letters on p. 97, n. 22) should be kontonomialon; cf. DAI 1935, RE a.s. 'Monobolon', Capps in Helga, Suppl. VIII, etc. The term 'pyx' as used by the author (pp. 122, 123) is commonly used by German writers, and is retained in Dimnour's index to 'The Architecture of Ancient Greece', but has no ancient authority.

On p. 8, note 7 is presumably refers to the Roman seats, made from re-used Greek seat blocks, which are mentioned on p. 49 and illustrated in fig. 41. At p. 28 n. 13, for 'Falkner' read 'Falkener', the translator and editor of the botanist Onorio Bello, whose manuscript on Greek theatres dated 1566 (wrong date in the reviewer's article in BSA XLIII, 162 n. 5) At p. 35 n. 25, ηπεασατος looks like a misprint. At p. 137 n. 25, for 'oo' read '190' (op. cit. refers to n. 19), for 'Weiner' read 'Weinert'.

We may conclude that, whereas the Greek theatre at Corinth has little new to add to our store of knowledge, the Roman adaptation of it has much; and that Dimnour (op. cit. 314-15) is justified in dealing fully, on a comparative basis, with his manuscript on Greek theatres dated 1566 (wrong date in the reviewer's article in BSA XLIII, 162 n. 5) At p. 35 n. 25, ηπεασατος looks like a misprint. At p. 137 n. 25, for 'oo' read '190' (op. cit. refers to n. 19), for 'Weiner' read 'Weinert'.

We may conclude that, whereas the Greek theatre at Corinth has little new to add to our store of knowledge, the Roman adaptation of it has much; and that Dimnour (op. cit. 314-15) is justified in dealing fully, on a comparative basis, with his manuscript on Greek theatres dated 1566 (wrong date in the reviewer's article in BSA XLIII, 162 n. 5) At p. 35 n. 25, ηπεασατος looks like a misprint. At p. 137 n. 25, for 'oo' read '190' (op. cit. refers to n. 19), for 'Weiner' read 'Weinert'.

The work is well written, and the study of a Romanised Greek theatre or of the Corinth excavations will certainly need Stillwell's volume.

O. A. W. DELKE.
NOTICES OF BOOKS

corinthisch clay vases of nearly a thousand years earlier. 832, pl. 61, alabaster alabaster: why not 6-5 e. like similar examples elsewhere? 1155, pl. 76: could the impression be of a briddled Pegeas? 1398, pl. 81: mirror-case rather than mirror? F. 190: fish-books were found in Peiraeus. 336-337, pl. 80: the sea because Corinthisch stands two miles from the sea that more have not been found there. Pl. 147 e (see p. 204), Corinthian weight in Athens: 5 e., not archaic; see L. H. J effery, BSA XXIII, 205, n. 4, 1862-7, pl. 102, and p. 227, migher, 800 B.C. to 480 (Perachora I, 74, pl. 102, fig. 2-3). 1159, n. 999 is mentioned ibid. 74, n. 3 and 177, 2887-9, pl. 136: of Corinthian bits refers to N. Yalouris, Muse. Hell. VII, 39 ff., 1909-19, 68.6.415, pl. 102, cf. the late archaic votive inscribed pyramid found at S. Mauro Forte in S. Italy (XS 1882, pl. 11, IG XIV, 632). 2292-2396, pl. 115, 351-41: no evidence of handles on the votive shields; so also on the fourth century and Helenistic period. (Corinthisch XV, Class XXXVI, 23-5); earlier most model shields have handles.

An index by periods might have been useful (I have made and use one), but the grave-groups and other closed deposits are thoroughly cross-referenced. The context of some of the smaller groups might have been given more fully, as the coins and vases which provide most of the dating evidence are not published in this volume. But where so much is given, in relatively manageable space and form, it would be unfair to ask for more. The comparanda in particular are models of relevance.

Dr. Roebuck's volume on the Asklepieion and Lerna is an admirable account of an outlying part of the site, which in its completeness is comparable to the other volumes. It is remarkable, in that he was not the original excavaator of these buildings. The Asklepieion was laid out in the late fourth century B.C., with a small Doric temple prostyle in antis, which had been preceded by another little shrine, probably of Apollo, a dais or prosomeion. The temple was found in the votive deposit. The surroundings of the fountain of Lerna, with a peristyle court into which dining-rooms, were laid out at the same time as part of the same plan. The date at which Asklepios appeared in the sanctuary beside Apollo, whom he was to displace, is uncertain; the appearance of votives especially suited to Asklepios (parts of the human body) and inscriptions which record dedications to Asklepios in the last quarter of the fifth century indicates that it was at least as early as that period. The earliest material from the area of the middle of the sixth century, from graves; the votive deposit begins at that date, but most of it belongs to the fifth and fourth centuries. There are few vases, though the miniature and other late conventionalising vases are interesting, nor other votives of intrinsic value. The many representations of parts of the body offered in gratitude to Asklepios show an unfortunate lack of medical differentiation; it is clear that they were ready-made and, with one or two exceptions, are not appropriate representations. The votivity of the prostyle seems certain; although it had been argued that the destruction of the early group of buildings and closing of the votive deposit is dated after 315, on the evidence of a single coin of Thebes (p. 129). Other evidence, of lamps, pottery, dedications, occur in the mid-fifth or early fourth century, perhaps in the third quarter. Is it justified to prefer a later date because of the presence of a single coin?

A topographical point of interest concerns the temple of Zeus, which, according to Pausanias (ii. 4. 5), was close associated with the temple of Asklepios. A few fragments of a Doric temple were found in the excavation (pp. 5, 147, and pl. 62. 1-2). The dimensions do not accord with those of the fragments recently studied by Dinnoor (Hesperia, Suppl. VII, 1948, p. 176). It is known, however, that this temple was outside the size of the temple of Apollo. Dinnoor's is a much larger building. No trace of either of these temples (if indeed there were two) was found by trenching in the area where from Leake's time to this large temple must have been dug up (fig. 1) marks 'Zeus' in the area west of Lerna, although the evidence of the excavation was negative. This offers a topographical and architectural problem which it is hoped that future excavators at Corinth will seek to solve.

One point which the author insists that a complete plan of ancient Corinth may soon be published. For many purposes one is now obliged to use the map sketch in de Waelie's article in RE, Suppl. VI, 189-90.

J. T. DUNBAIN.


The important and imaginative series of eighth-century Attic gold vases, so called, usually treated for the first time in a thesis published by W. Reichel in the early years of the war. This work was not altogether satisfactory: war conditions prevented its adequate illustration and it contains gaps and inconsistencies which would not have been possible if the author had not been killed in the war. In any case, only one or two copies of Reichel's book exist in this country.

Only's study will be welcomed not only for its meticulous re-examination of the material but also for the rays of light it sheds on the development of Attic art in the seventh century. Although Ohly's plough goes deeper, he has in fact considerably narrowed Reichel's field both in time and space. Of the thirty-five eighth-century reliefs discussed, thirty are Attic (excluding one previous to the Corinthian and the remaining five Etruscan, Contemporary gold reliefs from Crete, Rhodes, and Corinth are mentioned only in footnotes. Ohly adds to Reichel's list material from the Ashmolean and Kerameikos, two reliefs in a Swiss private collection (included belonging to Professor Phyllis), another (recently published by J. M. Cook) in Mme Stathato's collection in Athens, and, in a final footnote, a new relief in the possession of a dealer which is published by Hampe in Die Griechischen Homer und die Bildkunst seit (1949).

Ohly devotes much ingenuity to the reconstruction of the matrices from which the reliefs were struck, and from a group of them re-creates with all the skill of a conjurer a wooden chest covered with gold reliefs. His classification and chronology is correct. This is largely due to the fact that the four Attic groups. The Etruscan finds are attributed to a local workshop contemporary with or later than the latest Attic. The arrangement of these groups in a chronological sequence is more controversial. Ohly, in comparing the surviving animal-frizee reliefs first and the incompetent 'geometric' last, the conception of a gradual decline in artistic technique in the course of the eighth century is an interesting one. (Kunze and Ohly rightly discount Reichel's suggestion that the geometric reliefs come from a different source.) Ohly goes further, if I understand him rightly, and will not allow that these early Greek masterpieces are even influenced by oriental art. Ohly attempts to trace this tendency in other branches of art, and has added that a similar development appears to have occurred in Crete, though at a rather earlier date. Here an imaginative and original, 'proto-orientalisering' style is nipped in the bud by the wintry influence of Attic geometric design. But is must be admitted that the parallel artistic trends which Ohly professes to see in allied arts—such as the relief pithoi from Teos—are little more than interesting possibilities. To obtain the desired sequence, the dates proposed even by early-dating' archaologists like Kunze must often be drastically changed, and the final peroration of Ohly's thesis, though at this stage largely speculative, may turn out to be solidly founded.

The author conscientiously laces the possibility of his chronological sequence being inverted. The argument for Ohly is convincing—and might well have been stronger—but the evidence from tomb groups—although painfully imprecise in view of our ignorance of contemporary Attic ceramic development and burial customs in the manner of all tomb groups—does make it at least unlikely that the animal-frizee reliefs are the latest. How far back in the century they belong remains doubtful. Only appears to consider that they were made early in the eighth century but as far as I can see this evidence is not very strong compared to a date earlier than about 760. An earlier date is not, however, inherently improbable, since a fragmentary 'orientalisering' gold relief was found in a tomb near Kerameikos (shortly to be published) in a context not later than the first third of the sixth century B.C.

Some of Ohly's speculations, which cover a wide range, seem to border on fantasy. For instance, the supposed spiritual affinity between a sixth-century Rhodian relief-pithos and a Phoenician sard, shows a strange mind. I would like to see a correspondence of the Dipylon ivory figures with a huntsman wrestling with a lion, still less with the lions themselves on gold reliefs. Nor is it sound to compare the figure style of Attic painting with that of the reliefs, leaving out the painter and that of the engraver (since, as Ohly points out, we are concerned here with engravings rather than goldsmiths) are demonstrably poles apart at this period.

On the whole the reader will find it difficult to appreciate stylistic niceties owing to the inadequacy of the illustrations—inevitably inadequate from the nature and condition of the originals, but it may be said that here no miracle has been

When Neugebauer died in 1945, he had virtually completed the text of the second volume of his catalogue of the Berlin bronzes, which was to contain all the post-archaic Greek statues that are still known, but the main part of the work had also been prepared for publication several of the statuettes from Magna Graecia which were to share a third volume with Italic bronzes. All this valuable material has now been made available to students thanks to the labours of Professor Blümert; and its publication, despite the difficulties of post-war Berlin, is a fitting tribute to a lifetime devoted to the study of classical bronzes.

As a catalogue Neugebauer believed that no detail was too trivial; and in any detail about having seen the bronze for oneself; and the opportunity of doing so seems as remote as ever. In the meantime, the following are a few random points suggested by reading the volume:

(ii) Is there really sufficient evidence to assign the Dodona Zeus to Corinth? Neugebauer draws attention to the close resemblance between the heads of the Zeus and the Perachora Heracles, especially in profile; but the Zeus has neither the direct gaze of the V-shaped stomach nor the slanting eyes characteristic of the Heracles and the related Modena kourous (Payne, Perachora I, 141). Nor, after all, is the Corinthian origin of the Heracles more than a suspicion.

(iii) The praying peleus (no. 4) is ascribed to Sicyon (even if with a good deal of reserve) on the strength of the symmetrical folds of her skirt; but, notwithstanding the mirror found in a Sicyonian tomb (AJA, 1937, 337, fig. 3), is this convention necessarily confined to Sicyon or even the Peloponnesus? It occurs, to mention only a few examples, on BMC Bronzes no. 242, probably found at Corinth (cf. Pouillon, Strange Stil, 16; in any case not Sicyonian according to BMC), on BMC Bronzes no. 244 from Susium (not Athens as stated in BMC Bronzes), on Athens Nat. Mus. 7390 from Attica; on Acropolis 6491 (de Ridder 793) and Acropolis 6514 (de Ridder 767). Miss Lamb is surely right in connecting this wavy kore and the closely related kourous, Cab. Méd. no. 928, for Athens (Greek and Roman Bronzes, 154 f.); and with them must go BM 242. I do not mean to imply that the Berlin bronze is Attic (against which its Peloponnesian provenance argues). To find the convention too mechanical a factor and too easily transferable to indicate by itself where a bronze was made.

(iii) For the same reason I feel doubtful whether the sleeping girl can be ascribed to Argos merely because two Argive terracottas from Tiryrum happen to show approximately the same peleus arrangement. To make the argument watertight one would have to prove that a similar arrangement of the peleus could not have occurred elsewhere; and Olympia is sufficient to discourage the attempt.

(iv) The combination of Polyeuktian anatomy with Lyceippic proportions makes one wonder that the hollowcast male figure (no. 108) may not be Hellenistic rather than first half of the fourth century as Neugebauer proposes.

The Dodona holograph is: it is worth recording that according to some MS, notes (at a place in the British Museum) for a study of Corinthian bronzes, Hunfray Payne thought this piece Corinthian. The holograph looks close to the warriors on the splendid large crater recently discovered at Vix (Lug. 13, 1953, 999).

(vi) With the warrior from Tarentum, no. 45 compare H. van Gulik, Allard Pierson Museum Catalogue of Bronzes, no. 3, p. 2 and pl. 11.

(vii) Nos. 73 and 74: to the list of parallels add a bronze from Egypt recently acquired by the British Museum.

Compared with those of the first volume, the collybote plates are a little disappointing, but not more so than most post-war reproductions. I noticed few printing slips, and only one which might cause momentary trouble: p. 8 'Heraklesteppe' for 'Heraklessteppe'.

D. E. L. HAYNES.


This excellent little book contains a description, accompanied in each case by an adequate photograph and a discussion, of the votive reliefs now in the Antalya Museum. These stones had indeed remained almost too long unpublished in the path of L. Robert’s illuminating article on Kaşakos (Hellenica III, 38 ff.). M. Metzger does much to clear up the prevailing confusion between the various local deities of southern Anatolia. The discussion is carried on in a style admirable by good sense and restraint; the conclusions never go beyond the limits imposed by the evidence. Two principles are emphasised in the foreword: first, the importance and all the useful cases of the worship of other attribute carried in the deity, and second, the strictly local character of the cults which these rustic reliefs attest. M. Metzger has accordingly confined himself for the most part to classifying the monuments and assembling the relevant evidence from the locality in question. Of the new discoveries the most strikingly admired are those afforded by No. 16, a dedication 'Αρπακτις Κε. - [Χρ]όνια βοηθείας καὶ γενν [. . .] [σωτήριο]. Both Artemis and the father are new in these Twelve Gods dedications. The thirteenth figure in the middle being in this case unmistakably feminine, evidently the Artemis of the inscription, Weinrich’s explanation of the previously known male central figure as representing the Roman Emperor must plainly be abandoned; he is not, as M. suggests, the father of the Twelve Gods.

A few individual points call for remark. P. 42, n. 3: the stauette dedicated διά Πέρσας is at present actually in the Antalya Museum. P. 48, n. 1: M. objects to Pace’s reading Ἀρτάγος Νύσσας Ξαρακοθας[1] that after the patronymic we expect an ethnic or an epithet for the deity. (Meres.) But in fact, in the Burdur district from which this stone comes, the grandfather’s name is frequently added without τοῦ (see JHS LXXII, 110). P. 63, No. 34: the obscure ΩΤΤΩΝ of the inscription must be explained by No. 16; read [Μ]ΩΠΙΟΝ ΔΟΠΙΟΝ [τοὺς σωτήρια] καὶ [ἐπιμελέσαι] δὲν [τοὺς δοκεῖ]. Lastly, the difficult inscription of No. 16 itself. M. reads κατ᾽ [ἐπιμελέσαι] τοῦ Αρχίμενος is certainly not on the stone, being much too long ([τοῦ] is partia[li]ly erroneous). From my own squeeze I am inclined to read κατ᾽ ἐπιμελέσαι καὶ μεταμορφουσθῆναι τὸ οὐ οὐκ οὖν looking like ΟΥΑΚΟΥ, perhaps an error for ΟΥΛΑΓΟΥ. The six or eight misprints are not serious: in No. 22, 1, 1, read 'Αρτάγος for 'Αρτάγος, and in No. 23 read PL VIII for PL VII. But not to be regretted is that the author has not seemed to fit use the modern Turkish spelling of place-names: this is a really any longer justification for transliterations like ‘Khodja Tush’. Now that we have at last a standard spelling that has every prospect of permanence, and which will eventually prevail, surely the sooner it is adopted by scholars, the sooner we shall be rid of this tiresome nightmare.

It may be added that a number of new reliefs of this kind have turned up in the last few years and will, I hope, shortly be published. They necessitate no modification of M. Metzger’s conclusions.

G. E. BRAN.

In less than 200 pages accompanied by 72 fine plates and a short essay dealing with the most absorbing subjects of Greek, Etruscan, and Roman paintings and drawings—i.e. vase-paintings and engravings—from about 1000 B.C. to about A.D. 450. This Herculean task, as is pointed out in the preface, was first entrusted to Pflüg, who died in 1898, four volumes were published (1901-1908), and then to Rodenwaldt (who had to relinquish it in 1939 because of other duties), then jointly to von Salis and Rumpf, and finally to Rumpf alone. Rumpf's manuscript was finished and reviewed in 1952; it is now published for the first time, and during the war the manuscript was destroyed. What now we have is a new work begun by Rumpf in 1950 and at long last brought to a happy conclusion.

It is an extraordinary achievement—a model of comprehensiveness, conciseness, and clarity of writing that characterizes the works of the best historians of ancient art. No similar work seems to have been omitted, and though important objects have often had to be described in a few words, they are placed in their proper setting and footnotes refer the reader to the relevant bibliography. Moreover, though the task of providing a trustworthy handbook is never lost sight of, the text is also personal in the sense that it gives the author's considered opinions and thus presents a consistent picture. Rumpf must, of course, have been greatly helped by Pflügl's volumes, as the late director so admirably compiled and annotated them (constantly quoted), but these books appeared more than twenty years ago, and much has happened in the interval.

The author begins with a short general introduction dealing with the development of art in these lands from the earliest times and with an outline of studies regarding it, from the time of Winckelmann to that of our day. It is a heartening tale, showing the immense progress made in archaeological research during the last two centuries due to enrichment of material, a more modern approach, and the widespread use of photography. The actual story starts with proto-geometric and geometric of the ninth and eighth centuries B.C., as it was expressed all over the Mediterranean world—in Argos, Lycia, Crete, the Cycladic islands, Cyprus, East Greece, and Italy. (To the bibliography on Cycladic we may now add Kondoleon's valuable article.)

The manifold waves of the succeeding epoch are next described. Instead of calling it 'the period of Oriental influence, as von Dusen does, Rumpf proposes the term 'idäisch', as, since, in its early phase at least, the decoration resembles that on the shields from the Idaean cave in Crete. He points out that 'Oriental influence' covers a much longer period than the old term implied and that the widespread use of this term has not been without some defect. Furthermore, it is claimed that the so-called 'Attic' vases are not primarily due to contact with the Orient. On the other hand, it remains true that the curvilinear floral ornaments and the rows of animals and monkeys of the second half of the century have an unmistakable Oriental flavour, and that therefore the old term is not inapt; so, being by now familiar, it will probably remain with us. Rumpf's next period, starting about 650 B.C., is the 'Daedalic', which brought restraint and order into the 'Sturm und Drang' of the Idaean style. It produced such masterpieces as the Chigi vase, the Piraeus amphora, and the metopes of Themist, and it ended with Sophilos.

Attic black-figure and red-figure vases and related material of the sixth and fifth centuries are described at considerable length, with full use of Beazley's attributions. Literary sources and extant monuments are correlated wherever possible, so that we obtain a vivid picture of this great epoch. The same applies to the fourth century, the period of similar vases from Sicily and from Etruscan paintings. (Lyssipp's career, by the way, we now know from a Delphian inscription, began not in the fifties but in the fourties (p. 132), but as early as the sixties.)

Of particular importance are the author's remarks on the wall paintings of the Roman period. It is refreshing to see taken for granted what seems to many of us an obvious fact—but which has nevertheless been challenged—that the figures in these wall paintings from Rome, Pompeii, Herculaneum, Boscoreale, and elsewhere are of the same date as the famous Greek works, as were many sculptures of that time. Instead of lengthy polemics, Rumpf simply accepts the facts and puts illustrations of such paintings on the same plates with original Greek works, so that the figures speak for themselves. (The landscapes appear as 'collections of Hellenistic pictures of c. 150 B.C.' in the caption of pl. 55.) Here and there supporting evidence is cited, for instance, the existence of several copies of the same composition or the incongruity of an extant work with the description by an ancient writer of a famous Greek original.

Naturally, and Rumpf also makes this plain, such copying was more or less confined to the actual figures. The incidental decorations must in many instances have been original work, necessitated by the adaptation of the pictures to the decoration of Roman houses.

In conclusion it is interesting to see that Rumpf concurs with the now prevailing view that the scenes on the Centaurs vases, which so strikingly resemble some of the Pompeian paintings, belong to the third century B.C.

The story continues through the second, third, and fourth centuries B.C., and the fourth century A.D., the three-volume edition being devoted to the fifth century. The chief paintings and mosaics of this later period are enumerated and described, and, since they are less well known than the Pompeian ones, this section of the book will prove particularly valuable. The delays retard our progress, and the reader really in the paintings of the first three centuries of our era such clearly defined styles that we can call them Augustan, Flavian, Hadrianc, Antonine, and Severan? Must we not bear in mind that in those times also the majority of the actual figures can be ascribed to former works? Apart from the artistic evidence that enables us to distinguish classical and Hellenistic prototypes and the specific statements by Vitruvius and other writers, there is the fact that even in the meagre store that has survived we find replicas belonging to different periods. The same figures, often in similar compositions, appear not only in pictures placed in Mau's second, third, and fourth styles, but in those of later periods. It is only gradually, it would seem, in the course of the third century A.D., and perhaps even later, that the fourth century is fully assimilated. Generally the Byzantine conceptions makes itself felt. Until then 'Greco-Roman' motifs persist to an astonishing degree—in painting as they do in sculpture.

The author apologizes for the absence of an index on the understandable score that it would have had to be almost as long as the text. Perhaps, however, an index limited to names of artists would have been possible and helpful.

Mr. Rumpf is to be congratulated on his fine book which will be a boon to all who is a worthy companion of Lippold's Antike Plastik. 

GHELA M. A. RICHTER.


The second fascicle of the Karlsruhe CV contains those vases in the collection which were acquired elsewhere than on the Greek mainland and includes 3 plates (43-5) of Cypriot, 3 (46-8) of East Greek, 1 (49) of Villanovan and Impasto, 1 (59) of Baccho, 2 (51-2) of various Italic wares, 2 (53-4) of Etruscan, 3 (55-59) of South Italian red-figure, 5 (82-6) of Gaza, Campanian black-figure, and Hellenistic pottery. The plates, as usual in Germany, are admirably produced; the illustrations are clear and of reasonable size. There is some confusion over the classification of the South Italian vases, especially the Campanian, which is treated like Phrygian. On pp. 24-30 M. H. M. F. McCrindle M.C.T. 11-1t-6 to Base-Ring 11, Cypro-Geometric I; pl. 15-6: Cypro-Archaic I-Bichrome IV.

Pl. 54. 7. The skyphos B150 is surely not Cypriot, but Campanian; other vases of similar date are by Phrygian are Naples 85995; B.M. old nos. 1285, 1284, 1287; Catania 4257; Nocera, Raccolta Fienga 598; Paris, Bib. Nat. 1167, later fourth century B.C.

Pl. 55, 1 and 7. The column krater B68 is not by the Signorino Painter himself but by a member of the Tarpen school under his influence; for the drawing cf. the columnkrater Bologna P190 (Pellegrini, fig. 74); CT 3 IV, Gr. pl. 1-3 and the bell-kraters Sydney 46. 48 (NMH, p. 933, fig. 83) and 67; 67. 1-2 (CV, 2) and 3. Pl. 55, 3 and 57, 2. The false attribution of the bell-krater B68 by the Amykos Painter is the fault of Trendall. In Frühlat. Vasen (p. 34. 90) he confuses this vase (Winnefeld 261) with Bellkrater 210), which is not a Bellkrater but a B68. It is a quite different painter, interested in the later work of the Tarpen Painter; other bell-kraters by his hand are B.M. 1605 and Vatican V3 (Trendall, Vasi Italiani, p. 82, pl. 23). (cf. also Würzburg 1124 (Langlois, pl. 247) and a pebble in Aitkens (Bielefeld, Gr. u. Etr. Tongefäss, pl. 12, above)

Pl. 55, 4-5 and 58. The bell-kraters B68 and B127 are both...
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(maced on Oxford stamnos), Pan Muler, pl. 9 (Herakles on Athens Bueisir pelike). It must be connected with the technical process of outlining the whole silhouette first and putting in all details afterwards. Pl. XXXII., 1: preliminary sketch in thinned glowing brown. Pl. XXXIII: these surely are a pair. Pl. XL, 3/4: has this really any connexion with pictures of the Persian wars?

Martin Robertson.


Beazley has long promised a list of Attic Black-figure Painters and their works, corresponding to his ARV. This is not that—though that is here described as being well advanced—but the closest approach to it so far. It is an admirable and more welcome thing. Attribution is not enough; and it is we who must remembe that Beazley's tireless employment of his unequalled eye for individual styles has set such a fashion in the study of Greek pottery, should sometimes show us as clearly as here that broad grasp of the nature of art and style without which detailed study is barren. There is much illuminating and delightful detail in the book, but its purpose is to trace the main lines of development, and many corners are left altogether unexplored: 'Tyrtæian' vases, for instance, are only incidentally in an occasional footnote; the mannerist fringe beyond the Amasis Painter (Affecter, Elbows Out) not, I think, at all.

Chapter 1, after defining the black-figure technique, the author glances at the development of vase-painting in Athens from Procoetes to Exekias, and traces it closely through the seventh century, up to the moment before the adoption of full black-figure by the Nessos Painter and his companions. A debt to Corinth is often noted here and hereafter, and often with a valuable characterization of black-figure in relation to Greek art as a whole. The book goes on to discuss the great painters of the latter seventh century and their sincerer successors of the early sixth, running into the second and third quarter with C Painter. Chapter 3, one of the most fascinating, is devoted to the Forms, and its portrait painter; Chapter 4 to their contemporaries, painters more monumental than Kleitias, the Painter of Acropolis 606, Nearcho, and especially Lydos, who carries on into the next generation. Chapter 5 covers the Little Masters, other cup painters, and the Amasis Painter; Chapter 6, Exekias, with a word or two at the end about others: Nikosthenes and the painters who worked for him, and other better men. The last sentence of this chapter should be engraved on all our minds: 'The lesson is that fine work may be found on vases which cannot be assigned to any of the noted artists.' Chapter 7—Late Black-figure—falls into two parts: the generation of the invention of red-figure (Andokides Painter, Psiax, Antimenes Painter, Amphiklymenus, Strato, corresponding to the red-figure Pioneers). The final chapter, on Pharnaces, picks up earlier threads and carries on the story through the fifth and fourth centuries with a glance at the Hellenistic age.

The illustrations are a good picture of the development and achievements of the style, and the accompanying material (column-krate of panathenaic by Lydos, pls. 15, 18; the strange Amasis cup, pl. 26, 4; fr. by Exekias, pl. 27, 3) are on the whole well reproduced, through no fault of the author's the backgrounds have been painted out.

A few points of detail. P. 36: for a possible Portuguese version of the Dionysian work. P. 37: Corinthisch geomancy with deformed pyramids (frr. of Transitional olpe in Leiden, Brants, pl. 12, VIII, 8. 9, Nero-corinthian B. pl. XLI, 31. 3, 5. 9. P. 40: Acropolis 606—Is not the fallen man on the Lydos of 1928, exposition,? P. 42: a model for the body of a hero, rather than simply a fight in which one man has already fallen. P. 44, line 9: for 21 read 19. P. 55: eleven lines from the bottom: for 'horses' read 'hales'. P. 68, pl. 27, 3: the body of a horse looking much greater than that above Tyndareus's, and he may have been seated. P. 91: I do not understand why the fr. by Lydos in Chicago should be later than the Florence Panathenaic, which is at instant to the late ornament of Berlin. P. 92: the Mastos Painter seems to me in my Nautilus Pindaric, no. 37, to be nearer in feeling to Exekias than the Andokides Painter or any other of the circle ever gets; I could imagine that he is the hand behind the Vatican mourner (pl. 53, 54. P. 74). P. 108 (p. m. p. 25): another current seventh-century by Zeus in the presentation scene on the B.M. Phrynos cup (pl. 21). P. 109, n. 44, four lines from the bottom: for 'Neoptolemos' read 'Achilles'. P. 119, Chapter VIII, n. 6: the Burgon amphora has been cleaned, and the animals are clearly horses.

The book is full of illuminating accounts and suggestions: distinction between Lydos himself and his workshop (p. 49); assessment of position of Heidelberg Painter (p. 50); importance of Amasis as potter (p. 62); development of Exekias (pp. 84 ff.); distinctions in Nikosthenes's workshops (p. 73); the Antimenes Painter perhaps a pupil of Lydos (p. 79); and immemorial others. A book to instruct and delight scholars and laymen alike.

Martin Robertson.


The choes, small vases few of them of any size, of which almost every Museum has an example, delight us with their shape and pictures. They also stimulate our scientific curiosity whither they are connected with the Anthestheria festival at which such vases were dedicated, the Anthestheria.

The idea of collecting all known choes is an old one, but after the premature death of Frickenhaus, it remained unfilled. Deprived of some sort of systematic method, we have created a number of little choes. He then reckoned the number of choes known at about 400 (p. 95). But Deubner's contribution was mainly philological, a critical working over of the written sources. Professor Van Hoorn's book, the publication of which we have awaited with undiminished interest, has shown how much richer the scattered material is. Over 1000 choes are included in his catalogue. Apart from many unpublished vases in Museums, it enumerates also the material in private collections which are difficult of access, and has also collected statuette choes for the first time.

It is clear that a long and conscientious pursuit and collection of the material and diligent autopsy in many Museums has been needed for this work. The author's chief object has been the descriptive catalogue, with which some two-thirds of the book, and only what is left is devoted to the text. In the sixty pages of the text, in large type and with broad margins, the author sets out briefly what he believes to emerge from the process of demonstration on the choes. The work is extremely detailed, not only unexplored, such as the heroi gamos, to which only a few lines are devoted. In the ceremony of the Swinging the aetiological myth is not alluded to, though the two beautiful choes of the Viastos Collection and New York (f igs. 10 and 12) give occasion for an extensive elucidation of this ceremony. The author avoids heortological questions presented by the choes themselves, and there are many queries to which he gives no answer. The author refers to the subjects on the choes with equal brevity, some would prefer if the author took a more important, those which are of special artistic interest or whose content is rare. In the chapter Artistic competitions the important questions raised by the few choes with representations from the sancta are not touched on at all. In vain among the illustrations for the choes in Lemnian with child actors (in the relevant bibliography, catalogue no. 858, add the sole publication from photographs, Beethe, Griechische Dichtung, pl. VIII). In his very general account of the theatrical choes the author does not indicate at all on which of the three days of the festivals these representations could be placed. We are not accustomed to this timeless and placeless exposition of the elements of this festival. Buschor in his brief account (AM I, pl. 15, and more broadly Deubner in his book, try as far as possible to follow the participants in their three-day programme.

The author is guided by sound judgement in not illustrating or relating to the Anthestheria certain rather larger choes, mainly with a biological, particular interest, such as the symbolic relation to Dionysos. Indeed, the opposite problem presents itself, whether the pictures on the festival choes are to be not always referred to the Anthestheria, but to other festivities of the year. It is pitiable to think, that the Amasis Painter on his late oenoechoe represented feasters at the Anthestheria moved by the state organisation of this feast about that time.

The beginning of the choes is carried back by the author (1920, p. 156) to 253 B.C.; and he accepts their use in Protociotic too. Here it could have been demonstrated, as a prelude to the later choes the nice Protociotic child's choes from the Kerameikos, Athens N.M. 206 (C.C., no. 399: 371 II, 1187, fig. 13).

The chapter on Technique of the Cho ses could be supplemented by a brief examination of the shape. H. R. W. Smith


"Travaux mythographiques" have long occupied scholars of classical myth and religion, and by now the literature devoted to many subjects or scenes has become formidable. Not only can any work involving the collection of representations remain definitive for long, but can at the best reassemble what is known and adjust our attitude to the myth in the light of any additional material. Such works may be designed for the archaeologist and give full lists and descriptions avoiding overmuch entanglement in religion or cult; this omission may sometimes be welcome, but the picture is incomplete and may result in a resultant confusion of reference which should be more a guide to the interpretation of incomplete or obscure representations. More rarely, all other sources are assembled and discussed as fully as the monuments; the result may then be both the better for being complete and the more likely to being overburdened. The books under review here represent much of the best in each approach. Vian's two books on gigantomachies mark him out as himself a giant-killer. He has already tackled other aspects of the subject, such as REDA and RA, and more is promised. In La guerre des géants, for which the Répertoire provides lists and illustrations, he discusses the monuments and literary sources, both extant and hypothetical, for the myth before the Hellenistic period. Le mythe des déesses de Kromos, and the Giants, rebellious children of Ge, are fairly distinguished. Early representations of Zeus' duel with centaurs or Typhon are associated with the former while true gigantomachies appear first only toward the middle of the sixth century. The battle scenes he describes are essentially oriental and Egyptian schema of god or pharaoh grouped with falling or fallen enemy, as is the Zeus and Heracles combination fighting from the chariot and not dismounting as parables in the Homeric myths. The battle scenes are unity to their stature of bestiality. The gods often muster the same order of battle; thus a central group of Zeus in the chariot, Heracles shooting from the timon, Athena beyond the horses and a supernaturally large Zeus, which are a considerable fragmentary Acropolis vases which Vian for the most part convincingly restores. Poseidon breaks Nysros from Cinos to crush and bury a giant; Hera's role as decoy for Porphyryion and her lively participation in the battle remind us that she was not always Juno-esque; Dionysos uses animals, the Letoicis bows and arrows. Athena in a stilly archaic Promachos pose con-

fronts a falling giant and only relaxes on later-sixth-century scenes, where further dissemination of the theme is apparent. Driving a chariot drawn in three-quarter view, she rides down a giant, Heracles descends from the chariot as sometimes does Zeus. As Athena is more prominent in Athenian art (a characterisation among c. 26 black-figure gigantomachies) so Delphic representations give place of honour to the Letoicis. Etruscan versions offer characteristically barbaric features. In the fifth century Dionysos' entourage with satyrs and maenads appears. The Dioscuri Phidias the giants are becoming bestial in appearance and eventually anguiped, and discarp armour and sword for skins or stones and branches. The Parthenon metopes and the painted decoration within the Athenian temple, such as the Siphnian Salis and the Pergamene Salis (on p. 115 a reconstruction derived mainly from vase paintings) were rather conservative in these figures and Iain perhaps exaggerates Phidias' influence as responsible for the reshaping of the myth in art which is apparent in his works and unduly assigns any major painting while I may have influenced the vase scenes.

A second part of the book is devoted to literary sources and religious matters. Giants are found in the Odyssey, not the Iliad, and it is difficult to tell whether Homer or Hesiod knew of a written Gigantomachy. Iain argues that in the Bibliotheca of Ps-Apollodorus is preserved the outlines of the archaic story, and a descriptively fragmentary passage of Aematus is adduced to provide a rougher outline of the more barbaric poetic series well for the dependance of the representations on a literary text, but the scenes do not appear until the time when Pythagoras inaugurated the Panathenaic Games in part commemorating the Olympian victory and incidentally providing the mythic imperialisation of the world. It is not possible to say that the same occasion crystallised the elements of the myth to the standard story which inspired the artists of that period. It is noteworthy that 'Götterversammlungen' appear with growing frequency on Athenian vases in this time, and the Olympians fight and sit together as a family at last, and another generation of scholars might have paralleled the phenomenon second to a Pythagorean's aid to Homer and Hesiod in giving the Greeks their gods. Further correspondences with archaeological data are sought in the term 'overthrown' (in a racing metatation is found in some gigantomachy chariot scenes), the Pyrrhic dance, the Athena type, and the embroidered scenes on the goddess' peplos—motifs not convincingly significant in this context. Throughout Iain gives all necessary references and pursues various relevant diversions from the theme. His interpretation of the monuments is thorough, and his command of the material justifies some other otherwise bold restoration of fragmentary vases or worn metopes. Discussing the myth in religion, he is more often led to giants than gigantomachy, which as a rationalised story given literary coherence rather derives from isolated cult practices, beliefs, and stories than influences them. His presentation of the evidence for an archaic date, though his criteria are too few, is sometimes convincing and he presses too far the theory of the origin of the myth in 'confréries' of giants. On the whole the results of his patient sifting of evidence are more sound when that evidence is material than when it is literary or mystic.

The Répertoire lists 558 Greek and Roman representations of the myth, including combats against Typhon, many monomachies and monuments illustrating the development of the giant in art; within this scope it includes little which is double and always acknowledges it if doubt is justified (however, 408 plates should be struck out). He illustrates nearly one-sixth of the monuments he lists in figures which are small, and some indifferently reproduced. The lack of detail in them is a mark concerned rather with subject than style, but his interpretation of some scenes rests on details invisible in his illustrations. Hardly any have not been published before (no. 95 is republished incompletely). A contention to caster. Iain has his reasons omitted from them are recorded.

Clairmont writes for the archaeologist and tackles his theme in two parts. In the first he lists 688 Greek, Etruscan, and Roman scenes of the Judgment of Paris in its context of being made by earlier scholars. The objects are described and discussed where their original publication is wanting, and many vases are illustrated for the first time. Greek vases supply over two-thirds of the catalogued scenes, and there is considerably more work on Etruscan vases. The second part is devoted to a brief discussion of the role and appearance of thearbiter, usher, and competitors with other figures divine or semi-divine who appear sometimes in the public gallery. The prize-attribute, goat, is set on a Gorgon's head on the backs of vases illustrating the Judgement receive attention. As the interrelation of back and front is so often ignored by iconographer and archaeologist, the latter is
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especially welcome in a work of this kind. We miss a more
general discussion embracing the literary sources (which
are not ignored as well as the monuments, and the combina-
tions and permutations of lists reflect the diligent scholar-
ship of the writer with a facility that it is almost like to identify
this characteristically Greek story of a beauty contest which
started a war. But the author promises no more in the title.
The references to each item are generally full, although for
the red-figured Attic vases the restriction might be as well as
the base ARV? reference; the artist of K. 500 and others
in the Antinomes Painter not Antinomes, K. 38 was attributed
in Met.Mass.Stud. V 114 no. 84, K. 43 are fragments of stands,
the museum number of K. 48 bis is Mykonos KZ 1125, and K. 59
is telling the best story; but the numbering is faultless. Omissions
are rather than inclusions, although the Alexanders of Louvre
F 66 (CVA VIII, pl. 77, 12; Beazley, JHS LIII, 310) might
have found mention beside the other exerpts and line figures
listed. Another reference, for an earliest-ever judgement of Paris,
perhaps later than the Cigi vase illustrated, but before the Sparta
ivy comb (K. 3), is the 'Agamemnon' of BSA XXXV, pl. 54 f.;
the inscription may be as well read A[A]a[?][a]d[?][a] on the analogy of the Aeginetan lambada of the
Menelaus stand (Jeffery, JHS LXIX, 26; Rumpf, Maq., 31).
Some identifications are based on the presence of Hermes,
august ubiquitous in mythological scenes, a figure seated on a
rock, groups of women, some with men attendant, running
figurines as regards a figure in Perseus and the like; etc.: they do
not all convince. K. 6 is most doubtful and the 'godess' is a
male. An 'error' in the identification of Hermes' arm on K. 7
is pointed out on p. 17, yet made on p. 16. The arm is surely
Hermes', as the preserved part of Paris' drapery suggests that
he does not appear leading his legs towards the front, but
wrongly drawn—as is that of the second goddess, whose
left hand must it be we see—and the gesture is as on K. 8.
Plate references to Chalkihske Vases for K. 7 (pl. 134-8) are
counting. The actual West frieze of the Siphon treasury at Delphi,
is identified more convincingly thus liths, although there
is no near contemporary parallel for the moment depicted
with Athena and Hera leaving court and Aphrodite just arriving
on the stand. Since publication K. 29 has been illustrated
in Berlin, pl. 1 K. 73 with a picture in JHS LXII, pl. 39f.,
while Baige Vente Publique XI, no. 319 and PAE 1951,
125 f., have appeared. Misprints are scattered and unimportant (Roman figure II is regularly prioritised).
The production of the book and quality of the paper are excellent and the plates printed (no late dupli-
figure lekythos can be so fully illustrated as K. 116).
The writing is lively and the indexes full; the book is a pleasure
to handle, as well as being a mine of information.

JOHN BOORDMAN.

C. R. C. and T. R. Hamondsworth: Penguin Books,
1952. Ps. 41, 48 pl. 6, 6d.

Whether coinage was the invention of the Greeks of western
Asia Minor or their neighbours the Lydians may still be an open
question. But it was the Greeks who succeeded in combining
in the best possible way the means of economic
success and the means of civic glory, and the means of civic
success and the means of civic glory, and the
means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic glory, and the
means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
and the means of civic success and the means of civic glory,
Macedonia, including the Chalcidice, through Thrace, to Illyria, Epirus, Acarnania, and the islands off the Epirote coast. The majority of the coins are from the collection of Colonel Leake and reflect, though not perhaps to the extent that might have been expected, his 'Travels in Northern Greece'. Leake had by this time a number of specimens (of the kind) from the catalogue of certain South Illyrian or North Epirote mints serves to emphasise the small scale of their coinages and to console more recent collectors who have similarly failed to acquire them.

If the catalogue contains few specimens of outstanding interest, it nevertheless provides a valuable body of material for reference or research. As series the Alexander tetradrachms, including posthumous issues, and drachms (nos. 2106-2187, 2190-2247) are especially significant. The reverse of one of them (no. 2187) is a distinctive type from a unique bronze coin of Philip II (2434). An interesting and rare piece is the coin of Ichna (no. 1900): here, the style, strongly reminiscent of Akanthos, does nothing to contradict Svoronos' attribution of coins of this type to a mint in the Strymonian district. Less certain is the tentative attribution, following Svoronos, of no. 1901 to Aineia: coins of this type, showing a cow sucking a calf, with the legend 'En ...' have long been claimed to be of this place, but the indefinite heading 'Uncertain Mints, Thracio-Macedonian region'. So, too, must no. 1992, which is assigned with even greater reserve to Thracia.

The catalogue has, again, admirably compiled by Professor H. Menzler. Merely, however, would have looked for the coins of Neapolis (nos. 1971-82) under the heading Thrace while Damas in (nos. 2571-4), although correctly defined as Ilyrio-Paeconian, is still given an Ilyrio-Paeconian context. Sometimes an individual plate, e.g. the relevant plates, even though these face the catalogue. The plates themselves, unfortunately, are of variable quality, and in general fall short of the standard required for and deserved by a work of this nature.

J. M. F. MAY.

Antioch-on-the-Orontes, IV part 2: Greek, Roman, Byzantine and Crusaders' Coins. By Dorothy E. Newell. (Oxford: Oxford University Press). Pp. 82, 120 ill. Students of coin-circulation in the ancient world will be indebted to Mrs. Waage for this detailed catalogue of over 14,000 coins found in the excavations at Antioch and Seleucia Pieria. It should perhaps be pointed out that the 'Greek' coins, apart from those of the Seleucid kings and of other Hellenistic rulers and cities, are largely of the Roman period and issued in the name of Roman emperors. (Find s of Arab coins from the same sites have not been included in this work.)

The work is carried out on a lavish scale, with some good illustrations. There is, however, a minimum of interpretation, beyond the bald statement in the preface (p. x) that 'At no time during this is, in the capital of the Seleucid empire, was a single coin found that can be verified from the excellent charts, which are a must for the factor and present a good summary of the essentials. Thus, in the Seleucid period, only a little over a hundred coins, out of a thousand, are of mints other than those of the capital. The Seleucid empire had more than one currency needs; and indeed was able to supply other areas, as far afield as, e.g. Dura-Europos (as emerged from the Dura finds, published by A. R. Belling in Dura, Final Report II). During the Antioch the three centuries of the Roman Empire, Antioch continued to supply the bulk of its own currency. The Antiochene issues of Roman emperors, usually inscribed in Greek save for the Latin form s, 'SEXTI AVG', outnumbered the imperial Roman currency at Antioch, by far more than three to one. The long and regional issue, which Michael Grant has done much to define and emphasise in recent years, could hardly be more strikingly demonstrated. Some change may be perceived during the first half-century forming the same organisation and system: the products of the Antioch mint occurring in the finds now have a somewhat reduced majority of less than two to one (of the pieces with identifiable mint-marks).

The tendency evident on the author's point to wish to attribute the mention above listed coins which are better attributed to other mints. For instance, on p. 7 it is argued, albeit not in the least dogmatically, that certain Seleucid issues attributed by Newell to Apatamea may have all after have been struck at Antioch; but it seems to the reviewer that the attribution to Apatamea remains unshaken, and that it is natural enough for coins of Apatamea to have found their way to Antioch. Again, there is the case of nos. 900 ff., Greek inscribed coins of Trajan previously attributed to Caesarea in Cappadocia; but here regarded as products of the Antioch mint, on the strength of the number of specimens found. Here it must be remarked that too many of the specimens found seems to be found from Caesarea, and that the coins differ radically in type, style, and fabric from known Antiochene issues. They are in fact, unnecessarily intrusive into the very homogeneous Antiochene series, and the attribution to Caesarea is a case of mistaken identity.

But a catalogue of this sort is a great task, and it has on the whole been successfully carried out. One is reluctant to make small criticisms, though there are one or two that should be mentioned. The curious convention of describing several reverses under the name of the emperor, the absence of any mention of a possible preface, for its advantages are dubious, and it even at times makes it more, rather than less, difficult to recognise what is being described. There is a fair crop of misprints, which, if anyone were to attempt an expensive (and expensive) book. Finally, the datings of coins nos. 266 and 297-9 need to be revised in the light of Henri Seyrig's important article on eras in Syria 1950, which evidently cannot have been available in time for its results to be used here.

G. K. JENKINS.

Bilicht über einige Reise in Bithynien. By F. K. DÖRRNER. (Osterreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philo-

Hist. Klasse, Denkschriften, 75, 1 Abh.). Vienna: Rohrer, 1952. Pp. 75, 50 ill. £1 7s. 6d.

Since before the war Dr. Dörner has been engaged in the collection of material for his volume of the 'Reise in Bithynien' and his 'Vorarbeiten' in this field began in 1941 with the substantial Inschriften and Denkmaler aus Bithynien (Istanbul Forschungen, 14), and after the war he was able to carry out a further volume in 1948, I. Dörner's report of this journey appeared in his Die Inschriften aus Bithynia, 1949 (12), and particular points were dealt with in Kleinaustische Forschungen, II 1951, 9-46, and in Studies Presented to D. M. Robinson, I. 1951, 373-9. The present volume contains the fruits of the detailed investigation which may be said to have followed his Bithynien-Claudopolitan, and their chora, carried out on this same trip.

In general, the inscriptions of Bithynia are more rewarding to the antiquarian than they are to the historian in search of the political history of Asia Minor, and this volume is no exception. The majority of the inscriptions are funereal, though there are a few honorary dedications. Very few of the texts are earlier than the second century A.D., and our lamentably slight direct knowledge of Hellenistic Bithynia is not increased. However, although the material is mostly of relative unimportance, D. has published it with great care. The texts themselves are mostly well preserved, and raise few or no difficulties in the way of translation. At the same time, the comprehensive photographs with which D. has been able to enrich the volume permit us to see at a glance the development of the lapidary style of these two cities in the second and third centuries of the Christian era. One satisfactory aspect is that D. has been able to bring together inscriptions previously known (mostly in IGR III, 66 ff.), and rediscovered by him, and also able to correct existing supplements in the light of his new texts.

D.'s commentary is brief. In regard to the antiquities and history of Prusa he properly leaves his discussion to his article on that city to appear in Pauly-Wissowa's Realencyclopädie (see Bericht, p. 7), though he gives a very clear account of the geography of the region. The brevity is rather to be regretted; the most interesting texts, and a few points where I disagree.

Prusa ad Hyphasis: 4: a lengthy honorary inscription erected by abadus in honor of their king Pausanias (60 B.C.); this enables D. to improve some supplements in the texts of the series IGR III, 66 ff., 1421 ff. (His correction of ibid, 50, 1, 2, δέκαπτα του ἱπποτα, 'it can not be - πρῶτον ἱπποτα gelaueht haben', is difficult to accept. Mommsen's reading, based on a squeeze.) 7: a dedication in honour of M. κόρης Μενοβίας Κλάους δο ρόγιοντας. The latter word is claimed by D. as δείκνυς λογιστικός. 9: another dedication to Hadrian, to a πέλατος διώκτη, further described as δομικός. 10: another dedication to Hadrian, to a πέλατος διώκτη, further described as δομικός. 11: a dedication to abadus (not previously attested at Prusa), and as ἱπποκάμπως ἱπποκάμπως ἱπποκάμπως. The phrase is ἵπποκάμπως ἱπποκάμπως, which occurs only at Prusa in IGR III, 66, is extremely rare. It is possible that it may be found in other inscriptions or in the more specific κασατο (with which, as associated in both inscriptions of the office of ἱπποκάμπως, it no doubt refers). 12: apparently a fragment of an official instruction,
NOTICES OF BOOKS

perhaps prohibiting the cutting of wood. 15: Δίος Στασίας Γάους Κονδώρλον την πλευρική τον βούμι κ. των ιδίων σεμνούσται να δείξει νέος σημνότητο στον ιοτο ιελλίας με ως πλευρική (see pl. 6). This phenomenon, the main purpose of which was to distinguish syllables, is found in inscriptions of the second century A.D.: see, e.g. IG II, 210 (for οίκος); IG III 36 (for κόσμος); IG IV 37, 2 (for πολιτεία). The emphasis on friendship in lines 1-3, ευνοϊκος καθ' εαυτόν, ευνοϊκός καθ' εαυτόν, ευνοϊκός καθ' εαυτόν, ευνοϊκός καθ' εαυτόν. B: interest palaeographically by reason of the two dots over the iota of ιελλίας in line 8 (see pl. 6). This phenomenon, the main purpose of which was to distinguish syllables, is found in inscriptions of the second century A.D.: see, e.g. IG II, 210 (for οίκος); IG III 36 (for κόσμος); IG IV 37, 2 (for πολιτεία). The emphasis on friendship in lines 1-3, ευνοϊκος καθ' εαυτόν, ευνοϊκός καθ' εαυτόν, ευνοϊκός καθ' εαυτόν, ευνοϊκός καθ' εαυτόν. B: interest palaeographically by reason of the two dots over the iota of ιελλίας in line 8 (see pl. 6).

the imperial titles of Hadrian. Hadrian's interest in the city derived from the fact that it was the native city of Antinoos (cf., below, 78), and it may well be, as D. suggests, that the building attested by this fragment was dedicated by the emperor after the death of his favourite. 74: a list of persons with the office of aegitogenes and gymnasiarch, established an agon to Zeus Kautopdo. D. says, 'The Beinames of Zeus scheint an keltische Sprachformen anzuklingen', and he may well be right: see Holder, Alkelt. Sprach. s.v. Quaedariz, Quaedariz, Quaedariz, Quaedariz.

les inscriptions grecques du temple de Hatshepsout à Dier el-Bahri


An inscription first published in 1927 revealed the existence in 261-60 B.C. in the ruined temple of Hatshepsout of a cult dedicated to Anubis. The temple was one of the new sanctuaries with Imhotep-Akepsilon and his daughter Hygieia. Graffiti discovered on the walls of the shrine have been published by many scholars, notably the late J. G. Milne, who copied all and published, in a very exhaustive study of the case of the Graffiti, a possibility. D. does not envisage: the omicron are written consistently as omega. 154: a tombstone erected by a family in Italy. 155: a tombstone erected by a family in Italy. 156: a tombstone erected by a family in Italy. 157: a tombstone erected by a family in Italy. 158: a tombstone erected by a family in Italy. 159: a tombstone erected by a family in Italy. 160: a tombstone erected by a family in Italy. 161: a tombstone erected by a family in Italy. 162: a tombstone erected by a family in Italy. 163: a tombstone erected by a family in Italy. 164: a tombstone erected by a family in Italy.
expression or content: the same _formulae_ recur ad nauseam with only those variations caused by grammatical or orthographical idiosyncrasies. But from the collection as a whole at least three important deductions may be made about healing cults in general and this cult and its clientele in particular. In no age, it seems, was there a more widespread and constant reminder of the tremendous popularity of these healing cults and their early adoption by the Greeks in Egypt. The writers of our texts came for the most part as pilgrims, not as sightseers, to seek the help of a healer whose dealings had already become legendary. They found the indigenous deity with no Hellenic associations, who yet appealed to Hellenised Egyptians and even Greeks, whose cult was more popular even than that of Asklepios at Dér El Bahari, which by this time had become so demotic but Greek for all that. On the other hand, this ignorance of their _εὐήλογοι_ ὑγρομενοι and consequent readiness to adopt an alien tongue is not unexpected in view of the traditional priestly monopoly of writing. Thirdly, the psychology of the average pilgrim is illuminated by the frequent examples of repetition of the same name or group of names, confirming that his chief motive in writing was the desire to perpetuate his own name and so ensure the survival of his own person, or whatever element represented it after bodily death. Clearly such a belief would have lent little of its ancient magical significance for the inhabitants of Egypt, for few even dated their _grafiti_. Few indicated their own place of origin, few recorded their trade or profession; yet 76 ends with συγγενεῖς ἡμῶν, a term which has had little of its ancient _nomos_ status.

Further points of general interest are the evidence for the progressive disappearance of the dative in favour of the genitive (e.g. 2, 77), the abundance of names unknown from the _Namensbuch_ (e.g. in 4, 15, 66), the use of nominative forms in (12, 55) early in the Hellenistic era, and in (48) the presence of the genitive; and not least the variety and realism of the drawings (e.g. 29, 33, 69, 169, 189, and 190–3).

All the texts and drawings are reproduced with facsimile accuracy; they were, with the exception of the most recent, hampered by the lack of bibliographical and descriptive detail. Few are completely lacking in interest. One of the fascinating groups comprises 43, 48, and 49, all the work of a Macedonian, Andromachos, who in (43) describes himself as ἀρησις ἡμῶν, giving the date of his visit as early as the Ptolemaic era, and in (48) records the circumstances of his case, retracing his name in deep, large letters in 49. In 82, from the first or second century A.D., is dedicated to Memphis, as well as Ammonios, because the Theban necropolis was a tourist of Greek tongue the domain of Menunou, the Muawwana. 86–89 are closely interconnected—66, the original _prosyzmena_, has a magical or Gnostic addition in 87, associated with it in 88, and in 89 a Christian endorsement probably intended, like the _Γενεαλογία_, as a form of bibliographical and descriptive detail. One feels his guiding hand also in the footnotes to the bibliography in which he points out that books with a later date than 1047 are added but not taken into account in the text. These last years considerable progress has been made in the study of our four Styllarids, and we must expect that the connection which Mme Verdiel sees between a number of signs of the Kontakaria notation, i.e. the _great signs_ attributed to Koukouzeles; the relationship of both is made evident by the tables on pp. 200–9.

On pp. 200–1 there is a consistent error, which one feels his guiding hand also in the footnotes to the bibliography in which he points out that books with a later date than 1047 are added but not taken into account in the text. These last years considerable progress has been made in the study of our four Styllarids, and we must expect that the connection which Mme Verdiel sees between a number of signs of the Kontakaria notation, i.e. the _great signs_ attributed to Koukouzeles; the relationship of both is made evident by the tables on pp. 200–9.

Another small point for reference is the wide influence of the Charrtes fragment, of which folios 62r and 63r are given on Plate VI; the text of the two Stycheres is quoted by A. Gasouil in p. 97 of his Catalogue des manuscrits de musique byzantins, from which Plate VI is taken. The Stycheres fragments that have been cut out from the Athos MS. Laura B 67, as Styllard has already stated in _BZ_ XIX, 96, n. 1.

These points, however, are all of minor importance compared with the value which this laboursomely compiled material will have for the progress of our studies. Now that the identity of a number of melodies from the Hirmologion and Sticherarium in both Byzantine and Slavonic MSS, has been shown—as one can see from the examples given on pp. 192–5—the bold step has been taken of translating some of the Slavonic hymns and placing them at the disposal of Eastern Liturgical students. For the student of the Christian Stchant in general Mme Verdiel’s work has given another proof of the importance of the role of Byzantine hymnography in the conversion of the Slavs.

E. J. WELLESZ.

---


We must be grateful to the late Thomas Whittemore, to whose enterprise Byzantine studies owe so much, for having asked Professor C. Hœg in 1948 to publish Mme Verdiel’s doctrate thesis in co-operation with the Byzantine Institute of Princeton, with financial and technical assistance of the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique Française to cover the expense of illustrating the text with a great number of tables showing the different stages of Russian and Byzantine neumes notation.

Until the publication of Mme Verdiel’s book one had to rely on O. von Riesemann’s Die Notationen des Alt-Russischen Kirchengesanges (Leipzig, 1909), which was in the main a summary of the work done by Rjashki, Metallow, Smolenks, and other Russian scholars in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. In his article Zur Frage der Entzifferung alter byzantischer Noten, the late ed. (1924–26), Riesemann, however, following Proobrashenski’s line of investigation, had already proved the derivation of old Slavonic from Byzantine chant from the identity of Russian with Byzantine neumes.

These facts were nearly forgotten, and no further attempt to carry on these studies has been made since the study of Byzantine chant and its notation has been put on a broader basis.

Mme Verdiel therefore had to start from the beginning in order to produce a text-book which should give all the necessary information to scholars interested in the development of Slavonic chant. This needed a summing up of work of her forerunners in the field of Slavonic chant of the nine years since the death of Professor C. Hœg, who had already drawn attention to a list of early Byzantine neumes which differed from the usual type of notation (BSA XIX, 1912–13), i.e. the Kontakaria notation.

One of the most valuable details of Mme Verdiel’s investigation is her division of the Kontakaria-notation into two periods: (1) the first stage, dating from the ninth century, of which no Byzantine, but only Slavonic MSS, have survived, and (2) a later form which one finds in Byzantine MSS of the tenth century. This second form does not apply to the old form of neumes until the middle of the thirteenth century. The tables of the signs of the Kontakaria notation on pp. 141–3 give an excellent survey of this strange kind of musical notation which was given up in the twelfth century. Mme Verdiel is certainly right in comparing these signs with the great hypostases of the Koukouzelian notation, i.e. signs for the guidance of the singer who knew the music by heart. This discovery is even more important: it shows that Mme Verdiel sees between a number of signs of the Kontakaria notation and the ‘great signs’ attributed to Koukouzeles; the relationship of both is made evident by the tables on pp. 200–9.

On pp. 200–1 there is a consistent error, which one feels his guiding hand also in the footnotes to the bibliography in which he points out that books with a later date than 1047 are added but not taken into account in the text. These last years considerable progress has been made in the study of our four Styllarids, and we must expect that the connection which Mme Verdiel sees between a number of signs of the Kontakaria notation, i.e. the ‘great signs’ attributed to Koukouzeles; the relationship of both is made evident by the tables on pp. 200–9.

An other small point for reference is the wide influence of the Charrtes fragment, of which folios 62r and 63r are given on Plate VI; the text of the two Stycheres is quoted by A. Gasouil in p. 97 of his Catalogue des manuscrits de musique byzantins, from which Plate VI is taken. The Charrtes fragments that have been cut out from the Athos MS. Laura B 67, as Styllard has already stated in _BZ_ XIX, 96, n. 1.

These points, however, are all of minor importance compared with the value which this laboursomely compiled material will have for the progress of our studies. Now that the identity of a number of melodies from the Hirmologion and Sticherarium in both Byzantine and Slavonic MSS, has been shown—as one can see from the examples given on pp. 192–5—the bold step has been taken of translating some of the Slavonic hymns and placing them at the disposal of Eastern Liturgical students. For the student of the Christian Stchant in general Mme Verdiel’s work has given another proof of the importance of the role of Byzantine hymnography in the conversion of the Slavs.

E. J. WELLESZ.


The Sticherarium of the Gennadius has made an auspicious start on the laborious task of publishing a detailed catalogue of its vast wealth of material, collected with unfailing zeal throughout his long life by Joannes Koukouzeles, and now
splendidly housed on the slopes of Lycabettus in the charge of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens.

The purpose and scope of the whole collection are explained in the Preface, which gives a lucid survey of its multifarious contents (the book is not short). It is not the intent to present the catalogue of the present collection, but rather an account of the catalogue as a whole. The present volume marks only part of one of the seventeen main sections under which the library is classified ('Geography and Travel in the Near East from the earliest times to the present').

We have, accordingly, in the present volume a list of the full titles, with date and place of publication, of nearly 1100 works, followed by an Appendix giving over a hundred more, which are mentioned in the present work or in subsequent editions. The translations into another language are given separate numbers. The choice of the year of publication as the basis of arrangement is no doubt the best for practical purposes; and the usefulness of the work is much increased by the editor's invaluable notes on the various items, and by his admirable indexes (I. 'Travelers and Authors'; II. 'General') the latter comprising place-names, important persons mentioned by travellers, and topics of interest, not merely archaeological. For instance, 'Black, Mrs., (The Maid of Athens) gets five entries, Lady Hester Stanhope gets eight, Bandits (three), Brigands (four), Missionaries, in various towns and districts nearly twenty in all.

The notes provide a useful compendium of the more important works, for which all students of topography will be grateful, though opinions may differ as to the acc of summarising at some length the itineraries of such familiar works of Anatolian travel as those of Fellows and Arndell, whilst that of Spratt and Rich is not found here. The place-names may be similarly treated to leave out Adalia (above all) from the list of places visited. On the other hand, these notes will be particularly valuable to the searcher among unfamiliar works: such place-names are 'responsive and inaccurate' (No. 871) will help him quickly to sift those which do not match the Geonainde in this field. It may seem ungracious to draw attention to omissions, but when we find here nearly all the major works of travel in Greece and the Near East, we may wonder at the absence of Barker's Lacs et Pattes (Cilicia), Hogarth's Desa Cypria (from a particularly strong section of Cyprus), Manatt's Aegean Islands, and any of its topographical interest from the pens of Finlay or Sir W. M. Ramsay. As it is, we do wonder about this section No. 446 (the work of a French traveller to North Africa). There is no mention of Cartledge, no. 924 (Prince Roland Bonaparte's tour of Corsica)? This is not the only work with Napoleonic associations, for Pouqueville's Voyage en Mont is represented by the actual dedication-copy presented to Napoleon in 1805, as well as by versions in German and Italian.

Among many points of interest suggested by the perusal of the Index of Authors we may contrast the paucity of works by Robert men, women of letters (Durræl, no. 208, Harriet Martineau, no. 411, F. W. Newman, no. 535, Thackeray, no. 391), with the rich array of French writers, which includes Chateaubriand, A. Dumas, Flaubert, Lamartine, Pierre Loti, and Théophile Gautier. It was merely for the sake of completeness that Géa or Gédéon does not find a place in this Library. This is an example of the over-emphasis on little-known names, which is characteristic of the catalogue as a whole. The book is not perhaps entirely convincing, but one cannot grudge S. some such theme to bear him up in the labour of compilation which he has so admirably performed. For the student of the history and description of the Near East, a fair amount of space has been devoted to the subject—five subjects that happen to interest the author particularly are given a disproportionate amount of space.

On the other hand, the sixty-two small and inevitably rather arbitrarily chosen illustrations are poorly reproduced and might well have been omitted. Working in Basle, S. was in an exceptionally good position to avoid the isolation forced on most scholars by the war, and to keep in touch with developments on all sides. He made the most of the opportunity, and in this book makes it possible for others to profit from it too. In cases where I have been able to check him he has shown an impressive thoroughness, and in general good judgement, though there is perhaps inevitably a tendency to accept too uncritically the opinions of any writer on a subject in which he has no special interest. A book for which all classical archaeologists should be exceedingly grateful.

MARTIN ROBERTSON.


The title Orient Helles und Rom (the rest appears in sub-title form), is a misleading description of this very useful book. It is essentially a bibliography of works on classical archaeology published in the last ten years, exclusively for its bearing on Greek and Roman developments) produced during the decade 1939-49. As such it could hardly be bettered; but it attempts more, that the author tries to see the whole field in perspective and to recognise some kind of common character—a common style—in the archaeological research of this period. This side of the book is not perhaps entirely convincing, but one cannot grudge S. some such theme to bear him up in the labour of compilation which he has so admirably performed. For the student of the history and description of the Near East, a fair amount of space has been devoted to the subject—five subjects that happen to interest the author particularly are given a disproportionate amount of space.

On the other hand, the sixty-two small and inevitably rather arbitrarily chosen illustrations are poorly reproduced and might well have been omitted. Working in Basle, S. was in an exceptionally good position to avoid the isolation forced on most scholars by the war, and to keep in touch with developments on all sides. He made the most of the opportunity, and in this book makes it possible for others to profit from it too. In cases where I have been able to check him he has shown an impressive thoroughness, and in general good judgement, though there is perhaps inevitably a tendency to accept too uncritically the opinions of any writer on a subject in which he has no special interest. A book for which all classical archaeologists should be exceedingly grateful.

MARTIN ROBERTSON.


Among many other papers whose subjects range from ancient Egypt to Roman Gaul, this memorial volume includes important studies on topics more closely related to the scope of this section of the catalogue than the ivory plaque of a warrior from the Artemision at Delos, and the fifth-century B.C. bowl under the sacred way at Delphi; C. De Wit on the origin of the alphabet; M. -Th. Lenger on a papyrus fragment of Aeschines in Timarch. 53-4 (P. Found 222); M. Leroy and J. Menninger on the teaching of Greek; A. Seyfovy on the fifteen-liners summary of the story of the Judgement of Paris prefixed to some...
NOTICES OF BOOKS

The contents are: (i) pp. 5–60, text and translation; (ii) pp. 80–91, biographical notes; (iii) p. 91, notes on the text; (iv) pp. 99–123, der Dichter und sein Wer; (v) pp. 124–
No pretension is made, and none could be allowed, for the text. The principal fragments published in P. Oxy. xxi are repeated from the source with little change. For the rest, the text comes mainly from Dihl, including and adding to the offences against dialect, proosy, and palaeography with which it is bedaubed. The resource abundance (most of the notes in the text seem to be in the various eyes, καθοσ, Ἀργ., ἐρωτ., ἀτε, τινε (twice), γνώριμοι, οὗ οἶδα, and dozens more). There is no apparatus criticus. Opposite the text stands a translation into German verse, imitating the metre of the original wherever feasible.

The work of Alcæus is in some respects better than any of its predecessors. It is worth while, though not always easy to penetrate the mist of uncertainties stated positively, of particulars described as universals.
The Erläuterungen are not a commentary, but notes on selected passages, various in scope and quality. The text being what it is, the value of the notes is limited in advance; there are numerous useful observations.

D. L. PAGE.

Interpretationi Eschili. By A. MADDALENA. PI 6 +
The voice of Aeschylus says Signorelli that in his poem, has many notes and different people feel that different notes predominate. He himself will place chief emphasis on the note of sorrow, since he believes that sorrow is the centre of the poetry of Aeschylus. But sorrow has many aspects. It can appall the guilty, but it also comes to the innocent, and it can be active, but it can also be passive. 'Modi infiniti ha il dolore, e infiniti gradi: ma sempre è dolore.' These sententious banalities give a very fair notion of the general character of the book. The whole plan of the commentary, in separate chapters, for which sections will help the reader to understand the pattern of the work. The Agamemnon is discussed under the following headings: 'Giustizia,' 'Colpe e Sofferenze,' 'Il Guardiano, il Coro, l'Araco,' 'Cittenebra,' 'Cittenebra,' 'Cittenebra,' 'Cittenebra,' 'Ate, poi, la abbandona,' 'Ma il Bene trionfi.' So much of the book consists of translations and summaries, punctuated by aesthetic comments after the fashion of the remarks about 'sorrow' which I have paraphrased, that one wonders why the writer did not adopt the simpler plan of a running commentary. The actual views expressed, while in no way new, are for the most part sensible enough. Their lack of novelty would not be matter for reproach, were it not also true that they are too supportable, and cannot defeat critical scrutiny of the poet's text. But controversial issues are never discussed in detail; and without detailed discussion of controversial issues little can be said about the Prometheus trilogy, for example, that brings any profit. Brief notes at the end of this chapter provide a gloss to the ordinary commentaries, and acquaintanceship with the modern literature of the subject, but do little to remedy this deficiency. All quotations are in a prose translation which is accurate and seems to me to be in good Italian. M. is obviously a man of taste, and writes in an easy and agreeable style. But his book contains far too many of the vague and platitudinous generalisations that are typical of the 'aesthetic criticism' now so popular on the Continent to make it anything but dull reading. There are already far too many popular explications of the conventional view of Aeschylus; and any new general book about him is bound to be a bore unless its author can offer fresh and well-grounded opinions that rest upon a careful examination of the poet's difficult text. The requirement M. would not meet; and though it has its merits, they are of too negative a sort for them to excuse this failure.

HUGH LLOYD-JONES.

The light that shines forth from the histories of Herodotus that is contained in the 'Prometeo d'Eschilo' in the eyes of Signor Baglo is indeed a lurid glare. His book will at once take its place in a special section of the immense literature of this play, a section whose components give their readers, if not perhaps an entrance to a lively pleasure, at least an access to Lucio Félix-Faure-Goyau ('Un pressentiment poétique du Calvaire,' in Le Correspondant, 1914, 1175 f.), who was the first to suggest that Aeschylus, like Virgil, was vouchsafed a prophetic glimpse

manuscripts of the iliad, with comment on the literary and archaeological evidence for the apple of discord; R. Van Campenolle on Segesta, the first part of a study in which he examines ancient and modern theories on the origin of the Elymians, concluding that they are a Sicilian people, and traces the history of their relations with Greek culture down to 510 B.C.

T. J. D.


In the ninety-ninth pages of the Handbuch der Bibliothekswissenschaften devoted to classical antiquity, the student will find a sober and, in general, up-to-date account of the very little that is known about the libraries of Greece and Rome. In a branch of enquiry, the facts ' are mainly the review of the literature of the writer, and the amount of 'correction to be applied is determined by subjective considerations, the reader is well served by references both to sources and other points of view. It would be easy but unfair to quarrel with conclusions on particular controversies. Few in this country, for instance, will follow the authors in their restatement of the dogma firmly held on the continent (e.g. A. DAIN, Les Manuscris, p. 99) that it was the great library of Alexandria which perished in 47 B.C. Nevertheless, they ignore the negative theory that 'Did the best, in some cases the unique, copies of ancient authors perish in this fire? ' The absence of an agreed answer to such a question emphasizes the superficiality of our knowledge of ancient libraries.

E. G. TURNER.


Within the thirty-six pages of his inaugural lecture delivered at University College, London in 1947, Professor Cherny compresses a large amount of exact information available nowhere else. From the natural history of the papyrus plant, mode of manufacture (he decides that paste was not used), and the quality of the finished article; the make-up into rolls, and the sizes of books; the scribe's writing instruments (the Egyptian hieratic only a reed brush, not a pen), palette, and posture; the lay-out of the writing, methods of correction, punctuation, and illustration, even the probability of a book trade in copies of the 'Book of the Dead.' The closeness of C.'s inspection of the original material and the bibliographer's rigor applied to its measurement and tabulation will be of great service to the Hellenist who seeks to probe the known debt of Greece to ancient Egypt. The reviewer gladly acknowledges that he has learned much.

E. G. TURNER.


The relation between literature and its material means of expression is at no time of more interest than in Athens of the classical age, and though there is information to be gleaned from contemporaries, it needs interpreting particularly in the light of the practice of subsequent ages as we see it in the papyri. It is the particular merit of Professor Turner's inaugural lecture that it invokes the aid of archaeology and the vase paintings, as well as the manuscripts, in his argument. The paper is that is the closest and most convincing we have of the subject. It is a subject that demands considerable versatility; witness Professor Turner's exegesis of Aeschylus, Suppl. 944 st., on the one hand, and his fascinating pages on the development of the pen, on the other.

Perhaps more attention might have been paid to the implications for Professor Turner's argument of the knowledge of drama that Aristophanes and other comic writers take for granted in this treatment of Euripides, 480-400, might be cited as evidence of the common use of books in the later fifth century. And I am not convinced that the passage quoted on p. 17 from the Palamedes ' leads straight to the geography of the loss of the lost;' is it more than the cliché that, thanks to the invention of writing, the stay-at-home can keep in touch with friends abroad? But these are small points; unless Athens unexpectedly provides us with written material other than stones (ostreia are of little use here), it is unlikely that Professor Turner's essay, learned, humane, and wide-ranging, will be bettered.

C. H. ROBETS.
NOTICES OF BOOKS

of the Christian revelation; beside E. G. Harman (Aeschylus, Prometheus Bound, London, 1920), who argued that the play was an allegorical defence of Themistocles against his enemies; and beside J. M. Pryse (A New Presentation of the Prometheus Bound, London, 1925), who was one of the first to recognize that the play is a tragedy for Xerxes, the tyrant of Persia. First perceived the 'hidden meaning' of the Prometheus myth, and of having 'related it to mythology in general and to the ancient mystical anatomy which mythology includes' (p. 5), Hestia and the Aeschylian fragments. In this respect, the two figures of Xerxes and Themistocles, and the two figures of Prometheus and Zeus, alludes to the ancient Anatolian and the Iliadic tradition of the myth. In this sense, the play is a philosophical argument for the existence of a higher power, which controls the destiny of men. The Iliad and the Prometheus are both concerned with the question of the nature of power and its relationship to the individual. The Iliad deals with the power of the gods, while the Prometheus deals with the power of the individual. The Iliad is a tragedy because it deals with the power of the gods, while the Prometheus is a tragedy because it deals with the power of the individual.

HUGH LLOYD-JONES.


This book is clearly a labour of love, written by one who is, very probably, an effective lecturer; reduction to print is not always kind to his style (e.g. p. 162, footnote). It does not set out to be a critical study of problems, although the author is aware of some, at least, of them (cf. p. 69, note 2). It is useful, one hopes, in stimulating interest at the elementary level of those for whom it is designed; one should perhaps be unkindly put off by the tendency of the reviewer to quasi-superiority, especially at the opening of the many of the chapters: e.g. 'Hermione is a point verging on naiveté (e.g. last paragraph of ch. 6), but he is to be commended for his lively interest in contemporary transatlantic performances of ancient drama (e.g. pp. 22, 88, 9, 191).

JOHN G. GRIFFITH.


In this book the author builds, from the evidence of the dialogues, a comprehensive picture of the Academy and its students. He stresses the central importance of the Ideal Theory, relating it to the mathematical proportionality, the political teachings of the school, and the classificatory discipline which became a paramount interest. His account is at many points valuable and suggestive. This second edition is, it appears, distinguished mainly by expansion of the notes which appear at the end and which contain many useful suggestions. The edition would be still more useful if easier to relate to their context if indicatory numbers were inserted in the text itself; as it is, their manner of reference (to page and line) condemns the attentive reader to counting every time down a page of forty-three lines in order to find his cue.

D. TARRANT.

Plato's Statesman. A translation of the Politicus of Plato with introductory essays and footnotes. By J. B. Skemp. Pp. 254. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1952. 28s. A fresh study of the Politicus has indeed been long overdue, as the author of the present work remarks in his preface. This translation, accompanied as it is by full and valuable introductory and exegetical material, goes far to take the place of a new edition of the text itself.

Discussing the position of the dialogue in the development of Plato's political thought, Professor Skemp stresses its close relationship to the República, maintaining (again Grube and others) that the conception of the philosopher-king is not here abandoned, but is upheld in preference to use of the popular 'shepherd' metaphor—the latter properly the analogue for a divine ruler rather than a human statesman. The astronomical and religious implications of the myth are considered with thoroughness and profit. The probable relation between the Politicus and Aristotle's de philosophia is discussed in the light of Cicero's reference in de nat. deor. I. 13. In treating of the cosmology of the dialogue, its priority to the Timaeus is assumed, and the comparison of the two accounts is made on that basis. But in an argument of Mr. G. E. L. Owen's argument (since published, CQ, January—April 1953) that the Timaeus should be given an earlier than the customary dating. In this view Professor Skemp gives an interim and qualified ascertainment; we may hope that he will take part in the further discussion that may be expected on this matter.

For the translation, the established text is in the main followed, but some of Diósé's emendations and some of the translator's own are introduced and supported. The version gives easy and convincing aptitude and sound in detail. The passage beginning at 596d, on the various types of visual action, may be instanced for the felicitous rendering of a great variety of epiphanies. The method of 'running commentary' at intervals, favoured by Comford and Hackforth, is discarded for a continuous translation supported by ample footnotes where necessary; these are marked by equal erudition and humanity, and are indeed full of good things. The same is true of the detail of the opening essays, though at some points there is a marked omission of what may (e.g.) feel the present reviewer that the attempt to find a homiletical reference in the phrase ἐν ὁράσεως παθητικώς, Rep. 595b, is unsupported by the context of the passage and fails to carry conviction.

Platonists must all be grateful to Professor Skemp for this very valuable book.

D. TARRANT.


'The Little Library of Liberal Arts', to which this volume belongs, is a series of cheap, convenient texts and bibliographies, and including a number of translations from classical authors. Most of the Plato volumes are reprints of old versions (Jowett or F. J. Church), but Mr. Helmbold has provided a new Gorgias with a brief Introduction. It is a useful piece of work. H. follows Burren's text, except that he brackets a number of disputed passages as interpolations: 453B (σκιών 460α1–6, 505B3–4 (surely 55–6 must go too, if this is right?), 520α2–3, 525C4–5, 526B6–7. For most of these suggested omissions there are precedents, but H. is clearly inclined to detect interpolation freely; in a work of this scope it is, of course, impossible for him to argue the case.

One or two places in which the translation is misleading may be mentioned. At 496E Burren's text (with his punctuation) merely means: You may, in this, you are patriarchal. H., however, translates: 'You keep talking about food and drink ...'. This is probably wrong: see Burren on Phaedo 109E. At 501B2, the construction of the sentence seems confused at 481C 705B τίτων ἀρχαῖος is rendered 'my other love'; i.e. Alcibiades. There are, however, not many such slips, and on the whole the translation is a reliable guide.

H. does not seek any special elevation or distinction of style; but the characterization of Callicles raises, I think, an interesting issue. He says (Intro. p. viii): 'So far as Plato allows us to know, Callicles may have merely laughed or sighed or shaken hands all around when Socrates' final speech reached its great conclusion. I am not sure that we should be very surprised that Socrates' utterances by a more colloquial style than he allows Socrates (e.g. 482c–486d; 489b-c). Is this right? Callicles is a serious young man, and, I should have thought, not only a vehement speaker, ready to use phrases like ὑπερήφανος καὶ ἀλήθεια, but also a formal one: witness his repeated use of quotations and general 'bookishness'. But this is perhaps a topic which it would be worth while to debate in detail.

D. A. ROSS.


So much industry and ingenuity on the part of the author make it highly regrettable that his main conclusions must be
pronounced fundamentally unsound. He makes out a satisfactory case for regarding 
Laws and Epinomis as of a piece in thought and style; they are, he holds, genuinely Platonic; and their 'imoccurrences' are not to be laid at the door of Philip's influence; they can be cured by the theory that Plato left these works in an unfinished state. But he fails to prove that a 'deep chasm' separates Laws from the other works of Plato; that Plato here reintroduced or rather misinterpreted, levelled out, and trivialised his own philosophy, and wrote so feebly, faintly, and obscurely that the once clear light of 'the Platonic reason' must now be declared dim and blind.

Müller obtains this result by the method of verbal analysis. Such a method, he feels, if it is not carefully controlled, may be wholly misleading. A few instances of careless interpretation must here suffice. At 902a 9 he thinks Plato committed to the view that wrong-doing is no longer involuntary; his paraphrase omits μικρός, which shows how careful Finsler is of the polemic aspect of the question. When he discusses the matter. He outruns the text in finding one evil 'work-soul' in Laws X. In spite of the warning of 212b 6 μνήμη in 393b 1, he finds nothing 'mythical' in 393c-4. He finds a new brand of hedonism in Laws II and V, which is inconsistent with a new similarly distinct view of φύσις; φύσις is now piety, and piety is astronomy! The doctrine of the ψως which governs the universe receives scant consideration; Müller has made up his mind that the cosmos now is for Plato self-sufficient and divine. From the point of view of Rep the whole of Plato's doctrine is 'grotesque'. The chief basis of the argument is a series of alleged obscurities; it is curious that from this insipid gloom Müller does not scruple to draw very definite conclusions. The absence of similar results which he applied to his methods to Rep. Different things are said there about the different grades of virtue and of knowledge; it is easy to produce confusion by mixing them all together. It is typical that on quite inadequate. This procedure 549d to the end of Book VII is condemned as an interpolation.

In general, Müller fails to allow for the restricted nature of Plato's aim in Laws. There is, for example, nothing about the form of Good in Laws, but this fact does not prove that the dialectic briefly described in Laws XII is radically different from that of Rep. Nor does the absence of a detailed statement of the doctrine of Forms prove that Plato is now using the language of philosophy without its genuine sense. The absurdity of such statements is evident which are of great value to students of textual criticism. In order to recover the archetype reading, the readings of the sources have to be considered independently, while again and again the decision has to be made on internal grounds, observations holding true not only of the text of the 'Meditations', but also of any text to be published. In 2. 4 the diagrammata φύσις is removed with Randell, 2. 6 Gataker's διαφάνεια accepted with Farquharson, the genitive absolute δι' ευθύνης δυνάμεως (2. 11) well explained in the above-mentioned article, p. 54.

Both introduction and translation are masterly. The former is soberly and sensibly with what one may call the seamy side of the Symposium, and rightly emphasises the correlation between the Symposium and the Republic. For the translation of 7. 54 to Beauty in Diotima's speech is as near to Good in the Republic, which also uses the language of marriage and begetting (490b). The translation is remarkably lucid and readable. One would have liked to see some attempt to reproduce the stylistic flavour of Agathon's speech in euphonic English. Unnecessary freeness is rare: 'abundance for φαρμάκης (174a 7), 'abundant supplies' for διαφάνεια (202a 2), sal 49 omitted (210c 2). At 175b 6 συμφέρειν is rightly taken as indicative.


In his own words, the author, like too many others, had used the term 'catharsis' for what he took to be the 'psychic effects' of art. Later he decided to consult texts and commentators to see if Aristotle had used the word in a similar sense. In addition to Beauty in Diotima's special stress on the asceticism and of the ethical character of kingship, while no 4 is devoted to Epicteetes. The second passage deals with Providence (116). In CQ XLIIV (1950), 69, Zuntz discussed the connection between these passages and the 'pura et simplici' reference to ἑκάτην in the first place. It seems, however, more probable that the second ἑκάτην is due to faulty repetition, and other considerations support this view: in 16, 16 ἑκάτην appears first. Zuntz's reference to 16, 15 does not help, for there too both ἑκάτην and ἑκάτην appear, in this order. Lastly, the assumption of faulty repetition is facilitated by the preceding ἑκάτην. For these reasons I would read ἑκάτην in the first place.

The thirteen papyri of nos. 5 and 6 show the conditions prevailing among the Greek and indigenous population of Egypt. A few more notes on nos. IV and XII, explaining the second syntax, might have given the intended help to the student. Because of the full bibliography it appears helpful to W. Peremans and J. Vergote, Papyrologist handboek, 1949, should be added to the literature.

Interesting is the composition of nos. 4 (Asclepius). Four compositions, Epiphanes and Aristion. Aristion follows one of the quite different reactions to the text from the later papyri (Aelius Aristides) and Christian (Justinus Martyr) sides.

From Lucian's Alexander and Philopipes four paragraphs have been included in the study, and Paterinos (Alex. 30) is attractive, the interpretation of δαί (ib. 'each time') undoubtedly correct (cf. CQ XLIIV (1950), 70).

No. 9 (Phil's description of the Therapeutae) serves the purpose of the series well, and so do nos. 10-12 (Psalms of Solomon, Mesecian). Finally, no. 13 contains Theophrastus's views on superstition and true devotion.


The texts of the thirteen sheets have primarily been taken from the philosophical and religious literature. Each group of texts is preceded by a short bibliography. As the texts are meant for University use, the references to translations may only be of place.

In nos. 1-4 the Stoai is well represented. Nos. 1 and 2 contain passages from M. Aurelius. In the bibliography is a reference to Zuntz's 'Notes on Antoninus' (CQ XI, 1946, 363). A reference to 1. 18 used of passages in Aristobulus is given to 1. 80.

As there is no textual evidence for this view of catharsis (but rather the contrary), the author follows Finsler and Rostagni in leaning heavily on the assumption that Aristotle's treatment of both catharsis and imitation is meant as a 'strangely welladapted or more precisely: of the aporiai, which he has himself in his summary of Rep. X (on which he might well have consulted CQ XXX; 4), does little to fill the gap between the text and the gloss. Among minor blemishes one may note: an inaccurate and tendentious translation of 'Poetique' (p. 1) is a misprint, s. 8) 834b 12 ff.; the omission of five crucial words in the quotation from Ramblichus (p. 11); the neglect of the 'repugnant' quality in the plot of the Medea (p. 23); and certain incautious remarks on the poetic universal, which is said to be 'held to the intellect': 'all the characters are mere 'symbols', and that the 'reason' and 'law' inherent in the plot could be separately stated in plain prose.

J. TATE.


Both introduction and translation are masterly. The former is soberly and sensibly with what one may call the seamy side of the Symposium, and rightly emphasises the correlation between the Symposium and the Republic. For the translation of 7. 54 to Beauty in Diotima's special stress on the asceticism and of the ethical character of kingship, while no 4 is devoted to Epicteetes. The second passage deals with Providence (116). In CQ XLIIV (1950), 69, Zuntz discussed the connection between these passages and the 'pura et simplici' reference to ἑκάτην in the first place. It seems, however, more probable that the second ἑκάτην is due to faulty repetition, and other considerations support this view: in 16, 16 ἑκάτην appears first. Zuntz's reference to 16, 15 does not help, for there too both ἑκάτην and ἑκάτην appear, in this order. Lastly, the assumption of faulty repetition is facilitated by the preceding ἑκάτην. For these reasons I would read ἑκάτην in the first place.
This series fulfils its purpose: ideas and conditions of the Hellenistic world are clearly illustrated by well-chosen passages. Besides, the texts have not been mechanically reproduced, but are based on an independent study of the evidence. Therefore it is to be hoped that the field covered by the Hellenistic world be extended. For the sake of clearness, religious, philosophical, and profane texts could then be properly grouped.

A. H. R. E. PAP.


In 1936 Dr. van Straaten published in Fressch a level-headed study of the collection reviewed in this Journal, to which was subjoined a collection of the 'fragments' and testimonia. This collection is now reprinted separately with minor alterations. One fault of the original was that verbatim copying of the apparatus standard for Dionysius Halikarnassius was misleadingly appearing that Dr. van Straaten was claiming the credit for other scholars' emendations; this has been corrected. Some more scraps of Storcorus Index Heroularnesi has been added, but there has wisely been no concession to the critics who would have had him print more of Cicero. It might, however, have been useful to do more than is done in the preface to record the passages in various authors, including Cicero, that have with more or less plausibility been alleged to have a Panatii origin. Three 'dubia' should certainly have been included from Porphyry's commentary on Pulemy's Harmonics.

Two of these fragments are printed by L. Edelstein in a review in 1950, 79; the first (if genuine) is not only unique as being a verbatim quotation, but also long enough to give an idea of the argument of Belrat against Diodorean work. It is ascribed to Panatii τον πειρόμενον to την την της καθημερινήν και μοναχήν λόγου και διεγερτήματος (p. 65 Düring). Who was this younger Panatiius? K. Ziegler (RE s.v.) would distinguish him from Ziegler, who, it is supposed at least, by Suidas διώτροφον in contrast with an otherwise unknown (and it is to be feared fictitious) Rhodian philosopher. The subject-matter, too, suits him as a pupil of Diogenes of Babylonia (who wrote πυθμοιδές), and the citation of Plato's Republic as a Platonic source. Plato is referred to (Tim.) in a fragment not noted by Ziegler or Edelstein: βεβαιος δ' τω προειρημένου και Πανατιου ἄποδεξε οὗτος καὶ ἀπότομος ἔρευσθηνα... καθέρτιστον τῶν διεγερτημάτων κατακεκτημένον (p. 96). But on the whole this page tends to emphasize the weakness of the whole assumption Can Panatiius the mathematician be the Panatiius? Perhaps, if Porphyry supposed that an author with such a title must have been a mathematician.

F. H. SANDBACH.


Porter's very popular edition of the Aretus, now edits the Dion, which, as he points out in his preface, 'has hitherto lacked an annotated edition in English'. No scholarly edition has, so far as I am aware, been published in any language, for that of R. de Roca, Rev. 2, Florence, (1940) is for a practical and is to-day redundant. The Dion is to-day among the most widely studied of the Lives. It is of special interest to Platonists because of Dion's associations with Plato and the Academy; it is a major source for Sicilian history in the fourth century; it is among the most brilliant of all the Lives, and the same time illustrates the weakness of Plutarch as a biographer. An edition has long been needed, and Porter's work is to be warmly welcomed.

The longest section of the introduction deals with the vexed question of the sources. This survey contains nothing startlingly new, but is admirably clear and sound, especially on Timotheos. It may be doubted whether, in view of the state of recent work on the Platonic Epistles, there is any necessity to refute the argument of Belrat against Diodorean work. An addendum to this section rejects, rightly in my view, the hypothesis that the chapters on Dion in Diodorus xvi are derived from Thopompos. That of K. Ziegler is printed without much alteration. Among the few conjectures of the editor διώκεται δ' ἀναπτομένου for διώκεται δ' ἀναπτομένου (23, 4) is noteworthy. The commentary is mainly historical, though difficult of interpretation, as well as linguistic, syntactical, and stylistic. Seven Supplementary Notes on matters demanding fuller discussion are inserted at appropriate points in the commentary. This system is perhaps preferable to the grouping of these discussions in a series of appendices, but has some disadvantages. Because the influence of the Academy on the subject of Supplementary Note V, his project reform of the Syracusan constitution is dealt with after chapter 21, though Plutarch does not mention it until 53. 2-5 (where the commentary contains no reference to this discussion).

In far too many cases the references to passages in ancient and modern works are incomplete. It is not helpful to the reader to be informed that the date genealogy for the death of Dion is to be found in the Osyynchos (sic) Papyrus (this chronographical papyrus is Ox, Pap. 1, 12). On p. 69 there are six incomplete references. The introduction and Supplemental Notes do not in every respect, would have been easier to follow had not the paragraphs been so short. Pp. 93-4 contains twenty-three completed paragraphs, of which only four consist of more than two sentences. The notes on 3. 1-2 and 38. 4 conflict on the year in which Dionysius II became king: in the manuscript Parmen Peromae date, which is undoubtedly false. The number of misprints is not excessive.

It is to be hoped that Professor Porter will now write a historical study of this field, for which he is admirably equipped. The only modern monograph, that of R. von Schellin (Dion, 1934), is unsatisfactory.

H. D. WESTLAKE.


Dr. Holden in the nineteenth century edited seven of Plutarch's Lives, and his (1896) was red in 1939, and on the present century continues to give to his favourite author. The Gracchi, the Anemid, the Lycurgus, and the Catoh motor have all found modern editors; Professor Porter has given us annotated editions of the Aretus and the Dion; from Italy we already have (with Diez and C. Wolf) the Cato, and it is likely that this edition of the Flaminius should also appear in Italy.

An Roman master stands on Grecian ground, And to the concourse of the Isthanian games He, by his herald's voice, aloud proclaims The Liberty of Greece.

Plutarch's Flaminius is of value as a source for the history of Rome's relations with Greece at the end of the third, and the beginning of the second century, B.C. A school edition of the Life, edited by Sieffert and Blass, appeared in 1876: since then much valuable work has been done (by Holleaux, Aymard, Diez, Gervini, Walbank) on the period with which the Flaminius deals. Gervini's edition (1934) and Porter's work are to be held, however, not because this is the only edition, but because the whole problem is of fundamental importance. The question of Plutarch's sources, for example, is not adequately treated; in this connection, the important remark la leon principe résta sempre Polibio is not illuminating: one article on the sources by R. E. Smith (CQ 1944) is mentioned, but another (CQ 1945) is omitted; neither is there any discussion of an article by Bondi in L'Antichita 1952, which seeks to show that the annalist, Valerius Antias, was the source of the non-Polibian part of the biography.

The introduction is brief, but the Commentary is even briefer. A total of seventy notes works out at three to four per chapter. In chapter 1 nothing is said, though some information would seem desirable, on the great statue of Apollo brought from Carthage; in chapter 2 no comment is made on Plutarch's obvious error in making Flaminius (a patrician) prince of the tribe of Labinius. Plutarch's three works on the tributaries of the Tiber are not mentioned in his account of these many similar omissions. Plutarch's idiom is sometimes strange and often difficult, but the commentary gives little or no help on points of grammar or syntax. The translation in the Supplements occurs at about half, e.g., at 4, 3, 40, 19, 53, 2, 4, 1, it is preferable to Perrin's in the Loeb edition. There are some misprints; most of them will not cause difficulty, but Kofoed passion should be Kofoed, and E. T. Griffith (p. 36) is surely G. T. Griffith. The bibliography should have included the well-known works and Walbank's Philip V of Macedon (Cambridge, 1949).

M. DUGGAN.


This book is published by the Faculty of Letters of the University of Strasbourg for the use of students: as the preface points out, it thus prolongs an old tradition, since the Dialogi Deorum were included in the syllabus when the teaching of

The conception of fundamental leading currents in the grammatical thought of the Greeks, the Romans and the mediaeval grammarians, and concludes with a description of the views of modern linguistics on the main problems involved. These are two-fold: first, that of the basis, theoretical or empirical, which language has, and second, the attitude which the grammarian should then adopt to the facts which his study has disclosed (centring in antiquity about the analogy: anomaly). Grammar, for the first half—has largely been given to the Greeks, because of their pioneer work and intrinsic importance.

The main points at issue are well set out, the style is eminently readable, and the book will make a useful introduction to its subject.

It would have been well to remark that unfortunately the Greeks did not make a scientific study of other languages; nor did they formulate a truly historical picture of their own language. But what did most damage was their inaccurate word-analysis, which bedevilled Greek and Roman etymology and stood in the way of a scientific treatment of language development. The author shows, the theoretical basis of much of the Greek grammatical work is now called into question, yet its practical success, especially in the establishment of the parts of speech, is incontrovertible. This, too, despite the often logical rather than formal basis of differentiation. Sometimes in this book the failure of the logical approach is over-stressed; so on p. 28, with reference to the Stoic view that a verb needs a subject to make a complete utterance. This view is perfectly true and valuable within wide limits, and is exemplified by almost all written language (which was the primary concern of their analysis). Its inadequacy is, of course, most evident when we deal with colloquial speech. But to say that the question of completion 'has nothing to do with its logical form' is over-statement. The mechanistic outlook appears in the sharp criticism (p. 92) of the 'conception of language as "expressing thought"' or "expressing idea"', which not everyone could accept unreservedly.

A subject index is desirable. On p. 32 l. 8 read particip for particle; on p. 44 l. 22, understanding for undertaking; on p. 52 l. 17, words for works.


In his inaugural lecture, here printed with the addition of references to the evidence it presents, his professor Jones demonstrates that whether or not the policies advocated by Demosthenes were in other respects the best policies for Athens there were at least good economic reasons for the failure of the Athenians to do all that they asked them to do.

In the conclusion (on which the above article by his former pupil G. de Sainte Croix has since been published in Classica et Mediaevalis, 1953). He argues convincingly that 6000 talents was the total declared value of the property of those Athenians who owned enough to be liable for deëppôs, that 35 minae was the minimum taxable capital, that deëppôs was not a progressive tax but was levied at a fixed rate, that over a period of years it was equivalent to an income tax of not more that 6d. in the pound, without making any allowance for underassessment or concealment, but that the way in which it was levied made it bear heavily on those whose property did not greatly exceed the minimum—which is why the assembly was so very reluctant to vote a levy (for he argues that relatively well-to-do citizens attended the assembly and bore a disproportional amount of the tax). That is one reason why Athenian military efforts in this period were too small a scale or too spasmodic to achieve solid results.

The idea that the ancient world might well include the one which has in the Bible and of a document is surely extravagant; their employment for legal documents is sufficient to show that it was not at least a common practice. And it is perhaps a pity that Dr. Moule so warmly commends Moulton and Mil ligan's Grammar of the Greek N.T.; attractive as it is, it leaves out of sight many important theories and results.

The book, therefore, is a boon to students and a departure from the overwhelming majority of Latin grammars which do not even attempt to present a comprehensive account of the grammatical structure of the text. It is a book in which a reader can find what is known about the language of the New Testament, and what is not known.

The complete grammatical treatment of the Greek N.T. is a departure from the overwhelming majority of Latin grammars which do not even attempt to present a comprehensive account of the grammatical structure of the text. It is a book in which a reader can find what is known about the language of the New Testament, and what is not known.

The complete grammatical treatment of the Greek N.T. is a departure from the overwhelming majority of Latin grammars which do not even attempt to present a comprehensive account of the grammatical structure of the text. It is a book in which a reader can find what is known about the language of the New Testament, and what is not known.

The complete grammatical treatment of the Greek N.T. is a departure from the overwhelming majority of Latin grammars which do not even attempt to present a comprehensive account of the grammatical structure of the text. It is a book in which a reader can find what is known about the language of the New Testament, and what is not known.
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considerable scale was impossible or at least incompatible with the maintenance of the established democratic institutions, since these absorbed a large part of the ordinary revenues (though the crown’s part in this is not suggested or shown in an article in Past and Present 1, 1952), with peacetime expenditure on defence forming another big item. These were the facts that Demosthenes failed to face—until it was too late (which is not to say that earlier recognition of them would have made it any easier for him to organise successful resistance to Philip).

It is to be hoped that publication of this salutary lecture will stimulate further study of Athens and the Greek world in the fourth century, a period which has long been unduly neglected by British scholars (though Cambridge has furnished some exceptions). As this lecture shows, there is much that needs to be reconsidered in older work on this period.

C. Roodwald.


In the first part of his inaugural lecture Professor Guthrie speaks in defence of the classical scholar’s approach to ancient philosophy. It is his purpose to get to know the ancient thinkers as individuals, rather than to single out what seems true and important in the light of later experience; and he will view the philosophy of the Greeks in connexion with their language and literature (or, if they are barbarians, in connexion with some larger cultural unit), rather than with later doctrines, even those inspired by Greek precedents, or with the philosophy of the present day.

Here the reader may, I think, be inclined to ask, why not both? Is it beyond the capacity of the scholarly mind to view Greek philosophy in relation to the culture from which it sprang, and at the same time to appreciate the historical significance of the texts, and their indelible value as patterns of thought? This, and perhaps already been done in the past by the best scholars in their more enlightened moments; what has happened to render it impossible?

Presumably the classical scholar and the historically minded philosopher have one aim in common—to discover what an ancient thinker really meant—but the latter has an additional purpose, for he wishes to understand the influence which a doctrine has exercised, and also to judge whether it is in fact true. Now it is clear, and experience confirms, that each approach, pursued to the exclusion of the other, has its risks. The philosophical writer too often claims to be exempt from the labour of interpretation, and to know intuitively what an ancient thinker must be trying to say. But the classical scholar, on his side, may tend to paint in the background so minutely that it begins to appear that the thinker was bound to say what he did say. The reasons from which he supposed his own doctrines to follow, and which he recommends to the acceptance of others, will then lose their force, and philosophy will be a blank. If philosophy happens to be that of Plato or Aristotle. The moral of this is that, while industry and imagination are the first requisites if one intends to understand ancient philosophical texts, they alone are not enough; they need to be balanced by some reflections on the problems themselves. And in a comparison of methods, such as is here attempted, there might at least have been some allusion to this danger inherent in the ‘classical’ approach.

The examples and illustrations which Professor Guthrie has given—the spokes of the wheel—seem to be loosely connected with one another and with the methodical disposition in the first part of the lecture. I should like to comment upon one of them. Referring to the Islamic achievement in preserving the Greek philosophical heritage, Professor Guthrie remarks that as can be seen at present, the Arabic writings must be viewed as an independent continuation of Greek philosophy in its final phase, not simply as a quarry from which lost Greek masterpieces may be recovered. The warning is useful and should be heeded: that it fell to the philosophers, in the thirteenth century, to reassert the Hellenic heritage in face of developments whereby the sense of human individuality would have been lost.

D. Allan.


This is not a new book, but a reprint with slight changes and a preface. It is an old one: the first edition came out at Bologna in 1921. It is therefore not necessary nor indeed fair to criticise it in full detail; there are statements here and there which if the author were now making them for the first time would call for comment, but these are not many, for fundamentally sane views concerning the religion of Greece have not altered much since the twenties of this century. One or two little slips on matters of fact (as p. 195: Hagesandros, still alive when Brasidas took Amphipolis, could not yet have had a hero-cult there) might have been corrected with advantage, however. One misstatement, or misprint, is not the author’s but the printer’s or publisher’s, and is not in the text but in the ‘Murb’; Professor Pettazzoni was born in 1893, not 1893.

The introduction, I understand, is to appear separately in an English version in a volume of opuscula to be published before long. It handles, with moderation, sound judgement, and wide knowledge of the facts, the matter of the historical origins of Greek religion. The general framework is of course, as it must be, the story of how two cultures, that of the invaders and that of the pre-Achaian inhabitants of Greece, met and mingled. But little is written that is likely to mislead or distort the picture. The author is well aware that if he calls the ‘Pelasgian’ culture matriarchal, he is using a conventional term (p. 12, n. 7); I would almost say that the term is now devoid of content. He also knows (p. 13) how we are condemned to limitations, he yet endeavours to analyse the compound and tries, with a considerable measure of success, to assign to each element those features which are its own. I find things which I personally would have stated otherwise, but very little which I consider fundamentally misstated.

H. J. Rose.


This is No. 582 of a series called Que sais-je? which rapidly pours out popularised information on subjects as varied as jazz and bull-fighting and the early days of Christianity. The small size of the volumes forbids any full discussion of the views of their authors on disputable points, as also the addition of anything like the apparatus of foot-notes and citations which a longer work would command. But this one is left with no means of correcting the slips into which even the most accurate writer sometimes falls. In this work, p. 5 makes the too sweeping statement that all peoples have legends; the fact is that some appear to have none at all and others very few. The next page commits the author to the very improbable position that the legend, if we may call it one, of Horatius Cocles originated in a statue of a one-eyed daimon on the banks of the Tiber. A great deal of proof would be needed to show that the present statue of Apollo on the Capitol existed or were for a moment supposed to exist (see p. 7) de toute éternité; rather do the usages of individual or communities seem to be the result of decisions taken by the gods from time to time. P. 12: since the cult of Asklepios is given the title of a god it must be shown to exist earlier than about 500 B.C. (Edelestein, Asclepius ii, p. 98), it is idle to dream of a prehistoric population bringing it from Thessaly to Epidaurus. P. 15: it is not quite accurate to speak of Ovid publishing the Metamorphoses, cf. Text. 14, 19, 24. On the same page, it is very far from beyond doubt that Apollodoros the mythographer is an epitome of anything by Apollodoros of Athens. P. 57 makes the old mistake, put right by Nilsson, of supposing that it is at sowing time that the Thracian hero departs for the lower world. P. 60: while it is true that there is ‘une légende cohérente entre le “biographic” de Dionysos’, this is no proof that he brought with him any considerable body of myth. A comparative late-comer, he was fitted into what was already rapidly becoming a grand system of mythology. P. 90: the story that Prometheus, in Aeschylus, becomes ‘un redempteur universel’, and that the trilogy (in the existence of which C. believes; I do not) was a sort of Gospel.

These are details. Of the general scope of such a book is to tell a selection of the myths and sagas, which is done clearly and well, the only weak point being that occasionally a late or aberrant detail is introduced without warning, and to say something of the way in which they were modified by literary influences (p. 112 is especially good on this point), and not a systematisation (pp. 101 f.). On p. 103 the author correctly points out the contribution to the legends as we know them made by élémens folkloriques, i.e. mères-thèmes. A short final chapter gives some account of modern mythological studies; it is for the most part good, but the vagaries of Dumézil are taken much too seriously.

H. J. Rose.
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Archäologie: I. Einleitung; Historischer Überblick.

The title of this book may be misleading to English readers. By stating that Rumpf means that we call Classical Archæology, the only ancient study of manuscript works—the one he candidly asserts—which has relevance for the Western world, and within this 'Archäologie' it is Art that is important. After the short Introduction the Historical Survey describes how 'Archäologie' has moved from the purely scientific and objective period of which Rumpf labels Antiquity (A.D. 550), the Middle Ages (A.D. 1350), the Renaissance (1550-1550), Baroque (1760-1770), and, like other European art, with the Great Excavations (1790-1914), and 'die neueste Zeit' (since 1914). The emphasis is naturally different in each section.

Most humanists are vague in their knowledge of this subject, important though it is. Rumpf has given an admirable account, refreshingly free of the usual and, perhaps, puerile invective, which has soured the literature of the subject. The two last sections are a little disappointing, as Rumpf begins to be discreet. He is just and generous in praise, but reticent in condemnation; and there is much in recent archaeological work that must be contested or even denounced before we can hope for reform. Again, Rumpf nowhere mentions of 'the neueste Zeit', though that two of its characteristics are a scholarly but indiscriminate specialization and a credulous admiration of Archæic art is suggested by the summary of its achievements. Among these, that of removing the figure from the excavation of the Athenian Agora (p. 125), since this is the first comprehensive excavation of a large ancient city. Finally, on p. 135, those who are distressed by the decay of taste in classical and Latin are offered a hope that will probably distress them even more.

Misprints, though frequent, are mostly trivial: on p. 126 l. 23 for 'Lemnos' read 'Lesbos'. There is a good index. The illustrations are well chosen and some of them enjoyable. The price is reasonable.

R. M. Cook.

Catalogue of Ancient Sculpture in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek.

The English version of the catalogue of the Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek, already widely known in the Danish edition of 1949, is very welcome. The translation is not quite perfect, and there are some misprints; but these are unimportant, and the English reads easily. Bibliography and, where necessary, description and identification are clear and complete (as a result of the studies of the present Director, V. H. Poulsen), and a few acquisitions since 1940 are included. The manuscript was completed at the time of Dr. Poulsen's death, and the book is a worthy monument to his years of research at the Glyptothek, and a worthy catalogue of one of the most important collections of ancient sculpture in Europe.

T. J. D.


These little books seem to be intended rather for the general public than for the specialist, but Scheodf is at the same time an informed introduction to original scholarship. He treats archaic Attic sculpture by original artists, of which he has found his way to incorporate one another and working on and worked on by the spirit of their time. The difficulty of this extremely valuable approach is one that is shared by Scheof himself: the paucity of material, which makes it a laborious task. However, the degree of connoisseurship is in accordance with the scholar's bulk of material sufficient to justly attempt such an attempt. Others, especially Payne, have already made important individual contributions, but Scheof is the first effort to plot the field as a whole. One may not agree with all his attributions and judgements, but it is at least true that his view of the best figures, and of their relation to each other and to their time, is essentially correct and adds greatly to our understanding of their art.

I particularly like the suggestion that the Master of the Moschophoros designed the Triton pediment. Scheof also seems to me right in maintaining against Payne Atanor's responsibility for the Delphi pediments. The rather neglected dying warrior of stele (p. 68) which Scheof, it seems to me, estimates at its true worth, I should, however, place nearer 540 than 520 and the Rampin Master than Atanor. There is a likeness between the Sabouroff head and Endoios's Athena in her present state strikes me as far-fetched; but perhaps Scheof is the same of my conviction that the Acropolis Kore head 643 (pl. 72) is the work of a new style and the reproduction doesn't lack clarity. This is a pity, as many of the photographs used were evidently excellent. Where reproduction improves from a reproduction, it is not the same as the reproduction, but is more disastrous.

The same criticisms apply to Schmalenbach's plates, and are more important since the text is little more than a slight introduction to the pictures. The best part seems to be the perception of new reasons for vases-painting's decline in the Classical age. Elsewhere the book altogether too simplified a picture of the development of style as a reflection of historical (political) developments. It is easy to criticise the selection of illustrations in such a book, but I will not blame the present writer, I think the book's object, in which the evolution of Greek vase-painting and of the heights it sometimes reached.

MARTIN ROBERTSON.

Die Gleichnisse Homer's und die Bildkunst jüngerer Zeit.

This Palatino collyque is built round a pot which recently found its way from Athens to Munich. It is a jug. Attic of the second half of the eighth century B.C. with the shoulder and neck are pictures done in opaque glaze on a lifeless ground, which seems in the photographs of the whole vase to contrast with the thinner glaze and brighten tone on the belly; the draughtsmanship in the pictures also. In comparison with the competent brush strokes of the bird's eye view below (note especially the 'inking in' of the interior of some of the human bodies). That the painter of these pictures was not accustomed to draw scenes of this sort is shown by the 'collisions' such as were normally avoided in Greek geometric painting and from various oddities—especially nautical ones like the polygonal rowing ports, the truncated steering oar, and the zigzagging of the horns of the winds. In the Iliad, similarly, the depth of the field of vision, combining a bird's-eye view with the horizontal plane, and the placing of a first-class narrative scene on the neck of a small jug show that what we have here is something out of the ordinary run.

The subject of the picture on the neck can pass without question. It is Odysseus, sitting astride the keel of his overturned ship, with his companions drowning around. If the painting dates, as Hampe maintains, to the full eighth century, it is of paramount interest, because it will be far more best known representation from the Odyssey and indeed easily the earliest recognisable mythological scene in Greek art. As such it would have an important bearing on the question of the date of the Odyssey and on the establishment of beliefs.

Hampe describes in this painting (and may it be in one or two others) a step beyond the traditional style of the big Dipylon vases in the direction of more complex grouping and arbitrary movement, and he explores the similes of the Iliad for significance correspondence, up to the stage being set, is occupied by a discussion of the notation, appositions, and uses of the similes; it contains many illuminating comments, though some of the most attractive of Hampe's ideas (like the successive stages indicated by the two similes that follow Agamemnon's ineptitude speech in Book II) do not square up to the Greek as it stands in our texts.

J. M. COOK.

La Géographie écclesiastique de l'empire byzantin.

Père Janin is undoubtedly one of the leading authorities today on the subject of the Geography of Constantinople. In 1950 he produced an admirable book on the siege, which has been discussed in detail the lay-out of the town and the whereabouts of the main monuments, more especially the secular ones; it has been followed this year by the work under review. However, the subject is in a way difficult for those with the ecclesiastical monuments only that the author is concerned. The field that will be dealt with, however, is much wider, for eventually the whole sphere of the Byzantine Empire will be considered. The volume under review is thus only volume III of a seven-volume study, to be undertaken in two parts. The other volumes of part I will deal with the 'Bishops and
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the patriarchate*, and *Patriarchal Ceremonies and the Episcopal Succession* respectively, while part II, in four volumes, will be concerned with the provincial organisations. Needless to say, this great enterprise will be the work of more than one author and the present volume, the first of the series to appear, contains a preface by Père Laurent outlining the plan of the work. But Père Janin's task is nevertheless considerable, and he has treated his subject with outstanding care and thoroughness.

The book is virtually an index, in alphabetical order, of all the churches and monasteries at Constantinople of which there is any mention of the texts. The names of as many as 485 churches and 325 monasteries and convents have been traced by Père Janin, and, though of course the records regarding many of them are scanty, those concerning others are often full. Seldom does an entry occupy much less than half a page; often they extend to several pages. When possible the old names are identified with existing monuments, and when this is done, a short description of the building and a summary of the archaeological and architectural literature concerning it is added.

The book will be of outstanding value to archaeologists working in Constantinople. The inclusion of an index of the present-day Turkish names would have been of assistance to such people. But perhaps the basic significance of the book most concerns the church historian. Constantinople was for many centuries the capital of Christendom, and the story of the religious foundations that were set up there will prove of the greatest interest. Père Janin is to be most sincerely congratulated on the completion of this most important work.

D. TALBOT RICE.


It has been repeatedly and rightly stated that it was the Orthodox Church that succeeded in keeping alive Greek national feeling in the long years of servitude after the fall of Constantinople in 1453, and fostered the spirit which finally led to the liberation of Greece. It is therefore fitting that the first volume of the Bibliotheca Graeca Aevi Posterioris, whose object is to provide a firm foundation for a critical investigation of the Post-Byzantine times*, should be dedicated to the history of the Greek church under Turkish domination.

In the first part of his study Mr. Papadopoulos gives an account of the history and administrative organisation of the Greek church in the period 1453-1800. The author, a master of the vast bibliography on the subject, makes a judicious use of his sources and gives a full and fair picture of the structure and significance of the Greek church in those times. In this part the concluding chapter *Effects of the Ecclesiastical Regime on the fortunes of Hellenism* (pp. 122 ff.) will interest both the historian of the church and the student of Greek and South-eastern European history in general.

The second part of Mr. Papadopoulos' study examines the patriarchate of Cyril V (1749-57). This, if of less general interest, is carefully done and throws light on the state of affairs in the Greek Orthodox Church of that period, and in particular on the controversy on the rebaptism of Roman Catholics, which had caused the rise of violent feeling in orthodox ecclesiastical circles in those days.

The third part of this study consists of the edition of a document by an unknown author in political verse called Lékáda laodiká, in which throws new light on the patriarchate of Cyril V and the controversy of the rebaptism. Its 3179 lines, composed in a pseudo-archaic idiom, have no literary and little linguistic value. They will mainly interest the ecclesiastical and social historians of the period. The text is carefully edited and followed by elaborate notes. In fact, far too many details are given in comparison with the importance of the text—even all the orthographical errors are noted in the apparatus! A full bibliography, two appendices (on bibliographical data and some minor text), and an index verboorum of the texts edited complete this interesting study.

C. A. TRYAPANIS.

BOOKS RECEIVED


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index to Volume LXXIV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Famagusta, excavations, 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishery, at Caunus, 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneva, Musée d’Art et d’Histoire, r.f. vases 12126, 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geran, early iron objects from, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold, in Homeric epics as form of wealth, 2; decorative use, 3; gold leaf, 4; pouring of liquid gold, 4; use for armour and tools, 5; for accessories in armour, 9; knowledge of source etc., 12 fl.; in metaphor, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greaves, Homeric, 8 f.; Mycenaean, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grotti (Cyprus), tombs at, 173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Apollo, response of, on inscription at Caunus, 86 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrow School, r.f. Apulian vase, 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads of women or Nike, on Apulian r.f. vases, 111 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hekateus as historian, 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellanica as historian, 50 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helmets: Homeric epithets for, 7 f.; Minoan-Mycenaean, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraia: discoveries at, 157; early coinage of, 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herakleion, museums, 166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesion: Shield of Heracles, 52; Theogony, 52 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histiae, inscriptions, 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History, development of writing of, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer, Iliad: fixing of established text, 51; structure illustrated by speeches, 122 ff.; detailed analysis by books, 194 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeric hymns, 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeric metal work, 1 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ialysos, bronze cheekpiece from, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibykos, date of visit to Samos, 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imbros, metrical epitaph, 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Incuse</em> coinages of S. Italy, 42 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscriptions Graecae: II, addenda and corrigenda, 64 f.; III, addenda and corrigenda, 66 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ida, graves of, 159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron in Homeric epics as form of wealth, 1 f.; use for armour, 5; for weapons, 10 ff.; for tools, 5, 10 ff.; knowledge of source etc., 12 fl.; in metaphor, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iskender (Cyprus), excavations, 173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isocrates, effect aimed at by, 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy, Greek inscriptions from, 77 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itaca, earthquake damage to museums, 163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaklaka (Cyprus), excavations, 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalymnos, tomb at, 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khalandritsa, excavations, 157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karphi, bronze cist from, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kassope, excavations, 159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katsamb (Crete), excavations, 166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kephallenia, earthquake damage to Museum, 163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerameikos, bronze and iron objects found together, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkaya: excavations, 165; new Museum, 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khatia, tombs at, 169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiliks, excavations, 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimos, excavations, 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kleomenes, formation of anti-Spartan League by, 32 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoæos, excavation of tomba, 166 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokkinokrenmos (Cyprus), discoveries at, 173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korinna, inscriptions from, 157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kouklia, excavations, 172, 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kritsa (Crete), excavations, 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kruma (Cyprus), excavations, 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrena, excavations, 173 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Ostrovo, grave circle, 159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laodicca (Nehavend), edict of Antiochus III from, 83 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larissa, excavations, 158 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larnaca, excavations, 173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larymna, vases from, 157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecce: r.f. vases, 840, 119; 842, 120; 860, 116; 861, 118; 863, 118; 864, 116; 865, 116; 866, 121; 867, 121; 869, 116, 118; 870, 116, 118; 940, 118; 941, 118; 942, 116, 118; 970, 118; 979, 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leiden, Rijksmuseum Van Oudheden, r.f. vase G.N.V. 109, 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemnos, inscriptions, 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lerna, excavations, 153 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libanias, relations with family of Argyrios, 44 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limassol: terracottas from, 173 f.; Roman tombs, 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature, development of, 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Museum: Terracottas, 1933, 4–10, 1–2, 177; Vases, F 285, 111, 114; F 339, 116; F 349, 116; F 365, 111; F 445, 116; F 447, 116; F 544, 111, 114; F 549, 111, 114; 59–2–16 82, 117; 59–2–18 83, 114; 1949–10–1, 114; 1951–2–4, 117; 1951–2–4, 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia, inscriptions from, 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lygdamus, tyrant of Naxos, 36 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lysimachus, negotiations with Antigonos, 26 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyttos (Crete), excavations, 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia, inscriptions from, 71 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makryphia, excavations, 156 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mâlia, excavations, 167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malthi, bronze and iron objects found together at, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester Museum: r.f. vases IV C 2, 116; IV C 3, 116; M.W. 1-069, 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantinea, separate coinage of, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marathon, late arrival of Spartans at, 32 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics, influence of on philosophy, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine, influence of on philosophy, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megara: excavations, 157; inscriptions, 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne National Gallery of Victoria, r.f. vase 1795, 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Méniko (Cyprus), excavations, 173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messene, discoveries at, 157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messenians, revolt of, 490, 32 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal-working in Homer, 1 f.; overlaying of one metal on another, 4; <em>painting in metal</em>, 3 f.; and see bronze, gold, iron, silver, tin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan, r.f. vase 2707, 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minoan script, research on, 63 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycenae: excavations, 151 f., 170 f.; finds of ivory, 170 f.; finds of Linear B tablets, 171; inscriptions, 69; restoration work, 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mytilene, inscriptions from, 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nauplion, excavations, 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naxos, inscriptions, 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoptolemus, King of Epirus, 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicosia, Museum acquisitions, 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikopolis, sculpture from, 159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Africa, Greek inscriptions from, 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odobianus, son of Argyrios, career of, 45 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oedipus, in Sophocles’ Oedipus Colonus, 16 ff.; 23 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympia: bronze objects among votives, 11; excavations, 155 f.; inscriptions, 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olynth (Cyprus), excavations, 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oslo, Kunstmuseum, r.f. vase O.K. 6226, 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oorhoene, bath inscription from, 179 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostraka, from Athenian Agora, 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, r.f. vase 485, 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palaioáylos (Cyprus), discoveries at, 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine, Greek inscriptions, 82 f.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Pallene, date of Battle of, 96 f.
Palmyra, Greek inscriptions from, 82
Pammphilia, inscriptions from, 80 f.
Panathenaeae, recitation of Homeric poems at, 51
Paramythia, excavations, 159
Paris, Musée Rodin: r.f. vases inv. TC 547, 117; inv. TC 553, 117
Paros, inscriptions from, 75
Patras, museum acquisitions, 157
Peace of 311, historical circumstances of, 25 ff.
Perachora, bronze and iron objects found together at, 11
Pergamos (Cyprus), archaic sculpture from, 174
Pfey (Cyprus), excavations, 175
Phaistos, excavations, 168 f.
Pharsala, excavations, 158
Phigaleia, Old, discoveries at, 157
Philosophy, development of, 49 f.
Phokis: early coinage of, 33; end of thalassocracy, 40
Phrygia, inscriptions from, 80
Physicus, inscriptions from, 71
Pitch and resin, import and export duties on at Caunos, 104
Pittsburgh, Carnegie Museum: r.f. vases, Scribner pl. XL 10, 117; Scribner pl. XLI 3, 114
Plataia tripod, 33 f.
Plato, Republic, recitation of, 54
Polyeuctes, victory over Antigonus, 25 f.
Poetry, earliest collections of, 51 ff.
Polykrates, tyrant of Samos, 36 ff.
Pomos (Cyprus), excavations, 173
Pért-Ráphi, excavations, 147
Praxias (Crete), tombs at, 168
Prose works, recitation of, 53 f.
Ptolemais, excavations, 158
Ptolemy: relations with Antigonus, 25 ff.; rift with Cassander, 28; desertion of Seleucus, 29 f.
Pyllos, excavations, 154 f.
Pythagoras, date of leaving Samos, 42

R

Rafina, excavations, 147
Ravilà Degen, quarry at, 168
Reading: Museum, Attic, r.f. kylix from the Thames, 178; University Museum, r.f. vases, 49.VIII.2, 114:
51-7, 13, 119; 87-35, 32, 119
Religious function of Greek tragedy, 16 ff.
Retaliation in Oedipus Coloneus, 17 f.
Rhodes excavations, 165; inscriptions, 74 f.
Rhókois of Samos, 40 f.
Rome: Greek inscriptions from, 78; Villa Gullia, r.f. vase 17615, 117

S

Salamis (Cyprus), excavations, 175
Salonika: museum acquisitions, 161; excavations, 159 f.
Salt, tax on, at Caunos, 100 f.
Samos: excavations, 164; inscriptions, 76; duration of Tyranny, 36 ff.
Samothrake: excavations, 161 f.; inscriptions, 76
Sardis, date of fall of, 36
Scepsis inscription, 25 f.
Scythia, inscriptions, 74
Scythopolis, treason trial at, 45
Seleucia, exclusion of from Peace of, 311, 25 ff.
Sermis, sculptures from, 160
Shields: Homeric, 8; Minoan-Mycenaean, 6
Shield of Achilles, 3 f.
Ships, tax on construction of, at Caunos, 105 f.
Sicily, inscriptions from, 77
Silk, excavations, 151
Silver, in Homeric epics: as form of wealth, 2; decorative use, 3 f.; armour and tools, 5; armour accessories, 9; knowledge of source, etc., 12 ff.; in metaphor, 13
Singitic Gulf, sculptures from, 160
Sitíeia (Crete), excavations, 168
Soloi (Cyprus), Roman tomb, 175
Sophocles, Oedipus Coloneus, 16 ff.
Sophists, in the fourth century, 47 f.
Sparta: inscriptions, 99; dedication at Olympia, 32
Speeche, in the Iliad, 122 ff.
Stavroloupolis, tomb at, 160 f.
Stock epithets, 7 f.
Stoke-on-Trent, Museum: r.f. vase 241 P 35, 114
Stymphalos, Elatean decree, 69
Sutton Hoo, tinned bronze plates from, 2
Sybrita (Crete), discoveries at, 169
Syracuse, inscriptions from, 77
Syria, Greek inscriptions from, 81 f.
Syros, inscriptions from, 75

T

Tanagra, Christian poem from, 70
Taranto: r.f. vases, 2966, 119; 3008, 119
Tegea, hostility to Sparta, 344.
Tell el-Amarna Tablets, weapons described in, 10
Tenos: excavations, 164; inscriptions, 75
Tepe Giyan, bronze and iron objects found together at, 10
Tepe Sialk, bronze and iron objects found together at, 10
Thasos: excavations, 161; inscriptions, 76
Thebes: excavations, 157; inscriptions, 70
Theodorus of Samos, 44
Theognis collection of Gnomae, 53
Theseus, in Oedipus Coloneus, 23 f.
Theseus: discoveries, 157; bronze and iron fibula, 3
Theseprotkon, discoveries, 159
Thessalonica, inscriptions from, 72
Theseus, inscriptions from, 71
Theseus, inscriptions from, 75 f.
Thucydides: criticisms by Dionysius, 54; criticisms by Marcellinus, 54 f.
Tin: decorative use of, in Homeric epics, 2 f.; armour and tools, 5; Homeric epithets for, 9
Toronto: r.f. vases, 395, 113; 396, 116; 449, 119; 461, 114; 470, 118
Triones, first used by Samians, 39
Truro, Cornwall County Museum, Apulian r.f. vase, 119

V

Várkiza, excavations, 148
Vase-epigraphy, 62, 65, 72
Vase-painters: Birth of Dionysos, 121; Fithos, 178;
Sisyphos, 121
Vathyvetro (Crete), excavations, 167
Vathyrykákis (Cyprus), tomb-group from, 173
Vatican: r.f. vases, V 48, 120; V 55, 120; V 57, 111;
V 59, 120; V 65, 120; V 66, 117; V 15, 111; Z 26, 119
Vergina, excavations, 159
Village-organisation, in Asia Minor, 87 f.
Vitsiliã (Crete), discoveries at, 166
Voûla, excavations, 148

W

Warrior Vase, type of corset on, 6
Western Greece, Greek inscriptions from, 78
Writing, history of, 63
Würzburg: r.f. vases, 863, 116; 868, 118

Z

Zakynthos, earthquake damage to antiquities, 165
Zankle, renaming of, 32
Zenobius, relations with family of Argyripus, 44, 46
Zeus: in Aeschylus, 18 f.; association with Erinyes, 19 ff.; with Moira, 22 f.; in Sophocles, 21
Zeus Naos, cult of, 56 ff.
Zithikonas (Cyprus), terracottas from, 174
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